United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 145 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, OCTOBER 18, 1999 No. 141

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
October 18, 1999.

I hereby appoint the Honorable CASS BALLENGER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. McDevitt, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 659. An act to authorize appropriations for the protection of Paoli and Brandywine Battlefields in Pennsylvania, to direct the National Park Service to conduct a special resource study of Paoli and Brandywine Battlefields, to authorize the Valley Forge Museum of the American Revolution at Valley Forge National Historical Park, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2990. An act 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; 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; and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 2990) ''An Act 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; 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; and for other purposes,'' requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. GREGG, Mr. FRIST, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. ENZI, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DODD, Mr. HARKIN, Ms. MIKULSKI, and Mr. ROCKEFELLER, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 548. An act to establish the Fallen Timbers Battlefield and Fort Miamis National Historical Site in the State of Ohio.

S. 762. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study to determine the national significance of the Miami Circle site in the State of Florida as well as the suitability and feasibility of its inclusion in the National Park System as part of Biscayne National Park, and for other purposes.

S. 938. An act to eliminate restrictions on the acquisition of certain land contiguous to Hawaii Volcanoes National Park, and for other purposes.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

PAIN RELIEF PROMOTION ACT OF 1999

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, this week H.R. 2260, the so-called Pain Relief Promotion Act will be brought to the floor of this chamber. The bill's supporters say passage will result in more humane treatment of terminally-ill patients. Tragically, they are mistaken.

This bill's passage will do two things. It will overturn Oregon's death with dignity law, and it will undermine the rights of States to establish medical standards. It also puts law enforcement agencies in the position of second-guessing one of the most difficult medical decisions faced by doctors: how to best alleviate the pain terminally-ill patients suffer, whether or not that treatment involves life-ending decision-making.

Congress is frequently put in a position of judging whether to intervene in the States' decisions. Some judgments are relatively easy to make. For example, we now have reached the point where most people are comfortable with the Federal Government protecting against racial discrimination. Such was not always the case. Many decisions, however, are very much in a

Printed on recycled paper.

gray area, which some choose, unfortunately, to use for political reasons. One such gray area, the issues that affect the end-of-life decisions, is not only difficult but personal.

In my State of Oregon we have struggled, debated, and agonized with this issue throughout the last decades. The end-of-life issue is a very complex one. With the advent of new medical technologies, it is becoming even more challenging. There are a wide range of moral and medical issues associated with end-of-life decisions, but none that require Federal interference. Yet Congress is being asked to pass legislation that would undermine a law passed and subsequently upheld not once but twice by a vote of the citizens of Oregon.

Now, our death with dignity legislation is still a work in progress, but the preliminary evidence suggests that this option may actually reduce the incidence of suicide. Rather than having a flood of people to our State to take advantage of the provisions of the law, it appears that individuals having the knowledge that they, their families, and their doctor can control this situation, gives them a sense of peace and contentment that enables many to move forward, enduring the pain and the difficulty without resorting to taking their own life. It may actually reduce the incidence of suicide.

As Americans struggle with these issues, mostly hidden from public view, it is important that we not have the personal tragedy, that agony, that frustration made more difficult by laws that ignore the range of legitimate medical choices.

There are some very serious technical problems with this legislation. It would interfere with the practice of medicine, of pharmacy, of pain management in ways that can have a profound effect on the rights that many in America take for granted. This is why a large number of medical professionals have come forward in opposition to this legislation.

This bill asks law enforcement agencies, not doctors, law enforcement agencies, to make, on a case-by-case basis, judgment as to whether a doctor intended a terminally-ill patient's death while trying to alleviate pain. Asking nonmedical personnel to determine a doctor's intent and subsequent causal connection is neither appropriate nor is it even practical. The threat of these investigations can have a chilling effect open the treatment of pain.

Now, at the same time, some medical boards can and have imposed sanctions on doctors, including in Oregon, for not treating pain aggressively enough. So here we have put physicians in an impossible situation: On one hand nonmedical activities second-guessing them and being sanctioned; on the other hand for not being aggressive enough.

Today, doctors help deal with end-of-life decisions everywhere in America; and, in some cases, I guaranty that every day in America there are the equivalent of physician-assisted suicides. In every State but Oregon people look the other way. Oregon stands out because we have at least attempted to provide a framework. If this misguided legislation were to be passed, ironically, Oregon, the only State with guidelines where we are trying to deal with it, would be subjected to extraordinary scrutiny. Elsewhere, people would continue to look the other way.

I strongly urge the defeat of this ironically termed Pain Relief Promotion Act before it undermines not only the will of the people of Oregon, but also before it damages the sanctity of the doctor-patient decision-making process and erodes quality end-of-life medical treatment.

REPUBLICANS HAVE ACCOMPLISHED A LOT BUT STILL NEED PRESIDENT'S HELP

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, last week President Clinton in his press conference attacked the Republican Senators for their courageous stance against a poorly designed nuclear test ban treaty, a test ban treaty that was unverifiable. A lot of the nations had not signed it yet, and a lot of rogue nations never intend to comply with it. But, more importantly, during that press conference he posed a question, ''What will happen if the Republicans stay in office?'' I am here on the floor this morning, and I feel compelled to answer his question.

Mr. Speaker, let me remind the President of some of the past accomplishments of the Republican Party here in Congress, which unlike the ill-advised test ban treaty are actually good for America. If we can be judged by our past, a lot of good things for America will occur in the future if we stay in power. Let me just take a few moments to talk about what we have accomplished.

One of the first orders of business when we took over here in Congress was to declare that Congress would comply with all the laws and statutes which all Americans also have to comply with. We reduced the bloated size of committee staff here in Congress by one-third and added to that a ban on gifts from special interests here in Congress.

We reformed the bloated inefficient welfare system, which held captive many Americans who only wanted a better life for themselves and their families. We provided welfare-to-work incentives for both individuals and businesses. And the Republican-led Congress has succeeded in dropping the welfare rolls to the lowest level in history.

The majority here passed health insurance portability, guaranteeing working Americans that if they switched jobs or if they lost their job they could continue with their current health coverage.

We reformed the Food and Drug Administration, giving people quicker access to life-saving drugs and medical devices and provided for better food quality.

The Republican controlled Congress got tough on criminals by enhancing penalties for sexual crimes against children, and established a Nationwide tracking system for sexual predators. We also enhanced punishment for drug-induced rape.

Education was enhanced by giving local districts more say in how the money that they had was spent on teaching their children.

We also provided tax relief and allowed for health insurance deductions for small businesses.

We developed medical savings accounts so Americans can better decide how to provide for their health care. We also protected elderly patients from being evicted from nursing homes.

The Republican majority strengthened our national defense by increasing pay and retirement benefits, long overdue for our military; enhancing health care for veterans; and providing for a military which this administration has grossly underfunded and, I believe, forsaken.

Let us not forget the budget. The Republicans passed the Balanced Budget Act and bound our appropriations bills to spending caps. Now, this is the first time in 30 years that this was done. The Congressional Budget Office last week released its monthly budget review and the Federal Government's on-budget accounts, which excludes Social Security, are running a $1 billion surplus for the year. Again, Mr. Speaker this, is the first time in 30 years. The majority party in Congress are to be commended.

Now, this is probably not new to the average American family, who also has to balance their budget and make their payments without going into deficits every year.

It is interesting that when President Clinton pushed the largest tax increase in history and passed that on to the American public, incidently he got it passed here very narrowly, that same year he could not balance the budget when the Democrats were in control in Congress. The Republican majority passed a lockbox measure, which declared $1.8 trillion of the Social Security surplus untouchable. But what is amazing is that the President refused to join with us in this budget process to protect this lockbox. He is proposing brand new spending at the same time we are trying to balance the budget and protect Social Security.

Now, the Democrats, when they were in control, when they were in control, spent $837 billion of the Social Security money for new spending programs. Now

they claim they want to save it. I remind my colleagues we have to remember when the Democrats were in control they spent all the Social Security surplus. In fact, the last year they controlled Congress they spent over $130 billion from the Social Security Trust Fund.

We are trying to do a great deal around here. We need the help of the President. We have stood for much needed legislation on welfare reform, better health care, better education, tougher criminal penalties, tax relief, a stronger defense, a balanced budget, and, lastly, Social Security protection for our seniors. So I believe, contrary to what the President said in the press conference, the Republicans have done an excellent job for Americans in trying to save this republic and bring accountability. I need to remind the President that great things will occur for the American people if Republicans stay in office.

And in the future, I think we can look for great things for all America, but I remind the President that we need his help too.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 43 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

Of all the virtues that we desire, we pray, O gracious God, for a grateful heart for the gifts of life and the opportunities of each day. For a nation where we can live in liberty and freedom, for colleagues and friends who encourage us, for mothers and fathers, sisters and brothers who love us and forgive us, for the blessings of faith and the gifts of hope, we offer this prayer of gratitude and thanksgiving. In Your name, O God, we humbly pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House her approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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 Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. TRAFICANT 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.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 15, 1999.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted to Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on October 15, 1999 at 11:10 a.m.

That the Senate Agreed to conference report H.R. 2684; that the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 3036.

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

JEFF TRANDAHL,
Clerk of the House.

ORVILLE MAJORS DESERVES DEATH

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Madam Speaker, Orville Majors was convicted for killing patients in an Indiana hospital. Majors is now also accused of killing another 130 patients in hospitals. And after all this, Majors got life in prison.

Think about it. Majors will get three square meals a day, television, free health care, activity in exercise rooms. Beam me up, Madam Speaker. Orville Majors should not be given life; Orville Majors should be given death. It is no wonder America continues to have 17,000 murders a year. The truth is, America tolerates murderers like Orville Majors.

I yield back the unheard screams of 136 American victims.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair announces that she 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 votes on postponed questions will be taken after debate has concluded on all motions to suspend the rules, but not before 6 p.m. today.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 3081

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have my name removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 3081.

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

There was no objection.

PATRIOT ACT

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments to the bill (H.R. 659) to authorize appropriations for the protection of Paoli and Brandywine Battlefields in Pennsylvania, to direct the National Park Service to conduct a special resource study of Paoli and Brandywine Battlefields, to authorize the Valley Forge Museum of the American Revolution at Valley Forge National Historical Park, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendments:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Pennsylvania Battlefields Protection Act of 1999''.

TITLE I—PAOLI AND BRANDYWINE BATTLEFIELDS

SEC. 101. PAOLI BATTLEFIELD PROTECTION.

(a) PAOLI BATTLEFIELD.—The Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the ''Secretary'') is authorized to provide funds to the borough of Malvern, Pennsylvania, for the acquisition of the area known as the ''Paoli Battlefield'', located in the borough of Malvern, Pennsylvania, as generally depicted on the map entitled ''Paoli Battlefield'' numbered 80,000 and dated April 1999 (referred to in this title as the ''Paoli Battlefield''). The map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service.

(b) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary shall enter into a cooperative agreement with the borough of Malvern, Pennsylvania, for the management by the borough of the Paoli Battlefield. The Secretary may provide technical assistance to the borough of Malvern to assure the preservation and interpretation of the Paoli Battlefield's resources.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated $1,250,000 to carry out this section. Such funds shall be expended in the ratio of one dollar of

Federal funds for each dollar of funds contributed by non-Federal sources. Any funds provided by the Secretary shall be subject to an agreement that provides for the protection of the Paoli Battlefield's resources.

SEC. 102. BRANDYWINE BATTLEFIELD PROTECTION.

(a) BRANDYWINE BATTLEFIELD.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized to provide funds to the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, a political subdivision of the Commonwealth, or the Brandywine Conservancy, for the acquisition, protection, and preservation of land in an area generally known as the Meetinghouse Road Corridor, located in Chester County, Pennsylvania, as depicted on a map entitled ''Brandywine Battlefield—Meetinghouse Road Corridor'', numbered 80,000 and dated April 1999 (referred to in this title as the ''Brandywine Battlefield''). The map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service.

(2) WILLING SELLERS OR DONORS.—Lands and interests in land may be acquired pursuant to this section only with the consent of the owner thereof.

(b) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary shall enter into a cooperative agreement with the same entity that is provided funds under subsection (a) for the management by the entity of the Brandywine Battlefield. The Secretary may also provide technical assistance to the entity to assure the preservation and interpretation of the Brandywine Battlefield's resources.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated $3,000,000 to carry out this section. Such funds shall be expended in the ratio of one dollar of Federal funds for each dollar of funds contributed by non-Federal sources. Any funds provided by the Secretary shall be subject to an agreement that provides for the protection of the battlefield's resources.

TITLE II—VALLEY FORGE NATIONAL HISTORICAL PARK

SEC. 201. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this title is to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into an agreement with the Valley Forge Historical Society (hereinafter referred to as the ''Society''), to construct and operate a museum within the boundary of Valley Forge National Historical Park in cooperation with the Secretary.

SEC. 202. VALLEY FORGE MUSEUM OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION AUTHORIZATION.

(a) AGREEMENT AUTHORIZED.—The Secretary of the Interior, in administering the Valley Forge National Historical Park, is authorized to enter into an agreement under appropriate terms and conditions with the Society to facilitate the planning, construction, and operation of the Valley Forge Museum of the American Revolution on Federal land within the boundary of Valley Forge National Historical Park.

(b) CONTENTS AND IMPLEMENTATION OF AGREEMENT.—An agreement entered into under subsection (a) shall—

(1) authorize the Society to develop and operate the museum pursuant to plans developed by the Secretary and to provide at the museum appropriate and necessary programs and services to visitors to Valley Forge National Historical Park related to the story of Valley Forge and the American Revolution;

(2) only be carried out in a manner consistent with the General Management Plan and other plans for the preservation and interpretation of the resources and values of Valley Forge National Historical Park;

(3) authorize the Secretary to undertake at the museum activities related to the management of Valley Forge National Historical Park, including, but not limited to, provision of appropriate visitor information and interpretive facilities and programs related to Valley Forge National Historical Park;

(4) authorize the Society, acting as a private nonprofit organization, to engage in activities appropriate for operation of the museum that may include, but are not limited to, charging appropriate fees, conducting events, and selling merchandise, tickets, and food to visitors to the museum;

(5) provide that the Society's revenues from the museum's facilities and services shall be used to offset the expenses of the museum's operation; and

(6) authorize the Society to occupy the museum so constructed for the term specified in the Agreement and subject to the following terms and conditions:

(A) The conveyance by the Society to the United States of all right, title, and interest in the museum to be constructed at Valley Forge National Historical Park.

(B) The Society's right to occupy and use the museum shall be for the exhibition, preservation, and interpretation of artifacts associated with the Valley Forge story and the American Revolution, to enhance the visitor experience of Valley Forge National Historical Park, and to conduct appropriately related activities of the society consistent with its mission and with the purposes for which the Valley Forge National Historical Park was established. Such right shall not be transferred or conveyed without the express consent of the Secretary.

(C) Any other terms and conditions the Secretary determines to be necessary.

SEC. 203. PRESERVATION AND PROTECTION.

Nothing in this title authorizes the Secretary or the Society to take any actions in derogation of the preservation and protection of the values and resources of Valley Forge National Historical Park. An agreement entered into under section 202 shall be construed and implemented in light of the high public value and integrity of the Valley Forge National Historical Park and the National Park System.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE).

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

I rise in strong support of H.R. 659, introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON). H.R. 659 is a very important bill. It is necessary to protect two significant battlefields of the Revolutionary War and begin the process of developing a much needed new visitors' center at Valley Forge National Historical Park. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) deserves credit for developing this bill, which protects some of our most treasured Revolutionary War sites.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 659 authorizes appropriations for the protection of the Paoli and Brandywine Battlefields in Pennsylvania. Appropriations for these battlefields must be matched dollar for dollar by non-Federal sources.

This bill also authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to enter into an agreement with the Valley Forge Historical Society to construct and operate a museum within the boundaries of the Valley Forge National Historical Park. After the museum has been built, all rights, title and interests would be conveyed to the Federal Government; however, the society would continue to operate the facility.

Madam Speaker, this bill was passed earlier by the House and sent to the Senate where they amended the bill to eliminate a provision that directed the National Park Service to conduct a special resource study of both the Paoli and Brandywine Battlefields. We have agreement on this item now, on this amendment; and we now have a bill with full bipartisan support.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, H.R. 659 is a comprehensive measure which provides assistance for the preservation of two Revolutionary War battlefields in Pennsylvania. In addition, the bill authorizes a public-private partnership agreement for the construction of a museum on Federal land within the Valley Forge National Historic Park.

The legislation originally passed the House on June 22, 1999. The Senate considered the measure on October 14 and returned a bill with several minor changes.

Title I of H.R. 659 authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to provide up to $1.25 million to assist in the protection and preservation of the area known as the Paoli Battlefield. It also authorizes up to $3 million to assist in the protection and preservation of the area known as the Meeting House Corridor, part of the Brandywine Battlefield.

In both instances the funds provided are for land acquisition only, and all funds provided by the Secretary are to be matched dollar for dollar by non-Federal sources. The Secretary is also authorized to provide technical assistance and to enter into cooperative agreements to provide for ownership and management of the battlefields by the non-Federal partners.

Madam Speaker, Title II of H.R. 659 deals with the Valley Forge National Historic Park, which is so ably represented by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL). The bill authorizes the Secretary to enter into an agreement under appropriate terms and conditions with the Valley Forge Historical Society, construct the Valley Forge Museum of the American Revolution on park property. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL) has been a strong supporter of this provision and for that he is to be commended.

The Senate amendments to H.R. 659 changed the title of the legislation and deleted the provisions for a special resource study of the Paoli and Brandywine Battlefields. These changes do not alter the primary purpose of the legislation. As such, we have no objections to H.R. 659, as amended.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), the author of the legislation.

(Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this final act to support this legislation, and I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. DOOLITTLE), my good friend; and I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) for his support. I also thank the chairman of the full committee and subcommittee, and the ranking members.

Madam Speaker, 222 years ago last month the cry, ''Remember Paoli,'' sounded through the ranks of the patriots who at that time were fighting in the Philadelphia campaign to protect the beginnings of this Nation. It was an unbelievable battle that occurred at Paoli that resulted in that cry. I remember Paoli because 53 young Americans had been butchered by the British. They were butchered by the British with their bayonets because the British did not want to fire their guns to send the signal that they were on the attack. Fifty-three brave young Americans ended up lying on the ground at Paoli where they are at this day buried because they were fighting for the independence of this great Nation.

Madam Speaker, 222 years later, we remember Paoli. We remember Paoli by this legislation, setting aside the 40 acres of that great battle; that battle where America lost, where young Americans were massacred. But the rallying cry became the call for the patriots at Valley Forge, and before that at Brandywine to go on to defeat the British and to allow this Nation to achieve its independence. This, in fact, was one of the most historic campaigns in the Revolutionary War; and today we take action, the final action before this bill goes to the President for his signature to preserve the 40-acre site which is about to be developed.

In fact, it is interesting, Madam Speaker. The deadline for development of this site was the end of October, so we are just a few short weeks away from being able to say that we have saved this site from having been developed. Secretary Babbitt was up at the site not long ago. He lent his personal support, and support from Democrats and Republicans in both this body and the other body have allowed us to move this legislation forward.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS), who has been a tireless champion of the Brandywine site which is in his district and the Paoli site which abuts his district and in my district, and the Valley Forge site which is in my district but abuts the district of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOEFFEL), who is not with us today, all were instrumental in moving this forward. Senator SANTORUM did a remarkable effort in the Senate, and we thank everyone who played a major role in getting us here today.

I thank all of my colleagues. At this time I would ask to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter from a fourth grader signifying the over 4,000 letters and correspondence and phone calls we received from young children asking us to save this site, and I further include the chronology of our battle to save the Paoli and Brandywine Battlefields.

FEBRUARY 5, 1999.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WELDON: I wrote this letter because we need to save Paoli Battlefield. We can't develop Paoli Battlefield because we would love to share the battlefield with generations. We can't stop honoring the fallen soldiers. If we do will lose another battle.

Thank you for helping us save Paoli Battlefield. We know how important Paoli Battlefield is, and it is very nice of you to be a part of remembering Paoli.

Sincerely,

EMILY MURRAY.

CONGRESSMAN CURT WELDON'S CHRONOLOGY OF BATTLE TO PRESERVE PAOLI AND BRANDYWINE BATTLEFIELDS

April 95: Malvern Preparatory School challenges the local community to raise the $2.5 million necessary to save the 40-acre Paoli Battlefield site.

October 95: A non-profit organization headed by Pat McGuigan, borough manager of Malvern, is formed—The Paoli Battlefield Preservation Fund.

September 96: Fundraising begins.

October 97: Chester County pledges $250,000 in matching funds to save the battlefield.

March 98: The Paoli Battlefield Preservation Fund approaches Congressman Curt Weldon to ask for his help.

April 28, 1998: Congressman Weldon introduces H.R. 3746 which would authorize $2,500,000 and add the Paoli Battlefield site to the Valley Forge National Historical Park.

July 3, 1998: NBC's Today Show Features Paoli Battlefield.

July 31, 1998: Congressman Weldon seeks help from Senator Arlen Specter. Senator Specter introduces companion legislation, S. 2401, in the Senate.

August 6, 1998: The House National Parks and Public Lands Subcommittee passes H.R. 3746.

September 15, 1998: Weldon's language is included in H.R. 4570, the House Omnibus Parks and Public Lands bill.

September 23, 1998: During consideration of S. 2401 by the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, S. 2401 is stripped and language is added to authorize only a study of the battlefield.

October 5, 1998: The Clinton/Gore Administration issues a veto threat for H.R. 4570, citing the addition of the Paoli Battlefield to the Valley Forge National Historical Park as a provision of H.R. 4570 which would ''cause grave harm to the Nation's resources.''

October 7, 1998: H.R. 4570 fails in the House by a vote of 123–302 due to environmental objections.

October 9, 1998: Despite the disastrous Committee amendment, Senator Specter is able to pass the original legislation to save the Paoli Battlefield on the Senate floor. Due to political gamesmanship and controversy, legislation is not brought up in the House.

October 21, 1998: Legislative business of the 105th Congress concludes.

January 6, 1999: The 106th Congress Convenes.

February 8, 1999: Congressman Weldon visits the Exton Elementary School to applaud the school's efforts to raise ''Pennies for Paoli''. During this visit, the Congressman announces his intention to reintroduce legislation to save the Paoli Battlefield. This legislation is known as the PATRIOT Act—Preserve America's Treasures of the Revolution for Independence for Our Tomorrow. The PATRIOT Act also includes provisions to save portions of the Brandywine Battlefield, and to authorize a new museum of the American Revolution at Valley Forge National Historical Park.

February 9, 1999: Congressman Weldon introduces H.R. 659, the PATRIOT Act.

March 10, 1999: Senator Arlen Specter introduces companion legislation in the Senate, S. 581.

March 11, 1999: Hearings are held by the House National Parks and Public Lands Subcommittee on the PATRIOT Act. Fifty Chester County Grade School students travel to Washington, DC to express their support for saving the lands. Congressmen Weldon, Pitts, and Hoeffel, along with Senator Specter, participate in the hearings. General George Washington (a.k.a. Jim Gallagher of Newtown Square, PA) also testifies about the need to save this sacred land.

March 18, 1999: The PATRIOT Act clears the House Subcommittee.

April 22, 1999: Hearings are held by the Senate Subcommittee.

April 28, 1999: The PATRIOT Act clears the House Resources Committee.

May 1999: The PATRIOT Act is ready for consideration on the House Floor, but Representative George Miller, engaged in another act of political gamesmanship, refuses to allow any public lands legislation sponsored by a Republican to reach the House floor.

May 26, 1999: Governor Ridge and the State of Pennsylvania pledge $500,000 from the Department of Community and Economic Development.

June 8, 1999: Congressman Weldon approaches House Leadership to request their assistance in scheduling a vote for the PATRIOT Act. House Majority Leader Dick Armey, Rules Committee Chairman David Dreier and House Resources Committee Chairman Don Young, and House National Parks and Public Lands Subcommittee Chairman Jim Hansen all agree to help.

June 16, 1999: The PATRIOT Act is cleared by the House Rules Committee to be considered on the House Floor.

June 22, 1999: The PATRIOT Act passes the House of Representatives by a vote of 418–4.

June 29, 1999: Congressman Weldon announces that funding for Paoli Battlefield is included in the House Interior Appropriations bill.

July 1999: Senator Craig Thomas (R–WY), Chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Parks and Public Lands, holds up the progress of the Senate Legislation.

July 14, 1999: The House Interior Appropriations Bill, containing $1.25 million in matching funds for the Battlefield purchase, passes the House of Representatives.

July 29, 1999: Congressmen Weldon and Pitts meet with Senator Thomas and learn that he was misinformed about the intent of the PATRIOT Act. They clear up the misunderstandings, and Senator Thomas agrees to move the bill to the floor.

August 1999: Senator Frank Murkowski (R–AK), Chairman of the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee, places a hold on all public lands bills in order to force an agreement on a controversial Alaskan lands bill.

August 27, 1999: Secretary Bruce Babbitt visits Paoli Battlefield and pledges the support of the Administration to save the endangered land.

September 1999: Representatives Weldon, Pitts and Hoeffel, and Senators Santorum and Specter work aggressively to convince Senator Murkowski of the time sensitivity and importance of passing the PATRIOT Act. Senator Murkowski finally relents and puts together a package of four lands bills which will be moved in the Senate. Senator Jeff Bingaman, ranking Member of Murkowski's Committee, wants more proposals offered by Senate Democrats included in the package and refuses the package offered by Senator Murkowski.

October 1999: Senator Santorum continues to work aggressively to convince Senator Bingaman of the need to move the PATRIOT Act. Senator Bingaman finally agrees to the package, but Senate Minority Leadership will not agree to the package proposed by Senator Murkowski. Even support from Interior Secretary Bruce Babbitt does not convince them.

October 14, 1999: Senator Santorum finally achieves a breakthrough. The legislation is agreed to on the Senate floor by Unanimous Consent, but with a slight amendment. The legislation is returned to the House for final consideration.

October 31, 1999: The final deadline for the Paoli Battlefield Preservation Fund set by Malvern Preparatory School looms.

Madam Speaker, as the distinguished chairman outlined, this bill sets aside matching funds for Paoli which have almost entirely been raised. It sets aside similar funds for Brandywine. We are in the midst of raising that money now with the help of the Brandywine Conservancy, and it allows the Park Service to develop a new plan and a contract to develop a new visitors' center at Valley Forge National Park.

There are many people I would like to thank, Madam Speaker, too many to mention by name. I will include a listing of those individuals at this point in the RECORD.

THANK YOUS!

Senator Rick Santorum and Staff: Jill Hershey, Mike Hershey, and Zack Moore.

Senator Frank Murkowski, Senator Jeff Bingaman, Senator Craig Thomas, and Jim O'Toole, staffer on Thomas' subcommittee.

Specter staff: Pam Muha (no longer with Specter, but was the driving force over there), and Kevin Mathis.

Chairman Don Young, Chairman Jim Hansen, and Resources Staff: Tod Hull (he is the one with the dark hair who gave you the book), Allen Freemyer (he is the staff director of the subcommittee), and Rick Healy (Democrat).

Chairman Ralph Regula and Appropriations Committee: Debbie Weatherly, Congressman John Peterson, and Troy Tidwell of his staff, and Congressman George Nethercutt and Glenda Becker of his staff.

Representative Joe Pitts and Representative Joe Hoeffel, Ken Miller with Joe Pitts, and Don Grace with Joe Hoeffel.

State of Pennsylvania: State Representative Bob Flick, State Senator Bob Thompson, and Governor Tom Ridge.

Witnesses at our Hearing: Jim Gallagher of Newtown Square, General George Washington, Dr. Ed Barrs, Historian Emeritus at the Department of Interior, and Students of Exton Elementary, Sugartown Elementary.

Paoli Battlefield Preservation Fund: Pat McGuigan, Mike Steinberger (replaced Pat when he retired), Sandra Kelly (works for Malvern Borough), Henry Briggs, Tip O'Neill (the one with the famous name that we couldn't remember last time), and Tom Maguire (historian at Malvern Prep).

Valley Forge Historical Society: Jean-Pierre Bouvel and Ann Brown.

National Park Service: Secretary Bruce Babbitt, Arthur Stewart, Jim Pepper, and Don Barry.

Chester County Commissioners: Colin Hanna, Karen Martynick, and Andrew Dinniman.

School Children: Sugartown Elementary School and the ''Footsteps for Paoli'', Exton Elementary School and the ''Pennies for Paoli'', and all of the students from all over the county who wrote letters.

Members from the First Time Round on the Floor: David Dreier, Doc Hastings, and Ralph Hall who helped us obtain a rule, Majority Leader Dick Armey, Jim Traficant for reminding us to Buy American!, Joe Hoeffel, and Joe Pitts.

Madam Speaker, I would also like to thank the appropriators, especially the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. REGULA) and his staff, and particularly Debbie Weatherley and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT), who helped us secure the appropriation so that when this bill is being passed today the appropriation is also in the appropriation measure soon to come to the House floor.

So today we complete the final chapter of the battle to remember the cry of saving Paoli, and today I join with my colleagues in supporting the passage of this measure, and I thank everyone who made this day possible.

□ 1415

The gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) was an invaluable supporter. His staff Todd Hall, who is here with us today, I thank him for all of his efforts; Senator SPECTER and Senator MURKOWSKI on the Senate side. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS); the State of Pennsylvania, Governor Ridge who put $500,000 up from State funds; the county commissioners of Chester County; the Paoli Battlefield Preservation Fund, its leaders, Pat McGuigan and Mike Steinberger; the Valley Forge Historical Society, Jean-Pierre Bouvel and Ann Brown; the National Park Service headed up by Secretary Bruce Babbitt; the school children of Sugartown Elementary School and all the children who sent letters and raised over 40,000 pennies to save the Paoli site; and finally those other Members who have been supportive of this effort.

Finally, I would be remiss, Madam Speaker, if I did not mention the last time we had this bill on the floor and it passed the House overwhelmingly, when I was thanking everyone who was involved, in a lapse of memory, which from time to time Members of Congress have, at least this Member does, I gave my key staffer who worked this issue the wrong last name.

So as a final goodwill gesture, I want to thank Aaron for all the work that was done to get the Paoli bill through. The Patriot Act passed, and this time I got Aaron's name right.

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

Madam Speaker, I would like to commend my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) for his very, very hard work and tenacious work on this bill. I know this is a happy day for him.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS).

Mr. PITTS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 659, the Patriot Act. I also want to thank my colleague and friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), for introducing this legislation and taking the lead in protecting these treasures, the Paoli and Brandywine battlefields. He has done a magnificent job of shepherding, of birddogging the bill through the legislative process and it was because of his able leadership that we are here today. This bill first came to the floor in June, and it passed overwhelmingly. Today the bill is before us again for the House to adopt a Senate amendment which I also hope the House will support overwhelmingly.

The passage of the Patriot Act is essential for the preservation of two revolutionary war battlefields, Brandywine and Paoli. If we do not preserve these battlefields this year, we will lose both to the rapid development that is taking place in the region. Preserving America's historic treasures is essential if we as a Nation are to remember our past and our rich cultural heritage. It is particularly important to remember the sacrifices that our forefathers made to secure our independence from Great Britain and to build a new country that is today the world leader in freedom and democracy. Brandywine and Paoli battlefields are among the few Revolutionary War battlefields that remain unprotected.

I have visited the Brandywine battlefield in my district, on numerous occasion, and with each visit I am more concerned that America may lose this important piece of our heritage to sprawling housing developments. The Patriot Act will help preserve a portion of the Brandywine battlefield where the most intense conflict and loss of life took place. The battle of the Brandywine was the largest battle of the Revolutionary War in terms of number of participants. Approximately 26,000 British and American troops gathered there. All of the generals were at that battle. It was also a major conflict in the British campaign of 1777, that conquered Philadelphia. While the British eventually took Philadelphia, the battle of the Brandywine was significant in delaying the British campaign and allowing the Congress to abandon the city and to move to Lancaster, also in my district, and then to York, to escape before the British takeover.

History connects people and nurtures identity and community, and I think it is our responsibility to ensure that historical landmarks such as the Brandywine and Paoli battlefields are preserved for future generations. Preserving these battlefields will ensure

that our children and our grandchildren will be able to enjoy and experience how these battles unfolded.

In closing, I want to extend my thanks to the local communities in Chester County, near the Paoli and the Brandywine battlefields, for their unrelenting quest to save these monuments. This has been a grassroots effort, and it is now time for us to help them reach that goal. So I urge support the Patriot Act and concur in the Senate amendments.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS).

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

Mr. GEKAS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) for yielding me this time.

Madam Speaker, it is appropriate that this debate is being conducted at a time in 1999 when 200 years prior, in 1799, George Washington was living out his life at Mount Vernon in the last 80 days of that magnificent life. What we do here today is not only go forward with a project that brings pride and will bring additional historic value to Pennsylvania itself and to our Nation as a whole, but also to recall that George Washington was omnipresent at all of these events. He was at Valley Forge, making sure that our stalwarts remained stalwart during that winter. He was at Brandywine defending Pennsylvania and Philadelphia and the Nation, the new Nation yet to be born. He was then destined to become the victor of the Revolutionary War, of course, as Commander-in-Chief. He was the presiding officer of the Constitutional Convention of 1787 in Philadelphia, and then became the first President of the United States and for 8 years set the tone and the tradition and the standard for the presidency of the United States.

We here today, in doing something so valuable to our heritage, are in a separate way expressing our gratitude again to George Washington. He died on December 14, 1799. So we are coming to the memorization of that as well, but in the meantime his life was one that is inextricably interwoven with the life of every American, and that extra dividend is being paid to us today when the Congress is making certain that one piece of the Washington legacy, that of Brandywine and Valley Forge and Paoli, that that not only remains in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD but in the annals of history and in the minds and hearts of our people as he was first in the hearts of the American people.

Mr. HOEFFEL. Madam Speaker, I would like to start by thanking the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. WELDON for his extraordinary effort to bring this matter forward. The day this bill is signed into law will be a great day in celebrating American revolutionary history, and this is due to the gentleman from Pennsylvania and his efforts here on the floor.

I would also like to thank and congratulate Jean-Pierre Bouvel of the Valley Forge Historical Society for his leadership in marshalling local support for this public-private partnership. Also thanks to Paul Decker, the Executive Director of the Valley Forge Convention and Visitor Bureau and a number of Montgomery County officials who have given their strong support for this public-private partnership at Valley Forge.

I also want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. PITTS, for his cooperation and efforts on this legislation as well.

The events that occurred on both the Brandywine Battlefield and the Paoli Battlefield were key to the American revolutionary fight for freedom. The American forces lost at Brandywine, although they did buy additional time to protect the city of Philadelphia a little while longer from the British invasion. At Paoli, Americans were massacred at night and it truly was another disastrous defeat for America. Those two military operations forged the beginning of the winning spirit. We are all familiar with the history of the Valley Forge encampment. As far as I am concerned, that is where the American Revolution was truly won. No shots were fired. But the American army that arrived there tired, hungry, ill-clothed, ill-trained and ill-equipped, survived and trained. Six months later, with the tremendous leadership of George Washington, in June of 1778 an effective fighting force went on to win our independence.

So we are saving and preserving the two battlefields that led to the encampment at Valley Forge. We are offering an opportunity to provide a far more impressive visitor experience at Valley Forge. We are providing a greatly improved opportunity for historical artifacts to be presented through a Valley Forge Museum of the American Revolution. We will offer better education about the valor, determination, courage and resolve that Americans showed at both those battle sites and the 6 months where they survived a bitter winter at Valley Forge and emerged as an effective fighting army. We will preserve those battlefields so that future generations can appreciate the sacrifices that were made there.

I urge all my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Madam Speaker, I urge an aye vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendments to the bill, H.R. 659.

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

The title of the bill was amended so as to read:

''An Act to authorize appropriations for the protection of Paoli and Brandywine Battlefields in Pennsylvania, to authorize the Valley Forge Museum of the American Revolution at Valley Forge National Historical Park, and for other purposes.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHIPPEWA CREE TRIBE OF THE ROCKY BOY'S RESERVATION INDIAN RESERVED WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT AND WATER SUPPLY ENHANCEMENT ACT OF 1999

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 795) to provide for the settlement of the water rights claims of the Chippewa Cree Tribe of the Rocky Boy's Reservation, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 795

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 ''Chippewa Cree Tribe of The Rocky Boy's Reservation Indian Reserved Water Rights Settlement and Water Supply Enhancement Act of 1999''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) in fulfillment of its trust responsibility to Indian tribes and to promote tribal sovereignty and economic self-sufficiency, it is the policy of the United States to settle the water rights claims of the tribes without lengthy and costly litigation;

(2) the Rocky Boy's Reservation was established as a homeland for the Chippewa Cree Tribe;

(3) adequate water for the Chippewa Cree Tribe of the Rocky Boy's Reservation is important to a permanent, sustainable, and sovereign homeland for the Tribe and its members;

(4) the sovereignty of the Chippewa Cree Tribe and the economy of the Reservation depend on the development of the water resources of the Reservation;

(5) the planning, design, and construction of the facilities needed to utilize water supplies effectively are necessary to the development of a viable Reservation economy and to implementation of the Chippewa Cree-Montana Water Rights Compact;

(6) the Rocky Boy's Reservation is located in a water-short area of Montana and it is appropriate that the Act provide funding for the development of additional water supplies, including domestic water, to meet the needs of the Chippewa Cree Tribe;

(7) proceedings to determine the full extent of the water rights of the Chippewa Cree Tribe are currently pending before the Montana Water Court as a part of the case ''In the Matter of the Adjudication of All Rights to the Use of Water, Both Surface and Underground, within the State of Montana'';

(8) recognizing that final resolution of the general stream adjudication will take many years and entail great expense to all parties, prolong uncertainty as to the availability of water supplies, and seriously impair the long-term economic planning and development of all parties, the Chippewa Cree Tribe and the State of Montana entered into the Compact on April 14, 1997; and

(9) the allocation of water resources from the Tiber Reservoir to the Chippewa Cree Tribe under this Act is uniquely suited to the geographic, social, and economic characteristics of the area and situation involved.

SEC. 3. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this Act are as follows:

(1) To achieve a fair, equitable, and final settlement of all claims to water rights in the State of Montana for—

(A) the Chippewa Cree Tribe; and

(B) the United States for the benefit of the Chippewa Cree Tribe.

(2) To approve, ratify, and confirm, as modified in this Act, the Chippewa Cree-Montana

Water Rights Compact entered into by the Chippewa Cree Tribe of the Rocky Boy's Reservation and the State of Montana on April 14, 1997, and to provide funding and other authorization necessary for the implementation of the Compact.

(3) To authorize the Secretary of the Interior to execute and implement the Compact referred to in paragraph (2) and to take such other actions as are necessary to implement the Compact in a manner consistent with this Act.

(4) To authorize Federal feasibility studies designed to identify and analyze potential mechanisms to enhance, through conservation or otherwise, water supplies in north central Montana, including mechanisms to import domestic water supplies for the future growth of the Rocky Boy's Indian Reservation.

(5) To authorize certain projects on the Rocky Boy's Indian Reservation, Montana, in order to implement the Compact.

(6) To authorize certain modifications to the purposes and operation of the Bureau of Reclamation's Tiber Dam and Lake Elwell on the Marias River in Montana in order to provide the Tribe with an allocation of water from Tiber Reservoir.

(7) To authorize the appropriation of funds necessary for the implementation of the Compact.

SEC. 4. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ACT.—The term ''Act'' means the ''Chippewa Cree Tribe of The Rocky Boy's Reservation Indian Reserved Water Rights Settlement and Water Supply Enhancement Act of 1999''.

(2) COMPACT.—The term ''Compact'' means the water rights compact between the Chippewa Cree Tribe of the Rocky Boy's Reservation and the State of Montana contained in section 85–20–601 of the Montana Code Annotated (1997).

(3) FINAL.—The term ''final'' with reference to approval of the decree in section 101(b) means completion of any direct appeal to the Montana Supreme Court of a final decree by the Water Court pursuant to section 85–2–235 of the Montana Code Annotated (1997), or to the Federal Court of Appeals, including the expiration of the time in which a petition for certiorari may be filed in the United States Supreme Court, denial of such a petition, or the issuance of the Supreme Court's mandate, whichever occurs last.

(4) FUND.—The term ''Fund'' means the Chippewa Cree Indian Reserved Water Rights Settlement Fund established under section 104.

(5) INDIAN TRIBE.—The term ''Indian tribe'' has the meaning given that term in section 101(2) of the Federally Recognized Indian Tribe List Act of 1994 (25 U.S.C. 479a(2)).

(6) MR&I FEASIBILITY STUDY.—The term ''MR&I feasibility study'' means a municipal, rural, and industrial, domestic, and incidental drought relief feasibility study described in section 202.

(7) MISSOURI RIVER SYSTEM.—The term ''Missouri River System'' means the mainstem of the Missouri River and its tributaries, including the Marias River.

(8) RECLAMATION LAW.—The term ''Reclamation Law'' has the meaning given the term ''reclamation law'' in section 4 of the Act of December 5, 1924 (43 Stat. 701, chapter 4; 43 U.S.C. 371).

(9) ROCKY BOY'S RESERVATION; RESERVATION.—The term ''Rocky Boy's Reservation'' or ''Reservation'' means the Rocky Boy's Reservation of the Chippewa Cree Tribe in Montana.

(10) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior, or his or her duly authorized representative.

(11) TOWE PONDS.—The term ''Towe Ponds'' means the reservoir or reservoirs referred to as ''Stoneman Reservoir'' in the Compact.

(12) TRIBAL COMPACT ADMINISTRATION.—The term ''Tribal Compact Administration'' means the activities assumed by the Tribe for implementation of the Compact as set forth in Article IV of the Compact.

(13) TRIBAL WATER CODE.—The term ''tribal water code'' means a water code adopted by the Tribe, as provided in the Compact.

(14) TRIBAL WATER RIGHT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ''Tribal Water Right'' means the water right set forth in section 85–20–601 of the Montana Code Annotated (1997) and includes the water allocation set forth in title II of this Act.

(B) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—The definition of the term ''Tribal Water Right'' under this paragraph and the treatment of that right under this Act shall not be construed or interpreted as a precedent for the litigation of reserved water rights or the interpretation or administration of future compacts between the United States and the State of Montana or any other State.

(15) TRIBE.—The term ''Tribe'' means the Chippewa Cree Tribe of the Rocky Boy's Reservation and all officers, agents, and departments thereof.

(16) WATER DEVELOPMENT.—The term ''water development'' includes all activities that involve the use of water or modification of water courses or water bodies in any way.

SEC. 5. MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS.

(a) NONEXERCISE OF TRIBE'S RIGHTS.—Pursuant to Tribal Resolution No. 40–98, and in exchange for benefits under this Act, the Tribe shall not exercise the rights set forth in Article VII.A.3 of the Compact, except that in the event that the approval, ratification, and confirmation of the Compact by the United States becomes null and void under section 101(b), the Tribe shall have the right to exercise the rights set forth in Article VII.A.3 of the Compact.

(b) WAIVER OF SOVEREIGN IMMUNITY.—Except to the extent provided in subsections (a), (b), and (c) of section 208 of the Department of Justice Appropriation Act, 1953 (43 U.S.C. 666), nothing in this Act may be construed to waive the sovereign immunity of the United States.

(c) TRIBAL RELEASE OF CLAIMS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Pursuant to Tribal Resolution No. 40–98, and in exchange for benefits under this Act, the Tribe shall, on the date of enactment of this Act, execute a waiver and release of the claims described in paragraph (2) against the United States, the validity of which are not recognized by the United States, except that—

(A) the waiver and release of claims shall not become effective until the appropriation of the funds authorized in section 105, the water allocation in section 201, and the appropriation of funds for the MR&I feasibility study authorized in section 204 have been completed and the decree has become final in accordance with the requirements of section 101(b); and

(B) in the event that the approval, ratification, and confirmation of the Compact by the United States becomes null and void under section 101(b), the waiver and release of claims shall become null and void.

(2) CLAIMS DESCRIBED.—The claims referred to in paragraph (1) are as follows:

(A) Any and all claims to water rights (including water rights in surface water, ground water, and effluent), claims for injuries to water rights, claims for loss or deprivation of use of water rights, and claims for failure to acquire or develop water rights for lands of the Tribe from time immemorial to the date of ratification of the Compact by Congress.

(B) Any and all claims arising out of the negotiation of the Compact and the settlement authorized by this Act.

(3) SETOFFS.—In the event the waiver and release do not become effective as set forth in paragraph (1)—

(A) the United States shall be entitled to setoff against any claim for damages asserted by the Tribe against the United States, any funds transferred to the Tribe pursuant to section 104, and any interest accrued thereon up to the date of setoff; and

(B) the United States shall retain any other claims or defenses not waived in this Act or in the Compact as modified by this Act.

(d) OTHER TRIBES NOT ADVERSELY AFFECTED.—Nothing in this Act is intended to quantify or otherwise adversely affect the land and water rights, or claims or entitlements to land or water of an Indian tribe other than the Chippewa Cree Tribe.

(e) ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE.—In implementing the Compact, the Secretary shall comply with all aspects of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.), and all other applicable environmental Acts and regulations.

(f) EXECUTION OF COMPACT.—The execution of the Compact by the Secretary as provided for in this Act shall not constitute a major Federal action under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.). The Secretary is directed to carry out all necessary environmental compliance required by Federal law in implementing the Compact.

(g) CONGRESSIONAL INTENT.—Nothing in this Act is intended to prohibit the Tribe from seeking additional authorization or appropriation of funds for tribal programs or purposes.

(h) ACT NOT PRECEDENTIAL.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed or interpreted as a precedent for the litigation of reserved water rights or the interpretation or administration of future water settlement Acts.

TITLE I—CHIPPEWA CREE TRIBE OF THE ROCKY BOY'S RESERVATION INDIAN RESERVED WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT

SEC. 101. RATIFICATION OF COMPACT AND ENTRY OF DECREE.

(a) WATER RIGHTS COMPACT APPROVED.—Except as modified by this Act, and to the extent the Compact does not conflict with this Act—

(1) the Compact, entered into by the Chippewa Cree Tribe of the Rocky Boy's Reservation and the State of Montana on April 14, 1997, is hereby approved, ratified, and confirmed; and

(2) the Secretary shall—

(A) execute and implement the Compact together with any amendments agreed to by the parties or necessary to bring the Compact into conformity with this Act; and

(B) take such other actions as are necessary to implement the Compact.

(b) APPROVAL OF DECREE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the United States, the Tribe, or the State of Montana shall petition the Montana Water Court, individually or jointly, to enter and approve the decree agreed to by the United States, the Tribe, and the State of Montana attached as Appendix 1 to the Compact, or any amended version thereof agreed to by the United States, the Tribe, and the State of Montana.

(2) RESORT TO THE FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT.—Under the circumstances set forth in Article VII.B.4 of the Compact, 1 or more parties may file an appropriate motion (as provided in that article) in the United States district court of appropriate jurisdiction.

(3) EFFECT OF FAILURE OF APPROVAL TO BECOME FINAL.—In the event the approval by the appropriate court, including any direct appeal, does not become final within 3 years after the filing of the decree, or the decree is approved but is subsequently set aside by the appropriate court—

(A) the approval, ratification, and confirmation of the Compact by the United States shall be null and void; and

(B) except as provided in sections 105(e)(1), 5(a), and 5(c)(3), this Act shall be of no further force and effect.

SEC. 102. USE AND TRANSFER OF THE TRIBAL WATER RIGHT.

(a) ADMINISTRATION AND ENFORCEMENT.—As provided in the Compact, until the adoption and approval of a tribal water code by the Tribe, the

Secretary shall administer and enforce the Tribal Water Right.

(b) TRIBAL MEMBER ENTITLEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Any entitlement to Federal Indian reserved water of any tribal member shall be satisfied solely from the water secured to the Tribe by the Compact and shall be governed by the terms and conditions of the Compact.

(2) ADMINISTRATION.—An entitlement described in paragraph (1) shall be administered by the Tribe pursuant to a tribal water code developed and adopted pursuant to Article IV.A.2 of the Compact, or by the Secretary pending the adoption and approval of the tribal water code.

(c) TEMPORARY TRANSFER OF TRIBAL WATER RIGHT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of statutory or common law, the Tribe may, with the approval of the Secretary and subject to the limitations and conditions set forth in the Compact, including limitation on transfer of any portion of the Tribal Water Right to within the Missouri River Basin, enter into a service contract, lease, exchange, or other agreement providing for the temporary delivery, use, or transfer of the water rights confirmed to the Tribe in the Compact, except that no service contract, lease, exchange, or other agreement entered into under this subsection may permanently alienate any portion of the Tribal Water Right.

SEC. 103. ON-RESERVATION WATER RESOURCES DEVELOPMENT.

(a) WATER DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS.—The Secretary, through the Bureau of Reclamation, is authorized and directed to plan, design, and construct, or to provide, pursuant to subsection (b), for the planning, design, and construction of the following water development projects on the Rocky Boy's Reservation:

(1) Bonneau Dam and Reservoir Enlargement.

(2) East Fork of Beaver Creek Dam Repair and Enlargement.

(3) Brown's Dam Enlargement.

(4) Towe Ponds' Enlargement.

(5) Such other water development projects as the Tribe shall from time to time consider appropriate.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION AGREEMENT.—The Secretary, at the request of the Tribe, shall enter into an agreement, or, if appropriate, renegotiate an existing agreement, with the Tribe to implement the provisions of this Act through the Tribe's annual funding agreement entered into under the self-governance program under title IV of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 458aa et seq.) by which the Tribe shall plan, design, and construct any or all of the projects authorized by this section.

(c) BUREAU OF RECLAMATION PROJECT ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Congress finds that the Secretary, through the Bureau of Reclamation, has entered into an agreement with the Tribe, pursuant to title IV of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 458aa et seq.)—

(A) defining and limiting the role of the Bureau of Reclamation in its administration of the projects authorized in subsection (a);

(B) establishing the standards upon which the projects will be constructed; and

(C) for other purposes necessary to implement this section.

(2) AGREEMENT.—The agreement referred to in paragraph (1) shall become effective when the Tribe exercises its right under subsection (b).

SEC. 104. CHIPPEWA CREE INDIAN RESERVED WATER RIGHTS SETTLEMENT TRUST FUND.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF TRUST FUND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is hereby established in the Treasury of the United States a trust fund for the Chippewa Cree Tribe of the Rocky Boy's Reservation to be known as the ''Chippewa Cree Indian Reserved Water Rights Settlement Trust Fund''.

(B) AVAILABILITY OF AMOUNTS IN FUND.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—Amounts in the Fund shall be available to the Secretary for management and investment on behalf of the Tribe and distribution to the Tribe in accordance with this Act.

(ii) AVAILABILITY.—Funds made available from the Fund under this section shall be available without fiscal year limitation.

(2) MANAGEMENT OF FUND.—The Secretary shall deposit and manage the principal and interest in the Fund in a manner consistent with subsection (b) and other applicable provisions of this Act.

(3) CONTENTS OF FUND.—The Fund shall consist of the amounts authorized to be appropriated to the Fund under section 105(a) and such other amounts as may be transferred or credited to the Fund.

(4) WITHDRAWAL.—The Tribe, with the approval of the Secretary, may withdraw the Fund and deposit it in a mutually agreed upon private financial institution. That withdrawal shall be made pursuant to the American Indian Trust Fund Management Reform Act of 1994 (25 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.).

(5) ACCOUNTS.—The Secretary of the Interior shall establish the following accounts in the Fund and shall allocate appropriations to the various accounts as required in this Act:

(A) The Tribal Compact Administration Account.

(B) The Economic Development Account.

(C) The Future Water Supply Facilities Account.

(b) FUND MANAGEMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) AMOUNTS IN FUND.—The Fund shall consist of such amounts as are appropriated to the Fund and allocated to the accounts of the Fund by the Secretary as provided in this Act and in accordance with the authorizations for appropriations in paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 105(a), together with all interest that accrues in the Fund.

(B) MANAGEMENT BY SECRETARY.—The Secretary shall manage the Fund, make investments from the Fund, and make available funds from the Fund for distribution to the Tribe in a manner consistent with the American Indian Trust Fund Management Reform Act of 1994 (25 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.).

(2) TRIBAL MANAGEMENT.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—If the Tribe exercises its right pursuant to subsection (a)(4) to withdraw the Fund and deposit it in a private financial institution, except as provided in the withdrawal plan, neither the Secretary nor the Secretary of the Treasury shall retain any oversight over or liability for the accounting, disbursement, or investment of the funds.

(B) WITHDRAWAL PLAN.—The withdrawal plan shall provide for—

(i) the creation of accounts and allocation to accounts in a fund established under the plan in a manner consistent with subsection (a); and

(ii) the appropriate terms and conditions, if any, on expenditures from the Fund (in addition to the requirements of the plans set forth in paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (c)).

(c) USE OF FUND.—The Tribe shall use the Fund to fulfill the purposes of this Act, subject to the following restrictions on expenditures:

(1) Except for $400,000 necessary for capital expenditures in connection with Tribal Compact Administration, only interest accrued on the Tribal Compact Administration Account referred to in subsection (a)(5)(A) shall be available to satisfy the Tribe's obligations for Tribal Compact Administration under the provisions of the Compact.

(2) Both principal and accrued interest on the Economic Development Account referred to in subsection (a)(5)(B) shall be available to the Tribe for expenditure pursuant to an economic development plan approved by the Secretary.

(3) Both principal and accrued interest on the Future Water Supply Facilities Account referred to in subsection (a)(5)(C) shall be available to the Tribe for expenditure pursuant to a water supply plan approved by the Secretary.

(d) INVESTMENT OF FUND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) APPLICABLE LAWS.—The Secretary shall invest amounts in the Fund in accordance with—

(i) the Act of April 1, 1880 (21 Stat. 70, chapter 41; 25 U.S.C. 161);

(ii) the first section of the Act entitled ''An Act to authorize the payment of interest of certain funds held in trust by the United States for Indian tribes'', approved February 12, 1929 (25 U.S.C. 161a); and

(iii) the first section of the Act entitled ''An Act to authorize the deposit and investment of Indian funds'', approved June 24, 1938 (25 U.S.C. 162a).

(B) CREDITING OF AMOUNTS TO THE FUND.—The interest on, and the proceeds from the sale or redemption of, any obligations of the United States held in the Fund shall be credited to and form part of the Fund. The Secretary of the Treasury shall credit to each of the accounts contained in the Fund a proportionate amount of that interest and proceeds.

(2) CERTAIN WITHDRAWN FUNDS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Amounts withdrawn from the Fund and deposited in a private financial institution pursuant to a withdrawal plan approved by the Secretary under the American Indian Trust Fund Management Reform Act of 1994 (25 U.S.C. 4001 et seq.) shall be invested by an appropriate official under that plan.

(B) DEPOSIT OF INTEREST AND PROCEEDS.—The interest on, and the proceeds from the sale or redemption of, any obligations held under this paragraph shall be deposited in the private financial institution referred to in subparagraph (A) in the fund established pursuant to the withdrawal plan referred to in that subparagraph. The appropriate official shall credit to each of the accounts contained in that fund a proportionate amount of that interest and proceeds.

(e) AGREEMENT REGARDING FUND EXPENDITURES.—If the Tribe does not exercise its right under subsection (a)(4) to withdraw the funds in the Fund and transfer those funds to a private financial institution, the Secretary shall enter into an agreement with the Tribe providing for appropriate terms and conditions, if any, on expenditures from the Fund in addition to the plans set forth in paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (c).

(f) PER CAPITA DISTRIBUTIONS PROHIBITED.—No part of the Fund shall be distributed on a per capita basis to members of the Tribe.

SEC. 105. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) CHIPPEWA CREE FUND.—There is authorized to be appropriated for the Fund, $21,000,000 to be allocated by the Secretary as follows:

(1) TRIBAL COMPACT ADMINISTRATION ACCOUNT.—For Tribal Compact Administration assumed by the Tribe under the Compact and this Act, $3,000,000 is authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2000.

(2) ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACCOUNT.—For tribal economic development, $3,000,000 is authorized to be appropriated for fiscal year 2000.

(3) FUTURE WATER SUPPLY FACILITIES ACCOUNT.—For the total Federal contribution to the planning, design, construction, operation, maintenance, and rehabilitation of a future water supply system for the Reservation, there are authorized to be appropriated—

(A) $2,000,000 for fiscal year 2000;

(B) $8,000,000 for fiscal year 2001; and

(C) $5,000,000 for fiscal year 2002.

(b) ON-RESERVATION WATER DEVELOPMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Department of the Interior, for the Bureau of Reclamation, for the construction of the on-Reservation water development projects authorized by section 103—

(A) $13,000,000 for fiscal year 2000, for the planning, design, and construction of the

Bonneau Dam Enlargement, for the development of additional capacity in Bonneau Reservoir for storage of water secured to the Tribe under the Compact;

(B) $8,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, for the planning, design, and construction of the East Fork Dam and Reservoir enlargement, of the Brown's Dam and Reservoir enlargement, and of the Towe Ponds enlargement of which—

(i) $4,000,000 shall be used for the East Fork Dam and Reservoir enlargement;

(ii) $2,000,000 shall be used for the Brown's Dam and Reservoir enlargement; and

(iii) $2,000,000 shall be used for the Towe Ponds enlargement; and

(C) $3,000,000 for fiscal year 2002, for the planning, design, and construction of such other water resource developments as the Tribe, with the approval of the Secretary, from time to time may consider appropriate or for the completion of the 4 projects enumerated in subparagraphs (A) and (B) of paragraph (1).

(2) UNEXPENDED BALANCES.—Any unexpended balance in the funds authorized to be appropriated under subparagraph (A) or (B) of paragraph (1), after substantial completion of all of the projects enumerated in paragraphs (1) through (4) of section 103(a)—

(A) shall be available to the Tribe first for completion of the enumerated projects; and

(B) then for other water resource development projects on the Reservation.

(c) ADMINISTRATION COSTS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Department of the Interior, for the Bureau of Reclamation, $1,000,000 for fiscal year 2000, for the costs of administration of the Bureau of Reclamation under this Act, except that—

(1) if those costs exceed $1,000,000, the Bureau of Reclamation may use funds authorized for appropriation under subsection (b) for costs; and

(2) the Bureau of Reclamation shall exercise its best efforts to minimize those costs to avoid expenditures for the costs of administration under this Act that exceed a total of $1,000,000.

(d) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The amounts authorized to be appropriated to the Fund and allocated to its accounts pursuant to subsection (a) shall be deposited into the Fund and allocated immediately on appropriation.

(2) INVESTMENTS.—Investments may be made from the Fund pursuant to section 104(d).

(3) AVAILABILITY OF CERTAIN MONEYS.—The amounts authorized to be appropriated in subsection (a)(1) shall be available for use immediately upon appropriation in accordance with subsection 104(c)(1).

(4) LIMITATION.—Those moneys allocated by the Secretary to accounts in the Fund or in a fund established under section 104(a)(4) shall draw interest consistent with section 104(d), but the moneys authorized to be appropriated under subsection (b) and paragraphs (2) and (3) of subsection (a) shall not be available for expenditure until the requirements of section 101(b) have been met so that the decree has become final and the Tribe has executed the waiver and release required under section 5(c).

(e) RETURN OF FUNDS TO THE TREASURY—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In the event that the approval, ratification, and confirmation of the Compact by the United States becomes null and void under section 101(b), all unexpended funds appropriated under the authority of this Act together with all interest earned on such funds, notwithstanding whether the funds are held by the Tribe, a private institution, or the Secretary, shall revert to the general fund of the Treasury 12 months after the expiration of the deadline established in section 101(b).

(2) INCLUSION IN AGREEMENTS AND PLAN.—The requirements in paragraph (1) shall be included in all annual funding agreements entered into under the self-governance program under title IV of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 458aa et seq.), withdrawal plans, withdrawal agreements, or any other agreements for withdrawal or transfer of the funds to the Tribe or a private financial institution under this Act.

(f) WITHOUT FISCAL YEAR LIMITATION.—All money appropriated pursuant to authorizations under this title shall be available without fiscal year limitation.

SEC. 106. STATE CONTRIBUTIONS TO SETTLEMENT.

Consistent with Articles VI.C.2 and C.3 of the Compact, the State contribution to settlement shall be as follows:

(1) The contribution of $150,000 appropriated by Montana House Bill 6 of the 55th Legislative Session (1997) shall be used for the following purposes:

(A) Water quality discharge monitoring wells and monitoring program.

(B) A diversion structure on Big Sandy Creek.

(C) A conveyance structure on Box Elder Creek.

(D) The purchase of contract water from Lower Beaver Creek Reservoir.

(2) Subject to the availability of funds, the State shall provide services valued at $400,000 for administration required by the Compact and for water quality sampling required by the Compact.

TITLE II—TIBER RESERVOIR ALLOCATION AND FEASIBILITY STUDIES AUTHORIZATION

SEC. 201. TIBER RESERVOIR.

(a) ALLOCATION OF WATER TO THE TRIBE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall permanently allocate to the Tribe, without cost to the Tribe, 10,000 acre-feet per year of stored water from the water right of the Bureau of Reclamation in Lake Elwell, Lower Marias Unit, Upper Missouri Division, Pick-Sloan Missouri Basin Program, Montana, measured at the outlet works of the dam or at the diversion point from the reservoir. The allocation shall become effective when the decree referred to in section 101(b) has become final in accordance with that section. The allocation shall be part of the Tribal Water Right and subject to the terms of this Act.

(2) AGREEMENT.—The Secretary shall enter into an agreement with the Tribe setting forth the terms of the allocation and providing for the Tribe's use or temporary transfer of water stored in Lake Elwell, subject to the terms and conditions of the Compact and this Act.

(3) PRIOR RESERVED WATER RIGHTS.—The allocation provided in this section shall be subject to the prior reserved water rights, if any, of any Indian tribe, or person claiming water through any Indian tribe.

(b) USE AND TEMPORARY TRANSFER OF ALLOCATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to the limitations and conditions set forth in the Compact and this Act, the Tribe shall have the right to devote the water allocated by this section to any use, including agricultural, municipal, commercial, industrial, mining, or recreational uses, within or outside the Rocky Boy's Reservation.

(2) CONTRACTS AND AGREEMENTS.—Notwithstanding any other provision of statutory or common law, the Tribe may, with the approval of the Secretary and subject to the limitations and conditions set forth in the Compact, enter into a service contract, lease, exchange, or other agreement providing for the temporary delivery, use, or transfer of the water allocated by this section, except that no such service contract, lease, exchange, or other agreement may permanently alienate any portion of the tribal allocation.

(c) REMAINING STORAGE.—The United States shall retain the right to use for any authorized purpose, any and all storage remaining in Lake Elwell after the allocation made to the Tribe in subsection 201(a).

(d) WATER TRANSPORT OBLIGATION; DEVELOPMENT AND DELIVERY COSTS.—The United States shall have no responsibility or obligation to provide any facility for the transport of the water allocated by this section to the Rocky Boy's Reservation or to any other location. Except for the contribution set forth in subsection 105(a)(3), the cost of developing and delivering the water allocated by this title or any other supplemental water to the Rocky Boy's Reservation shall not be borne by the United States.

(e) SECTION NOT PRECEDENTIAL.—The provisions of this section regarding the allocation of water resources from the Tiber Reservoir to the Tribe shall not be construed as precedent in the litigation or settlement of any other Indian water right claims.

SEC. 202. MUNICIPAL, RURAL, AND INDUSTRIAL FEASIBILITY STUDY.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—

(A) STUDY.—The Secretary, through the Bureau of Reclamation, shall perform an MR&I feasibility study of water and related resources in north central Montana to evaluate alternatives for a municipal, rural, and industrial supply for the Rocky Boy's Reservation.

(B) USE OF FUNDS MADE AVAILABLE FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999.—The authority under subparagraph (A) shall be deemed to apply to MR&I feasibility study activities for which funds were made available by appropriations for fiscal year 1999.

(2) CONTENTS OF STUDY.—The MR&I feasibility study shall include the feasibility of releasing the Tribe's Tiber allocation as provided in section 201 into the Missouri River System for later diversion to a treatment and delivery system for the Rocky Boy's Reservation.

(3) UTILIZATION OF EXISTING STUDIES.—The MR&I feasibility study shall include utilization of existing Federal and non-Federal studies and shall be planned and conducted in consultation with other Federal agencies, the State of Montana, and the Chippewa Cree Tribe.

(b) ACCEPTANCE OR PARTICIPATION IN IDENTIFIED OFF-RESERVATION SYSTEM.—The United States, the Chippewa Cree Tribe of the Rocky Boy's Reservation, and the State of Montana shall not be obligated to accept or participate in any potential off-Reservation water supply system identified in the MR&I feasibility study authorized in subsection (a).

SEC. 203. REGIONAL FEASIBILITY STUDY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) STUDY.—The Secretary, through the Bureau of Reclamation, shall conduct, pursuant to Reclamation Law, a regional feasibility study (referred to in this subsection as the ''regional feasibility study'') to evaluate water and related resources in north central Montana in order to determine the limitations of those resources and how those resources can best be managed and developed to serve the needs of the citizens of Montana.

(2) USE OF FUNDS MADE AVAILABLE FOR FISCAL YEAR 1999.—The authority under paragraph (1) shall be deemed to apply to regional feasibility study activities for which funds were made available by appropriations for fiscal year 1999.

(b) CONTENTS OF STUDY.—The regional feasibility study shall—

(1) evaluate existing and potential water supplies, uses, and management;

(2) identify major water-related issues, including environmental, water supply, and economic issues;

(3) evaluate opportunities to resolve the issues referred to in paragraph (2); and

(4) evaluate options for implementation of resolutions to the issues.

(c) REQUIREMENTS.—Because of the regional and international impact of the regional feasibility study, the study may not be segmented. The regional study shall—

(1) utilize, to the maximum extent possible, existing information; and

(2) be planned and conducted in consultation with all affected interests, including interests in Canada.

SEC. 204. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR FEASIBILITY STUDIES.

(a) FISCAL YEAR 1999 APPROPRIATIONS.—Of the amounts made available by appropriations for fiscal year 1999 for the Bureau of Reclamation, $1,000,000 shall be used for the purpose of commencing the MR&I feasibility study under section 202 and the regional study under section 203, of which—

(1) $500,000 shall be used for the MR&I study under section 202; and

(2) $500,000 shall be used for the regional study under section 203.

(b) FEASIBILITY STUDIES.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Department of the Interior, for the Bureau of Reclamation, for the purpose of conducting the MR&I feasibility study under section 202 and the regional study under section 203, $3,000,000 for fiscal year 2000, of which—

(1) $500,000 shall be used for the MR&I feasibility study under section 202; and

(2) $2,500,000 shall be used for the regional study under section 203.

(c) WITHOUT FISCAL YEAR LIMITATION.—All money appropriated pursuant to authorizations under this title shall be available without fiscal year limitation.

(d) AVAILABILITY OF CERTAIN MONEYS.—The amounts made available for use under subsection (a) shall be deemed to have been available for use as of the date on which those funds were appropriated. The amounts authorized to be appropriated in subsection (b) shall be available for use immediately upon appropriation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE).

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

Madam Speaker, the Rocky Boy's water rights settlement process has been important for a number of reasons. The gentleman from Montana (Mr. HILL), the State of Montana, and the tribe have spent a good deal of time working through the issues in a constructive fashion, taking steps to minimize the impact on other affected water users. Furthermore, there has been minimal emphasis on some of the outmoded bases for calculating Federal Reserve Indian water right claims. This process has allowed the parties to look to newer, more flexible negotiations that find solutions which provide tribes with real opportunities without making demands that may destroy the economic livelihood of existing water users.

Additionally, this process has brought new solutions and introduced private sector expertise into the tribe's efforts to utilize these water supplies once the settlement is authorized. By approaching these Indian water right settlements in more creative ways, Congress and the Federal Government can narrow the divergent expectations of the parties as they enter negotiations and attempt to correct problems that have existed for decades. It is important for Congress to modernize the process and bases for settling these claims. It is taking far too long to arrive at a settlement. Often tribes receive water and money under circumstances that do not ultimately help them realize the benefits of the broader economy. It is the intention that this settlement will help the tribe reach their goal of self-determination. I urge my colleagues to support the legislation

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation. I commend my good friend, the gentleman from Montana (Mr. HILL), for his hard, hard work on this legislation. It balances all the interests so very carefully, and I commend him for bringing it to this point.

This legislation provides for a comprehensive settlement of the water rights claims of the Chippewa Cree Tribe of the Rocky Boy's Reservation in Montana. Under the terms of this legislation, Congress would approve and authorize participation in a water rights compact entered into by the tribe and the State of Montana. The compact recognizes the tribe's rights to approximately 10,000 acre feet of water on the reservation, and provides for specific water development projects and funding to benefit the tribe.

The future water rights of the tribe are also provided for in this bill. The Chippewa Cree Tribe, the State of Montana, and representatives from the Department of Interior have worked very, very hard for many years to secure agreement on this water rights settlement.

Again, the work of the gentleman from Montana (Mr. HILL) has brought this to a culmination. H.R. 795 provides an opportunity to ratify the first Indian water settlement since the early 1990s, and I urge my colleagues to support enactment of this important legislation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. HILL), the distinguished author of the legislation.

(Mr. HILL of Montana asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HILL of Montana. Madam Speaker, as the sponsor of this bill, I rise in strong support of H.R. 795, the Chippewa Cree Tribe Water Rights Settlement Act, which is a companion to a bill in the Senate, 438. I especially want to thank the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) and his staff Bob Faber and Josh Johnson for their tireless efforts to work with all the parties involved that has allowed us to move this important piece of legislation.

This bill is the culmination of many years of technical and legal work and many years of negotiations involving the Chippewa Cree Tribe, the State of Montana and representatives of the United States Departments of Interior and Justice. The bill will ratify a settlement that quantifies the water rights of the tribe and provides for the development in a manner that would be consistent with their neighbors, the needs of the local communities and farmers and ranchers. It provides Federal funds for construction of water supply facilities and for tribal economic development and defines the Federal Government's role in implementing that settlement. This settlement bill has the full support of the tribe, the State of Montana, the Department of Justice, the Department of Interior and the water users who farm and ranch on streams shared with the reservation.

This bill will effectuate a settlement that is a textbook example of how State, tribal and Federal governments can work together to resolve that difference in a way that meets the concerns of all. It is also a settlement that reflects the effectiveness of tribal and nontribal water users in working together in goodwill and in good faith with respect to each other's needs and concerns.

□ 1430

It is not an overstatement to say that the Chippewa Cree Tribe of the Rocky Boy's Reservation Indian Reserved Water Rights Settlement and Water Supply Enhancement Act is a historic agreement. This is truly a great occasion for all those who have worked so hard to get us to this point.

In closing, again, I want to thank the gentleman from California (Chairman DOLITTLE), the gentleman from Alaska (Chairman YOUNG), and the House leadership for scheduling the bill today. I also want to thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) for his cosponsorship and helping to move this bill forward and urge its adoption.

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

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Madam Speaker, I urge an ''aye'' vote; I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 795, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHATTAHOOCHEE RIVER NATIONAL RECREATION AREA AMENDMENTS

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2140) to improve protection and management of the Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area in the State of Georgia, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2140

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

SECTION 1. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area in the State of Georgia is a nationally significant resource;

(2) the Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area has been adversely affected by land use changes occurring inside and outside the recreation area;

(3) the population of the metropolitan Atlanta area continues to expand northward, leaving dwindling opportunities to protect the scenic, recreational, natural, and historical values of the 2,000-foot-wide corridor adjacent to each bank of the Chattahoochee River and its impoundments in the 48-mile segment known as the ''area of national concern'';

(4) the State of Georgia has enacted the Metropolitan River Protection Act to ensure protection of the corridor located within 2,000 feet of each bank of the Chattahoochee River, or the corridor located within the 100-year floodplain, whichever is larger;

(5) the corridor located within the 100-year floodplain includes the area of national concern;

(6) since establishment of the Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area, visitor use of the recreation area has shifted dramatically from waterborne to water-related and land-based activities;

(7) the State of Georgia and political subdivisions of the State along the Chattahoochee River have indicated willingness to join in a cooperative effort with the United States to link existing units of the recreation area through a series of linear corridors to be established within the area of national concern and elsewhere on the river; and

(8) if Congress appropriates funds in support of the cooperative effort described in paragraph (7), funding from the State, political subdivisions of the State, private foundations, corporate entities, private individuals, and other sources will be available to fund more than half the estimated cost of the cooperative effort.

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

(1) to increase the level of protection of the open spaces within the area of national concern along the Chattahoochee River and to enhance visitor enjoyment of the open spaces by adding land-based linear corridors to link existing units of the recreation area;

(2) to ensure that the Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area is managed to standardize acquisition, planning, design, construction, and operation of the linear corridors; and

(3) to authorize the appropriation of Federal funds to cover a portion of the costs of the Federal, State, local, and private cooperative effort to add additional areas to the recreation area so as to establish a series of linear corridors linking existing units of the recreation area and to protect other open spaces of the Chattahoochee River corridor.

SEC. 2. AMENDMENTS TO CHATTAHOOCHEE RIVER NATIONAL RECREATION AREA ACT.

(a) BOUNDARIES.—Section 101 of the Act entitled ''An Act to authorize the establishment of the Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area in the State of Georgia, and for other purposes'', approved August 15, 1978 (16 U.S.C. 460ii), is amended—

(1) in the third sentence, by inserting after ''numbered CHAT–20,003, and dated September 1984,'' the following: ''and on the maps entitled 'Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area Interim Boundary Map #1', 'Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area Interim Boundary Map #2', and 'Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area Interim Boundary Map #3', and dated August 6, 1998,'';

(2) by striking the fourth sentence and inserting the following: ''No sooner than 180 days after the date of enactment of this sentence, the Secretary of the Interior (hereinafter referred to as the 'Secretary') may modify the boundaries of the recreation area to include other land within the Chattahoochee River corridor by submitting a revised map or other boundary description to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the United States Senate and the Committee on Resources of the United States House of Representatives. The revised map or other boundary description shall be prepared by the Secretary after consultation with affected landowners, the State of Georgia, and affected political subdivisions of the State. The revised boundaries shall take effect 180 days after the date of submission unless, within the 180-day period, Congress enacts a joint resolution disapproving the revised boundaries.''; and

(3) in the next-to-last sentence, by striking ''may not exceed approximately 6,800 acres.'' and inserting ''may not exceed 10,000 acres.''.

(b) ACQUISITION OF PROPERTY.—Section 102 of the Act entitled ''An Act to authorize the establishment of the Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area in the State of Georgia, and for other purposes'', approved August 15, 1978 (16 U.S.C. 460ii–1), is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting ''from willing sellers'' after ''purchase''; and

(2) by striking subsection (f).

(c) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—Section 103 of the Act entitled ''An Act to authorize the establishment of the Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area in the State of Georgia, and for other purposes'', approved August 15, 1978 (16 U.S.C. 460ii–2), is amended by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

''(b) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary may enter into cooperative agreements with the State of Georgia, political subdivisions of the State, and other entities to ensure standardized acquisition, planning, design, construction, and operation of the recreation area.''.

(d) FUNDING.—Section 105 of the Act entitled ''An Act to authorize the establishment of the Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area in the State of Georgia, and for other purposes'', approved August 15, 1978 (16 U.S.C. 460ii–4), is amended—

(1) by striking ''SEC. 105. (a)'' and inserting the following:

''SEC. 105. FUNDING SOURCES AND GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN.

''(a) FUNDING.—

''(1) LIMITATION ON USE OF APPROPRIATED FUNDS.—'';

(2) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking ''$79,400,000'' and inserting '$115,000,000'';

(B) by striking ''this Act'' and inserting ''this title''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) DONATIONS.—The Secretary may accept a donation of funds or land or an interest in land to carry out this title.

''(3) RELATION TO OTHER FUNDING SOURCES.—Funds made available under paragraph (1) are in addition to funding and the donation of land and interests in land by the State of Georgia, local government authorities, private foundations, corporate entities, and individuals for purposes of this title.''; and

(3) in subsection (c)—

(A) by redesignating paragraphs (1) through (3) as subparagraphs (A) through (C), respectively, and indenting appropriately;

(B) by striking ''(c) Within'' and inserting the following:

''(c) GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN.—

''(1) INITIAL PLAN.—Within'';

(C) in paragraph (1) (as designated by subparagraph (B)), by striking ''transmit to'' and all that follows through ''Representatives'' and inserting ''transmit to the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives''; and

(D) by adding at the end the following:

''(2) REVISED PLAN.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—Within 3 years after the date funds are made available, the Secretary shall submit to the committees specified in paragraph (1) a revised general management plan to provide for the protection, enhancement, enjoyment, development, and use of the recreation area.

''(B) PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.—In preparing the revised plan, the Secretary shall encourage the participation of the State of Georgia and affected political subdivisions of the State, private landowners, interested citizens, public officials, groups, agencies, educational institutions, and other entities.''.

(e) TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS.—Title I of the Act entitled ''An Act to authorize the establishment of the Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area in the State of Georgia, and for other purposes'', approved August 15, 1978 (16 U.S.C. 460ii et seq.), is amended—

(1) in sections 102(d) and 103(a), by striking ''of this Act'' and inserting ''of this title'';

(2) in section 104(b)—

(A) by striking ''of this Act'' and inserting ''of this title'';

(B) by striking ''under this Act'' and inserting ''under this title'';

(C) by striking ''by this Act'' and inserting ''by this title''; and

(D) by striking ''in this Act'' and inserting ''in this title'';

(3) in section 104(d)(2), by striking ''under this Act'' and inserting ''under this title'';

(4) in section 105(c)(1)(A), as redesignated by subsection (d)(3), by striking ''of this Act'' and inserting ''of this title'';

(5) in section 106(a), by striking ''in this Act'' and inserting ''in this title''; and

(6) in section 106(d), by striking ''under this Act'' and inserting ''under this title''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE).

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2140, introduced by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL). The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. DEAL) is to be commended for crafting a bill which amends the Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area Act by modifying the boundaries of the area and to provide for the lands, waters, and scenic resources, and to provide protection for these within the recreation area.

Visitor enjoyment and protection of the river would be enhanced by adding land-based links between current units of the national recreation area. This bill also assures the recreation area is managed by forming cooperative agreements with State, local, and other entities.

The Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area attracts thousands of visitors year-round. The recreation area has seen a substantial increase in use, becoming one of the most visited national recreation areas in the country.

H.R. 2140 will also enhance the protection for the scenic and recreational values of the Chattahoochee River corridor from developmental pressures.

I urge all my colleagues to support this legislation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, H.R. 2140 modifies the boundaries of the Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area with the intention of providing for the inclusion of land within 2,000 feet of each bank of the Chattahoochee River on a 48-mile segment in metropolitan Atlanta, Georgia.

At the hearing on H.R. 2140 on July 20, 1999, the National Park Service testified in support of the legislation as introduced, with one technical change. As amended by the Committee on Resources, one substantive change and a number of technical and conforming changes have been made to the bill. The one substantive change is the new requirement that land could only be acquired on a willing-seller basis.

As the National Park Service noted in its testimony, there are cases of potentially severe and irreparable damage to resources that can only be prevented through the use of eminent domain. Given that rapid development and urbanization of the area, threats to these resources are a real danger.

The National Park Service also noted that, although eminent domain authority at Chattahoochee currently exists, it has never been used, and the National Park Service hopes it never will be. By tying the National Park Service's hands on acquisitions, we could open up the area to developers and speculators who can name their price with no recourse.

However, Madam Speaker, overall, H.R. 2140 is a good bill, and I would hate to see the bill hung up on this point. I understand that the Senate companion legislation has language on this point that the administration supports. Hopefully, this can be resolved so action on the measure can be completed and a bill sent to the President that has the support of all parties.

Mr. ISAKSON. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of this bill, H.R. 2140. This legislation would modify the boundaries of the Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area to protect and preserve the endangered Chattahoochee River and provide additional recreation opportunities for the citizens of Georgia and our nation. The river and its corridor lands are a vital source of water for the City of Atlanta, and more broadly for all of north Georgia. The area hosts diverse wildlife, significant natural communities and irreplaceable historic resources in the midst of one of America's most vibrant urban areas. It also affords a recreational haven for the millions of visitors each year to the dozen or so non-contiguous parkland areas that together compromise the Chattahoochee Recreation Area.

Congress established the Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area in 1978 to preserve and protect the natural, scenic, recreational, historic, and other values of a 48-mile segment of one of our nation's great urban rivers. Six years later, in 1984, as development around and within the recreation area increased, Congress acted to facilitate State and local government efforts to protect the area by declaring the 2,000-foot-wide corridor adjacent to each bank of the Chattahoochee as an area of national concern. Now, due to the rapid pace of commercial and residential development in the Chattahoochee River corridor, I believe it is absolutely essential that we pass this legislation in order to provide additional protection for this important resource. I have sought to continue former Speaker Gingrich's efforts to preserve the Chattahoochee River by funding the Chattahoochee Greenways Project, which will keep land on the banks of the river from further development and help clean up the waterway.

This legislation is essential because over the years there has been a shift from largely water-based to land-based use of the park by visitors to the area, thereby contributing to a need for a larger land base for recreation. H.R. 2140 would expand the recreation area and protecting most of the remaining open spaces along the river corridor. The goal of the legislation is to create as much of an uninterrupted stretch of land as possible along the river banks in order to meet increased demand for recreational opportunities by communities along the river.

This legislation also promotes private-public partnerships since Congress appropriated $25 million for land acquisition along the Chattahoochee last year and this will be matched by private funds. Remarkable cooperative efforts are currently underway to protect key lands in the corridor of Georgia's Chattahoochee River from Buford Dam to the Florida border. Thanks to the tireless efforts and leadership of the Trust for Public Land, the State of Georgia, private foundations, corporate entities, private individuals, and others have already given or pledged tens of millions of dollars to secure properties of public significance within the current authorized boundaries of the Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area and to preserve the river for future generations of Georgians to enjoy.

I would like to thank Representative NATHAN DEAL for introducing this important legislation and his efforts to protect one of Georgia's most indispensable natural resources. I am grateful for past efforts of Governor Zell Miller, Lt. Governor Pierre Howard, and for the efforts of other members of the Georgia delegation and Congress at large in support of this important legislation. I believe Congress must act fast to enact this legislation in order to protect the Chattahoochee River from any further development and environmental damage.

Mr. DEAL of Georgia. Madam Speaker, for the consideration on the floor today of an issue important to the State of Georgia and myself. H.R. 2140 is legislation I introduced earlier this year to improve the protection and management of the Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area.

The Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area was established August 15, 1978, and boundary adjustments were made in October 1984. The recreation area is along a 48-mile stretch of the Chattahoochee River within four counties, north and northeast of Atlanta, Georgia. The area immediately adjacent to the park is being heavily developed, and Forsyth County (which I represent) is the fastest growing county in the United States. The park currently contains about 9,238 acres of which approximately 4,500 are Federally owned. Presently, the park includes thirteen separate land units. Popular recreational activities in the park include fishing, hiking, picnicking, canoeing, rafting, tubing, and boating. It also contains a number of natural habitats, 19th century historic sites and ruins, as well as Native American archaeological sites. Annual visitation is about 3.5 million visitors.

My legislation would modify the boundaries of the Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area and authorize the creation of a greenway buffer between the river and private development to prevent further pollution, provide flood and erosion control, and maintain water quality for safe drinking water and for the fish and wildlife dependent on the river system. In addition, this legislation promotes private-public partnerships by authorizing $25 million in federal funds for land acquisition for the recreation area. The $25 million will be matched by private funds. The State of Georgia, private foundations, corporate entities, private individual, and others have already given or pledged tens of millions of dollars to protect and preserve the Chattahoochee river for future generations of Georgians to enjoy. At the same time, it includes an ''any willing seller'' provision to protect private property rights of landowners.

Last year, in anticipation of passage of this legislation, Congress made available $25 million for land acquisition in the Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area. That funding is serving to leverage state, local government, and private funding to further augment land purchases in the recreation area. However, legislative authority expanding the boundaries is needed before the additional land can be purchased. We can help preserve one of Georgia's most vital natural resources by enacting H.R. 2140.

Similar legislation was introduced in the House and Senate during the 105th Congress. As most of you know, the House passed the legislation in October 1998, however the Senate did not act on the measure.

During this Congress, Senator COVERDELL introduced the companion bill to H.R. 2140 (S. 109), and the bill was reported on June 7, 1999 by the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. I believe it is crucial for the House to act quickly on this legislation in order to protect the Chattahoochee River from further development and environmental damage.

Again, thank you Madam Speaker, and thank you to the Resources Committee members and staff for all the help they provided with H.R. 2140. I would also like to thank Representative ISAKSON for his assistance in protecting one of Georgia's most vital, natural resources.

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

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Madam Speaker, I urge an ''aye'' vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2140, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Madam 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.

NORTH AMERICAN WETLANDS CONSERVATION COUNCIL EXPANSION ACT OF 1999

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2821) to amend the North American Wetlands Conservation Act to provide for appointment of 2 additional members of the North American Wetlands Conservation Council, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2821

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 ''North American Wetlands Conservation Council Expansion Act of 1999''.

SEC. 2. ADDITIONAL MEMBERS OF THE NORTH AMERICAN WETLANDS CONSERVATION COUNCIL.

(a) ADDITIONAL MEMBERS.—Section 4(a)(1) of the North American Wetlands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 4403(a)(1) is amended by striking ''nine'' and inserting ''eleven''.

(b) APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL MEMBERS.—Section 4(a)(1)(D) of the North American Wetlands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 4403(a)(1)(D)) is amended by striking ''three'' and inserting ''five''.

(c) INITIAL TERMS.—Of the members of the North American Wetlands Conservation Council first appointed under the amendments made by subsections (a) and (b)—

(1) one shall be appointed to an initial term of 1 year; and

(2) one shall be appointed to an initial term of 2 years,

as specified by the Secretary of the Interior at the time of appointment.

(d) RELATIONSHIP TO EXISTING APPOINTMENT REQUIREMENTS.—Except as provided in subsection (e), this section shall not affect section 304 of the Wetlands and Wildlife Enhancement Act of 1998 (112 Stat. 2958; 16 U.S.C. 4403 note).

(e) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 304 of the Wetlands and Wildlife Enhancement Act of 1998 (112 Stat. 2958; 16 U.S.C. 4403 note) is amended by striking ''shall consist of'' and inserting ''shall include''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE).

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

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to present to the House H.R. 2821, introduced by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON).

The fundamental goal of this legislation is to diversify and expand the effectiveness of the North American Wetlands Council by increasing from three to five the number of nongovernmental representatives that may serve on that body.

Under current law, there are nine members, including the Director of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, who serve on the Wetlands Council. Their job is to review and recommend worthwhile conservation projects to the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission.

To date, the commission has approved 714 projects to protect, restore, and enhance critical wetland habitat in Canada, Mexico, and the United States. This represents a financial commitment of $310.8 million that has been matched by more than 900 nongovernmental partners, for a total investment of $798.5 million. These funds have been used to conserve over 33 million acres of wetlands which directly benefit millions of migratory birds.

By expanding the membership of the Wetlands Council, two additional conservation groups would be given a seat at the table, and they would bring with them their commitment to accelerate the growth of this extremely successful program.

H.R. 2821 is a noncontroversial and bipartisan bill that has been authored by the two House Members who serve with distinction on the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission.

I urge an ''aye'' vote on this legislation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, the council established under the North American Wetlands Conservation Act has made tremendous positive impact in helping to restore and conserve wetlands across the North American continent. Projects supported by the council help to preserve wetlands and provide crucial forage and resting habitats for migratory birds, not only in our Nation, but also in Canada and Mexico.

H.R. 2821 would simply add two additional nongovernmental seats to the North American Wetlands Conservation Council, thereby increasing the size of the council from 9 to 11 members in total. There would be no increase in the current number of two permanent seats in the council, which are reserved for the director of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the executive secretary of the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation.

It is my understanding from the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) that this increase in nongovernmental seats is considered an appropriate step in order to provide new opportunities for public participation on the council by a broader number of charitable and nongovernmental organizations. Furthermore, it is my understanding that the administration does not oppose this increase in seats.

As such, the bill appears to be straightforward and noncontroversial. Since the only intention of this bill is to increase the number of opportunities for nonprofit participation in the council, I strongly support this legislation.

By all measures, the North American Wetlands Conservation Council has proven itself to be a very effective and strong advocate for wetlands conservation and restoration. I believe most, if not all, Members of this House can agree that the modest increase in nonprofit seats proposed by this legislation would be a positive enhancement to this extremely successful council. I urge all members to vote ''aye'' on this bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Madam Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), one of the principal sponsors of the legislation.

(Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) for yielding me this time, and let me thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) for his help in getting this bill to the floor today.

I rise to pay a very appropriate thanks to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), author of this legislation.

I have had the pleasure for the past several sessions of the Congress representing the Republican side of the aisle on the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission, where the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) has had a tremendous career in providing leadership to this body for preserving flyaway space for the migratory birds in North America.

Madam Speaker, there is no other program that I can think of that enjoys such bipartisan support in voluntarily protecting land for birds and for wildlife and habitat.

We in this body tend to get in disagreements from time to time over the issue of takings and over the issue of forcing property owners to make their land available for the public. Well, this program is the exact opposite.

The father of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), if I am not mistaken, was the initiator of this entire program decades ago. This program, started by the father of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), and supported by the late Silvey Oconte, who were both tireless advocates for conservation issues in America, has provided the ability of our Government to protect over 34 million acres of land, 34 million acres of land, without taking anyone's property without their consent, but by simply entering into agreements where we bring conservation groups together so they can use the leverage to provide other funds, matched in such cases by State and local governments, to protect this land for migratory birds.

We now have a massive network of open space that would not have been protected were it not for this legislation, were it not for this program. What the bill of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) does, which I am very proud to be a cosponsor of, is it allows for the expansion of this council, to make sure that those conservation groups who are most heavily involved maintain their seats on this oversight board that recommends projects to us.

I will be remiss if I did not mention, Madam Speaker, Ducks Unlimited. Ducks Unlimited has put millions of dollars into programs that have allowed us to voluntarily protect land as provided for by the legislation of the North Americans Wetlands Conservation Act and by the role that the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) and I play on the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission.

Groups like Ducks Unlimited need to be a part of this process. This legislation allows for the expansion of the council for two more seats so that Ducks Unlimited, hopefully, will be able to maintain that seat in the future.

Once again, I rise in strong support of this. I urge all my Republican colleagues and, really, all of our colleagues to join in enthusiastically voting for the legislation of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), which is right. It is important for our country. I think it also speaks to his leadership following in his father's footsteps on conservation issues for America.

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL), the dean of the U.S. House of Representatives. I might add the youngest dean in this century.

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

Mr. DINGELL. Madam Speaker, I first thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) for his friendship and for what he has done to move this legislation forward.

I also want to compliment and commend the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman of the Committee on Resources; the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), the ranking member; the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA); the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON), chairman of the Subcommittee on Fisheries Conservation, Wildlife and Oceans; and of course the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

I want to say what a pleasure it is for me to work with the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), who serves on the Migratory Bird Commission.

This is a relatively small piece of legislation. Its purpose is very simple, and that is to see to it that we have enough participation by private conservation organizations which work so hard to see to it that this particular program works.

NAWCA is an extremely valuable program which has set aside, with the full consent of the landowners, millions of acres of land in the United States, in Canada, and in Mexico.

□ 1445

And it has done so with the good will of all involved; conservationists, government agencies, Federal, State and local, private individuals, and landowners are for what this has done. It has been a tremendous assist to the conservation movement in this country and is saving lands for very important purposes.

I want to say again what a pleasure it has been to work with my good friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), who has consistently been a great voice for conservation and who has worked wonderfully well with me and with the other members of the Migratory Bird Commission, which is one of the most successful land procurement agencies in the whole history of American government. The fact that so few know about it tends to prove that we work so well that there is really no cause for complaint in the acquisition of the millions of acres of land.

The function of the legislation before us is not to cost the Federal Government money. It will not. Rather, it will allow the Secretary of the Interior to use two additional slots to appoint organizations that will help make sound wetland conservation decisions and will draw in new organizations and organizational strength and achieve additional commitments towards further cooperative investments in reclaiming wetlands and wildlife habitat. This is, in that very small but very important particular, a very important but valuable piece of legislation, and I would commend the committee for its labors in bringing it forth.

I want to thank my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), who has given me all too much credit in this matter and who is my full partner in the business of the Migratory Bird Commission representing the House and also to observe that the commission is served very well by two of our good friends and colleagues in the Senate who have participated actively in the efforts to achieve this particular end.

So this is a good bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it. I think we will be pleased with what we have done when we look back on the successes that this has brought us.

Madam Speaker, today we have before us a relatively small bill to make a significant conservation program even more successful. H.R. 2821, the North American Wetlands Conservation Council Expansion Act, would make a modest improvement to a conservation law that has successfully saved wetlands throughout the United States, Canada, and Mexico during the past decade.

I want to thank Chairman DON YOUNG and Ranking Member GEORGE MILLER of the House Resources Committee for allowing this legislation to come before the House so swiftly. Together with the assistance of Fisheries Subcommittee Chairman JIM SAXTON and Ranking Member ENI FALEOMAVAEGA, their support for this legislation means a lot, and I hope it sends a strong message to the other body for favorable consideration.

NAWCA [naw-ka] was signed into law in 1989 in response to the finding that more than half of the original wetlands in the United States have been lost during the past two centuries. Congress recognized that protection of migratory birds and their habitats required long-term planning and coordination so that our treaty obligations to conserve these precious species would be met.

The purpose of NAWCA is to encourage partnerships among public and non-public interests to protect, enhance, restore and manage wetlands for migratory birds and other fish and wildlife in North America. NAWCA has been a tremendous success, funding 629 projects between 1991 and 1999, helping to restore, enhance or help approximately 34 million acres across our continent. Most impressive has been the ratio of partner-to-government contributions, which has been about $2.50 for every public dollar invested.

Madam Speaker, I believe that the most effective means to diversify and expand the effectiveness of the Council is to provide the Secretary with new authority to appoint two additional Council members under Sec. 4(a)(1)(D) of the North American Wetlands Conservation Act. These appointments would give the Service the ability to include additional charitable and non-profit organizations from among the many which actively participate in the development of NAWCA projects.

A little more than one year ago I first learned of the Fish and Wildlife Service's desire to promote change in the NAWCA program when the agency announced its intent not to reappoint two non-governmental organizations that played key roles in making NAWCA a cornerstone of American conservation success. I was greatly concerned that any replacement of Council members under NAWCA should not serve as a disincentive to continued active participation in meeting the Act's goals.

CBO has indicated that increasing the size of the NAWCA Council will not cost the federal government any money. Rather, it is my intention to allow the Secretary of Interior to use these two additional slots to appoint organizations that will make sound wetland conservation decisions and promote additional commitments toward cooperative investment in reclaiming these habitats.

I want to conclude by praising the hard work of the North American Wetlands Conservation Council, the staffs of its member organizations, and those staff of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service who have devoted themselves to the fulfillment of NAWCA's goals. Congress reauthorized NAWCA last year because its success during the first decade was clearly evident, and because the need for wetlands conservation is even clearer today than it was a decade ago. I hope that H.R. 2821 will provide a non-controversial, easy-to-approve mechanism to accelerate the growth of this magnificent program.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLITTLE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2821, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DOOLITTLE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 659, H.R. 795, H.R. 2140, and H.R. 2821, the four bills just debated.

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

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT REGARDING ADOPTED ALIENS

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2886) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide that an adopted alien who is less than 18 years of age may be considered a child under such Act if adopted with or after a sibling who is a child under such Act.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2886

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

SECTION 1. PROVIDING THAT AN ADOPTED ALIEN WHO IS LESS THAN 18 YEARS OF AGE MAY BE CONSIDERED A CHILD UNDER THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT IF ADOPTED WITH OR AFTER A SIBLING WHO IS A CHILD UNDER SUCH ACT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 101(b)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (E)—

(A) by inserting ''(i)'' after ''(E)''; and

(B) by adding at the end the following:

''(ii) subject to the same proviso as in clause (i), a child who (I) is a natural sibling of a child described in clause (i) or subparagraph (F)(i); (II) was adopted by the adoptive parent or parents of the sibling described in such clause or subparagraph; and (III) is otherwise described in clause (i), except that the child was adopted while under the age of eighteen years; or''; and

(2) in subparagraph (F)—

(A) by inserting ''(i) after ''(F)'';

(B) by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; or''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(ii) subject to the same provisos as in clause (i), a child who (I) is a natural sibling of a child described in clause (i) or subparagraph (E)(i); (II) has been adopted abroad, or is coming to the United States for adoption, by the adoptive parent (or prospective adoptive parent) or parents of the sibling described in such clause or subparagraph; and (III) is otherwise described in clause (i), except that the child is under the age of eighteen at the time a petition is filed in his or her behalf to accord a classification as an immediate relative under section 201(b).''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS RELATING TO NATURALIZATION.—

(1) DEFINITION OF CHILD.—Section 101(c)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(c)) is amended by striking ''sixteen years,'' and inserting ''sixteen years (except to the extent that the child is described in subparagraph (E)(ii) or (F)(ii) of subsection (b)(1)),''.

(2) CERTIFICATE OF CITIZENSHIP.—Section 322(a)(4) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1433(a)(4)) is amended—

(A) by striking ''16 years'' and inserting ''16 years (except to the extent that the child is described in clause (ii) of subparagraph (E) or (F) of section 101(b)(1))''; and

(B) by striking ''subparagraph (E) or (F) of section 101(b)(1).'' and inserting ''either of such subparagraphs.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, H.R. 2886, a bill introduced by the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN), amends the Immigration and Nationality Act and provides that an older child who is 16 or 17 years old may be adopted with or after the adoption of a younger sibling who is a child under such act.

Currently, the Immigration and Nationality Act permits a foreign-born child who has been adopted by a United States citizen parent to be classified as an immediate relative child for purposes of immigration to the United States. To qualify, the child must be under the age of 16 at the time an immigrant visa petition is filed on the child's behalf.

Since most parents prefer to adopt infants or very young children, older children constitute a relatively small portion of the adoptive children admitted as immigrants. However, in cases involving siblings, adoptive parents often wish to adopt the older child or children in order to keep the family group intact. If the oldest child happens to be 16 or 17, there is no way under current law for that child to immigrate to the United States.

A typical case would likely involve a group of siblings, one 16 or 17 years old who had been orphaned. A United States citizen family is willing to adopt all of the siblings in order to keep them together but, under current law, the oldest child cannot immigrate to the United States. The result would be either separation of the older child from the sibling group or, in cases where foreign adoption authorities will not prevent the separation of siblings, the U.S. citizen loses the opportunity to adopt any of the children.

The bill authored by the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) would allow minor orphaned siblings to stay together when being adopted by U.S. citizens. The bill would allow a 16- or 17-year-old child to qualify as an immediate relative child if the U.S. citizen parents have also adopted a sibling of that child who is under the age of 16.

This bill thus would achieve the goal of maintaining family unity in a relatively small number of cases involving the adoption of siblings one of whom is age 16 or 17 at the time the adoptive parents file immigrant visa petitions on the children's behalf, and I urge the House to adopt H.R. 2886.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, I wish to commend the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) for his hard work in sponsoring this bill and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) for shepherding this bill through committee and now bringing this to the floor for consideration.

The Immigration and Nationality Act provides immigration and naturalization benefits for the alien children of United States citizens. The word child, however, is a term of art with various definitions. In order to be considered a child in the basis of an adoption, an alien must be an unmarried person under 21 years of age who is adopted while under the age of 16 years. This bill would expand the definition of an adopted child to include an adoptive person between the ages of 16 and 18, provided that the child who is between 16 and 18 is a natural sibling of a child adopted while under the age of 16.

This bill would achieve a worthwhile purpose. If a United States citizen adopts a 15-year-old child, they should also be able to obtain immigration benefits for the child's 17-year-old sibling if they adopt the sibling too. Since most parents prefer to adopt infants, or very young children, older children constitute a relatively small portion of the adopted children admitted as immigrants.

According to the Immigration and Naturalization Service, out of a total of 11,316 immigrant orphans admitted in fiscal year 1996, only 351 were age 10 or older. However, in cases involving siblings, adoptive parents frequently wish to adopt the older child or children in order to keep a family group intact. If the oldest sibling happens to be 16 or 17, there is no way under current law that the child can immigrate to the U.S. This bill would change that.

H.R. 2886 will further the goal of maintaining family unity in the relatively small number of cases involving the adoption of siblings, one of whom is 16 or 17 at the time the adoptive parents file visa petitions on the children's behalf.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to thank the gentleman from Michigan for his supportive comments.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HORN. Madam Speaker, I am delighted that my colleagues have unanimously supported this legislation 404 to O.

Foreign adoption provides many U.S. citizens with the opportunity not only to experience the joys of parenthood but also to provide their children with a better life in the United States.

As the author of H.R. 2886, a bipartisan bill, we have provided for an expansion of these opportunities. The intent of the bill is to allow immigrant orphan siblings to stay together when they are being adopted by U.S. citizens.

Under current law, a U.S. citizen may bring an immigrant child they have adopted to the United States if the child is under the age of 16. This legislation would allow U.S. citizens to adopt immigrant children ages 16–17 if the adoption would keep a group of siblings together.

Family unity is a frequently cited goal of our immigration policy, and this proposal would promote that goal. The typical case this proposal would help is a group of siblings who were orphaned in their home country—or their parents became unable to care for them. If the children are adopted by U.S. citizens and the oldest sibling is 16 or 17, the oldest sibling cannot come to the United States with his or her brothers and sisters under current law. It does not make sense for siblings to be separated because of an arbitrary age limit.

Moreover, some foreign adoption authorities do not allow the separation of siblings. In such a case, if a U.S. citizen wanted to adopt a group of siblings and one of them is 16 or older, the citizen would lose the opportunity to adopt any of them under current law.

This bill is unlikely to cause a significant increase in immigration levels overall. During fiscal year 1996, a total of 351 immigrant orphans older than age 9 were adopted by U.S. citizens, out of 11,316 immigrant orphans adopted by U.S. citizens overall that year. Although the number of families helped by this bill may be relatively small, the chance to keep a group of brothers and sisters together would mean a great deal to these families.

I thank the House leadership for scheduling H.R. 2886 on the suspension calendar today. I also appreciate the support and assistance of Judiciary Committee Chairman HENRY HYDE, Ranking Member JOHN CONYERS, Immigration and Claims Subcommittee Chairman LAMAR SMITH, and Subcommittee Ranking Member SHEILA JACKSON-LEE.

We have all done the right thing—immigrant families and America will gain.

Mr. POMEROY. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2886, legislation introduced by my colleague, Representative HORN (R–CA). This legislation would promote adoption and improve the lives of hundreds of children by allowing immigrant orphan siblings to stay together when being adopted by U.S. citizens.

Under current law, a U.S. citizen may bring an immigrant child they have adopted to the United States only if the child is under the age of 16. If a group of siblings are orphaned in their home country, for example, and those children are adopted by U.S. citizens, any siblings aged 16 or older cannot come to the United States with their brothers and sisters under current law. Mr. Chairman, orphaned siblings should not be separated because of an arbitrary age limit. Representative HORN's legislation would allow U.S. citizens to adopt immigrant children ages 16–17 if the adoption would keep a group of siblings together. This legislation would go a long way towards ensuring that orphaned siblings join permanent families.

Madam Speaker, this legislation would produce an important change in our nation's immigration policy, but its most significant impact is deeply personal. My own mother was orphaned at a young age, and was separated from her siblings as a result. Through her experience, and later through my own experience as the adoptive father of two beautiful Korean children, I have come to appreciate family unity as precious to parents and children alike. Although the number of families helped by this bill may be relatively small, keeping even one group of siblings together will have an immeasurable impact on those children's lives. As a cosponsor of H.R. 2886 and an adoptive parent, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2886.

The question was taken.

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam 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.

CLARIFICATION OF APPLICATION OF LIMITATION ON STATE INCOME TAXATION OF PENSION INCOME

Mr. GEKAS. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 462) to clarify that governmental pension plans of the possessions of the United States shall be treated in the same manner as the State pension plans for purposes of the limitation on the State income taxation of pension income.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 462

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

SECTION 1. CLARIFICATION OF APPLICATION OF LIMITATION ON STATE INCOME TAXATION OF PENSION INCOME.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (G) of section 114(b)(1) of title 4, United States Code, is amended by inserting before the semicolon ''or any plan which would be a governmental plan (as so defined) if possessions of the United States were treated as States for purposes of such section 414(d)''.

(b) CORRECTION OF CLERICAL ERROR.—Section 114 of such title 4 is amended by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (c).

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to amounts received after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) each will control 20 minutes.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GEKAS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 462, the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I recall that in the 104th Congress, I suppose 2½ years ago, we introduced and had passed both in the House and the Senate, and signed into law, a measure which would guaranty that an individual who earns a pension, for instance in the State of California, and then moves for the remainder of one's life to another State, the bill that we introduced and passed would prevent California from reaching out and taxing the proceeds of that pension of a person no longer living in California.

We learned, to our dismay, that there were hundreds and thousands of people who, after their retirement and moving to another State, found that they were being pursued by a taxing authority of the State in which they earned the pension. Well, we cured that situation and passed, on a bipartisan basis, a measure originally introduced by our colleague, Mrs. Vucanovich, as I recall; and everyone seemed happy about it because we solved a very difficult problem.

But as we did that, it was brought to our attention that our commonwealths, like Puerto Rico and the other territories of the United States, were not accorded the same privileges as we embedded in this particular piece of legislation. What we do here today is simply bring that up to date to cover Puerto Rico and the other territories, so that someone retiring in Puerto Rico, who goes to another State, or vice versa, will not have that odious tentacle of taxation from the working State to the retirement State follow that individual.

In this endeavor to bring this matter to a close and close that little loophole, we were importuned by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA), as well as the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ), the resident commissioner of Puerto Rico, and that completed the cycle. The bill that is in front of us now extends that special tax benefit, shall we say, to everyone who has ever worked in the United States or its territories.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, this legislation was introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA), and the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ) on February 2, 1999. It would make a technical correction to the legislation enacted in the 104th Congress which exempted from income tax certain retirement income paid to a nonresident of the State in which the retirement income was earned.

□ 1500

The proposed legislation merely clarifies that governmental plans, that is public employee retirement plans, includes plans provided by governments of possessions of the United States.

The original bill only applied to States and, thus, excluded retirees from governmental entities of U.S. possessions. It would address the situation now faced by retirees from Puerto Rico who now reside in the United States who are unable to take advantage of the benefits of this law on par with the other retirees.

This bill has strong bipartisan support, it is technical in nature, and would grant equal treatment to retirees similarly situated.

I urge its adoption.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 462.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMITTING USE OF ROTUNDA OF THE CAPITOL FOR PRESENTATION OF CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO PRESIDENT AND MRS. GERALD R. FORD

Mr. THOMAS. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 196) permitting the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for the presentation of the Congressional Gold Medal to President and Mrs. Gerald R. Ford.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 196

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the rotunda of the Capitol is authorized to be used on October 27, 1999, for the presentation of the Congressional Gold Medal to President and Mrs. Gerald R. Ford. Physical preparations for the ceremony shall be carried out in accordance with such conditions as the Architect of the Capitol may prescribe.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS).

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

Madam Speaker, I am moving this resolution for the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) who represents the area of Grand Rapids, which was the area that Gerald R. Ford represented as a Member of the House of Representatives and as its minority leader.

I think it is entirely appropriate that the Presidential Congressional Gold Medal be awarded to President and Mrs. Ford.

Congressman Ford wound up President Ford in one of the most unique series of events in the history of the United States. Congressman Ford was appointed Vice President of the United States according to the 25th Amendment, and then Vice President Ford became President Ford upon the resignation of President Nixon.

I will soon conclude my time and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) will have an opportunity to talk about this particular representative from Michigan.

I have known President Ford for some time. I knew him briefly before he became President, and I have known him for some time after he became President. He is one of those individuals of which we have many on the floor of the House who are professionals. That is, they go about the business of representing their constituents in a professional fashion.

That is one of the reasons Jerry Ford rose to be minority leader and why when there was a need to fill the vice presidential slot in a time of national trouble that they turned to Jerry Ford and that, in one of the saddest periods I believe that, notwithstanding his being appointed to the two highest offices in the land, he conducted himself and his presidency in exemplar fashion, and that he should have been rewarded, in the humble opinion of this gentleman from California, the presidency through the electoral process.

That was not to be. But the people of the United States owe President Ford a great debt of gratitude on the way in which he conducted himself as an appointed Vice President and as an appointed President.

It is entirely appropriate that, in the rotunda on October 27, President Ford and Mrs. Ford will receive the Congressional Gold Medal.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. KILDEE. Madam Speaker, President Gerald and Mrs. Betty Ford are two of the finest people I have ever known. They came, as I do, from Michigan, great citizens of Michigan.

I happen to have had the great pleasure of serving with the brother of President Gerald Ford, Tom Ford, in the Michigan Legislature; and, in that fashion, I met Gerald Ford many, many times when he was minority leader here in the House where he conducted himself very, very well, was chosen, in a wise decision, to become the Vice President of the United States, and then succeeded to the presidency of the United States.

He and his wife brought to the White House exactly what America needed at that time. They brought decency and a concern and helped heal this Nation. This Nation and I personally are grateful to President Gerald and Mrs. Betty Ford for what they have done for this country. They certainly deserve this medal and certainly deserve this ceremony in the rotunda.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 196, to reserve the Rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony to present a Congressional Gold Medal to our distinguished former President, Gerald R. Ford, and our former First Lady, Betty Ford, for their ''dedicated public service and outstanding humanitarian contributions to the people of the United States.''

I was among the more than 300 cosponsors of legislation, enacted on October 21, 1998, to authorize this honor.

Since the American Revolution, Congress has commissioned Gold Medals as its highest expression of national appreciation for distinguished achievements and contributions. Each medal is individually struck to honor a particular individual or individuals, institution, or notable event.

President Ford is the first former President to be so honored during his lifetime, and this is also the first time that a President and First Lady have been honored jointly.

Congress has awarded Gold Medals to several distinguished men during their military careers who would later go on to become Presidents of the United States:

George Washington, by the Continental Congress before the Revolutionary War began

in 1776; Andrew Jackson in 1815; William Henry Harrison, in 1818; Zachary Taylor, three times, in 1846, 1847, and 1848; and Ulysses S. Grant, in 1863.

President Harry S. Truman was honored posthumously in 1984.

Mrs. Ford will be the second First Lady to be so honored; the first was Lady Bird Johnson in 1984.

Gerald Ford is, of course, best known for his service as the 38th President of the United States who attempted to move the Nation past the scars left by the Watergate scandal.

He was the first person in history to have been appointed Vice President of the United States to fill a vacancy, pursuant to the 25th amendment to the Constitution.

He was confirmed in that office by vote of this House and of the Senate.

He was also the first person to have assumed the Presidency, in 1974, without having been elected to national office. As such, Gerald Ford served the Nation for two years and five months as President under very trying political circumstances.

But Gerald Ford is best known to this chamber as a ''Man of the House'', who served from 1949 to 1973 as a Representative from Michigan and from 1965 to 1973 as minority leader of the House.

While Representative Ford could be tough and partisan, he represented a tradition of bipartisanship and friendship across the aisle which served the House and the Nation well for many years. His accession to the Presidency was welcomed with joy by Members of Congress from both parties.

In his retirement, the former President has often spoken out against the divisiveness and harsh partisanship which have enveloped our political institutions in the decades after he left office, and which have so damaged the national interest.

Betty Ford, a model of an outspoken and courageous First Lady in the White House, is perhaps best known since her retirement for showing Americans who suffer from personal despair that recovery is possible.

She established the Betty Ford Center, to help those seeking to reestablish productive lives after suffering from drug dependency.

She has been active in many philanthropic causes.

Madam Speaker, the Fords were perhaps the first modern ''First Family'' to jointly lead both active public and private lives once out of office, and they established a pattern for other Presidents and spouses to follow in the future.

They set a worthy example of service to America, and I am pleased to support our action today in approving this ceremony to recognize their achievements.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 196, which will allow us to use the Rotunda to present a fitting tribute to President and Mrs. Gerald Ford—the Congressional Golf Medal. I would like to thank Mr. EHLERS, who now represents the Grand Rapids area, for his work on this measure.

We are all aware of President Ford's political accomplishments: a 25 year career in the House of Representatives, serving as vice-president and then president. Throughout his career he represented Michigan and this country with dignity and was a great example to those that have followed in his footsteps in this House. He will forever be associated with the University of Michigan, and he always carried this pedigree proudly. President Ford ascended to the highest office in the land during one of the most turbulent periods in our political history, and it is the grace that he and his wife Betty comported themselves that is perhaps their greatest legacy. President Ford restored a sense of stability to the office that was absolutely essential for both domestic and foreign relations. Among her many accomplishments, Mrs. Ford's dedication to helping others fight the terrible effects of breast cancer and substance abuse is well-known, and is illustrative of the caring decency this family came to represent.

Madam Speaker, Gerald Ford answered the call when his country needed it most. His example of professionalism in the worst of circumstances helped the United States through one of its worst constitutional crises. I look forward to seeing this wonderful couple receive this well-deserved award, and I join my colleagues and the citizens of this country in thanking them for their devoted service.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 196.

The question was taken.

Mr. THOMAS. Madam 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.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. THOMAS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H. Con. Res. 196.

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

There was no objection.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Sherman Williams, one of his secretaries.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1700

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS) at 5 p.m.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 2670, DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. COBURN moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 2670 be instructed to agree, to the extent within the scope of the conference, to provisions that—

(1) reduce nonessential spending in programs within the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and other related agencies;

(2) reduce spending on international organizations, in particular, in order to honor the commitment of the Congress to protect Social Security; and

(3) do not increase overall spending to a level that exceeds the higher of the House bill or the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

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

This motion to instruct is parliamentary procedure only to reemphasize the importance of the process that we presently find ourselves.

Today, unfortunately, President Clinton vetoed the Foreign Operations bill and with that veto he made the statement that we did not have enough money in the funding for the things that he wanted in terms of foreign operations. As we have struggled this year to limit the spending in this Congress so that we do not touch Social Security money, part of the way we have done that is to flat-line the amount of money that is spent on the Foreign Operations bill. In fact, it is the only bill that we sent to the President that is somewhat less than the spending from the year before. That bill, as I recall, was $200 million less than what we actually spent last year.

As we think about the options, spending money and the $1.7 trillion budget that we have, I think it is important to look at what the President said in his own statement of administration policy which was issued August 4, 1999, in terms of his desires for the Commerce, Justice, State appropriations bill which this motion to instruct is directed at. On the second page of that,

he talks about international affairs programs which ties back into what he vetoed today in terms of the Foreign Operations bill. It is his message that the ''committee underfunds activities to support the ongoing conduct of effective diplomacy and does not fully fund payments to international organizations necessary to ensure U.S. leadership in international affairs.''

This weekend I happened to share my weekend on call that I do every 4 weeks in my medical practice in Oklahoma. Starting Friday night about 11:30 and finishing up about 4:30 this morning, 10 young Oklahomans came into this world. The debate we are going to be having with the President, whether we want to or not and whether we talk about it now or whether we talk about it in the future, is going to be focused on these 10 young lives. The fact is that the Congress and the President all too often make decisions in the short term and in the short run. What we find in the Commerce, Justice, State bill is many international organizations. I thought I would just kind of look at what the bill as coming out of the House funded in terms of international organizations and affairs programs that the President objected to. I just want to spend a minute talking about those.

There is $1,949,000 for funding the following programs: The International Copper Study Group, the International Cotton Advisory Committee, the International Lead and Zinc Study Group, the International Rubber Organization, the International Office of the Wine and Vine, the International Rubber Study Group, the International Seed Testing Association, the International Tropical Timber Organization, and the International Grains Council. The amount provided includes funding for travel and for arrears.

As we looked into some of these, I think it is very important that the American public knows what these organizations do and, remember, this money very likely, if the President has his way, will come from the future benefits of these 10 babies that I delivered this weekend. Their future is going to be compromised, because we are going to borrow money from their future to actually pay for this $1,949,000.

Let me give my colleagues a little outline of what the International Office of the Wine and Vine does. First of all, remember that the wine industry in America exports $537 million worth of wine each year and it is growing each year. In 1999 we sent $64,000 to this international organization. I want Members to know what we got for our money so we did a little research. It turns out that the International Office for the Wine and Vine wrote the rules for the chardonnay of the world competition. That is a healthy, very important thing for our taxpayers and these 10 new babies from Oklahoma to be saddled with in the future. A qualitative confrontation of the world's best chardonnay. That is where the American taxpayer's dollars are going. But that is not all. The International Office of the Wine and Vine also wrote a press release touting a Danish study that confirmed that the consumption of wine has health benefits. Well, our own Surgeon General said that 15 years ago. We know that. And actually that was all we could find that they actually did for 1999 for $64,000.

Now, let us talk about the rubber. The administration has proposed funding not one but two rubber organizations dedicated to supporting the rubber supply industry; not the rubber manufacturing industry but the rubber supply industry. We spent $300,000 on the International Rubber Organization last year, $111,000 on the International Rubber Study Group. The first organization we spent $300,000. What is their job? To keep the price of rubber high. To keep the price of raw rubber high. We are a total importer of rubber. Raw rubber, we produce no raw rubber in the United States, so we spent $300,000 asking that organization to help keep the price of our imports high.

The third organization, the International Copper Study Group established in 1992, we spent $77,000. What did we get for our money, you ask? According to the web site, you can order a number of products from the International Copper Study Group. We spent $77,000, but you cannot get any of that information unless you pay them big-time bucks. $350 for a report, a directory of the copper mines in this country is $350, and if you want to use their database, another $550. The American taxpayer has already paid for it. These dollar figures do not sound like much, but when we put it in perspective, it does.

I want to pull up a couple of charts for a minute and let the Members of the House see just in these international organizations, 475 American families, their tax rate if the average family is earning $55,000, they are paying $4,100 in Federal income taxes, that is what they are paying to fund this. Looking at it a different way, the average senior in this country earns $9,396, receives that in terms of Social Security payments. If we look at the amount of seniors, that is the equivalent of shipping 207 seniors' receipts overseas, for programs that the President wants us to spend more money on in terms of international organizations.

Mr. President, we are not going to spend a penny of Social Security. This motion to instruct is to reaffirm what the House has already done and to say that we are going to stand by the appropriated amounts and not go any higher than the House level. The Senate version actually is somewhat lower. We would expect you to be a better steward of our international moneys. All we have to do is look at what has happened in Russia. We do not need more money for foreign aid because the money that we are sending in foreign aid, whether it be through the International Monetary Fund, whether it is through the World Bank, we are not a good steward of it. All we have to do is trace the $3 to $4 billion that has been absconded from the money that we sent to Russia.

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

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

It is interesting to note that in anticipation of this debate, the House and Senate conferees took a break to be able to come here and speak about this issue. So from the onset, it should be noted that the work of the conferees is not being done at this moment because we have to be here to be dealing with what, in all due respect to the gentleman, I consider a waste of time.

The fact of life is that there is a process, a process where the House passes a bill and the Senate passes a bill and under our system we sit down to work it out. The gentleman does what he considers a good job at singling out some items that, if we look at any budget, could be for some people questionable items. But this is the Commerce, Justice, State, Federal Judiciary, Census Bureau, INS, FCC, FTC, NOAA, this is a bill that encompasses so much, that to single out some items that he may think are not proper and then try to in fact instruct the conferees to go out and destroy the bill is totally improper. It is for that reason, Mr. Speaker, that I rise in strong opposition to the motion to instruct conferees on the Commerce, Justice, State, Judiciary appropriations bill.

This is, as I said, a waste of time. Conferees are unable to meet because we have to be on the floor. On the motion, I would be interested in knowing what programs of, say, the Justice Department the gentleman from Oklahoma considers nonessential. For that matter, how would the gentleman from Oklahoma define ''nonessential''? I expect his definition would not agree with mine or with that of the administration. Does nonessential mean unauthorized? Much of the Justice Department is unauthorized. Does nonessential mean mostly salaries and expenses of Federal employees? The FBI is mostly salaries and expenses.

The second item in the motion suggests that the gentleman from Oklahoma thinks U.S. engagement with the world is of little importance. I wonder that after the Senate's failure to ratify the comprehensive test ban treaty last week, the gentleman also wishes to put the House on record as also favoring withdrawal from world leadership and refusal to meet our membership obligations to the various international organizations.

On the third point, it has been clear from the beginning that the allocations within which the House and Senate wrote their bills were too low and, therefore, unacceptable to many Democrats and certainly to the President. If Republicans are truly interested in getting the appropriations bills passed,

they will have to compromise with the Senate and the White House. That is a fact. Doing as the gentleman suggests moves us in the opposite direction.

I would remind the gentleman that while he has strong views on spending restraint, which I respect, and while this motion may actually pass because it is not binding so it is basically free, the votes are not there to pass bills that look the way he wants them to look.

I urge my colleagues not to support this motion and to have a fuller understanding of what this whole process is about. I would urge the gentleman to take a closer look at the various departments and agencies and the significance of this whole bill rather than to single out something which he feels is not proper and therefore should destroy a whole bill and a whole process.

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

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

I find it very interesting that we did not specifically hear a denial of the claims that I made just in this one program. I was trying to be very, very general and not going into details on a lot of programs because that in fact is the priority of the appropriations process. I also was one that happened to vote to send this bill to conference.

But I would also note that the gentleman from New York did not agree that we should reduce nonessential spending, he did not agree that we should reduce spending on international organizations that are wasteful, that do not have a purpose for our children and our future, and he did not say that he was opposed to increasing the spending. Where does he think the money is going to come from? The money is going to come from these 10 children I delivered this weekend. They are going to pay for it.

The fact is if we want to talk about authorizations, the reason the appropriations process is so hard is because the Congress does not do its job in terms of sending authorizations to the appropriators. And, in fact, if we followed the strict rules of the House and did not give a rule on every appropriation bill that would not make it a point of order to strike those bills which are appropriated that are unauthorized, we would in fact have a budget that is much easier to handle, we would be doing our jobs in terms of the authorization committees, and we would not be forced to play the line to where we have to walk up to the edge of stealing Social Security money.

□ 1715

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding this time to me, and, Mr. Speaker, I am in opposition to this motion. As the gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) has just said, we had to interrupt a meeting of the conferees that Members of the Senate and the House who are downstairs in Room H–140 of this building in the Capitol; we had to interrupt the deliberations almost as we were concluding in order to rush up here to discuss this motion to instruct the conferees.

Mr. Speaker, we are already working to do as the gentleman in his motion hopes. We are working within the overall framework set by the leadership to meet all of the relevant goalposts including saving Social Security. We are working to reduce spending for nonessential programs. And if the gentleman would like to attend the conference, I will invite him as my guest to sit at the table and to observe the nonessential spending that we have already cut from this bill, particularly several hundred million dollars worth of items that were in the Senate bill that no longer exists because the House conferees insisted that that nonessential spending be cut.

We are working to preserve funding for critical law enforcement programs. The Senate bill was a billion dollars below the House for the Department of Justice; that is the FBI, that is the DEA, that is the INS; that is most of the law enforcement of the Federal Government in this country is in this bill. We have managed to get that money back in place in this conference.

Mr. Speaker, we are working to get a bill that is acceptable to both the House and the Senate, and that is a job in and of itself because the bodies passed radically different bills. And we are trying to mesh them into something that both bodies can now agree on those changes. We are working to give our best shot to produce a bill that has a shot at least of being signed into law by the President. So my colleagues have to take into account in this divided government the desires of the administration; there is no way around that.

We are working to do all that I have talked about and to spend as few dollars as possible, but the fundamental point is that we are working within the framework laid down by our leadership that will meet the targets for spending and protecting Social Security, as the gentleman wants.

Mr. Speaker, I simply ask of the body:

Let us do our job. Let us bring our work to a conclusion, I hope tonight, and then we will lay it on the floor here, hopefully tomorrow, and let our colleagues judge the bill and vote up or down on the product that we produce.

So the process is working. We are going to see the product tonight or tomorrow, and then our colleagues can make their judgment. But beforehand to try to prejudge what the conferees are doing in the middle of our work is a little bit like saying to Picasso while he is half finished with a painting, ''Let's throw it out, it's not worth looking at.'' I do not want to be compared to Picasso, but let us finish our work, and then my colleagues can judge it according to their desires at that time.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge a no vote on the motion to instruct conferees so that we can go back to work and finish this bill tonight.

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

I would just be very brief; I have no speakers. I just wanted to tell the gentleman from Kentucky, if he wants to compare me to Picasso, I do not have a problem with that.

But to suggest that when we try to deal with the expenditures of government, and I might say just to be clear that the chairman and I are going through a process right now where we do not agree on how we are spending some dollars; that is the nature of our system. But that does not mean that I would try to impede his ability to do his job by having a motion like this one or that he would try to do the same with me. To suggest that somehow we are going to raid the Social Security system, I think we did that when we tried to tell the American people that the only thing they should get is a tax break and that nothing else mattered. That is the real danger. I do not think paying for the FBI, I do not think paying for the Immigration Department is necessarily creating that kind of a problem; and I have no further speakers.

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

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Speaker, I am going to be the closing speaker, so would the gentleman like to yield back the balance of his time?

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

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

The first point I want to address is the motion to instruct is an approved parliamentary procedure, and I hope the gentleman from New York would grant me the right to use the procedures within the House that are available to me to try to do a motion to instruct. We have the rules of the House, and this otherwise would not have been approved and would have been stricken down.

The next thing I would say is the American people need to know where we are on this. Last year we spent $34.9 billion on CJS, this appropriation bill, and what passed the House was 35.7 billion. The House passed that. What we are saying with this motion to instruct is: Do not go any higher.

Now we understand my colleagues have been given the ability within the conference to go to $37.2 billion; we understand that. What we are saying is: If we are ever going to control the spending, if we are ever going to truly balance the budget, let alone not touch Social Security, because what the American people do not know is just because Social Security is not being

spent this year, that does not mean the Inland Waterway Trust money is not being spent and the retirement program for all Federal workers that are unfunded is not being spent that we are going to have to come back and get sometime. All these things are still not accounted for, and even though we do not spend one penny of Social Security, the national debt is still going to rise something like $40 billion this year.

So we can claim that we are not going to touch Social Security, but is that good enough for our children?

Mr. Speaker, I want my colleagues to see this one graph because it tells greatly what our problem is. If we do not become frugal with our taxpayers' money and with our children's money, look what happens in the year 2014. That is when the amount of money coming in for Social Security and the amount going out starts exceeding. So we would not have the ability to spend Social Security money in 2014 because the amount going to seniors would be less than what is coming in, and if we look on out to about the year 2030, what we see is a trillion dollars a year in general tax revenues. A trillion dollars above and beyond what is paid in Social Security is going to have to be available to take care of our seniors, and we have not begun to address the problems associated with Medicare.

So what we are trying to do is to slow the increase in the Commerce Justice State appropriation to about a 2 percent increase instead of a 6.6 percent, which is about to come out of conference.

Is it not interesting in our country when the Senate passes a bill at $33.7 billion, and the House passes a bill at $35.7 billion, and when they get together the tendency is, we are going to spend $2.5 billion more, and that is exactly what is getting ready to come out of that conference.

So again, I would ask the Members to think about the new children born across this country in the last 72 hours and what are we leaving them. We can do better, we have to do better, and this motion to instruct says do not spend one penny we do not have to, do not send money overseas for the International Wine and Vine or the International Rubber Council because it does not benefit Americans. It is a token we throw down in the international market that brings us no benefit.

I am not an isolationist, and I believe that America has to lead the world, but if we are bankrupt, how can we lead the world? And this is too important of an issue. We should not walk away from it. We should walk up to the line, and we should make sure that we secure the future for our children.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Oklahoma, in offering this motion to instruct conferees, talked about some of the international programs that will be covered by the conference report.

However, reading the Coburn motion, I note that it also would instruct conferees to ''reduce nonessential spending in programs within the departments of Commerce'' as well as other Departments. Unfortunately, it does not indicate what programs might be meant.

In considering the motion, I must wonder whether it is aimed at making even further cuts in funding for NOAA's research programs, such as those carried out in its own labs or through cooperation with the University of Colorado and other universities. Because it's impossible to say whether NOAA is outside the scope of the motion, I cannot support the motion.

Similarly, I have to wonder whether the motion is intended to instruct the conferees to make further cuts in funding for the National Institute of Standards and Technology. Is funding for NIST something that the gentleman from Oklahoma thinks is not essential? Again, it's impossible to tell, so once again I cannot support the motion.

And what about the Justice Department and the Judiciary? What funding for law enforcement and the courts does my colleague think is not essential? I think that having that kind of information would make it easier to decide about this motion to instruct the conferees—and, yet again, without that kind of information, I cannot support this motion to instruct the conferees.

So, Mr. Speaker, I will vote against this motion to instruct conferees.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN).

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed until after the recorded votes on three suspension motions postponed earlier today.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 3064. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 3064) ''An Act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes,'' requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. KYL, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. INOUYE, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

ANNUAL REPORT OF THE UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Commerce:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 307(c) of the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5877(c)), I transmit herewith the Annual Report of the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission, which covers activities that occurred in fiscal year 1998.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 18, 1999.*

FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 106-145)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning herewith without my approval H.R. 2606, the ''Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2000.''

The central lesson we have learned in this century is that we cannot protect American interests at home without active engagement abroad. Common sense tells us, and hard experience has confirmed, that we must lead in the world, working with other nations to defuse crises, repel dangers, promote more open economic and political systems, and strengthen the rule of law. These have been the guiding principles of American foreign policy for generations. They have served the American people well, and greatly helped to advance the cause of peace and freedom around the world.

This bill rejects all of those principles. It puts at risk America's 50-year tradition of leadership for a safer, more prosperous and democratic world. It is an abandonment of hope in our Nation's capacity to shape that kind of world. It implies that we are too small and insecure to meet our share of international responsibilities, too shortsighted to see that doing so is in our national interest. It is another sign of a new isolationism that would have America bury its head in the sand at the height of our power and prosperity.

In the short term, H.R. 2606 fails to address critical national security needs. It suggests we can afford to underfund our efforts to keep deadly weapons from falling into dangerous hands and walk away without peril from our essential work toward peace in places of conflict. Just as seriously, it fails to address America's long-term interests. It reduces assistance to nations struggling to build democratic societies and open markets and backs away from our commitment to help people trapped in poverty to stand on their feet. This, too, threatens our security because future threats will come from regions and nations where instability and misery prevail and future opportunities will come from nations on the road to freedom and growth.

By denying America a decent investment in diplomacy, this bill suggests we should meet threats to our security with our military might alone. That is a dangerous proposition. For if we underfund our diplomacy, we will end up overusing our military. Problems we might have been able to resolve peacefully will turn into crises we can only resolve at a cost of life and treasure. Shortchanging our arsenal of peace is as risky as shortchanging our arsenal of war.

The overall funding provided by H.R. 2606 is inadequate. It is about half the amount available in real terms to President Reagan in 1985, and it is 14 percent below the level that I requested. I proposed to fund this higher level within the budget limits and without spending any of the Social Security surplus. The specific shortfalls in the current bill are numerous and unacceptable.

For example, it is shocking that the Congress has failed to fulfill our obligations to Israel and its neighbors as they take risks and make difficult decisions to advance the Middle East peace process. My Administration, like all its predecessors, has fought hard to promote peace in the Middle East. This bill would provide neither the $800 million requested this year as a supplemental appropriation nor the $500 million requested in FY 2000 funding to support the Wye River Agreement. Just when Prime Minister Barak has helped give the peace process a jump start, this sends the worst possible message to Israel, Jordan, and the Palestinians about America's commitment to the peace process. We should instead seize this opportunity to support them.

Additional resources are required to respond to the costs of building peace in Kosovo and the rest of the Balkans, and I intend to work with the Congress to provide needed assistance. Other life-saving peace efforts, such as those in Sierra Leone and East Timor, are imperiled by the bill's inadequate funding of the voluntary peacekeeping account.

My Administration has sought to protect Americans from the threat posed by the potential danger of weapons proliferation from Russia and the countries of the former Soviet Union. But the Congress has failed to finance the Expanded Threat Reduction Initiative (ETRI), which is designed to prevent weapons of mass destruction and weapons technologies from falling into the wrong hands and weapons scientists from offering their talents to countries, or even terrorists, seeking these weapons. The bill also curtails ETRI programs that help Russia and other New Independent States strengthen export controls to avoid illicit trafficking in sensitive materials through their borders and airports. The ETRI will also help facilitate withdrawal of Russian forces and equipment from countries such as Georgia and Moldova; it will create peaceful research opportunities for thousands of former Soviet weapons scientists. We also cannot afford to underfund programs that support democracy and small scale enterprises in Russia and other New Independent States because these are the very kinds of initiatives needed to complete their transformation away from communism and authoritarianism.

A generation from now, no one is going to say we did too much to help the nations of the former Soviet Union safeguard their nuclear technology and expertise. If the funding cuts in this bill were to become law, future generations would certainly say we did too little and that we imperiled our future in the process.

My Administration has also sought to promote economic progress and political change in developing countries, because America benefits when these countries become our partners in security and trade. At the Cologne Summit, we led a historic effort to enable the world's poorest and most heavily indebted countries to finance health, education, and opportunity programs. The Congress fails to fund the U.S. contribution. The bill also severely underfunds Multilateral Development Banks, providing the lowest level of financing since 1987, with cuts of 37 percent from our request. This will virtually double U.S. arrears to these banks and seriously undermine our capacity to promote economic reform and growth in Latin America, Asia, and especially Africa. These markets are critical to American jobs and opportunities.

Across the board, my Administration requested the funding necessary to assure American leadership on matters vital to the interests and values of our citizens. In area after area, from fighting terrorism and international crime to promoting nuclear stability on the Korean peninsula, from helping refugees and disaster victims to meetings its own goal of a 10,000-member Peace Corps, the Congress has failed to fund adequately these requests.

Several policy matters addressed in the bill are also problematic. One provision would hamper the Export-Import Bank's ability to be responsive to American exporters by requiring that the Congress be notified of dozens of additional kinds of transactions before the Bank can offer financing. Another provision would allow the Export-Import Bank to operate without a quorum until March 2000. I have nominated two individuals to the Bank's Board, and they should be confirmed.

A third provision could be read to prevent the United States from engaging in diplomatic efforts to promote a cost-effective, global solution to climate change. A fourth provision places restrictions on assistance to Indonesia that could harm our ability to influence the objectives we share with the Congress: ensuring that Indonesia honors the referendum in East Timor and that security is restored there, while encouraging democracy and economic reform in Indonesia. Finally, this bill contains several sections that, if treated as mandatory, would encroach on the President's sole constitutional authority to conduct diplomatic negotiations.

In sum, this appropriations bill undermines important American interests and ignores the lessons that have been at the core of our bipartisan foreign policy for the last half century. Like the Senate's recent vote to defeat the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, this bill reflects an inexcusable and potentially dangerous complacency about the opportunities and risks America faces in the world today. I therefore am returning this bill without my approval.

I look forward to working with the Congress to craft an appropriations bill that I can support, one that maintains our commitment to protecting the Social Security surplus, properly addressing our shared goal of an America that is strong at home and strong abroad, respected not only for our leadership, but for the vision and commitment that real leadership entails. The American people deserve a foreign policy worthy of our great country, and I will fight to ensure that they continue to have one.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 18, 1999.*

□ 1730

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal and, without objection, the message and the bill will be printed as a House document.

There was no objection.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. CALLAHAN

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the message, together with the accompanying bill, be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield the customary one-half hour to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) for the purposes of debate only.

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 veto message of the President to the bill, 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.

As my colleagues just heard, the President today vetoed the, I think, very responsible piece of legislation that the House and Senate and conferees worked on for some 6 or 7 months. The bill, I think, was a responsible bill that funded foreign aid at the $12.7 billion level, but did not do so at the expense of any Social Security monies. Basically, Mr. Speaker, it was a freeze at last year's funding levels, and I am amazed that the President now says he cannot live on what we gave him last year and that he wants a 30 or 40 percent increase.

I understand in reading his veto message that he wants about $4 billion more, but what the President does not say, even though he mentions Social Security in his veto message, is where are we going to get the money. So if we do not want to take it out of Social Security, which I am not going to agree to on any bill that I handle, we have other options.

We can increase taxes, which I am not going to have anything to do with either, Mr. Speaker. I am not going to burden the American taxpayers with additional money to help satisfy this insatiable appetite to give away our money that the President has. And, we are not going to take it out of Defense, Mr. Speaker. I know that some have suggested that that might be a way we could do it, but already our Defense budget is suffering, and we cannot afford to reduce our military moneys, because if we are going to comply with every request that the Department of State and the President makes with requests for foreign assistance in every Nation in the world, such as we witnessed in Kosovo, such as we witnessed in many other areas of the world, such as we are now facing in Indonesia, I think it would be a serious mistake to curtail the ability of the national defense, our military, by taking the money away from them.

So what the President does not tell us in his message is he is not suggesting what we do, other than to increase taxes, which we are not going to do. So maybe we are at an impasse.

But let me tell my colleagues something about the bill that the President just vetoed. One of the most popular provisions that I have ever seen since I have been in Congress with respect to the foreign assistance is the child survival account. We increased the child survival account over $70 million this year over the President's request; and yet, he says no, that we ought to maybe take some of the money out of child survival.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell my colleagues that the American people, while they do not have an appetite to give away their money that they are sending to us to foreign countries to be squandered away, such as reports that have come back about Russia have said have been done, but they do in fact support our efforts to provide food, to provide medical assistance, to provide educational opportunities for those children who live in nations which cannot afford to provide them with this.

So, they encourage this. Dozens of letters, hundreds of letters, thousands of communications have come to my office supporting the child survival account, supporting this type of foreign assistance. The American people support this. So what the President is suggesting is that we cut back maybe on child survival, and we are not going to do that. So he has left me no alternatives.

The President, in his original message, for example, suggested that we cut Israel by $30 million. We said no, we are not going to do that, that Israel has been an ally of the United States, that we want peace in the Middle East. There was some question about the Wye monies. The President went out to the Wye Plantation, when those efforts were beginning to fall to pieces, and it looked like that the Palestinians and the Israelis were going to walk out of there without some agreement, and it is my understanding that he volunteered to just give them $2 billion. Look, we will help you. We will give you $2 billion.

So he goes out there, and then he comes back and he says, this is an obligation of the United States of America. I do not consider that an obligation. When the President goes to one of these meetings and raises his glass of wine and toasts these leaders and tells them, I will give you $2 billion out of the Social Security Trust Fund, we are not going to stand for that. But that is exactly what he said.

In speaking with Mr. Netanyahu right after that meeting, Mr. Netanyahu told me he did not ask for the money, that the money was volunteered. Well, maybe that is good foreign policy, but I do not think that it is.

One thing I think is good foreign policy is for the Congress not to get too involved in dictating to the administration what they are going to do and where they spend the money. For 5 years, Mr. Speaker, I have worked, argued with Members of this body about earmarking monies, about policy in the bill, trying to give this administration the flexibility and the latitude that they need to have an effective foreign policy. So I have tried my darnedest to give the President all of the room that he needs to maneuver, to adjust, to reprogram, to do whatever with the $12.7 billion, for example, that we recommended be appropriated this year.

Now, all of a sudden, the President says, I do not care whether or not you are helping me with policy; I do not care whether or not you have taken out all of those obnoxious earmarks; I do not care that you have not hamstringed the administration and Mrs. Albright into trying to go to a foreign country and do the will of 435 Members of Congress. We get no appreciation for that.

The President said there has been a lack of communication. I read in the newspapers this morning where one of his complaints about the whole appropriations process is that there is no communication. But I called the President. I called him, Mr. Speaker, two weeks ago; and I said, Mr. President, this is the same amount of money we gave you last year, and just like every other area of government, you are going to have to live with what we gave you last year. We are not going to increase it. And I talked to the President and I told him about the policy omissions that were not in there which would hamstring his administration; and I promise my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, I think I had the President convinced that this was a good bill and that he might sign it.

But, he said, let me talk to my principals, which I assume that he meant Sandy Berger, who is one of his aides, and Madeleine Albright, who is Secretary of State. And I said, well, I will tell you what, Mr. President. That is all right with me. But before you talk with them about this issue that I have just explained to you, let me come over there and tell them what I have just told you. And he says, that is a good idea, Sonny. Let me call you back.

Well, the President never called back. Sandy Berger called me out of a restaurant about 9:30 at night the next night and said, the President asked me to call you and tell you that he reluctantly says he is going to have to veto your bill. You see, they did not want me in the same room with Sandy Berger and Madeleine Albright. They did not want me in the room with the President putting forth the same arguments that I am telling you about today. Instead, they wanted to tell the President well, this might have a political advantage. Do not worry about this; we will get more money. All we have to do is back old CALLAHAN down.

□ 1745

Well maybe that is good strategy, but the President cannot say to anybody that I have refused to communicate with him and work with him when I did every single thing that Jack Lew, one of his other assistants, wrote me and told me to do with respect to policy.

The only issue he has is that this is not enough money. Well, I am sorry, Mr. President. Tell me where to get it, but do not come up with this same old nonsense about you are going to raise taxes to do it; you are going to raise fees to do it; you are going to take it out of the national defense or you are going to take it out of Social Security,

because I am not going to have any part of that. So we are at a stalemate.

Now here we are having to start all over because we do not have the votes to override the President's veto. It has turned into a partisan issue. Whereas most every Democrat, when the bill initially passed the House, voted for it, now they say that the policy provisions are insufficient; they want $2 billion, $4 billion more money. Mr. Speaker, I do not know where we are going to get it.

I have thought about some strategy of my own. I mentioned when the bill was passed and we sent it to the President for his signature that every time somebody walks in the White House with a turban on his head that the President gets a glass of wine, gives it to the king or whoever he is talking to, then they stand there in the Oval Office or wherever they stand in the White House and they clink those glasses together and lo and behold the President says, ''Let me give you a little bit of money.''

So the president or king or whoever he is, walks out and he goes back to his country and he says, ''The President promised me some money,'' and then the President calls up here and says, ''Sonny, this is an obligation of the United States of America. I made this commitment to this king, to this president.'' And that is not right. That is not an obligation of the United States of America.

In fact, I think I am going to call the President, and I am going to go down to the White House one day this week. But before I go, I am going to buy me one of those turbans. And I am going to walk in the Oval Office with that turban on my head. And I am going to suggest to the President that we each get a glass of wine, and I am going to tell him that I am representing the senior citizens of this country, that I am representing the taxpayers of this country, and that I am representing the people who are concerned about Social Security, and let us have a toast. Let us toast that we are not going to take this $4 billion off the backs of the senior citizens or off of our national defense and we are not going to raise taxes.

Then the President can come over here and say, ''Well, we have an obligation. I made a toast, and therefore you Congress people are obligated not to raid Social Security, not to increase taxes, not to take money out of Social Security.''

So maybe I will try that strategy of going to the White House with a turban on my head and suggesting to the President that we, indeed, ought to keep this $12.7 billion where it is.

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

Mr. CALLAHAN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished chairman very diplomatically said he does not know where the President is planning to come up with this money, but it is true, it is reality, we do not have to kid ourselves, he is talking about transferring money out of the Social Security trust fund.

It is going to be real hard for me to go home and tell my grandmother that, ''You know what, today you are going to have a little bit less money in your trust fund because the President wants to send it to foreigners.'' I can envision the conversation.

''Oh, you mean Americans who live in foreign countries who paid into Social Security?''

''No, ma'am.''

''What do you mean going overseas with my Social Security money?''

''Well, the President wants to send it to India and Pakistan and Russia and North Korea, and all of these kinds of places, grandmother. What do you think about that?'' And she is going to be horrified.

The reality is, we need not kid ourselves, what the President of the United States said today to America's seniors, we want to get the money out of the Social Security trust fund and send it overseas to foreign governments and many governments who are not always friendly to the United States, and that is a direct affront to American taxpayers.

Mr. CALLAHAN. It is an affront to me, too.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), the majority whip.

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, I think we are starting to see what is going to be going on in the heat that will be turned up in this cool fall in Washington, D.C. The President is vetoing bills because they do not spend enough. There is simply no other explanation for his action. He wants more money. Some had said he wanted $2 billion, he wanted $4 billion more.

According to the White House, the President is vetoing this bill because he thinks there is not enough spending in it. According to the White House, $12.6 billion is not enough money; but if this is not enough, I only have one simple question: Where does the President think more money will come from?

Day after day, the President walks up to the television cameras and says that tough choices need to be made, but then all he suggests is skyrocketing spending increases. That is not a tough choice. That is the easy way out.

Times have changed here in Washington. Even the President claimed not so long ago that the era of big government was over. If this is true, the tough budget decisions that need to be made must be to restrain spending, not increase it. Money does not just fall from the trees. It is not the President's money.

There are only two ways to maintain a balanced budget, three ways actually, and pay for the President's big government spending increases. He can either raise taxes, and I can say unequivocally this House is not going to raise taxes for more government spending. The President can raid Social Security surpluses. We are not going to do that. Even the President says he does not want to do that. There is only one other way he could get more spending increases, and that is to find cuts in other parts of the budget.

Frankly, if the leadership goes down to the White House tomorrow I think the message is going to be, ''Mr. President, we are not spending one dime of the Social Security surplus. Mr. President, we are not going to raise taxes for more government spending. Mr. President, if you want more spending, then tell us how to pay for it. Where are you going to cut it from? Where are you going to move money around? How are you going to pay for it?''

All he said in his veto message was there is just not enough spending. He wants more spending.

Now, the President vetoed this bill and he said that he wants a whopping 30 percent increase in foreign aid. Make no mistake about it, every dime of this increase, without offsets and cuts in other spending come directly out of the Social Security surplus.

I think this is so shortsighted. Raiding tomorrow's generations to cover the excesses of today robs America of its future. The Republican budget plan is committed to balancing the budget without raiding Social Security or raising taxes to do it, and we can say it over and over until we turn blue in the face. The President says we are already into the Social Security surplus. That is another Clintonism, Mr. Speaker. We are not into the Social Security surplus.

They get a CBO letter that uses false assumptions that we are not doing, and they wave the letter around saying we are spending the Social Security surplus. We are not there. This House is not going to raise taxes.

Mr. Speaker, the budget will not balance itself. We in Congress are working very hard and making the responsible decisions for the future of America. All they are doing at the White House is throwing mud and hopes it sticks.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 8½ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I just borrowed the Constitution from the parliamentarian. I did not really need it because I am sure everyone in this room has memorized the preamble to it. ''We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our prosperity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.''

All of those goals stated in the preamble to the Constitution about insuring the safety of our country and the security of it and its future for our children are undermined by this foreign operations bill, and I salute President Clinton for his veto.

Although the Clerk has already read the veto message in its entirety, I want to call some specifics to the attention of my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, this foreign operations bill undermines the goals of our preamble to the constitution. President Clinton said it so well in his veto statement when he said, ''The central lesson we have learned in this century is that we cannot protect American interests at home without active engagement abroad. Common sense tells us, and hard experience has confirmed, that we must lead in the world, working with other nations to defuse crises, repel danger, promote more open economic and political systems, and strengthen the rule of law. These have been the guiding principles of American foreign policy for generations. They have served the American people well, and greatly helped to advance the cause of peace and freedom around the world.

''This bill rejects all of those principles.

''It implies that we are too small and too insecure to meet our share of international responsibilities, too shortsighted to see that doing so is in our national interest. It is another sign of a new isolationism that would have America bury its head in the sand at the height of our power and our prosperity.''

The President goes on to say that, ''By denying America a decent investment in diplomacy, this bill suggests we should meet threats to our security with our military might alone. That is a dangerous proposition,'' and an expensive one, I might add.

''The overall funding provided in this bill is inadequate. It is about half the amount available in real terms to President Reagan,'' which this Congress supported; half the amount available in real terms to President Reagan.

There are many concerns that I will just briefly address about it, that the President mentions. He mentions that, ''This bill would provide neither the $800 million requested this year as a supplemental appropriation,'' for the Wye River agreement, ''nor the $500 million requested in FY 2000 funding to support the Wye River agreement.

''Just when Prime Minister Barak has helped give the peace process a jump start, this sends the worst possible message to Israel, Jordan, and the Palestinians about America's commitment to the peace process.''

In addition, the bill is short in funding for economic support to the multilateral development banks, providing the lowest level of financing since 1987, with cuts of 37 percent from the President's request. This would virtually double the arrears. We are trying to have debt forgiveness. We are trying to go into the next century, the next millennium, giving these countries a chance, working with them, cooperating with them.

This is not about a handout. This is about a hand-up, and it is something that our country says that we profess. It will cost us less in the end if we can obtain markets for our products and promote peace and Democratic institutions in these countries. Ridding them of their debt will help do that. This bill also seriously undermines our capacity to promote economic reform and growth in Latin America, Asia, and especially Africa. If for no other reason, if we have no pragmatic sense or practical sense about what this means to us as a country, we do know that these markets, when developed, are critical to American jobs and opportunities. That is so much for what the President had said.

I would like to now talk about what Mr. HASTERT said.

□ 1800

The Speaker, in criticizing the President's veto, made these comments. He called this a responsible foreign aid package that funded our Nation's foreign aid programs at last year's level. Wrong. Wrong. Wrong. No matter how many times our colleagues on this floor in the majority say that this bill is funded at last year's level, it is not.

Our spending last year, when we combine the bill with our supplemental, and the supplemental does not include Kosovo and the Hurricane Mitch supplemental, we are below last year's funding significantly. But then the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT) goes on to say that we want to take Social Security money and give this money to foreign nations, and he does it in a very offhand way. He says the Republicans will play no part in this scheme. The Congress will not use Social Security as a pot of gold to fund foreign aid.

This is such an act of desperation. I feel so sorry for this pathetic initiative that is being taken by my colleagues. They have all the big guns rolled out: The Speaker's statement. The whip spoke before I even had a chance to put our statement on the RECORD, and that was fine. I see the distinguished Majority Leader here, and of course the distinguished gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs, coming all out full force to make this statement.

This is an act of desperation by a majority party that does not have a case to take to the American people. The economy domestically is doing great. Unemployment is down. The stock market is up. Inflation is practically negligible, and they have to go find an issue and, how convenient, one with the neoisolationism of their caucus giving them impetus to do this.

This is a very sad day because, frankly, the arguments that my colleagues make about this argue to eliminate all the funding in the bill completely. Why have any foreign aid if this is such a bad idea as we review it?

Mr. Speaker, others will, and I do not have time right now to go into the illusion that my colleagues are trying to present about their not spending Social Security and other aspects of these spending bills. I know the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) will go into that and, if I have time, I will later.

But I want to reiterate that this bill is $12.7 billion. Last year, the bill and the supplemental that went with it were $1.1 billion higher. Let us not play a shell game. Let us be honest with the American people about what we are spending, and let us not have a $1.1 billion cut from last year, again not including the Kosovo supplemental or the supplemental on Hurricane Mitch. Let us not have a $1.1 billion cut, which we call a freeze.

In conclusion, I want to call the attention of my colleagues to this chart. This is the total budget of the United States, $1.739 trillion. The foreign aid, as a percentage of the total budget of the United States, is less than 1 percent. In fact, it is .68 percent. With the President's request, it will be brought up to about 8 percent. It is less than 1 percent.

Within that 1 percent is the Export-Import Bank, which finances our exports overseas, creating jobs in the U.S., OPIC, Trade Development Administration, all of those initiatives that promote U.S. trade which have nothing to do with bilateral and multilateral assistance to any other country except the United States. It is all in our national interest. It is less than 1 percent.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield as much time as he shall consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), the majority leader of the House.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Alabama for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, let me begin my comments by thanking the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) for his hard work on this legislative effort. First thing I would observe is the American people are a generous people. We are a kind people. We are a people that have always been willing to sacrifice of our own treasury, of our own resources, indeed of our own lives and our own peace to help the rest of the world obtain peace, safety, and security, and above all freedom. That has not changed.

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) points out that our foreign aid budget has decreased as a percentage of the overall American Federal Government's budget over the years, and that is true.

Why has it decreased as a percentage of the overall budget? Not because we Americans have reduced our willingness or, in fact, our contribution to the rest of the world. Indeed, it still is exemplary by comparison with any other nation in the world. But because the burdens and the responsibilities that our Government carries within our own country for our own people has grown.

It has grown in Medicare. It has grown in Social Security. It has grown

in Medicaid. It has grown in education. It has grown in defense. It has grown in the environmental concerns we express for this country, and any number of different ways our Government's budget keeps growing. With all of that growth, we maintain a commitment to the rest of the world that is still exemplary by comparison with any other nation in the world.

So in that regard, again, I would like to compliment the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) for his dedication and his commitment.

Now, yesterday, put all this within the context of where we are today, we had both good news and bad news from the White House. I have to tell my colleagues I was pleased, I was enthusiastic, I was excited when I watched TV yesterday and saw the President's chief of staff, John Podesta, say, ''The President of the United States today shares the commitment that the Republicans in Congress have been fighting for to complete this budget without touching a dime's worth of Social Security for any other purpose.''

This is a historic change in the manner in which we use the taxpayers' money. For 30 years, the Federal Government has taken Americans' Social Security taxes and spent them on other purposes. Last year, for the first time ever, in all those 30 years, that did not happen. Last year, no dime of Social Security was used for some purpose other than Social Security.

We are trying to write a budget for next year that stays the same. This will not happen. It is time to stop the raid. So as we do that, we have to look at every manner in which the Federal Government might spend one's money and say, how can we pare back? Where can we make reductions? How can we engage in trade-offs, accept and set priorities and keep us within this one fundamental limit that we will not complete the budget for fiscal year 2000 with any money that spends Social Security taxes on any purpose other than Social Security?

That I take as a point of honor, a point of duty, a point of duty to two great generations, my parents and my children; my parents who are living off Social Security benefits today and my children who are paying the taxes so that that money is available for that purpose.

Now, the President has said we share with the House and the Senate this commitment. That was good news. We have waited a long time, Mr. President, for you to make this commitment to preserve Social Security. We were all startled. We were all disappointed when, in your own budget, you propose that 40 percent of the Social Security revenues be spent for something else. But now you have said, ''I agree with the Congress.'' I was heartened when I heard that.

I am delighted to go to the White House tomorrow at the President's invitation to discuss with the President of the United States how will we do this, complete this budget without spending a dime's worth of Social Security for any purpose other than Social Security. I am excited for this opportunity.

That was the good news. Now comes the bad news.

Within hours of this revelation from the White House, the President vetoes the foreign aid bill because he wants $4 billion more for foreign aid. We are left to ask, Mr. President, where will you get the money? We cannot take it from Social Security. You have expressed your commitment to not do so. Do you want to take it from education? You think that is a high priority, too. Should we take it from defense? We have got soldiers and sailors, men and women in our uniforms today, ill-equipped ill-prepared, ill-trained, and, frankly, ill-humored. Morale is a deterioration of readiness that this Nation can ill-afford.

Where would you take the money, the 4 billion additional dollars, Mr. President? We will work with you on the commitment. We will not take it from Social Security, nor will we deny any other domestic American priority that is equal or greater than foreign aid. That is our commitment. We look forward to working with you.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) has 7½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) has 21½ minutes remaining.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 11 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the distinguished ranking member of the full Committee on Appropriations, a gentleman who served 10 years as the chair of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, what a phony debate that I have heard here today. We hear our friends on the majority side of the aisle saying that somehow because the President wants us to meet some of our additional obligations overseas and because our President wants to have a well-rounded defense of our national interest overseas, that somehow he is spending more than our friends on the majority side want, and, therefore, is guilty of all kinds of fiscal sins.

I would point out it was not the President who added $16 billion to Pentagon spending for items that the Pentagon did not even ask for and then declared $6 billion of them emergencies so that they could pretend that that money was not being spent under the budget rules. It was not the White House that did that. It was our friends in the majority party.

Overall, they spent almost $16 billion more than the President asked for in the supplemental in the regular Pentagon appropriation bill. It was not the President who added $1.3 billion for a whole new ship the Navy did not want. It was our friends on the majority side because it was going to be built in the district of the Majority Leader in the other body, in Pascagoula, Mississippi. The President did not ask to spend that money, that pork.

The argument that we are hearing from the majority side comes from a party that has demonstrated time and time again its refusal to support our national interest in a well-rounded fashion around the world.

We hear this same argument from people who do not want us to pay our bills at the United Nations, even though we risk losing our vote because of that. We hear it from the same people who are refusing to provide the funding to meet the promises that we had already made in the Middle East with respect to the Wye agreement.

I saw one Republican leader stand in the White House and tell the President standing 6 feet away from him that the President had absolutely no right to engage in military action against Serbia because it was a sovereign country. Then after the President reached a successful conclusion of that conflict, I saw that same Republican leader go to the press and denounce the President because he had agreed to a solution that allowed Mr. Milosevic to stay in power. What hypocrisy. How do my colleagues expect we remove Mr. Milosevic, through emaculate conception? It takes military action.

This is the same party that last week, in what I believe to be the most irresponsible action by this Congress in 25 years, it is the same party that ripped up the test ban treaty. Now, to understand why that treaty is important, we have to understand why it is linked to the nonproliferation treaty.

The United States, under Republican and Democratic Presidents alike, has tried to convince the nonnuclear powers of this world not to achieve nuclear weapons status because it destabilizes the world. So we have tried to set a good example for them. We have said to them, Okay, if you do not develop your nuclear weapons, we will not test ours. Yet, last week, we saw the United States Senate majority party blow away any chance we have to exercise moral leadership on the issue of nuclear test ban treaties.

□ 1815

They say, oh, we do not know for sure that we will be 100 percent effective in detecting other people's tests. Well, we were going to be a whole lot more effective than we are right now, because that treaty would have allowed us to place sensors all around the world to detect all but the smallest nuclear explosions. But, no, they had to try to administer another political defeat to the President by defeating the nuclear test ban treaty.

So this is a party which has walked away from its responsibilities time and time again in the international arena, and now they try to pretend that they

are doing it all in the name of fiscal responsibility and because they want to save Social Security.

Are they kidding? Give me a break. The Republican Party is now the great savior of Social Security? The same party that tried to kill that program in the crib before it was ever created? The same party that has tried to turn Social Security over to the insurance industry for 30 years? They want to privatize it to death. The same party that wanted to take billions of dollars out of Medicare in order to pay for a big capital gains tax cut for their buddies? This is the party that we are now supposed to rely upon to save Social Security?

All I can say, if that is a record that demonstrates their support of Social Security, God save Social Security.

So what are they doing? What all of this is is a giant scam. Our friends in the majority party for the last year have tried to push a tax package through this House which would give 70 percent of the benefits to people who make over 100,000 bucks a year, and they took it home and they tried to sell it over the August break. And what did they find? They found that their constituents did not buy it. And what they found is that they had dropped 12 points to 16 points in the public opinion polls with seniors. So now what we have going on on this floor is operation crawl-back. And what it is, it is an effort to crawl back to another political position in order to try to win a few points back from senior citizens. It ain't gonna work, fellas. It ain't gonna work.

What is really going on here, the party that claims it is for fiscal responsibility has produced a budget this year which has more than $40 billion in gimmicks in order to pretend that they are staying within the budget ceilings and in order to pretend that they are not spending a dime in Social Security when, in fact, their own actions have already spent more than $23 billion of the Social Security surplus for other purposes this year.

Now, I just have to say, when they have over $40 billion in budget gimmicks, when they have already spent over $23 billion in Social Security, when they have engaged in a gimmick called advanced appropriations, which means they will move the money from this year into next year to hide the fact that they are actually spending it and committing it this year, when those advanced appropriations go from $4 billion to $27 billion, and then they come here and object because the President wants us to pay our U.N. bills, because the President wants us to meet our obligations to the Wye Accords to promote peace in the Middle East, pardon me if I do not take that with a straight face. Pardon me if I think there is just a little bit missing here.

When we put all the baloney aside on Social Security, what are the facts? The facts are that every year from 1983 until 1997 this Congress spent every dime that we generated in Social Security surpluses for other purposes and put IOUs in the treasury in order to recognize that fact. In 1997, we spent 100 percent of the Social Security surplus, as the Congress had for years, on other items. But starting last year, starting 2 years ago, I should say, that has been turned around. Two years ago, for the first time, we spent less than one-third of the Social Security surplus on other purposes, and we paid down debt by $60 billion. This last year that just came to a close, we paid down debt by over $100 billion.

When all of the baloney is over, whether the Republican Party wins the argument or whether the Democratic Party wins the argument, in the end this coming year we will pay down debt by another $100 billion. Only the people running this House could turn that kind of a major policy victory into a crisis.

It seems to me if we want to be honest with the people of the United States, we will tell them that this action in paying down debt over the last 2½ years has done more to strengthen Social Security than anything that we did for Social Security since the Greenspan Commission saved it with congressional votes. That is the honest truth.

But, no, instead, we are going to see this partisan slugfest on Social Security. Well, I have to tell my colleagues that it is not going to fool anybody. It certainly is not going to fool people in the House. They may fool themselves, that would be nothing new, but I would urge my colleagues, in the end, to remember we have an obligation to meet our domestic responsibilities and our international responsibilities in a balanced manner. It would be nice, for once, if we could see that coming out of the Republican leadership in this House.

I do not see it today, but I am going to go home tonight and pray again, and maybe some day we will.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, how much time now remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) has 7½ minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) has 10½ minutes remaining.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), a member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman, my good friend, for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, this poses, for me, a very puzzling situation. I have so much respect for the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), and I know that they have worked actively on behalf of all of us in the House of Representatives and this Nation in trying to provide for a stable, prosperous, and democratic world through foreign operations. But I put to my good friend, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), that when he cites the fact that the amount of money that is offered this year is the same as last year, events that have happened over the course of the year causes us to have to take a different view.

While the gentleman and I may disagree and have ideological perspectives that are different, the fact of the matter is that the Wye Accords are important to all of us. And we did, whether the gentleman agrees that the President had that responsibility or not, we agreed to $800 million that we would provide; and we have not in this year's budget.

Now, I do not know how that plays out. I cannot argue with appropriators and those of my colleagues that know the inner workings of the budget better than do I with reference to who is at fault about what having to do with Social Security. But I know cuts when I see them: $212 million cut from economic recovery and democratization in Africa, Latin America and Asia in this budget; $44 million cut from disaster assistance; $53 million cut from refugee assistance; $35 million cut from the Peace Corps; $17 million cut from the NAD Bank Community Adjustment; $178 million cut from IDA lending to the poorest countries; $87 million from debt relief; $107 million cut from global environment facilities; $53 million from the Inter-American Bank; $80 million, 10 percent, for promotion of U.S. exports, which helps American, American, businesspersons.

What we need to know is that foreign aid is not a giveaway; foreign aid shows the way. And we cannot proceed along these lines in this great country and be looked to for the direction, as we are by countries all over the world, if we intend to provide a stable, prosperous and democratic world.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations, to explain the real story of who is utilizing Social Security monies.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the question of Social Security is one that is important to all of us, especially those of us who have many people in their districts receiving Social Security checks.

I would just like to show this graph that is based on figures developed by the Congressional Budget Office. This graph shows that the money that was taken from Social Security under the Democrats in the Congress rose dramatically. The Republicans took over at this line, and we can see what happened. The number went way down, and for fiscal year 2000 it is going to be zero.

It is our determination, and that is one reason this bill does not spend as much money on foreign aid as the President wants, we are determined

not to take any money out of the Social Security Trust Fund, and we are determined that any spending requests that go over the budget surplus will be offset. It is a pretty simple plan.

But by doing this, we are going to maintain the balanced budget that we fought for years to get and finally achieved. We are going to preserve that balanced budget, and we are going to stop paying billions and billions and billions of dollars as interest payment on the national debt when we could use that money in more places than that.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), a member of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this motion because we now have a chance to reconsider this year's foreign aid bill which was plagued by low funding levels from the start and never really recovered. Now we are faced again with a very important choice. We can insist upon a dangerously underfunded foreign aid bill, jeopardizing not only the United States' leadership around the world but also our national security; or we can work to rectify some of the most egregious funding cuts to our initiatives abroad, maintaining the United States of America's international stature, and acting in the best interests of our own national security.

We really have no choice, in my judgment. This bill, as it stands now, will severely erode our ability to pursue our interests abroad. And our stinginess now will be an expensive mistake. Saving now but paying double and triple later is no way to protect the global interests of the American people. It is just plain irresponsible.

While the majority engages in political brinkmanship, we are already feeling the effects of turning our back on what has historically been a cornerstone of United States foreign policy. Funding for implementation of the Wye River agreement is essential. And each day we drag our feet, we jeopardize Israel's security; we endanger the very security of Middle East peace; and we destroy our own credibility as a mediator in the Middle East peace process. Wye assistance has become a pawn in the majority's budget game, a dangerous game with very high stakes indeed.

And Wye is not the only problem with this bill. The International Development Association, the Peace Corps, debt relief, international organizations and programs are all underfunded. The bill remains $2 billion below the President's request and $1 billion below last year's level.

This is not the first and it is not the only example of a reckless decision on the part of the majority that shows utter disregard for maintaining the United States' global stature. Last week, the Senate majority brazenly defeated the comprehensive test ban treaty. The United States is currently the U.N.'s biggest deadbeat, owing over $1 billion in arrears.

Thanks to the President's decision to veto the foreign aid bill we sent him, we can now, working together, begin to restore the United States' diminished global leadership. I urge my colleagues to do the right thing. Stop the games, stop the gimmickry now, and let us go back to work and return with a bill that preserves our national security.

□ 1830

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE).

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, in this century we have had the New Deal, starting with F.D.R. We have had the fair deal. We have had the square deal. But this could be called the ''misdeal'' because it is a raw deal for America's seniors. Congress ought to say ''no deal'' to the President.

Mr. Speaker, this weekend I had the opportunity to visit with a farmer in Kimball, South Dakota. He has been a farmer for 37 years, and he is hoping some day to be able to cash rent his farm ground out, which is not worth a whole lot right now, and that, coupled with his Social Security payment, retire.

What the President has said is that we are going to take from this farmer's account the Social Security Trust Fund to pay for more foreign aid because $12.6 billion in foreign aid is not enough, $12.6 billion in foreign aid is not enough. The American people ought to be outraged.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of South Dakota seniors, I say ''no deal'' to the President's bad policy in this respect.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), a ranking member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the kind words of the gentlewoman.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that I rise in opposition to H.R. 2606, the conference report on foreign operations appropriations. This moves us in the wrong direction. Unfortunately, the conference report moves us into a dangerously low budget.

We have the conference agreement, which provides $12.6 billion. It is nearly $2 billion below the President's request and $1 billion less than last year's bill.

The low level of funding is untenable. It will be impossible for the U.S. to maintain its leadership role in the world's 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.

The omission is particularly troubling, as it signals a lack of support for the recent strides made by countries in Africa. The development fund for Africa is being cut 40 percent from last year.

$175 million is cut from essential loans for the poorest countries. $155 million is cut from global environmental protection programs. $87 million is denied for debt relief initiatives for the poorest countries in the world. $50 million is cut from African development loans. $200 million is cut from economic development and democratic building in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. $35 million is denied for the Peace Corps, where we just agreed to move our numbers up to 10,000 volunteers. Many Members from both sides of the aisle said it was great. So what do we do? We approve 10,000 and cut 35 million.

The gentleman talked about $12 billion, how outraged people from South Dakota were. I think I am in a time capsule where we are back 200 years ago. I never heard such an egregious, outrageous statement.

Here we are going to give $782 billion back to the wealthiest people in this country, and we are talking about cutting $2 billion back from the poorest people in the world and that people in this country are outraged.

I think we live in a society that some people are really very, very narrow visioned; and I believe that we must regain our position in the world. I think that the President is absolutely right. I stand a hundred percent behind his veto.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), for yielding me the time. And I thank my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE). Because instead of categorizing this with a unique historical perspective that is revisionist, to say the least, let us engage in some recent history.

Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States came here about 10 months ago, and in his message to a joint session of Congress, in his State of the Union address, he said it was up to us to save Social Security first. But with his veto today, the President is telling all Americans, Mr. Speaker, that they should surrender a portion of their Social Security Trust Fund to go not for their retirement but to a scheme of bigger spending not on Americans but on other folks around the world.

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

Mr. HAYWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Speaker, I just got on the House floor. Is it correct that the President vetoed this bill because it takes Americans' hard-earned money and he wants to give billions away to other countries more?

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, that is exactly the

case. The President is taking the hard-earned money of Americans and wanting to spend more and more and more and jeopardize the Social Security Trust Fund.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT).

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton has vetoed a foreign aid bill because it does not send enough American tax dollars overseas. Outrageous.

In order to satisfy the President's insatiable appetite for foreign aid, Congress would have to raid the Social Security Trust Fund. That would be unconscionable.

Mr. Speaker, let us protect Social Security for those who receive benefits now and those who pay the taxes and those who want to receive benefits in the future. Let us stop the foreign aid raid.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES).

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, thank goodness the gentleman from Alabama (Chairman CALLAHAN) has said no to the President's taking money from our farmers in North Carolina who have lost their homes, small businesses.

The President has said, no, our farmers do not matter. He does not mind, and they do not matter. That is what he said. But the committee of the gentleman has said, our farmers and our seniors matter. I thank the gentleman very much for saying yes to our people.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 15 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member of the full committee.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, despite the last two comments, the facts are they have already spent $23 billion of the Social Security surplus in bills that they have already passed in the House this year. That is the fact even if they do not want to admit it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). The Chair will announce that the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) has 3½ minutes remaining and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) has 3¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON).

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, well, this year trick or treat for UNICEF will have a new meaning because the President just said no to a $9 million increase in UNICEF funding. So the children of America are going to have to work a little bit harder.

It is important because the President also said no to a $60 million increase in child survival programs. He also, to keep the streets just as dangerous as he could, said no to a $24 million increase in the international drug programs.

We keep hearing about our obligations overseas and our promises to the Middle East. I was in Israel. I spoke to Mr. Barak in a small group at a Congressional delegation in Israel and Jerusalem and also here in the Capitol. I also went to Jordan and spoke to King Abdallah. There was no discussion of you-all made this promise the Wye River is in the bag, we are spending the money. I did not hear that from the two top leaders of these countries.

But I do see that, in this bill, the President said no to our increasing aid to Israel $30 million where he had cut it.

We keep talking about what this money is going to do. It is going to go to good causes overseas, but any increase will come straight out of Social Security. We should reject this veto.

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

Mr. Speaker, since my speaker has not returned to the floor, I will use his time and my time in closing. It affords me the luxury of commending my distinguished chairman for the work that we did together to bring this bill to the floor originally. I encourage my colleagues to support the bill but only with the idea that when we came back from conference, it could only be supported if there was a higher allocation to this foreign operations bill.

So it is not with a criticism of the process with which the distinguished chairman moved the bill through. We worked together on that. What it is a criticism of is the lack of funding in the bill for us to live up to our leadership role in the world.

The distinguished majority leader said that the percentage of funding for foreign aid is going down because other spending is going up, he said in reference to my remarks. I did not say that. I said that, in real dollars, our foreign aid spending is being reduced since Reagan's years by, what, one-quarter to one-half in real dollars, not in percentages.

This debate about Social Security that our colleagues have drummed up really does a disservice to the whole debate on the budget and the appropriations process. This debate that our colleagues have drummed up, this illusion that they have tried to convey on the floor today is an insult to the intelligence of the Social Security recipients, to the Social Security donors, and their families.

Yes, President Clinton said he was going to save Social Security first, and we all subscribed to that. That is not the only thing we do. Now, if the gentleman thinks that is the only thing we do, maybe we should have a zero foreign operations budget. Maybe we should spend no money on any trade assistance for the Ex-Im Bank for us to promote U.S. products abroad or the Trade Development Administration for the same purpose or OPIC, which enables our products to find markets abroad. Maybe we should do none of that.

Maybe we should abandon everything we do with the religious community to reach out to poor children throughout the world and to help them stave off disease and starvation.

What is in this bill, as I said earlier, is 6.3 percent of a percentage, less than 1 percent, of the Federal budget. With President Clinton's funds, it would be .8 percent. So it would be still less than 1 percent of the Federal budget, a small percentage and a small price to pay for what the President enumerated in his veto message about promoting democracies and free economies throughout the world, about promoting markets for our products, about honoring our commitments internationally, about living up to our leadership role in the world.

This century that we are coming to an end as we do fiscal year 2000 appropriations bills is a terrible century in many respects. Nazism, communism, authoritarianism were rampant throughout this century and they are coming to an end now.

One of the brightest stars of this century was the founding of the State of Israel. How sad it is that this body, representing the American people who have fully supported that brave, courageous state all these 51 years of its existence, that we, coming to the end of this century, will not take yes for an answer in the peace process by funding the Wye River agreement.

Leaders in that region gave their lives, their health, and all of their future for this peace agreement; and we in this body are rejecting all of that sacrifice.

I urge my colleagues to support the President's veto when the time comes.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I yield myself the balance of the time.

Mr. Speaker, let me compliment the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) and echo what she said. We have worked in a nonpartisan fashion trying to give the President the flexibility, trying to give the President the sufficient amount of money to have effective foreign policy.

The President, in my opinion, has just thrown this agreement out the door when he vetoed this bill. I am going to send him a bill now that will instruct him on what foreign policy problems can be if indeed he is so obnoxious in vetoing a bill such as this.

So let me tell the President, this next bill he is going to get, number one, is not going to be any more and, number 2, is going to give him a reason to veto it. Because we are going to go back to the old days when the Democrats were indeed telling Ronald Reagan and George Bush what they were going to do during their foreign policy.

□ 1845

So if the President wants to declare war, this is war. It is war that he is going to suffer, not me. The people of Alabama could care less if I pass a foreign aid bill or not. So I am not going to suffer. But millions of children are going to suffer because they do not have the child survival money that we put into the bill.

Let me just give Members one example of what the President said, and I wish everybody in America could get a copy of this message from the President of the United States and understand what he is saying. One thing he says in here is I need $900 million to forgive debt for poorer nations. That comes from his trip to Africa where he took 1,700 people with him and spent $47 million of the American taxpayers' money and goes over there and once again clinks his glass and then comes back and says, This is an entitlement. We want to forgive this debt that these foreign leaders have incurred during these corrupt regimes in Africa.

Mr. Speaker, if people could see this message, if they could understand exactly what the President is saying, they would be up here marching on this Capitol saying, ''SONNY, don't give in to that guy. He has this insatiable appetite to spend our money to give it to these foreign countries just because they walk in his front door.''

I might forewarn the President that Halloween is just around the corner and a lot of these people knocking on the White House gate for trick-or-treat might have on turbans, and I might tell them when they go knock on the door, ''Wear a turban and carry a bag and let me tell you, that President will fill it up. He'll give you an IOU from the Congress.''

But we are not going to give in to the President on this issue. We might be here till Christmas, we might be here till Easter, but we are not going to give in.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN).

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will now put the question on each motion to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today in the order in which that motion was entertained.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Approval of the Journal, de novo;

H.R. 2140, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 2886, by the yeas and nays; and

House Concurrent Resolution 196, by the yeas and nays.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of 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.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 357, nays 49, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 505]

YEAS—357

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
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
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Callahan
Calvert
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth-Hage
Clayton
Clement
Coble
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Ewing
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Obey
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Paul
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
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
Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Upton
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—49

Baird
Borski
Brown (FL)
Clay
Clyburn
Coburn
Costello
Crane
DeFazio
Dickey
English
Evans
Filner
Gibbons
Green (TX)
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hastings (FL)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hutchinson
Kucinich
LoBiondo
Markey
McDermott
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Moran (KS)
Oberstar
Olver
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Peterson (MN)
Pickett
Ramstad
Sabo
Schaffer
Stupak
Sweeney
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Weller

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Tancredo

NOT VOTING—26

Brady (PA)
Buyer
Camp
Carson
Collins
Cooksey
Farr
Fattah
Frelinghuysen
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (OH)
Klink
Knollenberg
Lewis (GA)
Martinez
McIntosh
Menendez
Neal
Pallone
Pryce (OH)
Rush
Sanford
Scarborough
Towns

□ 1910

So the journal was approved.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GIBBONS). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 8, rule XX, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device may be taken on each additional motion to suspend the rules on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

CHATTAHOOCHEE RIVER NATIONAL RECREATION AREA AMENDMENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 2140, 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 Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2140, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 394, nays 9, not voting 30, as follows:

[Roll No. 506]

YEAS—394

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
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Callahan
Calvert
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Chabot
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
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
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
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
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
John
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pascrell
Pastor
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schakowsky
Scott
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
Tierney
Toomey
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)

NAYS—9

Herger
Holden
Hostettler
Paul
Peterson (MN)
Pombo
Schaffer
Sensenbrenner
Tiahrt

NOT VOTING—30

Blunt
Brady (PA)
Buyer
Camp
Carson
Castle
Chenoweth-Hage
Collins
Cooksey
Farr
Fattah
Frelinghuysen
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (OH)
Klink
Knollenberg
Lewis (GA)
Martinez
McIntosh
Menendez
Neal
Pallone
Payne
Pryce (OH)
Rush
Sanford
Scarborough
Towns

□ 1918

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT REGARDING ADOPTED ALIENS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 2886.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2886, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 404, nays 0, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 507]

YEAS—404

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
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Callahan
Calvert
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth-Hage
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Combest
Condit
Cook
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
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)
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, E.B.
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo

Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
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
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—29

Brady (PA)
Buyer
Camp
Carson
Collins
Conyers
Cooksey
Cubin
Farr
Fattah
Frelinghuysen
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (OH)
Klink
Knollenberg
Lewis (GA)
Martinez
McIntosh
Menendez
Neal
Pallone
Payne
Pryce (OH)
Rush
Sanford
Scarborough
Towns

□ 1927

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMITTING USE OF ROTUNDA OF CAPITOL FOR PRESENTATION OF CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO PRESIDENT AND MRS. GERALD R. FORD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 196.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 196, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 402, nays 0, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 508]

YEAS—402

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
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Callahan
Calvert
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth-Hage
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
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
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
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, E.B.
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
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
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—31

Brady (PA)
Buyer
Camp
Carson
Collins
Cooksey
Dicks
Farr
Fattah
Frelinghuysen
Gutierrez
Jefferson
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (OH)
Klink
Knollenberg
Leach
Lewis (GA)
Martinez
McIntosh
Menendez
Neal
Pallone
Payne
Pryce (OH)
Rush
Sanford
Scarborough
Serrano
Towns

□ 1935

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, due to my absence, I was unable to attend the House of Representatives on several votes. If I had been present, I would have voted ''aye'' on final passage of H.R. 2140; ''aye'' on final passage on H.R. 2886; ''aye'' on final passage on H. Con. Res. 196; ''nay'' on the motion to instruct conferees on the Commerce/Justice State Appropriations Bill; and ''aye'' on approving the Journal.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). Under clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair redesignates the time for the resumption of the proceedings on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COBURN) until Tuesday, October 19.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON RULES REGARDING AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2260, PAIN RELIEF PROMOTION ACT OF 1999

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, today a ''dear colleague'' letter was sent to all Members informing them that the Committee on Rules is planning to meet later this week to grant a rule which may limit the amendment process for floor consideration of H.R. 2260, the Pain Relief Promotion Act of 1999. Any Member wishing to offer an amendment should submit 55 copies and a brief explanation of the amendment to the Committee on Rules up in H–312 of the Capitol by 4:00 p.m., Wednesday, October 20. Amendments should be drafted to the bill as ordered reported by the Committee on Commerce on October 13. Copies of the bill may be obtained from the committee. Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure that their amendments to both bills are properly drafted and should check with the Office of the Parliamentarian to be certain their amendments comply with the Rules of the House.

I would like to inform members of the Committee on Rules that we are going to be meeting in 10 minutes upstairs for the consideration of two measures.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 2670, DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION ACT, 2000

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 7(c) of rule XXII, I hereby announce my intention to offer a motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 2670 tomorrow.

The form of the motion is as follows:

Mr. UPTON moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 2670 be instructed to agree to the provisions contained in section 102 of the Senate amendment (relating to repeal of automated entry-exit control system).

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, October 14, I missed five votes because I was in Texas on official House business. Had I been present, I would have voted yes on rollcall 500; yes on 501; no on 502; no on 503; and no on 504.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS TO COMMISSION ON ONLINE CHILD PROTECTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, and pursuant to section 1405(b) of the Child Online Protection Act (47 U.S.C. 231), the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following members on the part of the House to the Commission on Online Child Protection:

Mr. John Bastian, Illinois, engaged in the business of providing Internet filtering or blocking services or software;

Mr. William L. Schrader, Virginia, engaged in the business of providing Internet access services;

Mr. Stephen Blakam, Washington, D.C., engaged in the business of providing labeling or ratings services;

Mr. J. Robert Flores, Virginia, an academic expert in the field of technology;

Mr. William Parker, Virginia, engaged in the business of making content available over the Internet.

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 AFFORDABLE PRESCRIPTION DRUGS ACT

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. Mr. Speaker, many of us in this institution have been highly critical of the American pharmaceutical industry. Maybe, maybe we have been a bit too harsh. From a market perspective, drug companies are doing everything they should be doing. We cannot blame drug companies for maximizing their profits. That is their job. Nor can we blame the Federal Government for taking steps to protect seniors and the uninsured and to address the ramifications of what drug companies are doing to the disadvantaged. That is our job.

To address this issue, I have introduced H.R. 2927 to bring down prices without taking away the industry's incentive to act like an industry. My bill promotes good, old-fashioned American competition. The Affordable Prescription Drug Act does not use price controls, does not use regulations to bring down prescription drug prices. What my bill does is reduce drug industry power and increase consumer power by subjecting the drug industry to the same competitive forces that other industries bear. It is a means of moderating prices that are too high without inadvertently setting prices that are too low.

Drawing from intellectual property laws already in place for the U.S. for other products in which access is an issue, pollution control devices come to mind, the legislation would establish product licenses for essential prescription drugs. If, based on criteria published by the Department of Commerce, a drug price is so outrageously high that it bears no semblance to pricing norms for other industries, the Federal Government could require drug manufacturers to license their patent to generic drug companies. The generic drug companies could then sell competing products before the brand name patent expires, paying the patent holder royalties for that right.

The patent holder would still be amply rewarded for being the first on the market, and Americans would benefit from competitively driven prices.

Alternatively, a drug company could voluntarily lower its prices, which would preclude the Federal Government from being involved, from finding cause for product licensing. Either way, prescription drug prices come down.

The bill requires drug companies to provide audited, detailed information on drug company expenses. Given that these companies are repeatedly asking us to accept a status quo that is bankrupting seniors and fueling health care inflation, they have kept us guessing about their true costs for far too long. We can continue to buy into drug industry threats that research and development will dry up unless we continue to shelter them from competition. The argument, however, Mr. Speaker, falls apart when we actually look at how R&D is funded today.

Long story short, it is mostly funded by American taxpayers. Fifty percent of research and development for new drugs in this country is done by the Federal Government, by local governments and by foundations. The other 50 percent that the drug company spends, the Federal Government, Congress, has bestowed tax breaks on those companies for those dollars they do spend. The drug companies turn around and thank U.S. consumers by charging us two times, three times, four times what consumers in other countries pay.

We pay for half the research. We give tax breaks on the dollars they do spend. They turn around and charge American consumers twice or three times what consumers of prescription drugs pay in every other country in the world.

Mr. Speaker, we can do nothing or we can dare to challenge the drug industry on behalf of seniors and every health care consumer in this country. We should take a serious look at the Allen bill, the Berry-Sanders bill, the Brown bill. There is no excuse for inaction.

☐ 1945

I urge my colleagues to support lowering the cost of prescription medicine. Let us act responsibly before it is too late.

KAZAKHSTAN MAKING PROGRESS IN DEMOCRACY, FREE MARKETS AND HUMAN RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. METCALF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I return this week from monitoring an election in Kazakhstan. The election to the lower house of Kazakhstan's parliament, the Majilis, has been described by the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe as a ''tentative step in the country's transition to democracy.''

While the election was not perfect, the Kasakhs acknowledged this, it was an important step toward true representative self-government.

I have heard many negative comments towards the Kasakh government recently. Certainly the attempted transfer of MIG 21s to North Korea was a major security concern for the United States. However, the Kasakh government dealt with this matter swiftly, fired those responsible, and put in place mechanisms to prevent this from occurring again.

More importantly, we are not hearing the positive steps occurring in Kazakhstan. The Kasakh government is privatizing state assets, encouraging small business, and taking seriously the business of doling, of building real democratic institutions. Do not forget, voluntarily, Kazakhstan unilaterally disarmed its nuclear arsenal.

The United States needs to recognize that this secular nation, bordered by Russia on the north, China to the east, and several nations to the south and west that may export Islamic fundamentalism, really wants an economic and strategic relationship with us.

They understand that we want to see evolving liberal democratic institutions, free markets, and a real respect for human rights. We need to understand that Kazakhstan has only 7 years under its belt as an independent nation, and that they are taking important steps in these matters.

Let us look at Kazakhstan as an evolving partner, and let us reward their important steps in the fields of democracy, free markets, human rights with a stronger diplomatic and economic relationship. I invite my colleagues to visit this beautiful country and see for themselves the progress that is being made.

MEDICARE PAYMENTS AND THE STATE 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, today we kicked off Voices Against Violence, a congressional teen conference with a goal of involving young people in a nationwide debate on ways for legislators and others to prevent youth violence, both nationally and in local schools and communities. More than 400 students from across the country will participate in the teen conference. I want to thank the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) for his leadership in making this conference possible.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to discuss an issue that is very important to the citizens of my State of Florida. The cuts in the Medicare and Medicaid payments to the health providers in my State are causing a crisis.

With Florida's large senior population, no other single payer impacts health care providers in the State more than Medicare. With almost 3 million Medicare beneficiaries, Florida has the second largest Medicare population in the United States. Almost one in every five Floridians qualify for Medicare, the highest percent of any State in the country. Unfortunately for those hard-working people, the cuts in Medicare funding in the Balanced Budget Act are preventing them from getting the care that they need and deserve.

Florida's home health agencies, skilled nursing facilities, medical equipment providers, Teaching and Disproportionate Share Hospitals are in a state of crisis. Especially in the rural areas, these organizations are being forced to bear an extreme financial burdens, causing them to stretch their budgets dangerously thin and forcing them to provide substandard care to their patients.

Every single day in my office I receive calls and letters from patients and their providers who tell me horror stories of people being sent home early from the hospital, having therapy cut off before they are properly healed, and being denied care altogether. This is not right.

I hear from my colleagues that we have a huge surplus that we need to give back to the people. This Congress can start giving it back to the people by providing adequate funding for the health care for our seniors who have already paid for it and so desperately need it.

I am glad to hear that my colleagues on the Committee on Ways and Means are moving forward on this issue, and I am looking forward to working with them to restore these dangerous cuts. Let us do the right thing and restore these massive cuts in Medicare reimbursement.

CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL TO BE AWARDED TO PRESIDENT AND MRS. FORD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, just a short time ago, we passed a resolution allowing the use of the rotunda for a ceremony to grant a Congressional Gold Medal to President and Mrs. Ford. I would like to give some background information on that award. I was very pleased to sponsor the bill that would grant them this medal because they have served this country so well for so many years.

What is unique about this medal, this particular medal, and what is different than any previous medal in history, is that it will be awarded to both President and Mrs. Ford. I believe it very important to recognize the part that both of them played in the history of our country.

Mrs. Ford contributed a great deal to the health of the women of this Nation by discussing very frankly and openly the fact that she had breast cancer. Now, that may seem rather mundane today, but at the time she developed breast cancer, she was the First Lady in the White House. Breast cancer was not discussed in polite society. It was whispered about. As a result, many women did not know what caused breast cancer. They did not know about self-examination. They did not know what treatments were available.

Mrs. Ford announced that she had this terrible disease. She described the symptoms to this Nation. She worked with the media to publicize the nature of breast cancer. She was very effective in alerting the women of this Nation to the need for breast examination and treatment.

In addition to that, later on in life, due to a number of pain medications that she was taking and the use of alcohol, Mrs. Ford recognized the need for treatment for alcoholism and drug dependency and started the Betty Ford Clinic. This has been a life-saving institution for many, many people. She still takes a personal interest in it, still visits with new patients as they come in, and has been very effective in helping many people recover from substance abuse or alcohol abuse.

President Ford, of course, is well known as the President who healed our Nation after the resignation from office of President Nixon. However, since we have almost a generation elapsed since President Ford held office, I find many people simply are not aware of what was happening at that time and the incredible turmoil that this Nation felt at the time that President Nixon was undergoing examination by the Congress, facing impeachment, and eventually resigning from office.

When President Ford took that office, he, in a very calm and deliberate manner, proceeded to heal this Nation. He restored order. He restored financial stability. He reduced interest rates. He improved the economy and showed that our government could survive a crisis like that and function well. For this, he deserves our thanks and our commendation.

Because of this and because of the actions of both President and Mrs. Ford, I thought it very deserving that they receive the Congressional Gold Medal. This will be presented to them next

week in the rotunda of the Capitol. I urge all Members to attend, and I urge also the citizens of this country to join me in applauding both Jerry and Betty Ford, President and Mrs. Ford, for their selfless service to this country for all the good that they have done for all of us.

VOICES AGAINST VIOLENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I too rise today with great pleasure to stand and welcome the many young people who have come to Washington, D.C. to participate in Voices Against Violence, a congressional teen conference sponsored by the office of the Democratic leader and the Democratic Caucus.

However, these young people come from all over the country, and many of them come from so many different walks of life and, might I say, from different political parties. This is a bipartisan summit. Young people have come from across the country to talk about the issues of youth violence and how it impacts their lives.

I am pleased to have four students here from my district in Houston, and I met them at the airport this afternoon as they arrived in Washington, D.C. As they communicated with me their desires, each of them said they came to listen, but they also came to provide solutions.

They want to see more opportunities for parents and schoolteachers and counselors to listen to students. They want to find ways to help students who are concerned or have problems and pressures not to explode like what happened in Columbine, but to have resources where they can talk. These young people mean business, and they have come to work.

Young people live in a different world than what existed about 20 years ago. In this new era, young people have all the advantages of a new technologically advanced society as well as a new landscape of social interaction. Theirs is a future full of promise, and we are poised on a dawning of a new century that will bring even more.

However, in light of these changing times, we also have a society that seems to be more detached, more chaotic, more violent. We have seen a significant increase in violence against young people and violence committed by young people. These young people want the violence to stop.

There are many competing theories as to the causes of youth violence, from the increase in violence in popular culture to the lack of prayer in schools. Others will even say that the increase of youth crimes is the symptom of a larger breakdown of our society. But I believe these young people will be instructive as they come to Washington.

I welcome Jessica Abad from Booker T. Washington High School, Eric Del Toro from Barbara Jordan High School, Andrea Marie Garrity from Reagan High School, and Ashley Robinson from Jesse H. Jones High School, along with Dr. Alma Allen, the chaperone, a member of the Texas Board of Education and school administrator from the HISD.

As I close, Mr. Speaker, let me congratulate the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the Democratic leader, and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST), the caucus leader, for helping to sponsor this conference.

I said, Mr. Speaker, that we started out with a sense of hope for these young people coming here. I am disappointed, however, as I speak about another issue, that as the Commerce, State, Justice appropriation bill comes to the floor of the House, the conferees have decided or rejected the idea of adding to it the Hate Crimes Prevention Act of 1999. What a travesty inasmuch as the Senate bill did have this legislation.

In the light of the tragedies that have occurred in Illinois, in light of the tragedies that occurred in my own State of Texas with James Byrd being dismembered by hateful acts, those who promoted racist provocations and acts, along with the activities of the killing of Matthew Shepard, but many, many others, these are just examples of hateful acts in America.

For those who would say that other crimes are equal to hateful acts, that any murder is hateful, they are absolutely wrong. I wish they would understand what the hate stands for. It stands for the intimidation of large groups of people.

When James Byrd was killed and dismembered, it was not intended just to say something to James Byrd. It was intended to tell African Americans that they do not stand equal in this country, that they can be dismembered in this brutal manner. When Matthew Shepard was killed, it was intended to show gays and lesbians that they are not equal in this Nation.

Hate crimes intimidate groups. When is this Congress going to understand that, in order to make a national statement about who we are as Americans as we go into the 21st century, we need a national position as we did with the Voter Rights Act in 1965 and the Civil Rights Act of 1964, that we stand against hate crimes?

It is a travesty and a shame that this appropriations bill would not have the inclusion of the Hate Crimes Prevention Act of 1999 similar to what the other body did. We are going to fight it, and we are going to prevail because good people in America will prevail over evil.

Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I stand tonight to welcome the many young people who have come to Washington, DC, to participate in "Voices Against Violence," a congressional teen conference sponsored by the Office of the Democrat Leader and the Democratic Caucus.

Young people have come from across the country to talk about the issue of youth violence and its effect on their lives. I am pleased to have four students here from my district in Houston.

Young people live in a different world than what existed just 20 years ago. In this new era, young people have all the advantages of a new technologically advanced society as well as a new landscape of social interaction. Theirs is a future full of promise and we are poised on thedawning of a new century that will bring even more.

However, in light of these changing times, we also have a society that seems to be more detached, more chaotic and more violent. We have seen a significant increase in violence against young people and violence committed by young people.

There are many competing theories as to the causes of youth violence, from the increase in violence in popular culture to the lack of prayer in public schools. Others would even say that the increase of youth crime is a symptom of a larger breakdown in the moral fabric of society.

By now, we know that the problem of youth violence cannot be traced to a single cause or source. At the same time, we here in Congress have formed various working groups and task forces to address this issue, because we are all searching for some answers and solutions to youth violence.

It is now appropriate that we have now turned our attention to our children, and to take the time to hear from them. Not all of our young people are caught up in the cycle of violence. We know that 95% of all young people are good kids who want to do the right thing. Too often, we focus on the bad elements and overlook these children.

This conference gives us an opportunity to make up for our neglect of this 95%. The purpose of this conference is to go beyond pointing fingers at the various causes of youth violence, and to discuss tangible solutions. The solutions that will be offered these next 2 days will come from our children.

It is refreshing to hear the perspective of young people on solutions to youth violence. Last month, during the Congressional Black Caucus Annual Legislative Conference, some young people participated in the Juvenile Justice forum I sponsored and shared some unique insights into the problem of youth violence.

I was enlightened by the views of these young people, especially the views of the young men who were very articulate and insightful about their experiences. One young man spoke eloquently of what he thought were the negative perceptions he faced as a young Black man.

This is the type of dialogue I hope the young people will engage in as they discuss solutions to youth violence. The close to 400 participants will get to discuss these issues with the President and other policy makers to help us understand their perspective on this problem.

I hope that these teens will come away from this conference with a new understanding of each other that they can take back to their communities.

I am pleased to have four students from my district in Houston here to participate in the conference—Jessica Abad from Booker T. Washington High School; Eric Del Toro from

Barbara Jordan High School; Andrea Marie Garrity from Reagan High School; and Ashley Robinson from Jesse H. Jones High School.

I would like to thank the Houston community for assisting us in bringing these students to Washington. I would also like to thank Dr. Alma Allen, a member of the Texas State Board of Education and School Administrator from the Houston Independent School District who has accompanied the students as a chaperone.

I strongly urge my colleagues to participate in this conference to listen to the concerns of our young people. As I stated earlier, we have had many hearings, conferences, working groups and debates on this issue in which we relied on the expertise of trained adults to tell us about the problem. Now it is time to listen to our young people for their view.

I would like to thank the Democratic Leader DICK GEPHARDT and Caucus Leader MARTIN FROST for sponsoring this conference. Although the conference is being sponsored by the Democrat Party, we have bipartisan support in the form of Republican offices that have sent students. I thank everyone who has worked so hard since this summer to put this event together.

Finall, I thank the young people who came from all across the country to participate. I urge you to raise your voices against violence loud and clear—especially now because we are listening.

LANGUAGE AND COMMUNICATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NETHERCUTT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Speaker, like no other creatures on Earth, human beings have the unique ability to communicate through language. We can communicate feelings of love or hope or anxiety or suspense or excitement, all conveying feelings of emotions, feelings of concern. We do that through language. We use the English language and all the other languages of the world which are spoken through human beings who try to convey those feeling accordingly.

We have over the years respected great writers like Shakespeare and people in politics like Lincoln and Kennedy and the poetry of Robert Frost, and the magic word of Byron and Keats and Shelley as poets. George Will in today's world is a master of the word, of speaking effectively and carefully and with great meaning.

□ 2000

The reason I mention this today, Mr. Speaker, is that over the years I think we have seen a reduction in the respect for the English language and what words mean, how grammar is expressed or not expressed, whether it is proper or not. And just last Thursday we saw, on CBS television, a new low in expression for millions of people to see and observe and listen to on national television.

There was a show called Chicago Hope, and there was a headline in USA Today following that show entitled Chicago Hope Breaks the Barrier. Well, this is the barrier that Chicago Hope broke. It was the barrier of obscenity and foul language that I think we have not seen in any time in our history on television, on network television.

The actor involved, Mark Harmon, plays a doctor, apparently, and he was before a medical review board to explain why a promising teenage baseball pitcher had to have his arm amputated, the story says, when an infection set in and, following a series of operations, was unable to play, apparently. So this doctor on television, a revered profession in our society, by the way, said ''blank happens.'' The USA article says, ''Blank happens,'' Harmon said, using an epithet for excrement. Neither a CBS spokesman nor Henry Bromwell, executive producer of the series, could remember a time when censors had allowed the word to be used. ''It's nothing I haven't tried a couple of times before, except this time I won, Bromwell said.''

Apparently the word was expected to be used for artistic truthfulness. Well, Mr. Speaker, I think the American public has, I hope, had a bit of enough about artistic expression on national television with a captive audience that breaks new barriers, not new high barriers but new low barriers. What a distinction for CBS television. How proud they must be that this barrier has now been reduced even lower. The standards for conduct, for language, for propriety, for dignity, for expression has now reached a new low for CBS and this so-called entertainment show.

Now, it is one thing to pay money and go to the movies and watch trash, which there is plenty of in today's society. If individuals want to do that, people have the right in a free society to do that. But on national television, before a national audience, to somehow be proud of the breaking of this new low barrier, I fear, says volumes about television today and the entertainment industry.

Are there no bounds in the entertainment industry on television? I suspect there may not be, as these new lows keep being reached by people who are somehow proud of this low-class artistic expression as defined by some producer who feels that he is somehow trying to make his mark. He has made his mark all right. He has made a low mark.

I would urge Americans who are disgusted with this kind of language and the lowness of it and the failure of the language to be expressive in a dignified and acceptable societal way to write CBS News and give them all that they can express about their disapproval for this kind of activity.

FOREIGN OPERATIONS APPROPRIATIONS VETO

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, there was not time allowed in the debate on foreign aid, and I wanted to make some comments, and so I will do so now.

First of all, the ranking minority member on the subcommittee, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), made a statement that more money was available to Ronald Reagan for foreign aid. Well, that is because the Democrats controlled spending. There was always more money available, without any regard to a balanced budget. Ronald Reagan decreased taxes, he did not increase taxes like the President plans to do, $74 billion worth. And he only had control of the Senate for one term. The Democrats controlled Congress, where spending is originated and voted for.

After Ronald Reagan, the Democrats continued spending with no regard for a balanced budget. All additional revenue that the tax decrease brought in, they spent. And that was not enough, they raided the Social Security Trust Fund and used it as a slush fund to pay for such things as welfare, that was wasted in many cases. There are many families that need welfare, but not the 40 percent that was eliminated, and now the President lauds, after he vetoed our bill twice.

They are trying to do the same thing now that they did when they had control of the House, spend more than the balanced budget. To do so, they have to take it out of Social Security or the President has to identify where he would take the money from. He will not do that, because in each of his budgets he has said, I will make cuts in the fifth year, when he would not even be here. And then he refuses to tell where those cuts would come, except for defense, because he knows it would make people mad at him.

The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) said that the Democrats did more for Social Security. I think that is a joke. In 1993, they increased the taxes on Social Security. For 30 years they stole the money out of the Social Security Trust Fund. There is zero money in that fund, but they will say, oh, there are notes in there and they are guaranteed. But they are not backed up with gold; they are only backed up by the U.S. Government. And the only way to make those Social Security notes valuable is to put the money in there. When there is a surplus, the money can be put back in there. The Republicans have said we are going to put a lockbox on it and make it a trust fund not a slush fund, but yet the President wants to take the money out.

Remember, in 1993, he not only increased the taxes on Social Security, he increased the taxes on the middle income. I think using the term middle class is a terrible term to use. There are no middle-class citizens in this country. They may be low income,

they may be middle income or high income, but yet the Democrat leadership continues to use class warfare, and I think it is wrong.

We are not going to take the dollars from Americans, but yet the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) said that the billions of dollars is just a little bit, a good investment. Well, that little bit we already funded Africa at the same level, but they want more. They want more money not for American citizens but for foreigners, out of the Social Security Trust Fund, and I think that is wrong. The President vetoed it. They also want back the majority, but I think it is going to backfire.

The President wants more spending for Africa, but yet the President, in his trip this spring to Africa, took 1,700 staffers and press, 1,700, at a cost of $47 million. Africa would have loved the $47 million extra and let the President stay home.

The gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) quoted the Constitution of the United States. Well, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is our libertarian. I do not agree with everything he says, but he, if anybody, is a constitutionalist on spending. He votes against almost everything. But the Democrats vote against the Constitution every single day, in my opinion.

Remember when the President said he wanted 100 percent for Social Security in his address before Congress and the American people? Well, 3 weeks later he came back and said, no, 62 percent, and then 15 percent for Medicare. And what he does not tell us, and why we do not trust this President, is because he takes $100 billion out of Social Security and Medicare. He increases taxes $74 billion, and he spends it for brand new social spending. Not even the old social spending, new social spending. And we said no, Mr. President, we are going to put that money in a lockbox, not spend it, we are going to accrue those savings to protect Social Security and Medicare forever.

But yet now the President wants to take the money out. And we are saying absolutely not. We are going to send this bill back to the President. We are not going to spend money unless the President identifies where he wants those cuts to come from or unless he spends Social Security money.

I want my colleagues to look up WWW.DSAUSA.ORG, Democrat Socialists of America. They list the progressive caucus. There are 58 Democrats listed under the Democrat Socialists of America.

CONCERNS ABOUT IMMIGRATION AND POPULATION GROWTH IN THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to discuss an issue of great concern to me, I think of a number of people in the United States of America, but an issue that seldom makes its way to the point of being a topic of debate here in the Congress of the United States, and that is because, quite frankly, there are many, many people who are concerned, actually afraid, to bring this topic forward. I am talking specifically about the issue of immigration into the United States. And I mean massive immigration, immigration both legal and illegal.

I want to talk tonight about some of the effects of this particular phenomenon, because I believe they are detrimental; and I believe that we should confront them, even though it is sort of, politically anyway, very scary to do so.

Each year, close to 900,000 legal immigrants enter the United States from foreign countries; and these numbers have inflated our population to over 272 million. Mr. Speaker, the other day the world's population, we are told, reached 6 billion. Several cartoons have appeared in the papers in my State of Colorado depicting this phenomenon and saying that we are reaching a point where the resources of the country, of the Nation, of the world cannot support this kind of population growth.

Well, I do not know what is the critical mass in terms of population growth that the world can sustain, but I know in the United States we are reaching the point where growth is impacting upon us quite dramatically. Certainly it is in my State of Colorado. We are facing now at least two bond issues on our ballot in November dealing specifically with the issue of growth, both in terms of highway construction and how to deal with the massive increase in the numbers of people that have come to Colorado, and light rail construction totaling several billion dollars anyway, and then, of course, there are all the school bond issues we are going to face. This is just in Colorado. It is happening all over the country because of growth.

But where is this growth coming from? Is it from the population of the United States, the natural born population of this country? Are we experiencing just this kind of pressure because people in the United States are having children in such numbers that they are placing these burdens on our infrastructure? No, Mr. Speaker, it is not because of that kind of population growth. It is because of immigration policies.

We, tonight, are looking at immigration numbers that I just mentioned, of somewhere close to a million legal, and that is just legal immigrants. That does not count what we call refugee status, people coming in. It certainly does not count illegal immigrants. Every year there is a net increase. I mean we have a lot of people coming into the country illegally, everybody knows that. Some of them leave, go back to their native country, but many stay. So there is a net increase every year of at least this amount of legal immigrants. And it is difficult to count, of course, but we know that the pressures are there.

One State in which this pressure is evidenced day in and day out, besides the State of Colorado, of course, is the State of Texas. And there are a number of border States across the United States that are heavily influenced by this and that things are changing dramatically in those States, not just in terms of infrastructure costs, but there are a number of changes that are impacting those States that I think deserve to be discussed.

□ 2015

With me tonight to do that is a colleague of mine, I should say a mentor specifically on this issue. Because the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) has been laboring in this vineyard for many, many, many years, far more than I; and I do look to him and his leadership in this area. I am pleased that he is joining me tonight to discuss this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO), for yielding me time; and I appreciate his giving me the opportunity tonight to be able to make some comments of my own on such an important subject.

But first I want to thank him for his giving the attention to such a complex, sensitive and yet important subject that it deserves and also thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) for his expertise and for his knowledge of immigration, which I think provides a great contribution to those of us here in the House who certainly can benefit from his personal knowledge, firsthand knowledge, of immigration as it impacts his State of Colorado.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to the destructive effect of our current immigration policy. It is having a destructive impact on recent immigrants and black and Hispanic citizens and also how a more enlightened immigration policy would benefit American minorities and, in fact, the overall American economy.

Each year, close to 900,000 legal immigrants enter the United States. Of these, about 300,000 have less than a high school education and their competition for scarce jobs does have a destructive impact on the opportunity of American workers with no more than a high school diploma who are disproportionately and unfortunately recent immigrants and black and Hispanic citizens.

Mr. Speaker, among reports of a growing, prospering economy are other more troubling reports on a growing

gap between the well-to-do and the working poor. The national unemployment rate is about 4 percent; where, for those with less than a high school education, it is more than twice as high, over 8 percent.

In many cities where there are high recent immigrant populations, the unemployment rates are in double digits for those with less education. Where is opportunity for these individuals and their families?

Numerous polls indicate that black and Hispanic Americans know this only too well. This is no surprise, given that they are hurt disproportionately by our immigration policy today. We cannot pretend that the adverse impact of mass immigration on minorities does not exist. We can and should find solutions to protect the jobs and wages of recent immigrants and black and Hispanic citizens.

How often do we read about the long-term unemployed or the working poor or single mothers with no mention of the serious impact of immigration on their employment wages and working conditions? How often do we hear comments about the growing gap between the well-to-do and the working poor that do not mention that almost half the relative decline in wages of those who do not finish high school is caused, in fact, by competition from immigration?

Think of a single mother barely surviving in a minimum wage job who sees her annual wages depressed by $2,000 because she must compete with more and more unskilled immigrants. She very well might be a recent immigrant herself seeking a better life for herself and her children, or she might be able to trace her roots in this country back generations and is simply seeking the American dream that has been denied her ancestors.

Think what she can do for herself and her children with that lost money. Buy a used car so she does not have to take a bus to work. Put a down payment on a modest home. Or even fix the furnace before winter comes. Worse, think what would happen if she actually loses her job because of the never-ending competition from new arrivals.

It is certainly not the immigrants themselves who are to blame and who understandably want to come to America. It is our immigration policy that is to blame. But who knows how many people have been hurt by the unintended consequences of our outdated immigration policy.

A series of recent studies have all documented the effects of immigration policy on low-skilled American workers and recent immigrants. The National Research Council of the National Academy of Sciences concludes that immigration was responsible for about 44 percent of the total decline in relative wages of high school dropouts between 1980 and 1994.

The Rand Corporation reports that in California the widening gap between the number of jobs available for non-college-educated workers and the increasing number of new noncollege-educated immigrants signals growing competition for jobs and, hence, a further decline in the relative earnings at the low end of the labor market.

The U.S. Commission on Immigration Reform, chaired by Congresswoman Barbara Jordan, finds that ''immigration of unskilled immigrants comes at a cost to unskilled U.S. workers.''

The Hudson Institute states that ''U.S. immigration policy serves primarily to increase the number of U.S. residents who lack even a high school degree. America must stop recruiting workers for jobs that do not exist or exist only at the lowest wages.''

The Brookings Institute published a paper concluding that ''immigration has had a marked adverse impact on the economic status of the least skilled U.S. workers.''

The Center for Immigration Studies calculates that immigration may reduce the wages of the average native in a low-skilled occupation by over $1,900 a year.

CIS also found that the poverty rate for persons living in immigrant households of 1997 was 22 percent, almost double the 12 percent rate for persons in native households.

It concluded that reducing the flow of less skilled immigrants who enter each year would have the desirable effect of reducing job competition between more established immigrants and new arrivals for low-wage jobs. Reducing the supply of this kind of labor would create upward pressure on wages and benefits for the working poor, including immigrants already in the country. Over time, this should reduce poverty among immigrants who work.

These studies reinforce what common sense already tells us.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, add three other facts together. First, immigrants will account for half of the increase in the workforce in the 1990s.

Second, the skilled level of immigrants relative to Americans has been declining for years. Thirty-five percent of immigrant workers who have arrived since 1990 do not have a high school education, compared to only 9 percent of native-born workers. Some 300,000 illegal immigrants without high school educations arrived last year and will total 3 million this decade.

Third, close to 90 percent of all future jobs in America will require more than a high school education.

The mismatch is clear. Nearly half of all immigrants today are not prepared for the jobs of the future. Current immigration policy has many Americans and recent immigrants competing with hundreds of thousands of newcomers without high school degrees for a fixed number of low-skilled jobs. This is a recipe for disaster for millions of blue-collar workers and their families.

No one should complain about the plight of the working poor or the persistence of minority unemployment or the levels of income inequality in America without acknowledging the unintended consequences of our present immigration policy.

Of course, immigration is neither all good nor all bad. Immigrants benefit America in many ways. But we should design our immigration policies so that it enhances rather than diminishes opportunity for American workers. We should protect the jobs of working Americans, and we can make a better life for all Americans wherever they were born.

Just as American minorities would benefit from a reduced number of low-skilled immigrants, the American economy and American firms trying to prosper in this era of global competition would benefit enormously from an increased flow of more educated immigrants. American industry is pleading for more skilled and educated workers.

The chairman of the National Association of Manufacturers recently stated that ''the shortage of skilled employees is not a distant threat anymore. The skills gap is now catching up to us and could threaten the amazing growth and productivity gains of the past decade. Finding an adequate supply of qualified employees is the number one issue for American industry today.''

NAM found that 88 percent of manufacturers are experiencing a shortage of qualified workers, 60 percent find that current workers lack basic math skills and that 55 percent find serious deficiencies in workers' basic writing and comprehension skills. These problems can be solved with more educated workers. And because immigration accounts for such a high percentage of workforce growth, almost one-half, an emphasis on more educated immigrants would be an important part of the solution. The result would be a more productive American economy and more productive American businesses. As the productivity of the American economy increases, so will the prosperity of all Americans.

American citizens and legal residents will benefit in another way from more educated immigrants. To borrow a line from a new book by George Borjas, ''Skilled immigrants earn more, pay higher taxes, and require fewer social services than less skilled immigrants.''

The National Academy of Sciences states that over his or her lifetime, each immigrant with less than a high school education will cost American taxpayers $89,000. That is, the Government benefits consumed by each immigrant will exceed taxes they paid by $89,000.

To citizens concerned about how we are to rebuild our schools and protect and preserve Social Security in the next century, these numbers should set off alarms. More than 300,000 immigrant workers with less than a high school education entering our country this year will require $27 billion more in government services and benefits than they will contribute in taxes.

That is $27 billion, for example, that will not be available to rebuild our schools and protect and preserve Social Security and Medicare.

Next year another 300,000-plus immigrants will enter the country with less than a high school education. Over their lifetimes, they will claim another $27 billion that could provide education and training to recent immigrants and black and Hispanic citizens who have less than a high school education and who are disadvantaged in our economy.

Common sense tells us that we should align our immigration policy with the needs of America. The economy is crying out for more educated workers, and one of the easiest and most cost-free ways of providing these workers is through immigration reform. Doing so would mean more economic opportunity for all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, now I am happy to yield back to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) and thank him again for sharing his time tonight with me and thank him again for his attention to such an important subject and for his expertise on the subject, as well.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) for his comments, and I sincerely appreciate his contribution to this discussion which I consider to be quite definitive. As I say, he has had quite some time here even in the Congress of the United States to become involved with it, and I only hope that the rest of our colleagues will pay heed to his admonitions and to his clarion call for a change in immigration policies in the United States, and I want to thank him very sincerely for his support on this particular issue.

Mr. Speaker, every time we talk about the issue of immigration, it always results in someone coming up and saying something like, this is a Nation of immigrants. We are all immigrants.

And it is absolutely true that, unless our heritage is native American, and even then I guess you could say that they immigrated here, of course, across the Bering Strait, we are in fact a Nation of immigrants. This is undeniable. There was a time when immigration patterns across the world were such that the United States was the recipient of many hundreds of thousands of people, going into the millions, over a period of time.

Of course, I am speaking specifically of the turn of the century, especially where the United States was the place to which people came; it was a harbinger of hope. And it still is to many millions of people throughout the world.

I totally understand it. If I were an immigrant, if I were someone not in the United States, if I were someone born in other lands, especially into poverty, I would be doing exactly the same thing that we see millions and millions of them doing; and that is trying to come here. But my responsibility is different as a Congressman in this body. It is to address the issues that I believe are of concern and of a negative impact in terms of the general population of the country. And I believe immigration at this level, what I would certainly refer to as massive immigration, is not positive anymore.

Let me talk for a moment about the differences that exist between what we see today as immigration patterns and the situation in the United States as opposed to what it was around the turn of the century, of the last century.

The fact is that, of course, my grandparents came here about the same time as did millions of other people. And at that time this country was a place that relied upon brawn far more than anything else. We needed immigrant labor, low-skilled immigrant labor. It contributed to the capital development in this country, and it contributed to the well being of everyone.

□ 2030

The economy grew, the economic well-being of the families that emigrated grew, people prospered, and it was, generally speaking, a positive thing for the Nation. But we are in a brand new environment, a brand new environment that is not as hospitable to low-skilled labor as it was at the turn of the century. Today's needs are different. This Nation's needs are different. What we now see is that a massive immigration of low-skilled people have a detrimental effect on a number of things in the United States, including, of course, people who are at the lowest level of the economic scale. This is, I think, something that should concern us all and it is something I believe that my colleague from Texas addressed very clearly and very articulately, that the people in the United States that we find in most need of help are those people who are detrimentally affected by massive immigration. By the way, never before in our Nation's history, never, even at the beginning of the century, have we ever experienced the numbers of immigrants as we are presently that are a result of, quote, legal immigration alone, let alone illegal immigration. The numbers are far greater today than they ever were before. At present, just over 60 percent of the population growth in the United States is due to immigration. By 2050, it will be 90 percent, with a domestic population approaching 400 million people. Even if we allowed for a zero net increase in immigration, the population would increase by almost 75 million people by 2050 because of our recent track record. That is if we stopped immigration totally, today.

From 1997 to 1998, just 1 year in Colorado, almost 10,000 immigrants moved in and 3,000 people settled in Denver alone. These are legal immigrants. Far more came in illegally. Everybody knows it. Employers know it. School districts know it. The people who try to get to work and are confronted with massive traffic jams know it. I do not mean to say that all the people on the roads in Colorado and everywhere else, States not necessarily border States, are people who just came here from other countries, emigrated legally or illegally. But what I will tell you is that massive immigration causes a dislocation of populations, a movement of populations, and there are literally thousands, maybe hundreds of thousands of people even in my State, even in Colorado, who have moved there recently as a result of population pressures in the States from which they came, California, Florida, Texas and others, those population pressures brought on by immigration. So even though it may not be specifically immigrants in Colorado that caused the massive sort of problems we have with growth, they are exacerbated by our immigration policies nationally which do affect population trends in States all over the Nation.

With this major influx of people comes an influx of problems for United States citizens. Immigrants, both legal and illegal, are affecting all aspects of life within our society. From influencing our domestic job market causing lower wages for American citizens and even other recent immigrants, to the environment where a surging population means greater stress on our natural habitat, placing a true burden on our welfare system, we are feeling the strains of massive immigration in our economy.

In 1997, the National Research Council calculated the net fiscal cost of public services to immigrants, and I want to stress here, Mr. Speaker, the net fiscal cost, because when we get into this debate about what immigrants produce, what they contribute to the society as to what they take from the government services, there is always a debate about this, because we say, after all they come here, they get jobs, they pay taxes, that is true. But when they calculate the net fiscal cost of public services to immigrants, that is, after those taxes are paid and when we include education, welfare, Medicaid, housing assistance and Social Security beyond what immigrants pay in taxes, it was between 15 to $20 billion a year.

Now we are being asked to shoulder the burden placed on the economy of our current massive levels of immigration. In California, for example, each household must pay $1,178 a year in added taxes to cover the services which immigrants receive each year. Then there is the issue of poverty. We address that almost daily in the Congress of the United States. In every committee this issue comes up over and over again. We are now wrestling with all of the appropriations bills and we are constantly dealing with the issue of the poverty rate in the United States and we are fighting it. We are attempting to do what the government can do to reduce poverty levels in the United States. But it is the fact that a great percentage of this, of the group that we identify as being in poverty in the United States, far over a majority, as a

matter of fact, are recent immigrants to the United States, again both legal and illegal.

Why is that? For one reason, over 300 of the legal immigrants who enter the country have less than a high school education as was pointed out by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH). Likewise, the unemployment rate for people with less than a high school education is twice as high than for those with more schooling. I will tell you, also, there is another difference. I mentioned earlier there is a significant difference between what is happening in America today and what happened in America at the turn of the century with regard to immigration. When you came to the United States in 1900 as an immigrant, you had very few options in terms of what you were going to do for the rest of your life. You could work, or you could starve. There were no other options available to you. And in order to work, in order especially to progress in an upward way in order to go up the scale in America, to get a better job, to do better for your family, you had to do something else. You also had to learn English. It was an absolute necessity. It was not brought about because of any law. Well, it was a law, it was a law of economics. That is to say, if you wanted to do better in the United States, you had to learn English and you had to get a job.

Well, things are different in the United States today because of the welfare system we have in the United States, which is, by the way, bad for native-born Americans just as it is bad for immigrants, because of our insistence on issues like bilingual education and a type of bilingual education that allows children to actually try to go to school and be educated in a language other than English, and for a variety of other reasons we find ourselves looking at this immigration issue much differently than we did in 1900. It has an impact, a much more negative impact than it ever did before. One-third of the yearly immigration population is competing for jobs with a sector of society that is already plagued with high levels of unemployment.

Let us look at what is happening in our schools. Currently, there are 8 million school aged children with immigrant mothers. The influx of immigration is having dire effects on the ability to educate our children. In Los Angeles, for example, nearly two-thirds of the children in Los Angeles County schools are Hispanic and 43 percent of school children in California have parents who are immigrants. What does this mean? Well, it means, of course, larger classes. More children receive less attention. It means that precious resources for books, classroom space are being strained to the breaking point, trailers having to make do where classrooms once stood. It means a diversion of funds into remedial programs and away from the programs of hard science, math and history. It leads to racial separation between and among schools. There are significant problems we face because just the cost of bilingual education in this country is dramatic. Certainly in my own State we have noticed that the costs of supporting a bilingual education plan in several of our districts have caused school districts to come forward and request more funds time after time after time. This is not even talking about the value, the relative value of bilingual education which I would certainly like to critique, because I do not believe it is of great educational benefit.

It is not just the numbers, Mr. Speaker. That, we could deal with. The fact is that yes, we will have to build more schools; yes, we will have to hire more teachers; yes, there will be pressures for greater and greater resources to address the issue of more people. But then it is what happens even afterwards, in the development of, as I say, these bilingual programs and multicultural programs that have a tendency, unfortunately, I must say this, have a tendency to balkanize America. That is the other difference between the kind of immigration patterns we saw in the early 1900s and immigration patterns today. Instead of pressures within the United States to amalgamate the people who were coming here and bring them into the melting pot, instead of having a great desire on the part of most if not all of the immigrants in the early 1900s to become part of the American experience in every single way, we are seeing something else happening with recent immigrants to the United States, in that their desire is, of course, to achieve an economic level of existence that is comparable to what we would call the typical American experience, but something happens in terms of the willingness on the part of a lot of people to accept the greater American dream. We see a tendency to balkanize America, to break ourselves up into separate little enclaves, separated by language and culture.

This has a number of detrimental effects, of course. I hope that we will have the courage to address them as we get into the greater issues of immigration policies in America. But I think they are significant and I think most people in America know to what I am referring. I am referring to this phenomenon that changes the way we think about ourselves as Americans, as opposed to one Nation, one set of ideas, one historical perspective, to a Nation totally divided into a number of different camps with different ideas about American history.

I think we should cut back, and I think we should cut back dramatically on the number of immigrants which we are allowing into the country and we should do that through the implementation of legislation such as the moratorium bill of the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STUMP). We would better serve these immigrants by enabling them to have a better chance of achieving employment. Likewise, with less numbers of total immigrants these new arrivals to the United States would have an easier time of assimilating into their new society and the future American citizen. I agree with my colleague from Texas who indicated that perhaps a different group of immigrants ought to be identified as appropriate for immigration into the United States, and that being better educated.

There is one last issue I want to address, and, that is, the issue of immigrants and crime. Criminal aliens, that is, noncitizens who commit crimes, accounted for over 25 percent of the Federal prison population in 1993. I want to say that again, Mr. Speaker, because I do not think many people realize this. But criminal aliens, noncitizens who commit crimes, accounted for over 25 percent of the Federal prison population in 1993. They also represent the fastest growing segment. This does not count naturalized immigrants who commit crimes. About 450,000 noncitizens have been convicted of crimes and are either in American jails, on probation or on parole. In May 1990, foreign-born criminals comprised 18 percent of the inmates passing through the LA County jail inmate reception center. Some 11 percent had offenses sufficiently serious to qualify them as deportable aliens. A year later, in May 1991, a follow-up study showed only half of those deportable aliens had been returned to their country of origin.

□ 2045

Over 40 percent had already been rearrested in the United States for new offenses.

This is a result of a massive immigration problem and an immigrant policy, an immigration policy of this administration that chooses to ignore some of the most significant problems, the most significant crimes committed by people even before they come into this country. We do not go through their backgrounds, as we used to, and we end up with this kind of a problem in the United States.

I know in Colorado that a significant portion of the Colorado inmate population is made up by immigrants, both legal and illegal. The costs, again, of this kind of thing have to be added to the costs of education, costs of welfare, other costs of social services. So it is a significant issue.

The last, Mr. Speaker, and I mentioned that was the last thing; there is one more thing, Immigrants To The Public Charge. According to law, legal permanent residents are liable to be deported on a public charge if they use public benefits during their first 5 years in the United States, and although actually millions of people do this, only 41 people were deported on these grounds from 1961 to 1982.

Another issue is children under the birthright citizenship provision who are born in the United States and are automatically American citizens entitled to cash payments under the Federal Aid For Families With Dependent

Children program. Parents who often are illegal aliens are able to collect these checks, gain a foothold in the United States until their child turns 18, at which point they can be sponsored and made legal immigrants. The IRS makes no effort to prevent illegal aliens from receiving earned income tax refunds, which are sometimes payable even if no income tax is due and can exceed $2000. If a false Social Security number is used, an IRS agent will then assign a temporary number.

Well, these are some of the more egregious examples of the problems that we experience as a result of massive immigration into this country, Mr. Speaker; and I do hope that my colleagues will pay attention to them and will try to address them both by reducing the number of legal immigrants and by enforcing that with stricter policies on the border with using, if necessary, with using the Armed Forces of the United States to protect our borders which, as a matter of fact, is a perfect reason for having an Army, and that is to protect your borders, and in this case we need that protection against a flood of immigration of illegal immigrants that are seriously jeopardizing the situation in America today.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION AGREEING TO CONFERENCE REQUESTED BY SENATE ON H.R. 3064, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. LINDER (during special order of Mr. TANCREDO), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106–395) on the resolution (H. Res. 333) agreeing to the conference requested by the Senate on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3064) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 71, FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 2000

Mr. LINDER (during special order of Mr. TANCREDO), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106–396) on the resolution (H. Res. 334) providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 71) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2000, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

A NEW VISION FOR RUSSIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to discuss Russia, the current problems that we are seeing unfold in Russia, discuss consistent with the hearings that are being held in the Committee on International Affairs and the Committee on Banking and Financial Services and other committees of this Congress, the Committee on Government Reform, what impact, if any, the U.S. has had in the current economic and political turmoil inside of Russia and the former Soviet States.

Let me say at the outset, Mr. Speaker, this is an issue that I have discussed many times on this floor in the past, and I do not just come here tonight to criticize this administration, although some of my comments will appear to do just that. I come to offer some suggestions for perhaps a new way of dealing with Russia. In fact, what I come to offer tonight, Mr. Speaker, is a new vision for Russia, a new way that this country can relate to the people in Russia who have been dominated by a centrally-controlled Communist regime for 70 years and for the last 6 years or 7 years actually by a government that was totally focused on Boris Yeltsin and the people around him.

Mr. Speaker, I want the same thing for the Russian people that the President wants, and that is a stable, free democracy, a free market system allowing the people of Russia to enjoy the benefits that we in the West and we in America enjoy. I want them to be trading partners of ours; I want them to reap the benefits of free markets; and I want them to become a partner with us in helping to ensure world stability. From my position as chairman of the National Security Research Committee, my job is to oversee $38 billion a year of defense spending for new weapon systems and new technologies, and money of those technologies and much of that investment is focused on threats, either perceived or real, coming from Russia and the former states. So it is my interest, as a subcommittee chairman, to try to find ways to work with Russia so that perhaps we can create a more stable relationship, not have to spend so much of the taxpayers' money on building exotic new weapon systems that are designed to kill people.

Let me say at the outset, Mr. Speaker, I think we made a fundamental mistake in 1991. The Russia that people were so excited to throw off communism, they were so happy to finally be able to have the opportunity to enjoy the kind of democracy and free market capitalism that they saw us enjoying in the West. And in those first few months we were so excited with the leadership provided by Boris Yeltsin. And all of us were solidly behind him at the time, that I think we forgot one very important and basic notion, that Russia's success as a democracy was not dependent upon one man. It was not going to depend upon Boris Yeltsin, but rather we should have focused on upon helping Russia establish the institutions of a democracy that would last beyond one person.

If we look at America, we can see that quite evident in our history. Yes, we have had great leaders from George Washington, to Abraham Lincoln, FDR, Ronald Reagan, all good people. But America's success is not based on individual people and the work that they do. It is based on the institutions that allow our government to have a system of checks and balances. It is based on a Constitution. It is based upon the institutions mandated in that Constitution that allow people to assume positions, but that the institution can never be circumvented by those individual people.

In our rush to help Boris Yeltsin, Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that our focus was wrongheaded. We were so preoccupied with reinforcing Boris Yeltsin, the man, that we forgot that Russia could not and would not succeed and become more stable unless we focused on institutions and strengthening those institutions.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, it is no surprise to me that for 7 years, as Boris Yeltsin called the parliament in Russia, the lower house, the State Duma, and the upper house, the Federation Council, repeatedly called them a bunch of misfits and rogues and crooks and thugs, and while there may be one or two in that Duma or perhaps more that would fit those categories, what we did as a country was reinforce Yeltsin's notion of what the Russian Parliament was, that it was not an institution to be taken seriously. And, therefore, the President, largely through his policies of reinforcing Boris Yeltsin, sent a message to the Russian people and to the elected leaders of the state Duma that America's policy was based on a strong Yeltsin and that we were not, in fact, concerned with helping to strengthen the institution of the state Duma and the Federation Council and those institutions that would allow Russia's Constitution and the Russian government to stabilize itself. And now we are paying the price for that, Mr. Speaker.

Yeltsin's popularity in the most recent poll in Russia is 2 percent. In fact, one poll had him being disliked by the entire electorate, which is something I cannot believe, that everyone in Russia that would be polled would say that Yeltsin was not good for Russia as a nation and that, in fact, he should be replaced.

But the most recent poll that I see, provided by one of our think tanks here in Washington, showed Yeltsin's acceptance rate in Russia at 2 percent. Now that leaves us as a country that has been Russia's closest partner in this new experiment in democracy as a country that has totally reinforced

Yeltsin at the expense of the support for other institutions inside of Russia. And therefore, with Yeltsin's popularity plummeting at 2 percent, it is no surprise that the Russian people, and the Russian Duma and the Federation Council see America as an equal partner to the problems that Boris Yeltsin has brought to Russia, the problems of the threat of billions of dollars of IMF money, the problem of the misappropriation of dollars that were supposed to go to help stabilize Russia's economy and help create a middle class, the problems of a Russia that has not had control of its technology and has allowed proliferation to occur on an ongoing basis.

So now, Mr. Speaker, we find ourselves in a very difficult position, that the Russia that is, in fact, no longer supportive of Boris Yeltsin in fact no longer has trust for America's interests. We do not have to just look at the words that support this, Mr. Speaker. Just a few short months ago there were thousands of Russian young people, old people, standing outside of our embassy in Moscow, throwing rocks and bricks at the American embassy, something we had never seen, even under communism. We did not see massive demonstrations against our country; but recently, in the last several years, that is exactly what we have seen.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, I think one of the Russian Duma members perhaps summed it up best when he was visiting Washington in May of this year. I stood next to him at a press conference, and he was talking about the Russian perception of our involvement in Kosovo, and this is what he said. He said:

''You know America, for 70 years the Soviet Communist Party spent tens of billions of dollars to convince the Russian people that America was an evil Nation and that American people were evil, and they failed. But,'' he said, ''You know, in just a few short months and a few short years your administration has done what the Soviet Communist Party could not do. It has convinced the Russian people that America's intentions are not honorable, that in fact you have supported Yeltsin every step of the way, even when he's been out of line, even when he has overseen the misuse of dollars, even when friends, the oligarchs who started and who run many of the Russian banks have, in fact, siphoned money away from the Russian people, put it into Swiss bank accounts and U.S. real estate investments, leaving the Russian government and the Russian people to pay those loans back even though that money was misappropriated.''

Is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that our policies in regard to Russia have not been successful?

Now there are committees of this body and the other body holding hearings that started in September and will continue through the end of October and November about Russia. Some would characterize these hearings as: Who Lost Russia? Mr. Speaker, I am one that is convinced that Russia is not yet lost, but I do think it is certainly appropriate for the American people and its leaders to look at what happened and what went wrong. In my humble opinion, Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that this administration has to bear a significant part of the responsibility for Russia's economic and political turmoil today.

But we cannot just stop by pointing fingers at this administration because the logical response is: Well, what would you have done differently? It is easy to criticize, but what different approach would you take? And also the criticism would be such that the administration would say, well, hindsight is always 20–20. It is easy to say what we could have done, but where were you while these last 7 years unfolded?

Well, Mr. Speaker, that is why I rise tonight, because over the past 7 years I have not been silent. In fact, Mr. Speaker, 6 years ago, working with the Russian members in the state Duma, I started a caucus to deal with Russians on energy because I knew that helping them develop their energy resources was the quickest way to bring in hard currency to help stabilize Russia's economy, and so working with those Duma deputies from energy-rich regions, we got our energy companies together: Occidental, Mobil, Marathon, the key companies that wanted to do business in Russia to see if we could not encourage joint ventures and, in the process, encourage the Duma to pass production sharing laws, which they did twice, to allow American companies to invest in Russian energy.

And it was 5 years ago that we began a process of engaging the Duma on Russia's environmental problems to make sure that we were helping Russia deal with its nuclear waste issues and the problems of clean air and clean water and maintaining an environment for the Russian people to live and to work in, and it was the day that the current speaker of the Russian Duma was elected to that post that I was in Moscow almost 6 years ago with a letter from then Speaker Gingrich inviting the Speaker of the Russian Duma to engage the Congress in a formal way, an institutional relationship with the Congress so that we could begin the process of helping strengthen and helping to empower the parliament in Russia so that it could play its rightful role in making sure that Russia's democracy succeeded.

For the past 6 years, Mr. Speaker, working with my colleague on the other side, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) we have led delegation after delegation to Moscow and St. Petersburg, and we have hosted delegation after delegation to Washington.

□ 2100

We have discussed issues that confront us, and we have discussed opportunities to join together. But we have worked together in an effort to strengthen the Duma to make it a more powerful force in the governing of Russia.

Mr. Speaker, it was 5 years ago that I brought over then General Alexander Lebed, who is today the governor of Krasnoyarsk. I brought him over to testify 5 years ago of what he thought was happening in the Yeltsin government 5 years ago, and he said before this Congress and my committee that the current administration was corrupt. And following General Lebed's testimony, I brought over the leading Russian environmental activist Alexei Yablakov, Dr. Yablakov himself a member of the Academy of Sciences, and at two hearings on the public record he said that the leadership in Russia was corrupt, that it was siphoning off money that should have been going to the Russian people, and he begged America to come in and help establish proper oversight.

Mr. Speaker, that was not last year, it was not last month. Those hearings were 3, 4, 5, and 6 years ago. Mr. Speaker, we in the Congress have been telling this administration repeatedly that its policies were going in the wrong direction, that reinforcing Boris Yeltsin as a person as opposed to reinforcing institutions of the presidency, of the parliament and of the Constitution in Russia would eventually cause us major problems.

Mr. Speaker, it was 3 years ago that I brought in Stanislav Lunev, the highest ranking defector from the Soviet Russian Intelligence Service, to talk about some of the continuing problems that Russia was going through and how we needed to be aggressive in dealing with Russia, to ask candid questions.

So over the past 5, 6, 7 years, Mr. Speaker, this Congress has repeatedly questioned the policies of this administration relative to our embracing Boris Yeltsin, embracing him under any circumstance, fearful of embarrassing him. And that has been our policy for the last 7 or 8 years, Mr. Speaker. Actually starting with the last year of President Bush and then beginning with the leadership of President Clinton, we have seen a consistent policy of reinforcing one man instead of the institutions that Russia needs to strengthen itself so that it may survive for a long period of time much like America has survived.

So with those thoughts in mind, Mr. Speaker, a year ago I traveled to Moscow because I knew at that time that the Russian Duma was opposed to any more IMF funding going into their country. Now, imagine that, Mr. Speaker. Here, the elected Russian leaders equivalent to our Congress who were about to receive another $4 billion in outside aid from the International Monetary Fund, and here they were standing up, all seven major factions saying to the world, we do not want anymore IMF funding. We do not want any more dollars coming into our country.

Now, at the same time, the U.S. Congress has been saying the same thing. In fact, for 8 months President Clinton could not get the support in the Congress to support additional IMF funds to replenish the ones that had been committed. Why would the Russian Duma members oppose more IMF funding for their own homeland? The reason is very simple, Mr. Speaker.

Because for the previous 5 and 6 years, Duma Members had seen billions and billions of dollars go into Russia that were designed and supposedly earmarked to help Russian people, and time and time again, they saw those dollars simply flow through the system, through the oligarchs running the banking system in Moscow, many of whom were Yeltsin's friends and back out the other side.

Where were the dollars going? To U.S. bank accounts, to U.S. real estate investments, to Swiss bank accounts, to the Russian people in some cases who were former leaders of the Communist party and the KGB who had offshore accounts. In fact, there are reports being investigated today that Boris Yeltsin himself and his family had secret bank accounts where they have stashed significant amounts of money for his retirement days.

So it was no surprise, Mr. Speaker, that the Russian leaders said, we do not want any more, we do not want any more of your money. With those thoughts in mind, and realizing that if we did not get additional IMF dollars into Russia, their economy would collapse, I traveled to Moscow and I took with me eight points. Because I was convinced that if I could convince the Duma to accept a new direction in dealing with Russia, that perhaps we could bring some discipline and some new direction for the way that Russia was moving.

To my surprise, the Duma deputies that I met with and worked with representing various factions agreed to all eight points. Mr. Speaker, last week I submitted those eight points in the form of legislation. I want to review those eight points tonight because I think they represent a new direction for the U.S. in terms of dealing with Russia.

The Joint Statement of Principles Governing Western and Foreign Assistance to Russia is simple, but I think it is profound. In fact, I have introduced it and it is out now, H.R. 3027, for those Members who would like to become cosponsors. The eight principles lay out a new direction in terms of our relationship with Russia, both monetarily and in terms of dealing with them on issues of transparency.

The first is a simple one, Mr. Speaker, and that is to establish a joint Russian-U.S. legislative oversight commission to monitor all Western resources going into Russia. Today, there is no such effort. Today, we have no capability to monitor inside of Russia where the dollars are going, the dollars from the International Monetary Fund, the dollars from the World Bank, and the dollars from the U.S. taxpayer.

I might add, Mr. Speaker, we put approximately $1 billion a year of U.S. taxpayer money into Russia, much of it through the Cooperative Debt Reduction Program, other money through our military-to-military efforts, environmental cooperation, and cooperation with Russia in helping them stabilize their economy. So we, in fact, directly and indirectly put billions of dollars into Russia every year. There is today no ability for the U.S. Congress and the Russian Duma to monitor where those dollars end up.

Now, the administration would have us believe that they can watch over where the money is going, but I would say this, Mr. Speaker. Not being able to trust the Russian regime of Boris Yeltsin, which I think is a uniform given right now, I think everyone understands and it has certainly been pronounced in the press, as just several weeks ago we saw the first indictments handed down in the New York Bank case where there is expected defrauding of up to $4 billion to $5 billion of IMF money for the Bank of New York that was assisting some of Yeltsin's friends in Moscow.

We need to have the capability inside of Russia, one that understands the Russian process, but is backed up by the integrity of the U.S. The only way to accomplish that is to get the Russian Parliament, the Duma, and the Federation Council to join with the Congress in establishing a bilateral commission, separate from our two governments, separate from Bill Clinton and separate from Boris Yeltsin, whose only purpose would be to monitor where the monies are going; not to determine where they go, because we do not want congressional interference in saying that money should go to this agency versus that. That is up to the two administrations, whether it would be Clinton or Yeltsin or their successors.

Mr. Speaker, there needs to be a process where our two elected parliaments, representing both political parties in America and representing all of the political factions in Russia, can monitor where the dollars are ending up in Russia. The Russians love that recommendation, because the Duma today has no input in terms of monitoring where the money has gone and where it is going today and where it will go in the future.

The second principle was to focus Western resources on programs like housing that will help to develop a Russian middle class. Now, Mr. Speaker, over the past 7 or 8 years, we have pumped billions of dollars into Russia. Do we see a housing industry developing? Absolutely not. To date, Russia does not even have an established mortgage program. Three years ago, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR) and I traveled to Moscow. The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR), as we know, is a very successful banker from North Carolina, and he envisioned a plan where, initially controlled by a U.S. commission, we would help Russia establish a Western-style mortgage program, with tight discipline, a program that would bypass Russian banks because of their corruptness, that would establish standards based on the U.S. mortgage system with tight controls to which Russian entities could apply. We outlined this in a piece of legislation.

The Russian Duma was so excited, they produced this document, Mr. Speaker. It says, Housing for Our People. That was over 3 years ago, Mr. Speaker. We came back and we told the administration, the Duma, including the Communists in the Duma, we are ready to embrace a Western-style mortgage program initially controlled by the U.S., so that we can maintain the integrity of it when it is first started, and once it becomes successfully operational, then after a period of years, turn it over to the Russians to operate like our Freddie Mac and Fannie Mae. Mr. Speaker, the Russians even gave it a name. They called it Natasha Mae like our Fannie Mae.

They were excited about this idea, because for the first time, it would create a mortgage program at low interest rates and we envisioned below 10 percent interest rates for terms of 30 years to help develop a housing market to create jobs and housing for Russia's people.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, it was over 2 years ago that I came back from Moscow on one of our trips, after having negotiated the first phase of this, and I went to the administration very quietly. I went to Ambassador Morningstar with the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. TAYLOR), who at that time was in charge of the Russia desk at the State Department. And I went to him because Russia was very paranoid at that time about our expanding NATO.

Russians were being told by the ultranationalists in Russia that this was America's way of threatening Russia and using NATO to take over Russia. They were scaring the Russian people. And if my colleagues understand the history of Russia as I do, where Russia has been invaded from the west and the north and the south repeatedly in its history, my colleagues will understand why Russians might be paranoid and might believe the outlandish rhetoric from some of the ultranationalists in Russia trying to benefit politically from scaring the Russian people, basically putting in false ideas about America's real intentions.

But the gentleman from North Carolina and I went to Ambassador Morningstar; and we said, Ambassador, you have a chance here, and we want to give you a chance to have President Clinton do something extremely positive to show the Russian people that NATO's expansion is not about backing Russia into a corner. Take this housing mortgage initiative. We as Republicans

will help you get some small seed funding from the Congress. Take that seed money as we have done with Israeli housing and go to our NATO allies, all of them, and ask them to put a per capita amount equal to what we put up and create a NATO housing mortgage fund.

Imagine, Mr. Speaker, if we had taken the initiative 2 years ago, over 2 years ago with a very small amount of money going to our NATO allies and said put up a per capita amount and we will create a NATO housing mortgage fund to show the Russian people that we want them to enjoy the benefits of democracy, we want them to enjoy the benefits of free markets, and a benefit from the kinds of systems we have in the West because as we all know, when housing starts up in America, our economy is strong, because housing starts create jobs.

The administration had no interest in our idea. In fact, Mr. Speaker, for the past several years, the administration's only support for mortgages in Moscow has been to the established banks that we all know in many cases are corrupt, where they are charging interest rates of 15 to 30 percent for terms of 5 to 10 years, which we all know no Russian family could afford to be able to purchase a home. A missed opportunity.

So our second initiative says to those lending institutions putting money into Russia that you must focus the resources on programs like housing that will help to develop a Russian middle class, because the long-term success of Russia is going to require a strong middle class, much like America and much like Europe and much like Japan have. Today, Russia has no middle class.

Mr. Speaker, this is an area where all of us should come together. Imagine, Mr. Speaker, if we would have taken the $20 billion of IMF money that has been dumped into Russia, which who knows what it has been used for. I cannot point to one thing in Russia today that has been built with the $20 billion of IMF money we put in. But imagine, Mr. Speaker, if we had built $20 billion of homes for Russia's citizens. Even if they went bankrupt or belly up, would they be any worse off than they are today?

□ 2115

They have nothing to show for the billions of dollars of U.S. and World Bank and IMF money that has gone into their country. If we had put the money into mortgages, we would have $20 billion worth of new housing, and all the jobs that would have gone along with that to show for our investment.

The third priority, Mr. Speaker, in our joint statement is to make western resources available to reform-minded regional governments. Our policy for the past 7 and 8 years has been to reinforce Yeltsin in Moscow. Think of our policy: Clinton/Yeltsin, Major/Chernomyrdin. Everything has gone through those figures. In many cases, Mr. Speaker, anyone who travels to Russia knows that Moscow is Moscow and the rest of the Russian people consider the rest of Russia to be almost a second nation.

What has been our policy? It has been to reinforce Yeltsin and his cronies in Moscow, and not reinforce those reform-minded regions that are making outstanding progress in privatizing their land; in collecting more taxes; in making responsible actions to control corruption; in putting into place a legal system with a fair court system. We have done nothing of substance over the past 7 years to help direct our assets and our resources toward those regions to allow them to continue their reforms. If anything, they have looked at America and said, well, you in the West and you in America only want to reinforce Yeltsin, and he is corrupt. You are ignoring us out here in the regions where we are doing good things, where the governors in fact are making the reforms that we wanted to have happen in Moscow.

Mr. Speaker, the fourth principle was to deny any corrupt institutions, especially those in Moscow, any future resources. If a bank, if a lending institution or a business, is found to be corrupt, then what we say is we go after those companies, those individuals, try to bring them to justice, try to recapture any money that is left, sell off any assets we can seize, and never give them any more money again. Again, the Russians were ecstatic. The first four principles, all of them they loved.

Number five, and this one came from George Soros, who has probably been the single biggest private entrepreneurial in Moscow for the past 20, 25 years, I traveled up to New York to meet with him before I went to Moscow a year ago and I said, ''Mr. Soros, what would you do after this economic collapse of August a year ago, what would you do to help the Russian economic situation?''

He said, ''Congressman, there is only one thing that I could think of that needs to be done.'' He said, ''The International Monetary Fund is out of sync. It does not understand emerging economies like Russia's. What I think you need to do in the Congress is to call for the IMF to empanel an international blue ribbon commission to make recommendations back to the IMF, to reform itself, to make it more responsive to emerging economies like the Russian economy.''

So the fifth recommendation is just that, to have the International Monetary Fund establish a blue ribbon task force to make recommendations as to how it can reform itself.

Mr. Speaker, the sixth is probably the most substantive point of all the principles that we laid out, and this is absolutely amazing because this principle was a principle that the IMF has been demanding of Russia for the past 4 years and could not get. This principle is the principle Bill Clinton has been calling for for the past 4 years and could not get, and that was to put the horse in front of the cart, make the reforms precede and not follow the resources; to have the Russian Government understand reforms must come first and then the dollars will flow.

Now, the IMF said that was necessary, and the Duma said no way are we passing your tough reforms.

Mr. Speaker, if I was in the Duma I would say the same thing. Why should I pass tough reforms simply because the IMF board and Bill Clinton want us to pass them, or Boris Yeltsin, so we can get more IMF money when for the first 7 years that IMF money was coming in you ignored us, you pretended we were not here? In fact, you called us thugs and rogues and thieves and yet now you want us to do what you call the responsible thing?

I do not blame the Duma one bit. I would not come in and bail out a bunch of corrupt thieves that have siphoned off billions of dollars. When the members of the Duma, when the factions in the Duma see that we are willing to put some other principles down on the table, all of a sudden it is a different story because with these principles they see that we want the money to flow in a different direction. We want to recognize the regions. We want to help reward those regions that are doing good things. We want to have legislative oversight of where the money is going. When those things are done and the Duma understands, it must make the tough decisions. It must reform the budget process. It must collect taxes. It must make people pay for their electric and their housing, something that never happened in a Communist regime, and it must begin to privatize the land in Russia.

The seventh principle, Mr. Speaker, was to create a joint U.S.-Russian business-to-business relationship program, where we would identify as many CEOs in America as possible, at the small- and medium-sized corporate level, and we would link them up directly with the corresponding Russian CEO of a small- to medium-sized enterprise so that we could identify for every enterprise and business in Russia an American CEO that would become a mentor so they could work together one-on-one, discuss profits, motivating employees, meeting bottom lines, marketing techniques, the kinds of things that Russian entrepreneurs have to learn to compete in today's market worldwide; establishing a one-on-one program where American business leaders can interact with Russian business leaders one-on-one.

There are some efforts underway along that line but they are primarily at the upper, larger corporate level as opposed to small- and medium-sized manufacture and business establishment.

The last principle, Mr. Speaker, was to say that within 3 years we would bring 15,000 young Russian students to America. These students would be both

graduate and undergraduate students. They would be enrolled in American schools that are offering degrees in business, finance, accounting, and economics. The principles would allow them to get their degree and go back to Russia and create the next generation of free market leaders.

Now there was a stipulation in this principle, Mr. Speaker. None of these students could stay in America and live. When they completed their degrees, they would have to go back to Russia to their communities, to their towns and cities and regions, and live to help Russia create a new generation of free market leaders.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is the kind of approach that will allow us to help Russia help itself; not just pumping in billion after billion, uncontrolled as it has been done for the past 8 years.

Mr. Speaker, the bill that outlined these principles was dropped in the House last week. As I said, it is H.R. 3027. I was proud when I dropped the bill into the hopper that I had 25 Democrat cosponsors and 25 Republican cosponsors. Mr. Speaker, 50 Members of Congress made a statement last week and now we are up above 50 Members of Congress. I have had a couple more Democrats and more Republicans come on as cosponsors and come up to me and want to get more information, but when we dropped the bill last week, 25 Democrats and 25 Republicans said our policy needs to change. We need to deal with Russia in a new way.

Yes, we need to work with Russia. Yes, we need to help Russia stabilize itself, but not the way we have done it in the past.

I would encourage my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to sign on as cosponsors of H.R. 3027, so that we can set a new course and a new direction in terms of our relationship with Russia and the Russian people, because the Duma, Mr. Speaker, in Russia feels the same way that we do. In fact, we will be taking a delegation probably to Russia sometime before the end of the year. As we all know, Russia is having their Duma elections in December. All of us are watching and hoping that those people who win in Russia will be people who want to continue a strong relationship with the West.

Mr. Speaker, my policy of engaging Russia is one that allows me to consider myself to be a friend of the Russian people and the Russian Duma, but they know very well, Mr. Speaker, in the 19 times that I have been to Russia that I also can be their toughest critic because I am also convinced that part of our problem with Russia is that we have been so enamored again with President Yeltsin as the leader that we have been unwilling to ask the tough questions.

Mr. Speaker, Ronald Reagan had it right. Back when he was in office during the midst of the Cold War and the Soviet Union was maintaining its huge empire of Eastern Bloc regions, Ronald Reagan stood up and gave a famous speech where he called the then Soviet Union an evil empire. People were aghast that the President of the United States would say that.

Mr. Speaker, the 95 percent of the Russian people who were not members of the Communist party and benefiting from that system agree with him. So 95 percent of the people in Russia who were not communists understood Ronald Reagan when he said it was an evil empire because by not being members of the party they were not benefiting from the spoils. They saw that what Ronald Reagan said was true, and that is why today he still is very much revered in Russia.

Russian people are very bright people. They respect honesty. They respect candor, and they respect consistency. In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, in the last 7 years we have given them none of that. We have pretended things are not what they are. We have so been enamored with Boris Yeltsin that any time something happened involving the theft of IMF money, economic turmoil, we pretended it did not happen. When we had intelligence reports that came before us that showed that there was evidence that Chernomyrdin had people supporting him that were corrupt, what did Vice President Gore do? He wrote the word ''bull'' across the report and sent it back to the intelligence community because he did not want to hear it because it was saying something he did not want to be true even though it was true.

Mr. Speaker, for 7 years when it came to Russia abusing its money going in, we turned our head the other way because we did not want to embarrass Boris Yeltsin, but it is not just with the money, Mr. Speaker.

Back in 1997, as I have mentioned on this floor in the past, one of our career Navy intelligence officers, Lieutenant Jack Daley was flying a reconnaissance mission in Seattle, with a Canadian pilot in a helicopter monitoring a Russian trawling ship that we knew was spying on our submarine fleet in Seattle, in Pugent Sound. Lieutenant Daley had a sensation in his eye while he was taking photographs of this trawler that they knew was a spy ship because we had boarded the ship in the past and we saw sonar buoys on the ship which are only used to spy on submarines, and we also knew that ship was a spy ship, by the way called the Kapitan Man, because there was no cargo being brought into port and no cargo being taken out of port. It was spying on our submarines.

Lieutenant Daley had this sensation in his eye while flying on this helicopter mission and so the Canadian pilot, in this joint exercise, they landed their helicopter, they reported to the base infirmary and the doctor there said, ''You are suffering damage caused by a laser. Lieutenant Daley gave them the film from the camera and, sure enough, as they were taking photographs of this Russian trawler they were lasered from the ship.

Mr. Speaker, that is damage by a foreign nation to one of our own, our flesh and blood, an American hero, one of our soldiers in uniform.

What did we do? Well, the record speaks for itself, Mr. Speaker, but I can say in cables that have now been declassified, the Department of Defense cabled back to the State Department and got our current ambassador involved, Ambassador Collins, and the current Russian leader in the State Department, Strobe Talbott, and Bob Bell from the Security Council and each of them was consulted about what to do because this American pilot had been lasered by a Russian ship.

Initially, they wanted no American to board that ship. They did not want an international incident created. The Department of Defense said, no, that is one of our people; we are going to go on that ship so the cable that came back said, only search the public areas of the ship.

Now, Mr. Speaker, can you really believe that? That we are now going to board a Russian ship that we know is a spy vessel and we are going to look for a laser generator or a laser gun but the boarders that are going to go on the ship are being told only inspect the public portions of the ship?

□ 2130

Do we really think the Russians are that stupid to leave the laser generator out in the open? So obviously we boarded the ship, and we saw nothing.

Lieutenant Daley was taken down to San Antonio for further medical evaluation, and, in fact, it was determined that he had serious laser damage done to his eyes.

The outrage here, Mr. Speaker, is Jack Daley did nothing but do his job as a 16-year career Navy officer doing naval intelligence. He made the mistake of asking for his country to defend him when a foreign ship and its crew lasered him in the eye.

What did our administration do? We did not want to offend Boris Yeltsin. We did not want to make an incident here. So the State Department cabled back and tried to quash this thing.

Jack Daley was passed over for promotion right after that incident and a second time this past July. Even though his career had been an outstanding career with all positive evaluations, twice since that incident, he was bypassed for promotion.

This is what Jack Daley's commanding officer said to him, Mr. Speaker, in Jack Daley's own words. He said, ''Jack, you do not know the pressure I am under to get rid of your case. Jack, you do not know the pressure I am under to get rid of your case.'' A career Navy intelligence officer being told by his superior that they have to get rid of the case because we do not want to embarrass Boris Yeltsin.

Do we really think the Russians respect us? They are not stupid, Mr. Speaker. How about arms control violations? I did a floor speech last June a

year ago where I documented, based on a work done by the Congressional Research Service, not by me, and my colleagues know they serve both sides of the aisle, they are nonpartisan, they documented 17 cases, 17 cases since 1991 of arms control violations by Russian entities where technology was sent to Iran, Iraq, Syria, Libya, North Korea, China, and India. We imposed sanctions that are required by arms control treaties zero times, zero times.

Mr. Speaker, I was in Moscow January 1996. The previous December, the Washington Post carried a front page story above the fold, front page, headline: ''Russians caught transferring guidance systems to Iraq''.

So I am in Moscow in January. I said to Ambassador Pickering who is now the third ranking leader in the State Department, ''Mr. Ambassador, what did the Russians say when you asked them about this transfer of these guidance systems, because you know that is a violation of the missile technology control regime.'' He said, ''Congressman WELDON, I have not asked them yet.'' I said, ''Well, why have you not asked them?'' He said, ''That has got to come from Washington.''

So, Mr. Speaker, I came back, and I wrote a three-page letter to President Clinton at the end of January 1996. I said, ''What is the story, Mr. President? You saw the Washington Post headlines. If this occurred, it is a violation of an arms control treaty, and that requires us to act.'' The President wrote me back in March or April that year; I still have the response.

He said, ''Dear Congressman WELDON, you are right. If this violation took place, it is serious. If it took place, it would be a violation of the missile technology control regime. But, Congressman WELDON, we have no evidence.''

Mr. Speaker, I was not aware at the time, but I am now, in fact I carry a set of these around with me most of the time, the Russians transferred three different times over 100 sets of these devices to Iraq. These devices are used to make Iraq's missiles more accurate.

Mr. Speaker, 17 times Russian entities violated arms control treaties, and we did nothing. Do we really think the Russians are going to respect us? Do we really think when we abandon Jack Daley that they are going to respect us? Do we really think when we ignore billions and billions of fraud with our IMF money that they are going to respect us? I would not respect us, Mr. Speaker. That is the failure of this administration.

Now, why would this be the case? Well as I said at the outset, Mr. Speaker, our policy has been wrong-headed. We have been so preoccupied with Boris Yeltsin's success that nothing else mattered. That is a pretty hefty statement that I would make. How can I back that up?

Mr. Speaker, I would encourage my colleagues, if they have not yet read the book by Bill Gertz, who is probably the toughest foreign policy and defense investigative writer in this city for the Washington Times, get a copy of this book Betrayal or simply turn to the back of the appendix section, because in the back of this, Mr. Speaker, there are two things that the American people and our colleagues need to see.

First of all, on page 219 of this book, a document that was classified top secret, I do not know how Gertz got it because it was top secret, now the American people can read it, my colleagues will get the full chronology of the State Department cables of the Jack Daley case. So my colleagues can see for themselves that what I am saying about Jack Daley and the involvement of our State Department in trying to keep this thing quiet is right there in the State Department's own words, now declassified in a book that we can buy off the shelf at a bookstore.

Further back in this appendix, Mr. Speaker, on page 275, is a two-page document called ''confidential''. I do not know how Bill Gertz got this either, Mr. Speaker. But this confidential document is interesting. It is a cable summarizing a personal meeting between Bill Clinton and Boris Yeltsin. Guess what year it was written, Mr. Speaker? 1996, Mr. Speaker, which is the same year that Boris Yeltsin is running for reelection as the President of Russia.

Let me just read one of the paragraphs, Mr. Speaker, of this now publicized cable between our President and the Russian president. ''The President'', our President Clinton, ''indicated that there was not much time, but he wanted to say a few things about the Russian elections. First of all, he wanted to make sure that everything the United States did would have a positive impact, and nothing should have a negative impact. He was encouraged that the Secretary of State was heading to Moscow to meet with Mr. Primakov, and he wanted the April summit to be a positive event. The United States will work to Russia to ensure this so that it would reinforce everything that Yeltsin had done in this regard.''

It goes on to say that the President wanted to make sure that America would not let anything surface that will allow Yeltsin's election to go the wrong way.

Do we wonder why we have a problem, Mr. Speaker? We were so enamored with Boris Yeltsin that institutions did not matter. Yeltsin was our support, not Russian democracy, not Russian capitalism. Do we wonder why today, with Yeltsin's popularity at 2 percent, that the Russian people and their parliament have no respect for us?

Mr. Speaker, in dealing with Russia, we must work in a proactive way, because Russia still has tens of thousands of warheads on tens of thousands of missiles that are aimed at America's cities. We do not need a destabilized Russia anymore that sells off this technology to rogue states and rogue terrorist groups.

But it does not mean, Mr. Speaker, that we ignore the reality of what Russian individuals and entities are doing. I am not saying that everybody in Russia is corrupt. But when things are going wrong in Russia, we must challenge them. When Russia is not being honest with us, we must challenge Russia. We must let them know that we want transparency, just as Ronald Reagan did. When they do not give us transparency, they must know there is a price to pay.

So along with working in a new direction with Russia, I want to underscore and reinforce to our colleagues that we must also challenge Russia and what is happening there and whether or not there are forces within Russia that are looking to create instability in our relationship with that Nation.

Now, I am convinced that there are many positive leaders in Russia, many of whom are my good friends. I hope that they win their reelections come December of this year.

But I want to tell my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, there are some things that trouble me greatly about Russia that we just do not know enough about and that this administration is not asking Yeltsin to explain because they do not want to embarrass him.

Some examples. Ken Alibek, Mr. Speaker, was for years the head of the Russian's biological weapons program. Under the Soviet Union, Ken Alibek lived in Russia. His job was to monitor and to oversee the entire biological weapons program for the Soviet Union.

I have met with Ken Alibek five or six times. This is his book called Biohazard. He is convinced that Russia's biological weapons program continues today.

Mr. Speaker, we need leadership that is willing to challenge Russia on these issues. When someone like Ken Alibek comes forward, yes, we must work to help stabilize Russia, but we must tell the Russians that we want to know whether or not what he is saying is true. We are not doing that today, Mr. Speaker. We are not asking the tough questions.

Or how about Stanislav Lunev? Mr. Speaker, I had Stanislav Lunev, as I mentioned earlier, testify before my committee 3 years ago, as the highest ranking GRU defector ever from the Soviet Union. We had to put him behind a screen, and he had to wear a mask over his head because there is a price on his head from certain aspects of the Russian leadership because of what he has told.

Part of what he said in my hearing 3 years ago was that his job when he worked for the intelligence for Russia, the Soviet Union, and his cover was that he was a correspondent for, I think it was, Tass here at the Soviet Embassy, that one of Lunev's jobs was to look for sites where the Soviet Union could preposition military hardware and equipment on American soil.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is a pretty provocative statement.

What Lunev said several years ago was that the Soviet Union through its intelligence service deliberately, in a very provocative way, put military equipment and hardware on American soil in predetermined locations. In fact, he told us that that was part of his assignment. In fact, Mr. Speaker, later on this week, I will join Mr. Lunev in looking at one of those sites right outside of Washington where he looked, as a career intelligence officer for the Soviet Union, and scoped out for a drop by the Soviet military and intelligence services.

But not much has come about since Lunev made his comments until 1 month ago. One month ago, Mr. Speaker, this book came out. It is called the Mitrokhin Archive. It seems as though, for 30 years, the chief archivist of the KGB in Moscow did not like the KGB and what it was doing. Very quietly, for 30 years, this Russian gentleman, day by day, wrote down and copied every memo that he was putting in the KGB archives in Moscow. He snuck them out of work every day inside of his clothing, took them to his home and buried them under the floorboards of his house.

In 1992, after the Soviet Union collapsed, he emigrated through the Baltic States. His first trip was to a U.S. embassy, and we turned him down when he told us that he had secret documents from the KGB. He then went to the Brits. The Brits took him in, gave he and his family complete asylum where he lives in Britain today under an assumed name.

The British intelligence then had Mitrokhin link up with Christopher Andrew, who is a Cambridge scholar and an outstanding expert, probably the number one expert in the world on the Soviet KGB. For 6 years, Mr. Speaker, Christopher Andrew translated the Mitrokhin archives and files. This book is the first edition of documenting those files.

On October 26, Mr. Speaker, Christopher Andrew and Gordievsky, another high-ranking KGB defector will travel to Washington, and they will testify before my committee. The American people then can see for themselves and hear the kinds of things that were done during the Soviet era that we need to make sure are not happening today in Russia and that we need to have the will and the tenacity to question the Russian leadership about, not worrying about embarrassing Boris Yeltsin, but whether or not the KGB leadership still continues to do the kinds of things that were done under the Soviet era.

□ 2145

Why is this so critical? Because in the document by Christopher Andrew in the Mitrokhin files, as a follow-up to what Lunev said, they actually give the locations in countries around the world where the Soviet Union prepositioned military equipment. And guess what, Mr. Speaker? There are sites in the U.S. that are identified in the KGB files where the Soviet Union prepositioned military equipment and buried it and booby-trapped each site.

Now, in the book are photographs in the center where one such site was identified in Switzerland. There are the photographs of that site. The Swiss authorities realized it was booby-trapped, which it was. When they dug down, they found exactly where the KGB files had stated was military hardware that the Mitrokhin files said would be there.

The question, Mr. Speaker, is: Where are these devices on American soil? What towns and cities and park lands currently have in place military equipment and hardware prepositioned by the KGB?

This administration, Mr. Speaker, that has known about these files for 6 years should have been asking those questions of Russia's leadership. We are going to ask those questions now, Mr. Speaker, and we are going to find out if, once again, we have been afraid to ask the tough questions because we do not want to embarrass Boris Yeltsin.

Mr. Speaker, there is just one overriding thought here in this whole relationship. We want Russia to succeed. We want the Russian people to have a free democracy. We want Russia to have the institutions that we have in America. But you cannot get there when we deny reality, when we pretend things are something they are not. Because the only thing that occurs then is the other side loses respect for you. I am convinced that is the problem with Russia today. They have lost respect for America.

The Congress, with H.R. 3027, and our new vision for Russia, is outlining a new direction based on three simple premises: Strength, consistency, and candor. Help create the institutions of a true democracy, a strong middle class, a strong parliament, and a strong constitution that will survive individual personalities. If we want Russia to succeed, we must follow these steps, Mr. Speaker. This is the only way that America and Russia can work together and thrive in the 21st century.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MARTINEZ (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and October 19 on account of official business.

Ms. CARSON (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and October 19 on account of personal reasons.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and October 19 until 4:00 p.m. on account of a death in the family.

Mr. CAMP (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of attending the birth of his daughter.

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. BROWN of Ohio, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. BROWN of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. NETHERCUTT) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SALMON, for 5 minutes, October 19.

Mr. METCALF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EHLERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. NETHERCUTT, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 548. An act to establish the Fallen Timbers Battlefield and Fort Miamis National Historical Site in the State of Ohio; to the Committee on Resources.

S. 762. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study to determine the national significance of the Miami Circle site in the State of Florida as well as the suitability and feasibility of its inclusion in the National Park System as part of Biscayne National Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

S. 938. An act to eliminate restrictions on the acquisition of certain land contiguous to Hawaii Volcanoes National Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 356. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain property from the United States to Stanislaus County, California.

H.R. 2684. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Veteran Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3036. An act to restore motor carrier safety enforcement authority to the Department of Transportation.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported

that that committee did on the following date present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

On October 14, 1999:

H.R. 2561. Making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, October 19, 1999, at 9 a.m., for morning hour debates.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports and amended reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for official foreign travel during the second quarter of 1999 by Committees of the House of Representatives, as well as a consolidated report of foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for speaker-authorized official travel during the first, second, and third quarters of 1999, pursuant to Public Law 95–384 are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1, AND JUNE 30, 1999

Name of member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Visit to France, Lithuania, Czech Republic and Morocco; March 27–April 6, 1999:											
Hon. Herbert H. Bateman	3/27	3/29	France		502.00						502.00
	3/29	3/31	Lithuania		468.00						468.00
	3/31	4/3	Czech Republic		846.00						846.00
	3/4	4/6	Morocco		661.00						661.00
Visit to Vietnam, March 28–April 3, 1999:											
Hon. Lane Evans	3/28	3/30	Vietnam		200.00						200.00
Commercial airfare							6,402.38				6,402.38
Hon. Loretta Sanchez	3/29	4/3	Vietnam		1,378.00				18.48		1,396.48
Commercial airfare							3,335.59				3,335.59
Mieke Y. Eoyang	3/28	4/3	Vietnam		1,656.00						1,656.00
Commercial airfare							7,451.80		337.01		7,788.81
Visit to Malta, Italy, Egypt, Belgium, Germany, Macedonia and United Kingdom: April 4–12, 1999:											
Hon. Floyd D. Spence	4/4	4/6	Malta		464.00						464.00
	4/6	4/6	Italy		0.00						0.00
	4/6	4/8	Egypt		452.00						452.00
	4/8	4/8	Belgium		0.00						0.00
	4/8	4/9	Germany		206.00						206.00
	4/9	4/10	Macedonia		0.00						0.00
	4/10	4/12	United Kingdom		730.00						730.00
Hon. Saxby Chambliss	4/4	4/6	Malta		464.00						464.00
	4/6	4/6	Italy		0.00						0.00
	4/6	4/8	Egypt		452.00						452.00
	4/8	4/8	Belgium		0.00						0.00
	4/8	4/9	Germany		206.00						206.00
	4/9	4/10	Macedonia		0.00						0.00
	4/10	4/12	United Kingdom		730.00						730.00
Hon. Lindsey Graham	4/4	4/6	Malta		464.00						464.00
	4/6	4/6	Italy		0.00						0.00
	4/6	4/8	Egypt		452.00						452.00
	4/8	4/8	Belgium		0.00						0.00
	4/8	4/9	Germany		206.00						206.00
	4/9	4/10	Macedonia		0.00						0.00
	4/10	4/12	United Kingdom		730.00						730.00
Andrew K. Ellis	4/4	4/6	Malta		464.00						464.00
	4/6	4/6	Italy		0.00						0.00
	4/6	4/8	Egypt		452.00						452.00
	4/8	4/8	Belgium		0.00						0.00
	4/8	4/9	Germany		206.00						206.00
	4/9	4/10	Macedonia		0.00						0.00
	4/10	4/12	United Kingdom		730.00						730.00
Maureen P. Cragin	4/4	4/6	Malta		464.00						464.00
	4/6	4/6	Italy		0.00						0.00
	4/6	4/8	Egypt		452.00						452.00
	4/8	4/8	Belgium		0.00						0.00
	4/8	4/9	Germany		206.00						206.00
	4/9	4/10	Macedonia		0.00						0.00
	4/10	4/12	United Kingdom		730.00						730.00
Visit to Austria, April 30-May 2, 1999:											
Hon. Curt Weldon	4/30	5/2	Austria		458.00						458.00
Hon. Neil Abercrombie	4/30	5/2	Austria		458.00						458.00
Hon. Jim Saxton	4/30	5/2	Austria		458.00						458.00
Hon. Roscoe G. Bartlett	4/30	5/2	Austria		458.00						458.00
Hon. Jim Gibbons	4/30	5/2	Austria		458.00						458.00
Hon. Joseph R. Pitts	4/30	5/2	Austria		458.00						458.00
Hon. Don Sherwood	4/30	5/2	Austria		458.00						458.00
David J. Trachtenberg	4/30	5/2	Austria		458.00						458.00
Visit to France, June 11–14, 1999:											
Andrew K. Ellis	6/11	6/14	France		1,154.65						1,154.65
Committee total					19,789.65		17,189.77		355.49		37,334.91

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

FLOYD D. SPENCE, Chairman, July 30, 1999.

AMENDED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 3, AND AUG. 13, 1999

Name of member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Amy Jensen	4/3	4/5	Korea		576.00						
	4/5	4/8	Australia		354.00						

AMENDED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 3, AND AUG. 13, 1999—Continued

Name of member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
	4/8	4/11	New Zealand		259.00						
Ron Lasch	4/3	4/5	Korea		576.00						
	4/5	4/8	Australia		354.00						
	4/8	4/11	New Zealand		259.00						
Lisa Boepple	8/7	8/13	Armenia, Azerbaijan		800.00						
Committee total					3,178.00						3,178.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DAN BURTON, Chairman, Sept. 22, 1999.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1, AND JUNE 30, 1999

Name of member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Charles T. Canady	4/7	4/9	Italy		538.00						538.00
	4/9	4/10	Belgium		232.00						232.00
	4/10	4/11	England		315.00						315.00
Commercial transportation							4,897.50				4,897.50
Hon. William D. Delahunt	6/11	6/14	Haiti		455.50		(3)				455.50
Committee total					1,540.50		4,897.50				6,438.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

HENRY J. HYDE, Chairman, Aug. 6, 1999.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, PERMANENT SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1, AND JUNE 30, 1999

Name of member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Chris Barton, Staff	3/28	4/9	Asia		2,572.00						2,572.00
Commercial Airfare							5,651.30				5,651.30
John Mills, Staff	4/5	4/10	Middle East		1,665.00						1,665.00
Commercial Airfare							5,167.78				5,167.78
Tom Newcomb, Staff	4/5	4/10	Middle East		1,665.00						1,665.00
Commercial Airfare							5,167.78				5,167.78
Catherine Eberwein, Staff	4/6	4/9	Asia		877.00						877.00
							(3)				0.00
Tom Newcomb, Staff	5/27	6/1	Europe		1,352.00						1,352.00
Commercial Airfare							4,746.53				4,746.53
Hon. Gary Condit	6/12	6/15	Europe		1,419.30						1,419.30
							(3)				0.00
Committee totals					9,550.30		20,733.39		0.00		30,283.69

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

PORTER J. GROSS, Chairman, July 30, 1999.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, HOUSE DELEGATION TO ITALY, INDIA, AND THE CZECH REPUBLIC, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAR. 29, AND APR. 5, 1999

Name of member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Richard A. Gephardt	3/29	3/30	Italy		276.00						276.00
	3/30	4/3	India		1,203.00						1,203.00
	4/3	4/5	Czech Republic		590.00						590.00
Robert Borski	3/29	3/30	Italy		276.00						276.00
	3/30	4/3	India		1,203.00						1,203.00
	4/3	4/5	Czech Republic		590.00						590.00
Nancy Pelosi	3/29	3/30	Italy		276.00						276.00
	3/30	4/3	India		1,203.00						1,203.00
	4/3	4/5	Czech Republic		590.00						590.00
Jim McDermott	3/29	3/30	Italy		276.00						276.00
	3/30	4/3	India		1,203.00						1,203.00
	4/3	4/5	Czech Republic		590.00						590.00
Rosa De Lauro	3/29	3/30	Italy		276.00						276.00
	3/30	4/3	India		1,203.00						1,203.00
	4/3	4/5	Czech Republic		590.00						590.00
Dan Miller	3/29	3/30	Italy		276.00						276.00
	3/30	4/3	India		1,203.00						1,203.00
	4/3	4/5	Czech Republic		590.00						590.00
Mark Foley	3/29	3/30	Italy		276.00						276.00
	3/30	4/3	India		1,203.00						1,203.00
	4/3	4/5	Czech Republic		590.00						590.00
Bill Delahunt	3/29	3/30	Italy		276.00						276.00
	3/30	4/3	India		1,203.00						1,203.00
	4/3	4/5	Czech Republic		590.00						590.00
Silvestre Reyes	3/29	3/30	Italy		276.00						276.00
	3/30	4/3	India		1,203.00						1,203.00
	4/3	4/5	Czech Republic		590.00						590.00
Mike Thompson	3/39	3/30	Italy		276.00						276.00
	3/30	4/3	India		1,203.00						1,203.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, HOUSE DELEGATION TO ITALY, INDIA, AND THE CZECH REPUBLIC, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAR. 29, AND APR. 5, 1999—Continued

Name of member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
	4/3	4/5	Czech Republic		590.00						590.00
Steve Elmerdorf	3/29	3/30	Italy		276.00						276.00
	3/30	4/3	India		1,203.00						1,203.00
	4/3	4/5	Czech Republic		590.00						590.00
Brett O'Brien	3/29	3/30	Italy		276.00						276.00
	3/30	4/3	India		1,203.00						1,203.00
	4/30	4/5	Czech Republic		590.00						590.00
Kris Keller	3/29	3/30	Italy		276.00						276.00
	3/30	4/3	India		1,203.00						1,203.00
	4/3	4/5	Czech Republic		590.00						590.00
Paul Berkowitz	3/29	3/30	Italy		276.00						276.00
	3/30	4/3	India		1,203.00						1,203.00
	4/3	4/4	Czech Republic		295.00						295.00
Admiral John Eisold	3/29	3/30	Italy		276.00						276.00
	3/30	4/3	India		1,203.00						1,203.00
	4/3	4/5	Czech Republic		590.00						590.00
Committee total			Czech Republic		30,740.00						30,740.00

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

RICHARD A. GEPHARDT, Aug. 5, 1999.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, HOUSE DELEGATION TO SCOTLAND AND GERMANY, EXPENDED BETWEEN SEPT. 1, AND SEPT. 7, 1999

Name of member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Speaker Hastert	9/1	9/4	Scotland	185	294.00						294.00
Nancy Johnson	9/1	9/4	Scotland	185	294.00						294.00
Porter Goss	9/1	9/4	Scotland	185	294.00						294.00
Rick Lazio	9/1	9/4	Scotland	185	294.00						294.00
Rob Portman	9/1	9/4	Scotland	185	294.00						294.00
Jim DeMint	9/1	9/4	Scotland	185	294.00						294.00
Scott Palmer	9/1	9/4	Scotland	185	294.00						294.00
Bill Inglee	9/1	9/4	Scotland	185	294.00						294.00
Ted VanderMeid	9/1	9/4	Scotland	185	294.00						294.00
Chirsty Surprenant	9/1	9/4	Scotland	185	294.00						294.00
Pete Jeffries	9/1	9/4	Scotland	185	294.00						294.00
Chris Scheve	9/1	9/4	Scotland	185	294.00						294.00
Brian Gunderson	9/1	9/4	Scotland	185	294.00						294.00
Dan Turton	9/1	9/4	Scotland	185	294.00						294.00
Bill Livingood	9/1	9/4	Scotland	185	294.00						294.00
Dwight Comedy	9/1	9/4	Scotland	185	294.00						294.00
Dr. John Eisold	9/1	9/4	Scotland	185	294.00						294.00
Dwight Comedy	9/4	9/7	Germany	463.75	253.00		156.47				409.47
Dr. John Eisold	9/4	9/7	Germany	463.75	253.00		156.47				409.47
Speaker Hastert	9/4	9/7	Germany	463.75	253.00		156.47				409.47
Nancy Johnson	9/4	9/7	Germany	463.75	253.00		156.47				409.47
Porter Goss	9/4	9/7	Germany	463.75	253.00		156.47				409.47
Rick Lazio	9/4	9/7	Germany	463.75	253.00		156.47				409.47
Rob Portman	9/4	9/7	Germany	463.75	253.00		156.47				409.47
Jim DeMint	9/4	9/7	Germany	463.75	253.00		156.47				409.47
Scott Palmer	9/4	9/7	Germany	463.75	253.00		156.47				409.47
Bill Inglee	9/4	9/7	Germany	463.75	253.00		156.47				409.47
Ted VanderMeid	9/4	9/7	Germany	463.75	253.00		156.47				409.47
Christy Surprenant	9/4	9/7	Germany	463.75	253.00		156.47				409.47
Pete Jeffries	9/4	9/7	Germany	463.75	253.00		156.47				409.47
Chris Scheve	9/4	9/7	Germany	463.75	253.00		156.47				409.47
Brian Gunderson	9/4	9/7	Germany	463.75	253.00		156.47				409.47
Dan Turton	9/4	9/7	Germany	463.75	253.00		156.47				409.47
Bill Livingood	9/4	9/7	Germany	463.75	253.00		156.47				409.47
Committee total											

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

J. DENNIS HASTERT, Sept. 30, 1999.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, TRAVEL TO TAIWAN, THAILAND, AUSTRALIA, AND NEW ZEALAND, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN AUG. 8, AND AUG. 20, 1999

Name of member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Chaplain James D. Ford	8/8	8/10	Taiwan		530.00						530.00
	8/10	8/12	Thailand		498.00						498.00
	8/13	8/17	Australia		1,078.67						1,078.67
	8/17	8/20	New Zealand		713.19						713.19
Committee total					2,819.86						2,819.86

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JAMES D. FORD, Sept. 22, 1999.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, TRAVEL TO SPAIN AND ITALY, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN AUG. 9, AND AUG. 14, 1999

Name of member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Theodore J. Van Der Meid [3]	8/9	8/11	Spain		847.00						847.00
	8/11	8/14			990.00						990.00
Commercial airfare							5,101.69				5,101.69
Committee total											6,938.69

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Purpose: Review digitization and electronic distribution activities or various National and Institutional Libraries and archives; and to discuss with Spanish and Italian officials possibilities of sharing such technologies and activities with the U.S. Library of Congress.

THEODORE J. VAN DER MEID, Oct. 8, 1999.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

4794. A letter from the Administrator, Food and Nutrition Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—School Nutrition Service: Nondiscretionary Technical Amendments (RIN: 0584–AC01) received October 12, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4795. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the request and availability of appropriations to enable the Department of Health and Human Services' Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program to support the needs of New Jersey in the wake of Hurricane Floyd; (H. Doc. No. 106–144); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

4796. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Congressional Medal of Honor [DFARS Case 98–D304] received October 12, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4797. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Brand Name or Equal Purchase Descriptions [DFARS Case 99–D023] received October 12, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

4798. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plan: Alaska [AK21–1709; FRL–6450–8] received October 13, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

4799. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Final Flood Elevation Determinations—received October 13, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

4800. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Changes in Flood Elevation Determination [Docket No. FEMA–7296] received October 13, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

4801. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Final Flood Elevation Determinations—received October 13, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

4802. A letter from the Director, Corporate Policy and Research Department, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule—Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing Benefits—received October 12, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

4803. A letter from the Deputy Executive Secretary to the Department, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Human Drugs and Biologics; Determination That Informed Consent is NOT Feasible or Is Contrary to the Best Interests of Recipients; Revocation of 1990 Interim Final Rule; Establishment of New Interim Final Rule [Docket No. 90N–0302] (RIN: 0910–A89) received October 5, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4804. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Office of the Secretary, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Final Standard Review Plan—received October 13, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4805. A letter from the District of Columbia Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report entitled ''Audit of Public Service Commission Agency Fund for Fiscal Year 1998,'' pursuant to D.C. Code section 1–233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

4806. A letter from the Executive Director, Committee For Purchase From People Who Are Blind Or Severely Disabled, transmitting the Committee's final rule—Additions to the Procurement List—received October 12, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

4807. A letter from the District of Columbia Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report entitled ''Audit of Advisory Neighborhood Commission 3E for the period October 1, 1995 through September 30, 1998''; to the Committee on Government Reform.

4808. A letter from the General Counsel, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the Office's final rule—Prompt Payment (RIN: 0348–AB47) received October 5, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

4809. A letter from the Director, Retirement and Insurance Service, Office of Insurance Programs, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule—Federal Employee's Group Life Insurance Program: Court Orders (RIN: 3206–AI49) received October 12, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

4810. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Vessels Catching Pacific Cod for Processing by the Offshore Component in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 990304062–9062–01; I.D. 100599B] received October 13, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4811. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Branch, Customs Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Interest On Underpayments And Overpayments of Customs Duties, Taxes, Fees And Interest [T.D. 99–74] (RIN: 1515–AB76) received October 8, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4812. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Branch, Customs Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Flights To And From Cuba [T.D. 99–71] (RIN: 1515–AC51) received October 4, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4813. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Administrative, Procedural, and Miscellaneous [Rev. Proc. 99–38] received October 5, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4814. A letter from the Health Affairs, Assistant Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report regarding the appropriate health care for Gulf War veterans who suffer from a Gulf War illness.; jointly to the Committees on Veterans' Affairs and Armed Services.

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:

[Filed on October 15, 1999]

Mr. COBLE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1714. A bill to facilitate the use of electronic records and signatures in interstate or foreign commerce; with an amendment (Rept. 106–341, Pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GOODLING: Committee on Education and the Workforce. H.R. 2300. A bill to allow a State to combine certain funds to improve the academic achievement of all its students; with an amendment (Rept. 106–386). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Filed on October 18, 1999]

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 1753. A bill to promote the research, identification, assessment, exploration, and development of methane hydrate resources, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 106–377 Pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLILEY: Committee on Commerce. H.R. 2260. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to promote pain management and palliative care without permitting assisted suicide and euthanasia, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 106–378 Pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BURTON: Committee on Government Reform. H.R. 915. A bill to authorize a cost of living adjustment in the pay of administrative law judges; with an amendment (Rept. 106–387). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 2821. A bill to amend the North American Wetlands Conservation Act to provide for appointment of 2 additional members of the North American Wetlands Conservation Council (Rept. 106–388). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 1528. A bill to reauthorize and amend the National Geologic Mapping Act of 1992 (Rept. 106–389). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 2496. A bill to reauthorize the Junior Duck Stamp Conservation and Design Program Act of 1994; with an amendment (Rept. 106–390). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. S. 382. An act to establish the Minuteman Missile National Historic Site in the State of South Dakota, and for other purposes (Rept. 106–391). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COMBEST: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 2389. A bill to restore stability and predictability to the annual payments made to States and counties containing National Forest System lands and public domain lands managed by the Bureau of Land Management for use by the countries for the benefit of public schools, roads, and other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 106–392 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ARCHER: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 3070. A bill to amend the Social Security Act to establish a Ticket to Work and Self-Sufficiency Program in the Social Security Administration to provide beneficiaries with disabilities meaningful opportunities to work, to extend health care coverage for such beneficiaries, and to make additional miscellaneous amendments relating to Social Security; with an amendment (Rept. 106–393 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. GOODLING: Committee on Education and the Workforce. H.R. 2. A bill to send more dollars to the classroom and for certain other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 106–394 Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LINDER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 333. Resolution agreeing to the conference requested by the Senate on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3064) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes (Rept. 106–395). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DREIER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 334. Resolution providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 71) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2000, and for other purposes (Rept. 106–396). Referred to the House Calendar.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X, the Committee on Ways and Means discharged. H.R. 2 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X, the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 2. Referral to the Committee on Ways and Means extended for a period ending not later than October 18, 1999.

H.R. 2389. Referral to the Committee on Resources extended for a period ending not later than October 29, 1999.

H.R. 3070. Referral to the Committee on Commerce extended for a period ending not later than October 19, 1999.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE (for herself, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. METCALF, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. HERGER, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. POMBO, and Mr. HASTINGS of Washington):

H.R. 3089. A bill to provide for a comprehensive scientific review of the current conservation status of the northern spotted owl as a result of implementation of the President's Northwest Forest Plan, which is a national strategy for the recovery of the species on public forest lands; to the Committee on Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, 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. YOUNG of Alaska:

H.R. 3090. A bill to amend the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act to restore certain lands to the Elim Native Corporation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. LATOURETTE:

H.R. 3091. A bill to provide for the protection of train employees; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself and Mr. TOWNS):

H.R. 3092. A bill to amend part C of title XVIII of the Social Security Act to change the rate of increase in Medicare+Choice capitation rates for 2000 and subsequent years; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey:

H.R. 3093. A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to prevent the release of hazardous waste due to flooding, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. GORDON:

H.R. 3094. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to convey to the city of Murfreesboro, Tennessee, certain real property located at the Department of Veterans Affairs medical center in Murfreesboro, Tennessee; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PALLONE (for himself and Mr. SAXTON):

H.R. 3095. A bill to remove the waiver authority for the prohibition on military assistance to Pakistan; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. SANFORD:

H.R. 3096. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to correct the treatment of tax-exempt financing of professional sports facilities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SANFORD:

H.R. 3097. A bill to prevent governmental entities from using tax-exempt financing to engage in unfair competition against private enterprise; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TRAFICANT:

H.R. 3098. A bill to authorize grants for certain water and waste disposal facility projects in rural areas; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. YOUNG of Florida:

H.J. Res. 71. A joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2000, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

277. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 98 memorializing the United States Congress to take appropriate action to provide that reimbursement of operational expenses of school bus drivers who own their own school buses and are contract employees of a school system will not be taxed as income; 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. 25: Mr. HORN.

H.R. 82: Mr. BRYANT.

H.R. 274: Mr. VITTER, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 325: Mr. KANJORSKI.

H.R. 329: Mr. PORTER.

H.R. 371: Mr. JONES of North Carolina.

H.R. 420: Mr. MCINTOSH.

H.R. 460: Mr. FROST.

H.R. 566: Mrs. KELLY and Mr. LAMPSON.

H.R. 601: Mr. GEJDENSON.

H.R. 632: Mr. REYNOLDS.

H.R. 664: Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 675: Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.

H.R. 728: Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 740: Mr. OBEY.

H.R. 762: Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Mr. KLINK, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. DREIER, Mr. DICKS, Mr. PHELPS, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. SWEENEY, Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE, Mr. BARCIA, and Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 792: Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 798: Mr. CUMMINGS.

H.R. 828: Mr. BLILEY and Ms. CARSON.

H.R. 837: Mr. HOEFFEL.

H.R. 860: Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.

H.R. 881: Mr. VITTER.

H.R. 890: Mr. WATT of North Carolina.

H.R. 919: Mr. SABO, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 925: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. GILCHREST.

H.R. 997: Mr. VITTER, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 1006: Mrs. BIGGERT.
H.R. 1163: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mr. CROWLEY.
H.R. 1180: Mr. GALLEGLY and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.
H.R. 1271: Mr. CUMMINGS and Mr. SABO.
H.R. 1303: Mr. ANDREWS.
H.R. 1304: Mr. UPTON, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. MENENDEZ, and Mr. PHELPS.
H.R. 1367: Mr. HORN.
H.R. 1478: Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mr. WEINER.
H.R. 1482: Mr. SABO.
H.R. 1525: Mr. LATOURETTE.
H.R. 1579: Mr. LAMPSON, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mr. KUYKENDALL.
H.R. 1592: Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri and Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 1625: Mr. SERRANO, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Ms. STABENOW, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. TANCREDO, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 1650: Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. WU, Mr. FORBES, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 1775: Mr. GILMAN, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. MICA.
H.R. 1821: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 1824: Mr. EHRLICH.
H.R. 1869: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Ms. DUNN.
H.R. 1876: Mr. FROST, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. BONILLA, Ms. GRANGER, and Mr. COBURN.
H.R. 1977: Mr. HOLDEN.
H.R. 1994: Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 1998: Mr. LINDER.
H.R. 2001: Mr. MCINNIS.
H.R. 2002: Mr. MARTINEZ.
H.R. 2053: Mr. LAMPSON.
H.R. 2166: Mr. BASS, Mr. DIXON, Mr. WEINER, and Mr. GILCHREST.
H.R. 2260: Mr. WELLER and Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey.
H.R. 2289: Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 2418: Mr. LINDER, Ms. RIVERS, and Mr. JENKINS.
H.R. 2451: Mr. DOOLITTLE and Mr. DEAL of Georgia.
H.R. 2470: Mr. BRYANT.
H.R. 2512: Mr. GORDON, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, and Mr. REYES.
H.R. 2539: Mr. GARY MILLER of California.
H.R. 2573: Mr. MATSUI, Mr. SKELTON, and Mr. BERMAN.
H.R. 2590: Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. COSTELLO.
H.R. 2640: Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. BLUNT, and Mr. RAMSTAD.
H.R. 2678: Mr. STRICKLAND.
H.R. 2720: Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. KLECZKA.
H.R. 2731: Mr. WEINER.
H.R. 2748: Mrs. CLAYTON and Mr. JONES of North Carolina.
H.R. 2813: Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 2827: Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. WELLER.
H.R. 2828: Mr. WEYGAND, Mr. FROST, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. KLINK, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. BONIOR, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. TURNER, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, and Mr. DINGELL.
H.R. 2864: Mr. OLVER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. NADLER, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 2865: Ms. LEE and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 2870: Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. WYNN, Mr. KING, and Mr. SANDERS.
H.R. 2882: Mr. BARCIA.
H.R. 2899: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
H.R. 2900: Mr. KILPATRICK, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. NADLER, Mr. WEINER, Mr. GEJDENSON, and Ms. ESHOO.
H.R. 2915: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. OWENS, Mr. BONIOR, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.
H.R. 2936: Mr. LEVIN, Mr. TIERNEY, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mr. PAUL.
H.R. 2939: Mr. CLAY and Ms. LEE.
H.R. 2947: Mr. KUCINICH and Mr. SALMON.
H.R. 2966: Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. FROST, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. PHELPS, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. STUPAK.
H.R. 2980: Mr. STARK.
H.R. 3011: Mr. PICKERING.
H.R. 3044: Mr. BONIOR.
H.R. 3057: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
H.R. 3070: Mr. CRANE and Mr. ISAKSON.
H.R. 3072: Mr. MASCARA and Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 3075: Mr. HAYES, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. POMBO, Mr. GILCHREST, and Mr. SKEEN.
H.R. 3082: Mr. CAMP.
H.R. 3087: Mr. REYNOLDS and Mrs. MALONEY of New York.
H.J. Res. 46: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. REYES, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. WALSH, and Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi.
H. Con. Res. 51: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. EVANS, Mr. GEJDENSON, and Mr. LARSON.
H. Con. Res. 111: Mr. RUSH.
H. Con. Res. 134: Mr. BERMAN.
H. Con. Res. 188: Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. DINGELL.
H. Con. Res. 190: Mr. ARMEY.
H. Con. Res. 197: Mr. ARMEY, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. BASS, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. COBURN, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. FELINGHUYSEN, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. ISTOOK, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. KASICH, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. LEACH, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. NEY, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. OSE, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. PICKERING, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. WHITFIELD.
H. Res. 169: Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. HINCHEY.
H. Res. 325: Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. SHOWS, and Mr. RAHALL.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 3081: Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 2

OFFERED BY: MR. ARMEY

AMENDMENT NO. 1: Before section 111 of the bill, insert the following (and redesignate any subsequent sections accordingly):

SEC. 111. PUPIL SAFETY AND FAMILY SCHOOL CHOICE.

Subpart 1 of part A of title I is amended by inserting after section 1115A of the Act the following:

"SEC. 1115B. PUPIL SAFETY AND FAMILY SCHOOL CHOICE.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—If a student is eligible to be served under section 1115(b), or attends a school eligible for a schoolwide program under section 1114, and becomes a victim of a violent criminal offense while in or on the grounds of a public elementary school or secondary school that the student attends and that receives assistance under this part, then the local educational agency may use funds provided under this part to pay the supplementary costs for such student to attend another school. The agency may use the funds to pay for the supplementary costs of such student to attend any other public or private elementary school or secondary school, including a sectarian school, in the same State as the school where the criminal offense occurred, that is selected by the student's parent. The State educational agency shall determine what actions constitute a violent criminal offense for purposes of this section.

''(b) SUPPLEMENTARY COSTS.—The supplementary costs referred to in subsection (a) shall not exceed—

''(1) in the case of a student for whom funds under this section are used to enable the student to attend a public elementary school or secondary school served by a local educational agency that also serves the school where the violent criminal offense occurred, the costs of supplementary educational services and activities described in section 1114(b) or 1115(c) that are provided to the student;

''(2) in the case of a student for whom funds under this section are used to enable the student to attend a public elementary school or secondary school served by a local educational agency that does not serve the school where the violent criminal offense occurred but is located in the same State—

''(A) the costs of supplementary educational services and activities described in section 1114(b) or 1115(c) that are provided to the student; and

''(B) the reasonable costs of transportation for the student to attend the school selected by the student's parent; and

''(3) in the case of a student for whom funds under this section are used to enable the student to attend a private elementary school or secondary school, including a sectarian school, the costs of tuition, required fees, and the reasonable costs of such transportation.

''(c) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act or any other Federal law shall be construed to prevent a parent assisted under this section from selecting the public or private elementary school or secondary school that a child of the parent will attend within the State.

''(d) CONSIDERATION OF ASSISTANCE.—Assistance used under this section to pay the costs for a student to attend a private school shall not be considered to be Federal aid to the school, and the Federal Government shall have no authority to influence or regulate the operations of a private school as a result of assistance received under this section.

''(e) CONTINUING ELIGIBILITY.—A student assisted under this section shall remain eligible to continue receiving assistance under this section for 5 academic years without regard to whether the student is eligible for assistance under section 1114 or 1115(b).

''(f) STATE LAW.—All actions undertaken under this section shall be undertaken in accordance with State law and may be undertaken only to the extent such actions are permitted under State law.

''(g) TUITION CHARGES.—Assistance under this section may not be used to pay tuition or required fees at a private elementary school or secondary school in an amount that is greater than the tuition and required

fees paid by students not assisted under this section at such school.

''(h) SPECIAL RULE.—Any school receiving assistance provided under this section shall comply with title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000d et seq.) and not discriminate on the basis of race, color, or national origin.

''(i) ASSISTANCE; TAXES AND OTHER FEDERAL PROGRAMS.—

''(1) ASSISTANCE TO FAMILIES, NOT SCHOOLS.—Assistance provided under this section shall be considered to be aid to families, not schools. Use of such assistance at a school shall not be construed to be Federal financial aid or assistance to that school.

''(2) TAXES AND DETERMINATIONS OF ELIGIBILITY FOR OTHER FEDERAL PROGRAMS.—Assistance provided under this section to a student shall not be considered to be income of the student or the parent of such student for Federal, State, or local tax purposes or for determining eligibility for any other Federal program.

''(j) PART B OF THE INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES EDUCATION ACT.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect the requirements of part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1411 et seq.).

''(k) SECTARIAN INSTITUTIONS.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to supersede or modify any provision of a State constitution that prohibits the expenditure of public funds in or by sectarian institutions.

''(l) MAXIMUM AMOUNT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the amount of assistance provided under this part for a student shall not exceed the per pupil expenditure for elementary or secondary education, as appropriate, by the local educational agency that serves the school where the criminal offense occurred for the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the determination is made.''.

After part G of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as proposed to be added by section 171 of the bill, insert the following:

PART F—ACADEMIC EMERGENCIES

SEC. 181. ACADEMIC EMERGENCIES.

(a) ACADEMIC EMERGENCIES.—Title I of the Act is amended by adding at the end the following:

''PART H—ACADEMIC EMERGENCIES

''SEC. 1801. SHORT TITLE.

''This part may be cited as the ''Academic Emergency Act''.

''SEC. 1802. PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized to provide funds to States that have 1 or more schools designated under section 1803 as academic emergency schools to provide parents whose children attend such schools with education alternatives.

''(b) GRANTS TO STATES.—Grants awarded to a State under this part shall be awarded for a period of not more than 5 years.

''SEC. 1803. ACADEMIC EMERGENCY DESIGNATION.

''(a) DESIGNATION.—The Governor of each State may designate 1 or more schools in the State that meet the eligibility requirements set forth in subsection (b) or are identified for school improvement under section 1116(b) as academic emergency schools.

''(b) ELIGIBILITY.—To be designated as an academic emergency school, the school shall be a public elementary school—

''(1) with a consistent record of poor performance by failing to meet minimum academic standards as determined by the State; and

''(2) in which more than 50 percent of the children attending are eligible for free or reduced price lunches under the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.).

''(c) LIST TO SECRETARY.—To receive a grant under this part, the Governor shall submit a list of academic emergency schools to the State educational agency and the Secretary.

''SEC. 1804. APPLICATION AND STATE SELECTION.

''(a) APPLICATION.—Each State in which the Governor has designated 1 or more schools as academic emergency schools shall submit an application to the Secretary that includes the following:

''(1) ASSURANCES.—Assurances that the State shall—

''(A) use the funds provided under this part to supplement, not supplant, State and local funds that would otherwise be available for the purposes of this part;

''(B) provide written notification to the parents of every student eligible to receive academic emergency relief funds under this part, informing the parents of the voluntary nature of the program established under this part, and the availability of qualified schools within their geographic area;

''(C) provide parents and the education community with easily accessible information regarding available education alternatives; and

''(D) not reserve more than 4 percent of the amount made available under this part to pay administrative expenses.

''(2) INFORMATION.—Information regarding each academic emergency school, for the school year in which the application is submitted, regarding the number of children attending such school, including the number of children who are eligible for free or reduced-price lunch under the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.) and the level of student performance.

''(b) STATE AWARDS.—

''(1) STATE SELECTION.—From the amount appropriated pursuant to the authority of section 1814 in any fiscal year, the Secretary shall award grants to States in accordance with this section.

''(2) PRIORITY.—To the extent practicable, the Secretary shall ensure that each State that completes an application in accordance with subsection (a) shall receive a grant of sufficient size to provide education alternatives to not less than 1 academic emergency school.

''(3) AWARD CRITERIA.—In determining the amount of a grant award to a State under this part, the Secretary shall take into consideration the number of schools designated as academic emergencies in the State and the number of eligible students in such schools.

''(4) STATE PLAN.—Each State that applies for funds under this part shall establish a plan—

''(A) to ensure that the greatest number of eligible students who attend academic emergency schools have an opportunity to receive an academic emergency relief funds; and

''(B) to develop a simple procedure to allow parents of participating eligible students to redeem academic emergency relief funds.

''SEC. 1805. SELECTION OF ACADEMIC EMERGENCY SCHOOLS AND AWARDS TO PARENTS.

''(a) SELECTION.—The State shall select academic emergency schools based on —

''(1) the number of eligible students attending an academic emergency school;

''(2) the availability of qualified schools near the academic emergency school; and

''(3) the academic performance of students in the academic emergency school.

''(b) INSUFFICIENT FUNDS.—If the amount of funds made available to a State under this part is insufficient to provide every eligible student in a selected academic emergency school with academic emergency relief funds, the State shall devise a random selection process to provide eligible students in such school whose family income does not exceed 185 percent of the poverty line the opportunity to participate in education alternatives established pursuant to this part.

''(c) PAYMENTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—From the funds made available to a State under this part and not reserved under section 1804(a)(1)(D), a State shall pay not more than $3,500 in academic emergency relief funds to the parents of each participating eligible student.

''(2) PERIOD OF AWARDS.—The academic emergency relief funds awarded to parents of participating eligible students shall be awarded for each school year during the grant period which shall terminate—

''(A) when a participating eligible student is no longer a student in the State; or

''(B) at the end of 5 years,

whichever occurs first.

''(3) DURATION.—A State shall continue to receive funds under this part for distribution to parents of participating eligible students throughout the 5-year grant period.

''SEC. 1806. QUALIFIED SCHOOLS.

''(a) QUALIFICATIONS.—A State that submits an application to the Secretary under section 1804 shall publish the qualifications necessary for a school to participate as a qualified school under this part. At a minimum, each such school shall—

''(1) provide assurances to the State that it will comply with section 1810;

''(2) certify to the State that the amount charged to a parent using academic relief funds for tuition and fees does not exceed the amount for such tuition and fees charged to a parent not using such relief funds whose child attends the qualified school (excluding scholarship students attending such school); and

''(3) report to the State, not later than July 30 of each year in a manner prescribed by the State, information regarding student performance.

''(b) CONFIDENTIALITY.—No personal identifiers may be used in such report described in subsection (a)(3), except that the State may request such personal identifiers solely for the purpose of verifying student performance.

''SEC. 1807. ACADEMIC EMERGENCY RELIEF FUNDS.

''(a) USE OF ACADEMIC EMERGENCY RELIEF FUNDS.—A parent who receives academic emergency relief funds from a State under this part may use such funds to pay the costs of tuition and mandatory fees for a program of instruction at a qualified school.

''(b) NOT SCHOOL AID.—Academic emergency relief funds under this part shall be considered assistance to the student and shall not be considered assistance to a qualified school.

''SEC. 1808. EVALUATION.

''(a) ANNUAL EVALUATION.—

''(1) CONTRACT.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall enter into a contract, with an evaluating agency that has demonstrated experience in conducting evaluations, for the conduct of an ongoing rigorous evaluation of the education alternative program established under this part.

''(2) ANNUAL EVALUATION REQUIREMENT.—The contract described in paragraph (1) shall require the evaluating agency entering into such contract to annually evaluate the education alternative program established under this part in accordance with the evaluation criteria described in subsection (b).

''(3) TRANSMISSION.—The contract described in paragraph (1) shall require the evaluating agency entering into such contract to transmit to the Comptroller General of the United States the findings of each annual evaluation under paragraph (2).

''(b) EVALUATION CRITERIA.—The Comptroller General of the United States, in consultation with the Secretary, shall establish minimum criteria for evaluating the education alternative program established under this part. Such criteria shall provide for—

''(1) a description of the effects of the programs on the level of student participation and parental satisfaction with the education alternatives provided pursuant to this part compared to the educational achievement of students who choose to remain at academic emergency schools selected for participation under this part; and

''(2) a description of the effects of the programs on the educational performance of eligible students who receive academic emergency relief funds compared to the educational performance of students who choose to remain at academic emergency schools selected for participation under this part.

''SEC. 1809. REPORTS BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL.

''(a) INTERIM REPORTS.—Three years after the date of enactment of the Student Results Act of 1999, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit an interim report to Congress on the findings of the annual evaluations under section 1808(a)(2) for the education alternative program established under this part. The report shall contain a copy of the annual evaluation under section 1808(a)(2) of education alternative program established under this part.

''(b) FINAL REPORT.—The Comptroller General shall submit a final report to Congress, not later than 7 years after the date of the enactment of the Student Results Act of 1999, that summarizes the findings of the annual evaluations under section 1808(a)(2).

''SEC. 1810. CIVIL RIGHTS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—A qualified school under this part shall not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, or sex in carrying out the provisions of this part.

''(b) APPLICABILITY AND CONSTRUCTION WITH RESPECT TO DISCRIMINATION ON THE BASIS OF SEX.—

''(1) APPLICABILITY.—With respect to discrimination on the basis of sex, subsection (a) shall not apply to a qualified school that is controlled by a religious organization if the application of subsection (a) is inconsistent with the religious tenets of the qualified school.

''(2) SINGLE-SEX SCHOOLS, CLASSES, OR ACTIVITIES.—With respect to discrimination on the basis of sex, nothing in subsection (a) shall be construed to prevent a parent from choosing, or a qualified school from offering, a single-sex school, class, or activity.

''SEC. 1811. RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this part shall be construed to prevent a qualified school that is operated by, supervised by, controlled by, or connected to a religious organization from employing, admitting, or giving preference to persons of the same religion to the extent determined by such school to promote the religious purpose for which the qualified school is established or maintained.

''(b) SECTARIAN PURPOSES.—Nothing in this part shall be construed to prohibit the use of funds made available under this part for sectarian educational purposes, or to require a qualified school to remove religious art, icons, scripture, or other symbols.

''SEC. 1812. CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES.

''Nothing in this part shall affect the rights of students, or the obligations of public schools of a State, under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq.).

''SEC. 1813. DEFINITIONS.

''As used in this part:

''(1) The terms ''local educational agency'' and ''State educational agency'' have the same meanings given such terms in section 14101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8801).

''(2) The term ''eligible student'' means a student enrolled, in a grade between kindergarten and 4th, in an academic emergency school during the school year in which the Governor designates the school as an academic emergency school, except that the parents of a child enrolled in kindergarten at the time of the Governor's designation shall not be eligible to receive academic emergency relief funds until the child is in first grade.

''(3) The term ''Governor'' means the chief executive officer of the State.

''(4) The term ''parent'' includes a legal guardian or other person standing in loco parentis.

''(5) The term ''poverty line'' means the income official poverty line (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget, and revised annually in accordance with section 673(2) of the Community Services Block Grant Act (42 U.S.C. 9902(2)) applicable to a family of the size involved.

''(6) The term ''qualified school'' means a public, private, or independent elementary school that meets the requirements of section 1806 and any other qualifications established by the State to accept academic emergency relief funds from the parents of participating eligible students.

''(7) The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Education.

''(8) The term ''State'' means each of the 50 States and the District of Columbia.

''SEC. 1814. AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS.

''There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this part $100,000,000 for fiscal year 2000 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2001 through 2004, except that the amount authorized to be appropriated may not exceed $100,000,000 for any fiscal year.''.

(b) REPEALS.—The following programs are repealed:

(1) NATIVE HAWAIIANS.—Part B of title IX of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7901 et seq.).

(2) FUND FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF EDUCATION.—Part A of title X of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8001 et seq.).

(3) 21ST CENTURY COMMUNITY LEARNING CENTERS.—Part I of title X of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8241 et seq.).

H.R. 2

OFFERED BY: MR. ARMEY

AMENDMENT NO. 2: Before section 111 of the bill, insert the following (and redesignate any subsequent sections accordingly):

SEC. 111. PUPIL SAFETY AND FAMILY SCHOOL CHOICE.

Subpart 1 of part A of title I is amended by inserting after section 1115A of the Act the following:

''SEC. 1115B. PUPIL SAFETY AND FAMILY SCHOOL CHOICE.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—If a student is eligible to be served under section 1115(b), or attends a school eligible for a schoolwide program under section 1114, and becomes a victim of a violent criminal offense while in or on the grounds of a public elementary school or secondary school that the student attends and that receives assistance under this part, then the local educational agency may use funds provided under this part to pay the supplementary costs for such student to attend another school. The agency may use the funds to pay for the supplementary costs of such student to attend any other public or private elementary school or secondary school, including a sectarian school, in the same State as the school where the criminal offense occurred, that is selected by the student's parent. The State educational agency shall determine what actions constitute a violent criminal offense for purposes of this section.

''(b) SUPPLEMENTARY COSTS.—The supplementary costs referred to in subsection (a) shall not exceed—

''(1) in the case of a student for whom funds under this section are used to enable the student to attend a public elementary school or secondary school served by a local educational agency that also serves the school where the violent criminal offense occurred, the costs of supplementary educational services and activities described in section 1114(b) or 1115(c) that are provided to the student;

''(2) in the case of a student for whom funds under this section are used to enable the student to attend a public elementary school or secondary school served by a local educational agency that does not serve the school where the violent criminal offense occurred but is located in the same State—

''(A) the costs of supplementary educational services and activities described in section 1114(b) or 1115(c) that are provided to the student; and

''(B) the reasonable costs of transportation for the student to attend the school selected by the student's parent; and

''(3) in the case of a student for whom funds under this section are used to enable the student to attend a private elementary school or secondary school, including a sectarian school, the costs of tuition, required fees, and the reasonable costs of such transportation.

''(c) CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act or any other Federal law shall be construed to prevent a parent assisted under this section from selecting the public or private elementary school or secondary school that a child of the parent will attend within the State.

''(d) CONSIDERATION OF ASSISTANCE.—Assistance used under this section to pay the costs for a student to attend a private school shall not be considered to be Federal aid to the school, and the Federal Government shall have no authority to influence or regulate the operations of a private school as a result of assistance received under this section.

''(e) CONTINUING ELIGIBILITY.—A student assisted under this section shall remain eligible to continue receiving assistance under this section for 5 academic years without regard to whether the student is eligible for assistance under section 1114 or 1115(b).

''(f) STATE LAW.—All actions undertaken under this section shall be undertaken in accordance with State law and may be undertaken only to the extent such actions are permitted under State law.

''(g) TUITION CHARGES.—Assistance under this section may not be used to pay tuition or required fees at a private elementary school or secondary school in an amount that is greater than the tuition and required fees paid by students not assisted under this section at such school.

''(h) SPECIAL RULE.—Any school receiving assistance provided under this section shall comply with title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. 2000d et seq.) and not discriminate on the basis of race, color, or national origin.

''(i) ASSISTANCE TO FAMILIES.—Assistance provided under this section shall be considered to be aid to families, not schools. Use of such assistance at a school shall not be construed to be Federal financial aid or assistance to that school.

''(j) PART B OF THE INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES EDUCATION ACT.—Nothing in this

section shall be construed to affect the requirements of part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1411 et seq.).

''(k) SECTARIAN INSTITUTIONS.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to supersede or modify any provision of a State constitution that prohibits the expenditure of public funds in or by sectarian institutions.

''(l) MAXIMUM AMOUNT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the amount of assistance provided under this part for a student shall not exceed the per pupil expenditure for elementary or secondary education, as appropriate, by the local educational agency that serves the school where the criminal offense occurred for the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year for which the determination is made.''.

After part G of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as proposed to be added by section 171 of the bill, insert the following:

PART F—ACADEMIC EMERGENCIES

SEC. 181. ACADEMIC EMERGENCIES.

(a) ACADEMIC EMERGENCIES.—Title I of the Act is amended by adding at the end the following:

''PART H—ACADEMIC EMERGENCIES

''SEC. 1801. SHORT TITLE.

''This part may be cited as the ''Academic Emergency Act''.

''SEC. 1802. PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized to provide funds to States that have 1 or more schools designated under section 1803 as academic emergency schools to provide parents whose children attend such schools with education alternatives.

''(b) GRANTS TO STATES.—Grants awarded to a State under this part shall be awarded for a period of not more than 5 years.

''SEC. 1803. ACADEMIC EMERGENCY DESIGNATION.

''(a) DESIGNATION.—The Governor of each State may designate 1 or more schools in the State that meet the eligibility requirements set forth in subsection (b) or are identified for school improvement under section 1116(b) as academic emergency schools.

''(b) ELIGIBILITY.—To be designated as an academic emergency school, the school shall be a public elementary school—

''(1) with a consistent record of poor performance by failing to meet minimum academic standards as determined by the State; and

''(2) in which more than 50 percent of the children attending are eligible for free or reduced price lunches under the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.).

''(c) LIST TO SECRETARY.—To receive a grant under this part, the Governor shall submit a list of academic emergency schools to the State educational agency and the Secretary.

''SEC. 1804. APPLICATION AND STATE SELECTION.

''(a) APPLICATION.—Each State in which the Governor has designated 1 or more schools as academic emergency schools shall submit an application to the Secretary that includes the following:

''(1) ASSURANCES.—Assurances that the State shall—

''(A) use the funds provided under this part to supplement, not supplant, State and local funds that would otherwise be available for the purposes of this part;

''(B) provide written notification to the parents of every student eligible to receive academic emergency relief funds under this part, informing the parents of the voluntary nature of the program established under this part, and the availability of qualified schools within their geographic area;

''(C) provide parents and the education community with easily accessible information regarding available education alternatives; and

''(D) not reserve more than 4 percent of the amount made available under this part to pay administrative expenses.

''(2) INFORMATION.—Information regarding each academic emergency school, for the school year in which the application is submitted, regarding the number of children attending such school, including the number of children who are eligible for free or reduced-price lunch under the National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1751 et seq.) and the level of student performance.

''(b) STATE AWARDS.—

''(1) STATE SELECTION.—From the amount appropriated pursuant to the authority of section 1814 in any fiscal year, the Secretary shall award grants to States in accordance with this section.

''(2) PRIORITY.—To the extent practicable, the Secretary shall ensure that each State that completes an application in accordance with subsection (a) shall receive a grant of sufficient size to provide education alternatives to not less than 1 academic emergency school.

''(3) AWARD CRITERIA.—In determining the amount of a grant award to a State under this part, the Secretary shall take into consideration the number of schools designated as academic emergencies in the State and the number of eligible students in such schools.

''(4) STATE PLAN.—Each State that applies for funds under this part shall establish a plan—

''(A) to ensure that the greatest number of eligible students who attend academic emergency schools have an opportunity to receive an academic emergency relief funds; and

''(B) to develop a simple procedure to allow parents of participating eligible students to redeem academic emergency relief funds.

''SEC. 1805. SELECTION OF ACADEMIC EMERGENCY SCHOOLS AND AWARDS TO PARENTS.

''(a) SELECTION.—The State shall select academic emergency schools based on —

''(1) the number of eligible students attending an academic emergency school;

''(2) the availability of qualified schools near the academic emergency school; and

''(3) the academic performance of students in the academic emergency school.

''(b) INSUFFICIENT FUNDS.—If the amount of funds made available to a State under this part is insufficient to provide every eligible student in a selected academic emergency school with academic emergency relief funds, the State shall devise a random selection process to provide eligible students in such school whose family income does not exceed 185 percent of the poverty line the opportunity to participate in education alternatives established pursuant to this part.

''(c) PAYMENTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—From the funds made available to a State under this part and not reserved under section 1804(a)(1)(D), a State shall pay not more than $3,500 in academic emergency relief funds to the parents of each participating eligible student.

''(2) PERIOD OF AWARDS.—The academic emergency relief funds awarded to parents of participating eligible students shall be awarded for each school year during the grant period which shall terminate—

''(A) when a participating eligible student is no longer a student in the State; or

''(B) at the end of 5 years,

whichever occurs first.

''(3) DURATION.—A State shall continue to receive funds under this part for distribution to parents of participating eligible students throughout the 5-year grant period.

''SEC. 1806. QUALIFIED SCHOOLS.

''(a) QUALIFICATIONS.—A State that submits an application to the Secretary under section 1804 shall publish the qualifications necessary for a school to participate as a qualified school under this part. At a minimum, each such school shall—

''(1) provide assurances to the State that it will comply with section 1810;

''(2) certify to the State that the amount charged to a parent using academic relief funds for tuition and fees does not exceed the amount for such tuition and fees charged to a parent not using such relief funds whose child attends the qualified school (excluding scholarship students attending such school); and

''(3) report to the State, not later than July 30 of each year in a manner prescribed by the State, information regarding student performance.

''(b) CONFIDENTIALITY.—No personal identifiers may be used in such report described in subsection (a)(3), except that the State may request such personal identifiers solely for the purpose of verifying student performance.

''SEC. 1807. ACADEMIC EMERGENCY RELIEF FUNDS.

''(a) USE OF ACADEMIC EMERGENCY RELIEF FUNDS.—A parent who receives academic emergency relief funds from a State under this part may use such funds to pay the costs of tuition and mandatory fees for a program of instruction at a qualified school.

''(b) NOT SCHOOL AID.—Academic emergency relief funds under this part shall be considered assistance to the student and shall not be considered assistance to a qualified school.

''SEC. 1808. EVALUATION.

''(a) ANNUAL EVALUATION.—

''(1) CONTRACT.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall enter into a contract, with an evaluating agency that has demonstrated experience in conducting evaluations, for the conduct of an ongoing rigorous evaluation of the education alternative program established under this part.

''(2) ANNUAL EVALUATION REQUIREMENT.—The contract described in paragraph (1) shall require the evaluating agency entering into such contract to annually evaluate the education alternative program established under this part in accordance with the evaluation criteria described in subsection (b).

''(3) TRANSMISSION.—The contract described in paragraph (1) shall require the evaluating agency entering into such contract to transmit to the Comptroller General of the United States the findings of each annual evaluation under paragraph (2).

''(b) EVALUATION CRITERIA.—The Comptroller General of the United States, in consultation with the Secretary, shall establish minimum criteria for evaluating the education alternative program established under this part. Such criteria shall provide for—

''(1) a description of the effects of the programs on the level of student participation and parental satisfaction with the education alternatives provided pursuant to this part compared to the educational achievement of students who choose to remain at academic emergency schools selected for participation under this part; and

''(2) a description of the effects of the programs on the educational performance of eligible students who receive academic emergency relief funds compared to the educational performance of students who choose to remain at academic emergency schools selected for participation under this part.

''SEC. 1809. REPORTS BY COMPTROLLER GENERAL.

''(a) INTERIM REPORTS.—Three years after the date of enactment of the Student Results

Act of 1999, the Comptroller General of the United States shall submit an interim report to Congress on the findings of the annual evaluations under section 1808(a)(2) for the education alternative program established under this part. The report shall contain a copy of the annual evaluation under section 1808(a)(2) of education alternative program established under this part.

''(b) FINAL REPORT.—The Comptroller General shall submit a final report to Congress, not later than 7 years after the date of the enactment of the Student Results Act of 1999, that summarizes the findings of the annual evaluations under section 1808(a)(2).

''SEC. 1810. CIVIL RIGHTS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—A qualified school under this part shall not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, or sex in carrying out the provisions of this part.

''(b) APPLICABILITY AND CONSTRUCTION WITH RESPECT TO DISCRIMINATION ON THE BASIS OF SEX.—

''(1) APPLICABILITY.—With respect to discrimination on the basis of sex, subsection (a) shall not apply to a qualified school that is controlled by a religious organization if the application of subsection (a) is inconsistent with the religious tenets of the qualified school.

''(2) SINGLE-SEX SCHOOLS, CLASSES, OR ACTIVITIES.—With respect to discrimination on the basis of sex, nothing in subsection (a) shall be construed to prevent a parent from choosing, or a qualified school from offering, a single-sex school, class, or activity.

''SEC. 1811. RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this part shall be construed to prevent a qualified school that is operated by, supervised by, controlled by, or connected to a religious organization from employing, admitting, or giving preference to persons of the same religion to the extent determined by such school to promote the religious purpose for which the qualified school is established or maintained.

''(b) SECTARIAN PURPOSES.—Nothing in this part shall be construed to prohibit the use of funds made available under this part for sectarian educational purposes, or to require a qualified school to remove religious art, icons, scripture, or other symbols.

''SEC. 1812. CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES.

''Nothing in this part shall affect the rights of students, or the obligations of public schools of a State, under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq.).

''SEC. 1813. DEFINITIONS.

''As used in this part:

''(1) The terms ''local educational agency'' and ''State educational agency'' have the same meanings given such terms in section 14101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8801).

''(2) The term ''eligible student'' means a student enrolled, in a grade between kindergarten and 4th, in an academic emergency school during the school year in which the Governor designates the school as an academic emergency school, except that the parents of a child enrolled in kindergarten at the time of the Governor's designation shall not be eligible to receive academic emergency relief funds until the child is in first grade.

''(3) The term ''Governor'' means the chief executive officer of the State.

''(4) The term ''parent'' includes a legal guardian or other person standing in loco parentis.

''(5) The term ''poverty line'' means the income official poverty line (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget, and revised annually in accordance with section 673(2) of the Community Services Block Grant Act (42 U.S.C. 9902(2)) applicable to a family of the size involved.

''(6) The term ''qualified school'' means a public, private, or independent elementary school that meets the requirements of section 1806 and any other qualifications established by the State to accept academic emergency relief funds from the parents of participating eligible students.

''(7) The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Education.

''(8) The term ''State'' means each of the 50 States and the District of Columbia.

''SEC. 1814. AUTHORIZATIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS.

''There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this part $100,000,000 for fiscal year 2000 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2001 through 2004, except that the amount authorized to be appropriated may not exceed $100,000,000 for any fiscal year.''.

(b) REPEALS.—The following programs are repealed:

(1) NATIVE HAWAIIANS.—Part B of title IX of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 7901 et seq.).

(2) FUND FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF EDUCATION.—Part A of title X of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8001 et seq.).

(3) 21ST CENTURY COMMUNITY LEARNING CENTERS.—Part I of title X of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8241 et seq.).

H.R. 2

OFFERED BY: MR. MALONEY OF CONNECTICUT

AMENDMENT NO. 3: Add at the end of the bill the following new title:

TITLE IX—ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT ENHANCEMENT

SEC. 901. ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT ENHANCEMENT.

Title X of the Act is amended by adding at the end the following:

''PART L—ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT ENHANCEMENT

''SEC. 10994. SHORT TITLE.

''This part may be cited as the 'Academic Achievement Enhancement Act'.

''SEC. 10995. PROGRAM AUTHORIZED.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—

''(1) BONUS AWARDS.—The Secretary of Education is authorized to provide bonus awards described in subsection (b) to each eligible local educational agency that has adopted or adopts a policy to end social promotion.

''(2) ELIGIBILITY.—To be eligible to receive bonus funds under this section, a local educational agency shall submit an application to the Secretary that provides assurances that the agency has adopted a policy to end social promotion. Such policy shall include the following criteria:

''(A) Standards that clearly define and specify the content that a student must master in order to be promoted to the next grade level.

''(B) A system in place that clearly measures or assesses a student's progress in meeting standards.

''(C) A promotion policy that is based on demonstrated achievement in meeting the standards.

''(D) A system in place that monitors student achievement and can identify, in a timely fashion, a student who is struggling to meet the standards.

''(E) An effective intervention program and support services for a student who is identified as being at risk of failing.

''(b) BONUS AMOUNTS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to paragraph (2) and except as provided in paragraph (3), a local educational agency that meets the requirements of subsection (a) shall receive a bonus award in an amount that equals 5 percent of the amount the agency received under section 1124 for the preceding fiscal year.

''(2) RATABLE REDUCTION.—

''(A) REDUCTION OF FUNDS.—If the sums made available under this part for any fiscal year are insufficient to pay the full amounts that all local educational agencies are eligible to receive under paragraph (1) or paragraph (3) for such year, the Secretary shall ratably reduce the allotment to such agencies for such year.

''(B) INCREASE IN FUNDS.—If additional funds become available for making payments under paragraph (1) for such fiscal year, allotments that were reduced under subparagraph (A) shall be increased on the same basis as such allotments were reduced.

''(3) MINIMUM AWARD.—Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph (1), each local educational agency that meets the requirements of subsection (a) shall receive an amount that is not less than $25,000.

''SEC. 10996. USES OF BONUS FUNDS.

''A local educational agency that receives a bonus award under this part shall use such award to supplement the intervention and support programs for students identified as being at risk for failing which may include—

''(1) double-dose instruction;

''(2) weekend classes;

''(3) summer school classes;

''(4) extended day programs; and

''(5) tutoring.

''SEC. 10997. REPORTS.

''Each local educational agency that receives a bonus award under this part shall submit to the Secretary a report that describes the effectiveness of programs established or enhanced as a result of a bonus award received under this part.

''SEC. 10998. DEFINITIONS.

''For purposes of this part, the term 'double-dose instruction' means a class in a core subject that meets more frequently than the regularly scheduled class for such subject.''.

H.R. 2

OFFERED BY: MRS. MINK OF HAWAII

AMENDMENT NO. 4: In section 1114(c)(1)(B)(ii)(III) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as proposed to be amended by section 108 of the bill, insert '', including girls and women'' after ''underserved populations''.

In section 1114(c)(1)(B)(iii)(I) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as proposed to be amended by section 108 of the bill, insert '', which may include incorporation of gender-equitable methods and practices'' after ''schoolwide program''.

In section 1119A(b)(1) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as proposed to amended by section 116 of the bill—

(1) at the end of subparagraph (I), strike ''and'';

(2) at the end of subparagraph (J), strike the period and insert ''; and''; and

(3) after subparagraph (J), insert the following:

''(K) include strategies for identifying and eliminating gender and racial bias in instructional materials, methods, and practices.''.

After subparagraph (E) of section 1119A(b)(2) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as proposed to amended by section 116 of the bill, insert the following (and redesignate any subsequent subparagraphs accordingly):

''(F) instruction in the ways that teachers, principals, and guidance counselors can work with parents and students from groups, such as females and minorities which are under represented in careers in mathematics,

science, engineering, and technology, to encourage and maintain the interest of such students in these careers;''.

In section 1119A(b)(2) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as proposed to amended by section 116 of the bill—

(1) at the end of subparagraph (H) (as redesignated), strike ''and'';

(2) at the end of subparagraph (I) (as redesignated), strike the period and insert ''; and''; and

(3) after subparagraph (I), insert the following:

''(J) instruction in gender-equitable methods, techniques, and practices.''.

Strike the matter proposed to be inserted in section 1401(a)(3) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, (as proposed by section 142 of the bill).

After the matter proposed to be inserted in section 1401(a)(6) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, (as proposed by section 142 of the bill), add the following:

''(7) Pregnant and parenting teenagers are a high at-risk group for dropping out of school and should be targeted by dropout prevention programs.''.

In section 1423(6) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as proposed to be amended by section 149 of the bill—

(1) after ''social'' insert '', health'';

(2) after ''facilities'' insert '', students at risk of dropping out of school,''; and

(3) before the semicolon, insert '', including prenatal health care and nutrition services related to the health of the parent and child, parenting and child development classes, child care, targeted re-entry and outreach programs, referrals to community resources, and scheduling flexibility''.

In section 1424(2) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as proposed to be amended by section 150 of the bill, before the semicolon, insert the following: '', including pregnant and parenting teenagers''.

In section 1424(3) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as proposed to be amended by section 150 of the bill—

(1) after ''social'' insert '', health,''; and

(2) after ''services'' insert '', including day care,''.

Strike section 152 of the bill and the amendment proposed to be made to section 1426(1) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

At the end of title V of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, as proposed to be amended by section 201 of the bill, insert the following:

''PART C—WOMEN'S EDUCATIONAL EQUITY

''SEC. 5301. SHORT TITLE; FINDINGS.

''(a) SHORT TITLE.—This part may be cited as the 'Women's Educational Equity Act of 1994'.

''(b) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds that—

''(1) since the enactment of title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, women and girls have made strides in educational achievement and in their ability to avail themselves of educational opportunities;

''(2) because of funding provided under the Women's Educational Equity Act, more curricula, training, and other educational materials concerning educational equity for women and girls are available for national dissemination;

''(3) teaching and learning practices in the United States are frequently inequitable as such practices relate to women and girls, for example—

''(A) sexual harassment, particularly that experienced by girls, undermines the ability of schools to provide a safe and equitable learning or workplace environment;

''(B) classroom textbooks and other educational materials do not sufficiently reflect the experiences, achievements, or concerns of women and, in most cases, are not written by women or persons of color;

''(C) girls do not take as many mathematics and science courses as boys, girls lose confidence in their mathematics and science ability as girls move through adolescence, and there are few women role models in the sciences; and

''(D) the low number of girls taking higher level computer science courses leading to technical careers, and the low degree of participation of women in the development of education technology, will perpetuate a cycle of disadvantage for girls in elementary schools and secondary schools as technology is increasingly integrated into the classroom; and''.

''(E) pregnant and parenting teenagers are at high risk for dropping out of school and existing dropout prevention programs do not adequately address the needs of such teenagers;

''(4) efforts to improve the quality of public education also must include efforts to ensure equal access to quality education programs for all women and girls;

''(5) Federal support should address not only research and development of innovative model curricula and teaching and learning strategies to promote gender equity, but should also assist schools and local communities implement gender equitable practices;

''(6) Federal assistance for gender equity must be tied to systemic reform, involve collaborative efforts to implement effective gender practices at the local level, and encourage parental participation; and

''(7) excellence in education, high educational achievements and standards, and the full participation of women and girls in American society, cannot be achieved without educational equity for women and girls.

''SEC. 5302. STATEMENT OF PURPOSES.

''It is the purpose of this part—

''(1) to promote gender equity in education in the United States;

''(2) to provide financial assistance to enable educational agencies and institutions to meet the requirements of title IX of the Educational Amendments of 1972; and

''(3) to promote equity in education for women and girls who suffer from multiple forms of discrimination based on sex, race, ethnic origin, limited-English proficiency, disability, or age.

''SEC. 5303. PROGRAMS AUTHORIZED.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized—

''(1) to promote, coordinate, and evaluate gender equity policies, programs, activities and initiatives in all Federal education programs and offices;

''(2) to develop, maintain, and disseminate materials, resources, analyses, and research relating to education equity for women and girls;

''(3) to provide information and technical assistance to assure the effective implementation of gender equity programs;

''(4) to coordinate gender equity programs and activities with other Federal agencies with jurisdiction over education and related programs;

''(5) to assist the Assistant Secretary of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement in identifying research priorities related to education equity for women and girls; and

''(6) to perform any other activities consistent with achieving the purposes of this part.

''(b) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized to make grants to, and enter into contracts and cooperative agreements with, public agencies, private nonprofit agencies, organizations, institutions, student groups, community groups, and individuals, for a period not to exceed four years, to—

(A) provide grants to develop model equity programs;

''(B) provide funds for the implementation of equity programs in schools throughout the Nation; and

''(C) provide grants to local educational agencies in communities with an historic tie to a major leader in the women's sufferage movement to educate its students about the significance of the community's significant former resident.

''(2) SUPPORT AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—To achieve the purposes of this part, the Secretary is authorized to provide support and technical assistance—

''(A) to implement effective gender-equity policies and programs at all educational levels, including—

''(i) assisting educational agencies and institutions to implement policies and practices to comply with title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972;

''(ii) training for teachers, counselors, administrators, and other school personnel, especially preschool and elementary school personnel, in gender equitable teaching and learning practices;

''(iii) leadership training for women and girls to develop professional and marketable skills to compete in the global marketplace, improve self-esteem, and benefit from exposure to positive role models;

''(iv) school-to-work transition programs, guidance and counseling activities, and other programs to increase opportunities for women and girls to enter a technologically demanding workplace and, in particular, to enter highly skilled, high paying careers in which women and girls have been underrepresented;

''(v) enhancing educational and career opportunities for those women and girls who suffer multiple forms of discrimination, based on sex and on race, ethnic origin, limited-English proficiency, disability, socioeconomic status, or age;

''(vi) assisting pregnant students and students rearing children to remain in or to return to secondary school, graduate, and prepare their preschool children to start school;

''(vii) evaluating exemplary model programs to assess the ability of such programs to advance educational equity for women and girls;

''(viii) introduction into the classroom of textbooks, curricula, and other materials designed to achieve equity for women and girls;

''(ix) programs and policies to address sexual harassment and violence against women and girls and to ensure that educational institutions are free from threats to the safety of students and personnel;

''(x) nondiscriminatory tests of aptitude and achievement and of alternative assessments that eliminate biased assessment instruments from use;

''(xi) programs to increase educational opportunities, including higher education, vocational training, and other educational programs for low-income women, including underemployed and unemployed women, and women receiving assistance under a State program funded under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act;

''(xii) programs to improve representation of women in educational administration at all levels; and

''(xiii) planning, development and initial implementation of—

''(I) comprehensive institution- or districtwide evaluation to assess the presence or absence of gender equity in educational settings;

''(II) comprehensive plans for implementation of equity programs in State and local

educational agencies and institutions of higher education; including community colleges; and

''(III) innovative approaches to school-community partnerships for educational equity;

''(B) for research and development, which shall be coordinated with each of the research institutes of the Office of Educational Research and Improvement to avoid duplication of research efforts, designed to advance gender equity nationwide and to help make policies and practices in educational agencies and institutions, and local communities, gender equitable, including—

''(i) research and development of innovative strategies and model training programs for teachers and other education personnel;

''(ii) the development of high quality and challenging assessment instruments that are nondiscriminatory;

''(iii) the development and evaluation of model curricula, textbooks, software, and other educational materials to ensure the absence of gender stereotyping and bias;

''(iv) the development of instruments and procedures that employ new and innovative strategies to assess whether diverse educational settings are gender equitable;

''(v) the development of instruments and strategies for evaluation, dissemination, and replication of promising or exemplary programs designed to assist local educational agencies in integrating gender equity in their educational policies and practices;

''(vi) updating high quality educational materials previously developed through awards made under this part;

''(vii) the development of policies and programs to address and prevent sexual harassment and violence to ensure that educational institutions are free from threats to safety of students and personnel;

''(viii) the development and improvement of programs and activities to increase opportunity for women, including continuing educational activities, vocational education, and programs for low-income women, including underemployed and unemployed women, and women receiving assistance under the State program funded under part A of title IV of the Social Security Act; and

''(ix) the development of guidance and counseling activities, including career education programs, designed to ensure gender equity.

''SEC. 5204. APPLICATIONS.

''An application under this part shall—

''(1) set forth policies and procedures that will ensure a comprehensive evaluation of the activities assisted under this part, including an evaluation of the practices, policies, and materials used by the applicant and an evaluation or estimate of the continued significance of the work of the project following completion of the award period;

''(2) where appropriate, demonstrate how funds received under this part will be used to promote the attainment of one or more of the National Education Goals;

''(3) demonstrate how the applicant will address perceptions of gender roles based on cultural differences or stereotypes;

''(4) where appropriate, describe how funds under this part will be used in a manner that is consistent with programs under the School-to-Work Opportunities Act of 1994;

''(5) for applications for assistance under section 5303(b)(1), demonstrate how the applicant will foster partnerships and, where applicable, share resources with State educational agencies, local educational agencies, institutions of higher education, community-based organizations (including organizations serving women), parent, teacher, and student groups, businesses or other recipients of Federal educational funding which may include State literacy resource centers;

''(6) for applications for assistance under section 5303(b)(1), demonstrate how parental involvement in the project will be encouraged; and

''(7) for applications for assistance under section 5303(b)(1), describe plans for continuation of the activities assisted under this part with local support following completion of the grant period and termination of Federal support under this part.

''SEC. 5305. CRITERIA AND PRIORITIES.

''(a) CRITERIA AND PRIORITIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall establish separate criteria and priorities for awards under paragraphs (1) and (2) of section 5303(b) to ensure that funds under this part are used for programs that most effectively will achieve the purposes of this part.

''(2) CRITERIA.—The criteria described in subsection (a) may include the extent to which the activities assisted under this part—

''(A) address the needs of women and girls of color and women and girls with disabilities;

''(B) meet locally defined and documented educational equity needs and priorities, including compliance with title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972;

''(C) are a significant component of a comprehensive plan for educational equity and compliance with title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 in the particular school district, institution of higher education, vocational-technical institution, or other educational agency or institution; and

''(D) implement an institutional change strategy with long-term impact that will continue as a central activity of the applicant after the grant under this part has terminated.

''(b) PRIORITIES.—In approving applications under this part, the Secretary may give special consideration to applications—

''(1) submitted by applicants that have not received assistance under this part or under part C of title IX of this Act (as such part was in effect on October 1, 1988);

''(2) for projects that will contribute significantly to directly improving teaching and learning practices in the local community; and

''(3) for projects that will—

''(A) provide for a comprehensive approach to enhancing gender equity in educational institutions and agencies;

''(B) draw on a variety of resources, including the resources of local educational agencies, community-based organizations, institutions of higher education, and private organizations;

''(C) implement a strategy with long-term impact that will continue as a central activity of the applicant after the grant under this part has terminated;

''(D) address issues of national significance that can be duplicated; and

''(E) address the educational needs of women and girls who suffer multiple or compound discrimination based on sex and on race, ethnic origin, disability, or age.

''(c) SPECIAL RULE.—To the extent feasible, the Secretary shall ensure that grants awarded under this part for each fiscal year address—

''(1) all levels of education, including preschool, elementary and secondary education, higher education, vocational education, and adult education;

''(2) all regions of the United States; and

''(3) urban, rural, and suburban educational institutions.

''(d) COORDINATION.—Research activities supported under this part—

''(1) shall be carried out in consultation with the Office of Educational Research and Improvement to ensure that such activities are coordinated with and enhance the research and development activities supported by the Office; and

''(2) may include collaborative research activities which are jointly funded and carried out with the Office of Educational Research and Improvement.

''(e) LIMITATION.—Nothing in this part shall be construed as prohibiting men and boys from participating in any programs or activities assisted with funds under this part.

''SEC. 5306. REPORT.

''The Secretary, not later than January 1, 2004, shall submit to the President and Congress a report on the status of educational equity for girls and women in the Nation.

''SEC. 5307. ADMINISTRATION.

''(a) EVALUATION; DISSEMINATION; REPORT.—The Secretary—

''(1) shall evaluate, in accordance with section 14701, materials and programs developed under this part;

''(2) shall disseminate materials and programs developed under this part; and

''(3) shall report to Congress regarding such evaluation, materials, and programs not later than January 1, 2003.

''(b) PROGRAM OPERATIONS.—The Secretary shall ensure that the activities assisted under this part are administered within the Department by a person who has recognized professional qualifications and experience in the field of gender equity education.

''SEC. 5308. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

''For the purpose of carrying out this part, there are authorized to be appropriated $5,000,000 for fiscal year 2000 and such sums as may be necessary for each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years, of which not less than ⅔ of the amount appropriated under this section for each fiscal year shall be available to carry out the activities described in section 5303(b)(1).''.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 145 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, OCTOBER 18, 1999 No. 141

Senate

The Senate met at 12 noon and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Lloyd John Ogilvie, offered the following prayer:

Dear Father, You created us with a family likeness, with a potential of emulating Your character. This week we celebrate ''Character Counts Week.'' Thank You for the world leadership of this Senate in establishing this week in October to emphasize the six pillars of character so needed today: Trustworthiness, respect, responsibility, fairness, caring, and citizenship. Today we affirm how crucial are the character traits of trustworthiness, respect, and responsibility. We have learned from You what it means to be trustworthy. You are faithful, consistent, totally reliable, and absolutely true to Your promises.

God, we long to be people who are known for our integrity; that wonderful consistency between what we believe and what we do; that congruity of what we say and how we follow through. We also desire to be people who communicate respect and take responsibility for the natural world, for our Nation, and for the sacredness of the people around us. Each of us views Your particularized affirmation of our uniqueness. Help us to communicate that same respect for others. May this Senate be a shining example to America as men and women who are unreservedly trustworthy, respectful, and responsible in their leadership. Through them and all of us, strengthen the moral fiber of our Nation. In Your trustworthy name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable PAT ROBERTS, a Senator from the State of Kansas, led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Kansas is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. President, today the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 1 p.m. Following morning business, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 1593, the campaign finance reform bill. As a reminder to Members, two cloture motions were filed on the second pending amendment on Friday. Therefore, pursuant to rule XXII, those votes will occur on Tuesday, 1 hour after the Senate convenes, unless a consent agreement is reached to set those votes for a time certain. The majority leader has announced that the first vote today will occur at 5:30 p.m. It is hoped that the 5:30 vote, or votes, will be in relation to the amendments to the pending legislation. However, if votes regarding the campaign finance reform bill are not possible, the Senate will vote on any legislative or executive items available for action.

I thank my colleagues for their attention.

Mr. President, I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be a period of morning business until the hour of 1 p.m. with the first 30 minutes under the control of the minority leader. After that time has expired, the last 30 minutes will be under the control of the majority leader or his designee.

The distinguished Senator from Wyoming is recognized.

Mr. THOMAS. Thank you very much.

COMPLETING THE WORK OF THE SENATE

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I wanted to come to the floor this morning and talk a little bit about where we are in the Senate, at least in my view, and where we are going. We are, of course, nearing the end of this session. Nobody knows precisely or exactly when we will be out of here, but it won't be long. We have to take a strong look, in my view, at what we have to do, and the things that are necessary to do. There are, of course, certain things that are required.

At this time of year, Congress maybe hasn't finished its annual ritual, but the fact is we have done a great deal. I am pleased with that. But we must, of course, finish the appropriations. The continuing resolution expires this week, but hopefully we will have the appropriations to the President. We will see what happens from there.

In addition to that, of course, I am very hopeful that at least one other issue will be undertaken, and that is to do something about the balanced budget amendment and the Medicare restrictions that are in place.

You might recall that Congress asked for some reduction in the cost of Medicare over a period of time to ensure a firming up in the fact that these dollars are being used as they should be. Unfortunately, the administration has reduced that spending almost twice what was anticipated and, therefore, I

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

think it will be necessary for us to go back and do some things for all of Medicare and particularly, I might say, for rural areas and small hospitals in areas such as in Wyoming.

I think we have allowed ourselves to become a little bit off track. We have gotten involved in lengthy discussions of issues that are probably not particularly timely nor, indeed, perhaps even particularly appropriate, issues that did not need to be or were not ready to be discussed and debated this year and could well have been put off until another year. But, nevertheless, they have been discussed, and we are, in fact, still involved in some of those—the nuclear test ban treaty of course, being one of them. Now we are on campaign finance.

There have been extended debates brought about by the insistence of Members on the floor. We have also had a number of filibusters and threatened filibusters from the other side of the aisle in order to control what was occurring on the floor.

I haven't been here as long as have many Members of the Senate, but I can tell you I don't think that in the time I have been here I have seen such a contentious and combative situation. It is the most controversial session I believe—perhaps the most uncooperative—in terms of coming to terms with the things we need to do.

Our friends on the other side of the aisle, the Democrats, of course, have brought issues to the floor, and we have had a number of filibusters and threatened filibusters. I guess the most interesting was the latest nuclear test ban treaty debate in which there was an insistence that we come on the floor with it, and then there was a cry of foul when it came up. That was a somewhat interesting and difficult issue.

We have had Members forcing issues to the floor that have had little or no support, but yet under the rules of the Senate they are entitled to be discussed and discussed for a length of time. In fact, we have had the feeling we are becoming too oriented toward accomplishing things. But, again, that is one point of view.

It seems to me we find the President now in the most political posture that I recall a President being in, criticizing the Senate for doing the things that we have a constitutional responsibility to do—treaties. We have the advise and consent responsibility on all treaties. That is in the Constitution. The same is true regarding nominees. That is our responsibility. I believe we have the right to do the things that we believe are right without being criticized.

At every opportunity, the President is calling everything a political vote. I find that paradoxical. There were allegations of racial voting on nominees for the Judiciary. I for one—and I know many others—did not even know the race of the person being voted upon.

The White House, trying to use many of these votes to breathe some life into a lame-duck President, makes it very difficult. We still have a responsibility. We have things to do. We have things to complete. We find ourselves in a confrontation, with the President threatening to disapprove appropriations. He has that right, as well. However, we ought to come together. We ought to talk about it. We ought to decide what we are going to do. We know we will fund the Government. We know we will go forward. I don't think anyone genuinely wants to shut down the Government. However, we are faced with that possibility. It worked out so well politically for the President a couple of years ago; he shut down the Government and we got the blame. I hope we don't use that technique again.

It is a fairly simple thing. It is very difficult, but we have a commitment to have a certain amount of spending—about $592 billion worth of spending—outside the mandatory appropriations. We have to make agreements to stay within that commitment. We are dedicated to the idea of not spending more than that because we have to go into Social Security. As difficult as it may be, that is the goal. That is the bottom line. We simply have to make the adjustments that are necessary to do that. I think that is reasonable and certainly not impossible.

Aside from that, it seems to me we have had a good year. We started this year as the majority party saying we were committed to ensuring a sound Social Security retirement system. We said we were here to help improve educational opportunities for our children, to expand economic opportunities for all Americans, to provide a strengthening of our national security to protect our freedoms. Those were the four things we set about to do. I believe the leadership and the Members have called for that.

Despite all the talk and concern about education in the appropriations, the Republican proposal has $537 million more than the President requested. We have passed a bill that increases flexibility and opportunity for the States, the local school boards, and the parents to make the necessary decisions in their school districts. The school districts in Basin, WY, have different needs than in Philadelphia, PA. To the extent the Federal Government has a role—which represents, by the way, about 7 percent of total educational spending; not a huge amount—that money should be able to be spent the way the people wish to spend it. They, after all, are responsible for the education of their children.

In our tax bill, which the President vetoed, there were several educational propositions, educational savings accounts, and student loan programs available, as well. Of course, the President vetoed those bills. We have done a great deal in education. I think it is something of which we should be proud.

Everyone talks about Social Security. It is one of our most important issues. Everyone who has worked for a wage or worked in their own business has paid into Social Security. Our commitment is to have Social Security available not only for those who are now beneficiaries but, indeed, for those young people who have just begun to work. There has been a great deal of discussion. The President talked about saving Social Security, but, frankly, has put nothing forward.

We have done a couple of things. One is to have a Social Security lockbox to ensure we will not spend the Social Security money, and that will be a test of this budget. The other is to propose that we have the kind of Social Security program so at least a portion of those funds can be put into an individual account that belongs to the person who has been putting in the money. It can be invested directly in equities in the private sector to increase the return. I am pleased with that.

We have increased military spending by about $17 billion. It has gone down over the last several years despite the fact that the world is not safe.

Tax relief: We spent a great deal of time working on opportunities for all Americans to save some of the money they pay to taxes through marriage penalties, through estate tax reduction, capital gains reduction, and general reductions in rates. The President vetoed that because he wants to spend more money.

In health care, we have a Patients' Bill of Rights that I think is excellent. We also have committed ourselves to do something on the balanced budget.

These are the things on which we have made a great deal of progress. In addition, we recently had the test ban on nuclear testing. In a press conference last week, the President tried to deflect criticism about the lack of leadership he provided and the fact that not even a majority of this Senate supported it on a final vote by blaming it all on partisan politics, accusing the Republicans of making the world a more dangerous place.

Acting against the national interest? Nonsense. Let me give some canards. Neither the United States nor the Senate have changed their views on nuclear testing. I am chairman of the Subcommittee on Asia and Japan. We are not going to start testing; we have not changed our position. We have no plan to test. Our policies in that regard are exactly the same as they were before the vote. All we were saying in the vote was, this is not the treaty at this time, with these shortcomings.

The President tried to blame the Republicans for being in a partisan mode. The President should look at his own party. Democrats demanded we have a vote on this treaty or they would filibuster all action on the Senate floor. On September 18, the Senator from North Dakota said:

> I intend to plant myself on the floor like a potted plant and object. I intend to object to other routine business of the Senate until the majority leader brings this treaty to the floor for debate and vote. I don't run this

place, but those who do should know this is going to be a rough place to run if you do not decide to bring this issue to a vote.

We brought it to a vote and apparently they got exactly what they demanded—a debate and vote. Before the President blames the Republicans, he ought to take a look at the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The vote was not a vote against national security. In an attempt to frighten people, the President accused those who opposed it of threatening the national security, that no thinking person could possibly oppose it.

Let me list for the Senate some of the people whom the President dismissed: Henry Kissinger, six former Secretaries of Defense, four former CIA Chiefs, former Federal weapons lab Directors, two former Chiefs of Staff, the President's own head of Strategic Command at the time the treaty was negotiated, three former National Security Advisers. It goes on and on.

This idea of isolationism is ridiculous. The idea of maintaining the U.S. military strength is not. That, in the view of many, gives the best opportunity for security.

Now we are involved, of course, in this question of campaign finance. It is a legitimate issue, a good issue. We have been into it before. We passed bills in the 1970s. We passed bills in the 1980s. It has not changed an awful lot. Some people suggest it has been blown completely out of hand. I suggest it is probably not true. The expenditures in the average congressional district have gone up about 3.6 percent a year since 1986. That is hardly runaway. It amounts to about $1 per voter in most congressional districts.

But I believe—and, for myself, I think there is some consensus in the Senate—it is an important issue. I have said, and I continue to say, I support some changes. I would like to see more disclosure. It seems to me that is the most important thing. If there is going to be money—and, indeed, there has to be money—if people are to understand the issues and have a chance to speak out, to have the freedom of speech, to have the opportunity to participate, it has to be open. But I think there should be disclosure. There should be disclosure right up until the end of the election, and we can do that. We should enforce the laws already on the books, as is the case with many other matters of enforcement. I think we have to protect the constitutional rights of individuals to participate.

I would support some limit on soft money. I do not know how, constitutionally, that would be accepted by the Supreme Court. Nevertheless, I would set some limit and support that. But I would not support doing away with it. I would not support eliminating it. I would not support the bill as it is proposed now.

We can contribute to the integrity of the process and help return more confidence to it. I have thought about this a lot. People who support Members, or people who are running, do so because of what they believe. They do not change their beliefs because they received some support. As you look around for whom you are going to support in the election, you support the person whose beliefs are similar to yours. I support things in my State—I suppose some people call them special interests—because they are important to my State. Those are the industries at which most people in my State work. Those are the kinds of industries that we need to have a vibrant economy. Of course I support those, not because of some contribution.

In summary, I wish we were in a little different situation in our relationship on both sides of this aisle and in our relationship with the White House, so we could really look at some issues, come out with what seems best to us as a group, and move forward.

On the other hand, I am very pleased with many of the things we have done. I can tell you, most people in my State, when we talk about doing all these things, have a limit in their minds as to what the Congress ought to be doing, what is the role of the Federal Government. It is not up to the Congress to solve every problem. On the contrary, we are better off to push more and more of that government closer to the people, where they can make the decisions, not the one-size-fits-all kind of thing some people here would like to have.

We are ready to move on and finish up. I look forward to it. I hope we can conclude our work and do the best things for the country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SESSIONS). The distinguished Senator from Iowa is recognized.

EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we continue morning business until the hour of 1:05. I think it ends at 1 o'clock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

PARENTS' INFLUENCE IN YOUTHFUL DRUG USE

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I greet my colleagues with the often bad news of drug use by young people, and particularly with reference to the very important role of parents in preventing youth drug use. As I do occasionally, in my capacity as chairman of the International Narcotics Control Caucus of the Senate, I come to the floor to report on national surveys that go on in this area, surveys that have been going on for a couple of decades, so we are able to compare the incidence of increasing drug experimentation by young people as well as following trends we had in the last decade in declines in drug use by young people.

I seek the floor today to visit with my colleagues on this very same subject, as I have many times in the past since I have been chairman of this group of our colleagues who spend a great deal of time on drug problems generally and, of course, a lot of time on the issue of drug use by young people.

So, again, as happens at the beginning of every school year, there are these national surveys that are made public. Within the last month or so, several of these have been made public. That is what I want to discuss with my colleagues. There have been three national surveys released that tell the story of drug use in the United States, particularly among teenagers.

On September 8 of this year, the National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse—that is called CASA, for short. Let me say it again: It is a National Center on Addiction and Substance Abuse. That organization released its annual back-to-school survey on the attitudes of teens and parents regarding substance abuse. The survey stressed how essential it is for parents to get involved in their children's lives. The survey indicates that kids actually do listen to their parents. In fact, 42 percent of the teenagers who have never used marijuana credit their parents with that decision. Unfortunately, too many parents—45 percent—believe that teenagers' use of drugs is inevitable. In addition, 25 percent of the parents said they have little influence over their teen's substance abuse.

I suggest to that 25 percent that they ought to consider that 42 percent of the young people in America have already responded to this survey, saying they do not use marijuana because their parents have influenced them not to. And for the 25 percent of the parents who do not think they can have any influence over their teen's substance abuse, they would probably have considerable and beneficial influence.

CASA stresses how important parental involvement is. A child with a positive relationship with both parents is less likely to get involved with drugs. The survey also suggests that family-oriented activities such as eating dinners together and attending religious services together can reduce the risk of substance abuse.

The second week in September also marked the release of the annual Parents Resource Institute for Drug Education survey. That acronym is PRIDE, P-R-I-D-E. PRIDE's survey on teenage drug use. The survey also indicated the importance of parents' influence in shaping the attitude of teens regarding the harmful effects of drugs, just like the CASA survey.

Unfortunately, this past year the overall attitude among youth towards the harmful effects of drugs remains mostly unchanged. In fact, some attitudes worsened. Sadly, about 27 percent used an illegal drug at least once in the last year, and about 16 percent used drugs monthly or more often.

Moreover, the number of students who regarded cocaine and heroin as harmful has decreased from the previous year. We know that, as perception of risk of use goes down, actual use of cocaine and heroin goes up. The monthly use of cocaine by high school students rose from 3.1 percent to 3.2 percent, hallucinogens went up from 3.9 percent to 4.2 percent, and liquor—and we don't often think enough of a legal product, liquor, being used illegally by young people as being a problem—but it went up from 26.9 percent to 28.1 percent. Worse yet, beer tends to be a gateway for uses of these other drugs that eventually leads, by some young people, to worse drugs. Unfortunately, in this PRIDE survey, the number of students who said drugs cause no harm increased over the previous year.

So that message out there that is strong and hard and definitive and constant that drug use is bad, does work but not if it isn't consistently heard and reinforced.

The PRIDE survey reiterates that parents have the power to change these attitudes. Those young people who say their parents talk with them a lot about drugs show a 37 percent lower drug use than those students who say their parents never talk to them about drugs. Despite this statistic, less than 31 percent of the students say their parents talk with them often or a lot about the problems of drugs.

So we have one-third of the parents shirking their responsibility; and in shirking their responsibility, they are losing an opportunity to make a difference in whether or not their young people will experiment with drugs. Because we have that other survey that shows 42 percent of the young people in America do not use drugs because they have been influenced by their parents not to use drugs.

The last survey I want to refer to is a National Household Survey on drug abuse. It was released 2 months ago. It gives a very clear picture that we still have much work ahead of us when it comes to educating our kids about drugs.

The survey stated that almost 10 percent of our young people, ages 12 to 17, reported current use of illicit drugs. An estimated 8 percent of youths in the same age category reported current use of marijuana fairly regularly.

Unfortunately, this was not a significant change from last year. According to the survey, young people reported great risk of using cigarettes, marijuana, cocaine, and alcohol; and that percentage was unchanged from the previous year.

The disturbing fact is 56 percent of the kids, ages 12 to 17, reported that marijuana was very easy to get. And 14 percent of these young people reported being approached by someone selling drugs within 30 days of their interview for the survey.

Although these statistics seem daunting, we have made some progress in keeping drugs out of children's hands. The National Household Survey—the last one I referred to—stated that the number of youths using inhalants has decreased significantly from 2 percent in 1997 to 1 percent last year.

The PRIDE survey reported that monthly use of any illegal and illicit drugs fell from 17 percent last year to 16 percent this year. Even more important is the fact that 60 percent of the students say they do not expect to use drugs in the future. And this is a 9-percent increase from the 51 percent last year.

There may be some hope shown in those statistics, then, that finally a message about ''just don't do it,'' ''drugs are bad,'' may be making some progress.

But we all know the war on drugs is tough and it is not one that will be won easily, but it is not one from which we in public life or within our families can walk away. Although these numbers and statistics remain exceedingly high, our efforts can make a difference and are not futile. I believe creating a drug-free environment for our youth is an accessible goal that we must work to reach.

Surveys such as these play an important role in measuring our progress and determining the work that lies ahead of us. It is clear that the public is aware of the problem and expects Congress and the administration to do their part in finding ways to make counterdrug programs work.

In a national poll on national drug policy, produced last month by the Mellman Group, the public supports effective drug control programs. As you can see from chart No. 1—if you would look at chart No. 1—the public particularly supports strong interdiction programs and consistent interdiction efforts. The survey shows 92 percent of the people questioned view illegal drugs as a serious problem in this country.

I will now refer to chart No. 2. The majority of individuals think drug use in this country is increasing. Few see it declining, in other words. So it seems obvious to me—and I hope to all of you—that the American people are aware of the problem and are eager for a more assertive national drug policy from Congress and from the administration.

When Americans are more concerned about the availability of drugs than they are about crime, we clearly need to take action. We cannot afford to let drugs devastate our country any further; we cannot afford to let drugs devastate any more young people. We have to be proactive in our efforts if we want to change these disturbing numbers that have come out in the CASA survey, the National Household Survey, and the PRIDE survey.

We do not need a miracle for our young people. We need a strong family life and positive role models to guide our youth in the right direction.

Education of the dangers of drugs starts at home. But it needs to be carried over into all of society. Parents need help in sustaining a clear and consistent ''no use'' message.

In closing, I refer to an effort I am making in my State called Face It Together, an organization that tries to bring together all elements of our society.

There are two elements of our society—at least in my State—that I do not think have done enough to be supportive of families because the front line in the war against drugs is the home. We cannot, in the home, push it off on the school, off onto law enforcement, off onto substance abuse professions. That front line is the home.

But two institutions of society, in my State, I think, can do a better job. Maybe it is true of the other 49 States as well. Although it is more encompassing than just involving industry and business on the one hand, and the churches on the other hand in supporting families, that is where I want to concentrate my effort. Because most businesses and industries in my State have substance abuse programs, as a matter of necessity, for the health and well-being of their workers and to maintain the productivity of their workforce, we want those businesses that have a drug education and drug awareness program in the workplace to get their workers—men and women alike—to carry that message home and use it in the families, in the home, to support the effort which ought to be in that family already, of telling their children of the dangers of drugs.

The other place where I do not think we have used enough of our resources is in the churches of our State, for messages from the pulpit, and to use the institution of the church to disseminate educational information to, again, be supportive of the family—mom and dad—to keep that message strong back home. This is something we all need to work on.

I yield the floor.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, may I inquire as to how our time is being controlled? Do we have time limits?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We are to return to the pending business, with no time limitations.

Mr. ALLARD. I thank the Chair.

BIPARTISAN CAMPAIGN REFORM ACT OF 1999—Resumed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now return to consideration of S. 1593, which the clerk will report.

The legislative assistant read as follows:

A bill (S. 1593) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide bipartisan campaign reform.

Pending:

Daschle amendment No. 2298, in the nature of a substitute.

Reid amendment No. 2299 (to amendment No. 2298), of a perfecting nature.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, before making my comments on the campaign finance reform measure before us, I thank the Senator from Kentucky for his splendid work on this issue. This has been an issue on which he has spent a good deal of time. An issue this complicated is very demanding. As so frequently is the custom of the Senator from Kentucky, he has put his heart and soul into this issue. Many of us appreciate his dedicated effort in trying to deal with this issue in a very responsive manner. It is characteristic of the Senator from Kentucky to do this kind of work for the Senate. We all appreciate and respect him for it.

The Denver Rocky Mountain News ran an editorial on September 21st in response to the passage of the Shays/Meehan bill, expressing the paper's belief that soft money campaign contributions are a form of political expression and, as such, are protected by the First Amendment.

I don't bring this up now as a part of the Senate debate on campaign finance reform just because The News is a local paper. I am bringing this editorial up now because it is from a local paper with an exceedingly sound view.

In the editorial they use an example of an average citizen who might decide to distribute leaflets against a city pot hole problem. If this hypothetical citizen is stopped from doing so by a city council, it would be a clear-cut violation of freedom of speech.

The editorial then goes on, correctly, to explain that the difference between this simple form of election activity control and the kinds contained in the two main campaign finance measures considered on the Hill this year—Shays/Meehan and McCain/Feingold—is merely a difference of degrees, not type.

Donors who want to give to the Republican National Committee or the Democrat National Committee are expressing their political views.

I ask unanimous consent that the Rocky Mountain News editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Denver Rocky Mountain News, Tues., Sept. 21, 1999]

FREE SPEECH VS. 'REFORM'

Suppose that you were upset about potholes in a neighborhood street. Imagine that you started cranking out leaflets to win the support of fellow residents and maybe even to get them to consider the issue in the next city council election. And now suppose that the city government told you to cut it out on the ground that the amount of money you were spending on those leaflets was corrupting politicians. You just might suspect someone was messing with your freedom of speech, right?

Your assessment would be correct. And it would be equally correct to believe that a campaign finance bill passed recently in the House of Representatives would abridge the First Amendment guarantees of untethered political expression. The bill is aimed principally at money that's given to political parties for reasons other than directly influencing a candidate's election or defeat at the polls. The legislation would ban those kinds of unregulated contributions, and the cheers have been deafening.

But why is it that applauding throngs are so eager to quell free speech? Can't they see that it's as much an abuse of power to stop a rich donor from piling money at the door of the Republicans or the Democrats as it would be to limit the distribution of leaflets by a neighborhood activist? The Senate sponsors of a similar bill reportedly plan to drop one particularly obnoxious provision of the House legislation—regulating the content of issue advertisements that comment on candidates—but the proposed law remains an anti-democratic restriction of political discussion.

This so-called reform may be stopped this year by filibuster. It ought to be stopped because members of Congress recognize that the best cure the current system's many ills is more complete disclosure of contributors and even more freedom for direct campaign contributions, not less liberty for all of us.

Mr. ALLARD. As the Supreme Court has ruled, political spending equals political expression. Attempting to stop this political expression, however distasteful some might find soft money, is an attempt to stifle activities protected by the Constitution. And so it is our duty as legislators to find a better—a constitutional—way.

''Don't let perfect be the enemy of good'' is an expression we hear often on this matter. It's a slogan urging baby steps: small moves toward a distant goal.

The thought is that a soft money ban is one part of a move towards an ideal campaign finance system, and is part of an incremental process of improvement.

But alone, it is not good. It's not even merely average. Banning soft money will only give us different and arguably worse evils.

Let's take a look at just a few of them:

First, in some of my colleagues' minds it is a step towards taxpayer financed elections. This would be an absolute monstrosity with the bureaucracy calling the shots on campaigns. Our democratic process is voluntary and fiercely competitive.

Mandating completely taxpayer financed campaigns would force citizens to support candidates they disagree with, it would place bureaucrats in the position of legitimizing political candidates, and it unjustly allows candidates influence beyond their natural appeal to voters.

Let me explain also that I feel that a soft money ban is biased.

It might just be coincidental that the Republican caucus is leading the opposition to this bill instead of the Democrat caucus, but it might also have something to do with the fact that a ban on party soft money will ultimately benefit Democrat candidates over Republican ones.

If political parties are curbed, the Democrats already have a cohesive constituency ready and able to step up and assume party functions. Organized labor is just that—coordinated people ready to work. They are also ready to spend.

Senators SNOWE and JEFFORDS were kind enough to provide us all with a copy of the October 12th Washington Post article covering the announcement by the AFL–CIO that they were going to spend $46 million on the upcoming elections.

I don't begrudge the Democrat National Committee this labor and funding base, but it is unbalanced and blatantly partisan to attempt to shield this type of spending while attacking its counterbalancing force, the areas where the RNC instead has the advantage.

The natural constituencies of each party tend to balance each other out, but they do so in different ways.

If you will excuse this minor diatribe, I want to digress here for a moment and lament what seems so obvious to everyone and that is organized labor is not a Republican constituency.

I support the American worker. My party supports the American worker. We are the party of the individual worker, not a worker controlled by government.

In a more perfect world—of course, meaning a world that runs more according to my beliefs—the Republican agenda would be passed and would aid American workers tremendously.

The tax refund bill pushed by the Republican majority would have passed and returned money to taxpayers, also known as American workers.

The legislation I offered last year to pay down the debt would have benefitted all American workers in myriad ways.

The Social Security lock box would have passed and guaranteed this benefit for American workers.

I am therefore a little perturbed that the leaders of organized labor are so adamant against goals which I feel will greatly benefit the workers of America.

The nature or our political differences has resulted in the current situation where there is no other single entity willing to be so dedicated to a single party.

The Republican Party counters this absence by seeking contributions from diverse sources. Once these individuals give to the candidates they support, because they have not been coerced into giving and are without the option of labor unions to further spread their general message, they give to the Republican National Committee. To try and ''un-level'' the whole playing field by denying one side an outlet for political expression and clout, even if the objection is based an abhorrence of fund raising, is flagrant factionalism.

It is also, as I have said, unconstitutional.

The Supreme Court, in the case we are hearing about a lot this week, Buckley v. Valeo, said just that.

The Supreme Court struck down spending levels, because, and I quote, ''So long as persons and groups eschew expenditures that in express term advocate the election or defeat of clearly identified candidate, they are free to spend as much as they want to promote the candidate and his views.''

They allowed campaign donation limits, not because they did not interfere with First Amendment rights, but because the interference they impose can be grudgingly tolerated in light of the overriding interest in ensuring clean and fair elections.

To further limit soft money donations, or to attempt a different way to cut campaign spending, both of which a ban on party soft money would do, there must first be shown the corresponding overwhelming corruption it brings.

I feel compelled to respond to earlier discussion on this floor by pointing out that the mere lack of authorization for appropriations, while certainly unfortunate and unsound practice, is not by itself proof positive of corruption. We have not authorized the State Department in years. It is hardly pork barrel spending to fund the Drug Enforcement Agency, another unauthorized agency.

Just because large amounts of money flow around elections does not mean that the elections automatically become corrupt.

The Supreme Court has said that large gifts directly to a candidate could be corrupting. That is why the hard money limits are in place. I agree with these.

If a candidate were to receive a huge—say, in the millions—donation from one donor and could run an entire campaign from it, it would be awfully hard to tell it apart from what is commonly called ''being bought.''

But one donor making even a huge donation to a political party is not buying the party philosophy, they are supporting it. And we cannot tell people how and what to support politically.

Many of the proponents of other campaign finance bills try to reduce the influence of ''special interests'' by suppressing their donations and thus their speech.

First, I am not even sure suppressing special interests is an admirable goal, since ''special interests'' are citizens expressing a particular viewpoint, such as the Sierra Club, Chambers of Commerce, Common Cause and countless others.

That's the point of politics: advocating your goal during the march towards a collective good. There needs to be more interests in politics, not less!

I believe the absolute best way to ensure there are no undue special interest influence is to suppress and reduce the size of government.

If the government rids itself of special interest funding and corporate subsidies, then there would be less of a perception of any attempts to buy influence through donations.

A simplified tax code, state regulation flexibility, local education control—these are less government approaches to problems that would also lower the desperate need for access.

Meddlesome outside influences—another horror of campaigning—are a function of the hard money limits, not soft money availability.

Candidates lose control of their message when they lose the right to accept money people want to spend and will end up spending on their behalf.

The simple fact that large sums of money are spent on elections does not mean those elections are corrupt.

In my campaign for Senate, I was outspent by three-quarters of a million dollars. That money obviously did not buy the election. That money did not corrupt the election.

Supporters say that the election system is drowning in soft money.

They say that soft money has consumed the entire political process.

Let me say this. Or, rather, allow me to share what the Supreme Court has to say:

> The First Amendment denies government the power to determine that spending to promote one's political views is wasteful, excessive, or unwise. In the free society ordained by our Constitution it is not the government but the people—individually as citizens and candidates and collectively as associations and political committees—who must retain control over the quantity and range of debate on public issues in a political campaign.

The Supreme Court has been very clear in its rulings concerning campaign finance and the First Amendment.

Since the post-Watergate changes to the campaign finance system began, twenty-four Congressional actions have been declared unconstitutional, with nine rejections based on the First Amendment.

Out of those nine, four dealt directly with campaign finance reform laws. In each case, the Supreme Court has ruled that political spending—even if obviously excessive—is equal to political speech.

Even today, the Supreme Court is addressing a case regarding Missouri contribution limits, showing their continued dedication to protecting the freedom of speech expressed through political support.

Besides the constitutional question, there is the simple matter of plain reality. People with money and political views will not give up their desires to express themselves.

Like water flowing downhill, politically active Americans who find themselves blocked will just find different outlets to reach their goal.

Hard money was regulated, so soft money was invented. If soft money is banned, something else will take its place.

The problem is that the regulations and laws that go further and further towards cutting money also go further and further towards unconstitutionality.

Some in Congress have stated that freedom of speech and the desire for healthy campaigns in a healthy democracy are in direct conflict, and that we can't have both.

The only effective dam, they say, would be to change the First Amendment so as to allow the abridging of political speech.

I don't support that belief. Fortunately for those of us who believe in the First Amendment rights of all American citizens, the founding fathers and the Supreme Court do not either.

They believe, and I believe, that we can have free political speech and fair campaigns.

Also, supporters of some of the campaign finance reform bills believe that if we stop the growth of campaign spending and force give-aways of public and private resources then we will be improving the campaign finance system.

The Supreme Court again disagrees and is again very clear in its intent on campaign spending. The Buckley decision says,

> . . . the mere growth in the cost of federal election campaigns in and of itself provides no basis for governmental restrictions on the quantity of campaign spending. . . .

Campaigns are about ideas and expressing those ideas, no matter how great or small the means.

The ''distribution of the humblest handbill'' to the most ''expensive modes of communication'' are both indispensable instruments of effective political speech. We should not force one sector to freely distribute our political ideas just because it is more expensive than all the other sectors.

So no matter how objectionable the cost of campaigns, the Supreme Court has stated that this is not reason enough to restrict the speech of candidates or any other groups involved in political speech.

Despite my objections to this current legislation, I think I can agree with this bill's cosponsors that improvements can be made to today's system. I have some ideas on that. To that end I have introduced S. 1671, the Campaign Finance Integrity Act of 1999.

My bill would: Require candidates to raise at least 50 percent of their contributions from individuals in the state or district in which they are running; equalize contributions from individuals and political action committees (PACs) by raising the individual limit from $1,000 to $2,500 and reducing the PAC limit from $5,000 to $2,500; index individual and PAC contribution limits for inflation; reduce the influence of a candidate's personal wealth by allowing political party committees to match dollar for dollar the personal contribution of a candidate above $5,000; require corporations and labor organizations to seek separate, voluntary authorization of the use of any dues, initiative fees or payment as a condition of employment for political activity, and requires annual full disclosure of those activities

to members and shareholders; prohibit depositing an individual contribution by a campaign unless the individual's profession and employer are reported; encourage the Federal Election Commission to allow filing of reports by computers and other emerging technologies and to make that information accessible to the public on the Internet less than 24 hours of receipt; ban the use of taxpayer financed mass mailings; enhance cuts on the use of federal property for fund raising, restrict use of White House and Air Force One for fund raising, and require non-office holders who use government vehicles for campaigns to reimburse for that usage.

This is common sense campaign finance reform. It drives the candidate back into his district or state to raise money from individual contributions.

It has some of the most open, full and timely disclosure requirements of any other campaign finance bill in either the Senate or the House of Representatives. I strongly believe that sunshine is the best disinfectant.

The right of political parties, groups and individuals to say what they want in a political campaign is preserved but the right of the public to know how much they are spending and what they are saying is also recognized. I have great faith that the public can make its own decisions about campaign discourse if it is given full and timely information.

Objecting to the popular quest of the moment is very difficult for any politician, but turning your back on the First Amendment is more difficult for me.

I want campaign finance reform but not at the expense of the First Amendment. My legislation does this.

As we deal with this issue, I will continue to listen and continue to fine-tune my belief on this matter. But I will not stray from a firm belief in the first amendment, a firm belief in fair campaign laws, and a firm belief that whatever we do here in this body must justly serve the democratic process.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I shall take just a moment before the Senator from Colorado leaves the floor to thank him. This is his third year in the Senate. As he knows and as has been discussed, we seem to have this debate every year. He has participated every single year in the debate in an extraordinarily insightful way. His speech made a whole lot of sense. I listened to every word.

I thank him for the important contribution he has made to this debate, not only this year but in the other years since he has been in the Senate. I thank the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. ALLARD. I thank my friend from Kentucky.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I note that the Senator from Idaho is on the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I come to the floor this afternoon to engage in what has become an annual debate on campaign finance reform. But I am also here to honor Senator MITCH MCCONNELL, who has chosen to be a leader on this issue for all the right reasons and, most importantly, the right principled reasons. To defend our Constitution and to defend free speech in this country is an admirable cause. I thank him for engaging in it.

Along with that kind of leadership comes the risk of errors. I see that this weekend the New York Times, in its rather typical fashion, has decided to engage in this debate by simply calling names, suggesting that the Senate is a ''bordello'' and that MITCH MCCONNELL is its ''madam.'' Shame on you, New York Times. I thought you were better than that. But then again, why should we think you are better than that on this issue, because you have chosen to take what you call high ground, which is in fact exclusive ground, that only you as journalists would have to speak out for America when no one else would have that opportunity.

That is what this debate is all about. It is why I come to the floor, not only to support MITCH MCCONNELL but to support these important principles that somehow the New York Times just flat stumbles over on its way to its version of the truth.

There is another analogy I might use. It is similar to suggesting that this form of regulation is like a new architectural design for the Navy that gave us the *Titanic*. I suspect it is not new at all. In fact, it is not reform at all. And we have been up this creek one too many times.

We are here today and we are engaged in a most serious way to debate what I think is an important issue. The Senate has held more than 100 votes on campaign finance reform during the past dozen years. Although the definition of ''reform'' has fluctuated widely over that period of time, the essence of this legislation remains the same—to restrict and stifle political speech.

The bill now before us would also federalize or nationalize vast parts of America's politics. For the average citizen listening in today, let me repeat that phrase. Do you want your Government to federalize or nationalize political free speech in this country, to shape it and control it, and to tell candidates and their supporters how to speak? Someday they might even suggest what to speak. That is really the importance of why we come to this floor today to debate this most important topic.

Under the new plan offered by Senators MCCAIN and FEINGOLD, there would be once again an across-the-board ban on soft money for any Federal election activity.

You have already heard the sponsors and the supporters of this bill talk on and on about how soft money is bad, about how President Clinton rented out the Lincoln Bedroom in exchange for huge soft money donations, or how foreign nationals paid tens of thousand of dollars during the President's 1996 election campaign. They say all soft money is bad. Or should we say that Bill Clinton misused it and so, therefore, it is bad? I believe that is the kind of connection they are using.

Sorry, Senator MCCAIN; sorry, Senator FEINGOLD. Don't put me in the same category with Bill Clinton. Put me in another category. Put me in a category that recognizes the importance of free speech and that recognizes there are appropriate ways of handling it.

As I have said in the past, and I say again, a total ban on soft money will have a significant negative effect on the lives of thousands of citizens who believe it is their American right to become engaged in the political process. In the end, you will hear no disagreement on this point from the sponsors or the supporters of the legislation.

Let me take a few moments to explain how this proposal of a ban on soft money will affect thousands of citizens involved in America's politics.

Here in Washington, the national party organizations receive money from donors. The donations can be from individuals, lobbying groups that represent their members, businesses, or unions. The political organizations receiving these donations include the Republican National Committee, the Democratic National Committee, the Republican Senatorial Committee, the Democrat Senatorial Committee, the Republican National Congressional Committee, and the Democratic National Congressional Committee.

All of these political organizations receive donations from contributors. What happens next is—and it is very important that we follow this because this is supposed to be the negative side of politics; this is supposed to be the side that corrupts. And yet, so far, it is clearly outside the Halls of the Senate. The money flows to these national political organizations.

What happens next? These political organizations distribute some of that money to their respective political parties in counties and localities all over the country. As you can imagine, there are thousands of State, county, and local political offices that receive this financial aid.

Then, under certain conditions already defined by State and Federal law, the local parties use this money for activities such as purchasing campaign buttons, bumper stickers, posters, and yard signs to express an opinion, to express an idea. The money is also used by voter registration activities on behalf of the partys' Presidential and Vice Presidential nominees. The money is also used for multicandidate brochures and even sample ballots.

Can you imagine corruption yet emerging out of this that somehow

would affect the vote or influence the vote of an individual Senator on this floor? I know Halloween is close. I know Senators MCCAIN and FEINGOLD are searching for ghosts. And maybe in this scenario there is a ghost. But, fellow Senators, it is only a ghost because here is what happens next.

Let me give you an example. Say it is an election day. You go down to your local polling site, whether it is at a school, a local church, a National Guard armory, or your American Legion hall. Sometimes there is a person there who will hand you what is called a sample ballot listing all of the candidates in your party running for office. It is a way of identifying people running for your office or running for office in your party. As most voters, you are more than likely to choose candidates of your party. However, under the McCain-Feingold proposal, it would be against the law to use soft money to pay for a sample ballot with the name of any candidate who is running for Congress on the same sample ballot with State and local candidates combined. Corruption? As I said earlier, it is close to Halloween.

Under the McCain-Feingold legislation, it would be against the law to use soft money to pay for campaign buttons, posters, yard signs, or brochures that include the name or picture of a candidate for Federal office on the same item that has the name or picture of a State or local candidate. That is called Federal control. That causes the creation of a bureaucracy to examine every election process right down to the local county central committee. Imagine the size of the new building here in Washington. Imagine the Federal agents out on the ground. Imagine it; that is what ultimately we reduce ourselves to when we begin to micromanage, as is proposed in this legislation, the kind of political process that most Americans believe and have reason to believe is a fair and honest process.

Under McCain-Feingold, it would be against the law to use soft money to conduct a local voter registration drive 120 days before the election. These get-out-the-vote drives have proven to be effective tools for increasing interest among people in the political process. Frankly, that is what we are all about, getting people interested in participating in their government. Not enough do now. With McCain-Feingold, in the end we would probably even cause that to be restricted.

In fact, in 1979 Congress supported revisions in the law pertaining to get-out-the-vote drives because they were concerned about important party-building activities and they promoted citizen participation in the election process. As we have heard on the Senate floor, the sponsors and supporters of this bill think this, and what I have just discussed, is corruption.

Let's look at the reality of what this legislation creates. I will talk about a man I know by the name of Jack Hardy, the chairman of the Republican Party in Custer County, ID. Custer County is about as big as Delaware, New Hampshire, and New Jersey together with only about 4,000 citizens living in that huge geographic area. Jack Hardy, chairman of the Republican Party in that county, works at a full time job as a carpenter. He also enjoys spending time with his family. Jack relies on financial aid from the State and national party organizations to run his Custer County Republican Party.

There are thousands of Jack Hardys all over the country. Most are volunteers. They put in long hours supporting their party and their candidates hoping to make a difference because they believe as Americans they ought to be involved in the party process to get people elected who believe in and represent the ideals that the Jack Hardys of America hold. Jack Hardy is a hard-working man who wants to make a difference.

McCain-Feingold is saying we will make it tougher, Jack. Here is how we will make it tougher. We are not going to allow you to use the kind of resources that come from the State and the Federal parties. You have to get out and hustle: forget your job. You have to get hard money from donations, local business money, and individuals to fund any activities.

Jack already does some of this. He already solicits among individuals and businesses in his community. But never is there enough on an election day or before an election day to do the right kind of work. Jack Hardy relies on his State and Federal party to help him.

People such as Jack Hardy will be forced to take more of their time off from what is a nonpaid voluntary job to help participate in American political activities. In other words, fundraising hard money will become a bigger concern for the State and local officials than ever before, and whoever raises the most money can fund more political activities. It is that simple.

Essentially, what we have done is make money the most compelling factor in campaigns instead of part of what is necessary to run a good campaign organization.

Frankly, this is silly stuff. Exactly what kind of campaign finance reform is this? What are we trying to accomplish? We just added more laws to a system that is already heavily burdened with rules and regulations, many of which can't even get enforced because the Federal Election Commission doesn't function too well. Again, it is a federal bureaucracy that has probably outserved its usefulness.

We have just added more laws to a system that is already not working. We forced thousands of State and local party officials to raise more money from their constituents, to confuse the process that we think works pretty well now.

If the point of McCain-Feingold is to reform the campaign finance system, then I think the last thing we want to do is ban soft money.

I support the amendment offered by Senator MCCAIN to require State and local officials to file immediate electronic disclosure of contributions. That is key to anything we do. Let the voters know firsthand about the money source coming into their politics. Voters are not dumb. They are talented, bright Americans who make their own judgments. And they should be based on the knowledge handed them, without having to create a monstrously large Federal bureaucracy.

I am bothered by what has been left out of McCain-Feingold. For example, there is no protection in this bill against union workers. This issue has already been debated thoroughly on the floor. I noticed just this past week the AFL–CIO has endorsed AL GORE in his candidacy for the Presidency. Of course, this will bring in millions of dollars of reported and millions of dollars of unreported money. Why? In large part, we have exempted labor unions from certain levels of campaign requirements and we do not exempt other citizens of our country. Most importantly, we have said labor bosses can take the dues of their members and use them for political purposes that maybe even those union members don't want.

The American political process ought to be a free process. We want it to be open. We want and must always have full disclosure. If union dues go to fund AL GORE's campaign, there will be a lot of union people in Idaho who will be very angry because they openly tell me they cannot support this candidate. Why? Because he put them out of work. His policy on public lands and public land resources and this administration's reaction has cost thousands of union men and women to be out of work in my State. If their dues go without their ability to say no, they have a right to be angry. Yet the provision I am talking about is not in McCain-Feingold. I am talking about a term we call ''paycheck protection.'' This is a very important part of any kind of campaign finance reform any Member wants to see.

During the 1996 elections, union leaders tacked on an extra surcharge on dues to their members in order to raise $49.2 million to defeat Republican candidates around the country. There is no reason not to say it; that was their intent. They were open about it. The union bosses have announced they plan to spend much more in the 2000 election. Yet nothing in this law says they can't do that. We shouldn't say, ''You can't do it.'' We should say there are rules about how to collect the money. The right of the citizen is to say yes or no to how his or her money is used for political purposes.

There are others waiting to speak. This will be an issue we will debate into the week. It is an important issue, but it is one I think the American citizens understand quite well.

When mom and dad come home at night and they sit at the dinner table and one spouse says to another, ''How was your day?'' my guess is they do not say, ''And, oh, what about those campaign finance laws that Senator FEINGOLD is debating in the U.S. Senate? Those are really important to us.'' I doubt they say that. In fact, I doubt even few moms and dads have ever said that. I think what they will talk about, though, is the shooting that happened down the street too close to their school; or the economy that cost a brother or a sister their job; or the taxes they paid that denied them the ability to spend more on their children or put away more for their children's education. Yes, and they probably even, in a rather disgusted way, talk about some of the examples of moral decline in this country. My guess is that is what goes on around the dinner tables of America, not, ''Oh, and by the way, Senator FEINGOLD has a great campaign finance bill.''

What are important issues, as we debate the issues in the closing days of this Senate, are issues about public education and safety and crime and all of that. We will engage in that with our President in the coming days as we finalize some of these key appropriations bills.

Again, I think what is important to the American people are issues like crime, the economy, taxes, health care, education, social security, and the moral decline of the country.

What people really care about is whether their children will get safely back and forth from school—and whether they'll get a good education in the public schools.

They care about keeping their jobs and trying to make ends meet while they watch more and more of their hard earned money slip away to Washington to satisfy this President's lust for spending.

They care about their future—whether they can save enough money to retire some day. And if they retire, will there be any money left in the Social Security system, or will it all be spent on more government programs.

These are the real concerns of Americans today, and I hope the Senate will soon be able to turn its attention to these important issues.

Let me conclude by saying we are not wasting our time debating campaign finance reform. Defending the right of free speech and the right of citizens to participate in this most critical of American institutions is our job. To defend and protect that right is the reasonable goal. So I appreciate joining with my colleagues on the floor to oppose McCain-Feingold and hope Senators will join with us in protecting that freedom of expression of America's citizens.

I yield the floor.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

Mr. BENNETT. Before the Senator from Idaho yields the floor, will he yield to a question?

Mr. CRAIG. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. BENNETT. I was very interested in a comment about the money being raised by the AFL–CIO. I would like to get the exact figure. Did the Senator say $49 million?

Mr. CRAIG. That was in the last cycle.

Mr. BENNETT. In the last cycle.

Mr. CRAIG. Specific to those elections.

Mr. BENNETT. Let me ask a question, which I will be asking my friends on the other side as well. But since my colleague has raised it, I think he could be an expert on this issue.

Since we are being told repeatedly throughout this debate that the huge amounts of soft money are corrupting and controlling the votes, let me ask the Senator from Idaho, who is a member of the Republican leadership: If the AFL–CIO were to simply give that $49 million to the Republicans and thus corrupt and influence our votes, would that not be a better investment on their part than to have it wasted on people who are already with them?

Mr. CRAIG. That is a unique thought. I guess I had not thought of it that way. I do not necessarily suggest the $49.2 million is a corrupting factor.

Mr. BENNETT. I do not believe it is corrupting either, but we are being told repeatedly that it is.

Mr. CRAIG. What is corrupting about that is when a labor boss says he is going to take the dues of his member without asking him or her whether he can use those dues for a political purpose.

Mr. BENNETT. I agree with that.

Mr. CRAIG. Thomas Jefferson had something to say about that. He said it was wrong, and an individual's money never should be used for those purposes. That is the corrupting factor, when money you thought you controlled for the purpose of expressing your political opinion would get misused. I think in this instance it does.

Mr. BENNETT. I agree with the Senator from Idaho completely about that. But I want to go back to the argument that has been made again and again by my friend from Wisconsin and the Senator from Arizona, that the tremendous amount of money that is being put into the system influences how people vote. If I were sitting on a $49 million pot of money, advising the AFL–CIO, saying what you want is to get more of your legislation through the Congress, I would say to them: If in fact the $49 million does change the way people vote, why not give the $49 million to the people who are not voting for us? Why not give the $49 million to the Republicans and turn them all into rabid supporters of the AFL–CIO?

Mr. CRAIG. In other words, following the logic that money talks and money influences.

Mr. BENNETT. If we accept that logic, it is perfectly clear it ought to come on this side of the aisle rather than the other.

Let me ask the Senator from Idaho, if he was to suddenly receive in his campaign—through, let us say, the State party of Idaho, because it cannot be given to him directly, there is no way the soft money can corrupt you because you cannot receive it—but, if the AFL–CIO were suddenly to give to the Republican Party of Idaho $1 million in cash, would you change your position on any of the labor issues you have discussed, paycheck protection, for example?

Mr. CRAIG. How can you change your position on things that are fundamentally right in America, such as the right of an individual to control his money or her money for political purposes? Absolutely not.

Mr. BENNETT. I accept the integrity of the Senator from Idaho. Let me ask him, as a member of leadership——

Mr. CRAIG. Remember the New York Times says I am a member of a bordello.

Mr. BENNETT. That is why I am raising the question, because in a bordello you can change what happens by where the money goes, without any question.

Mr. CRAIG. I wouldn't know.

Mr. BENNETT. I have never been in one, but I am at least told that is the way it works.

Let me ask the Senator from Idaho, as a member of the leadership, you know other Members of the Republican Party. Do you know of any Member, on this side of the aisle, who would change his or her position on labor issues if the AFL–CIO were to suddenly put $1 million worth of soft money into his or her State party?

Mr. CRAIG. I not only do not know of anyone, I know if you accused anyone of changing their opinion because of that, you would have a fight on your hands. I do not mean just a verbal fight. I say to anyone who would suggest to any of us that money influences, from the standpoint it is going to change our philosophy, change our attitude or corrupt us, as some Senators have suggested on this floor that it does—out West we call them fighting words. Because you are questioning a person's integrity. You are basically saying they are for sale.

Shame on those Senators who come to the floor to make that kind of suggestion. Maybe they know something we do not.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Will the Senator from Idaho yield for a similar question?

Mr. CRAIG. I am happy to yield.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Most of the Republican Members of the Senate have been vigorous supporters of tort reform, changes in the legal system of this country. I ask my friend from Idaho, if the American Trial Lawyers Association gave $1 million to the Republican National Committee, would that turn the Republicans in the Senate into vigorous opponents of legal reform?

Mr. CRAIG. It not only would not, you are speaking of a fantasy idea that I doubt will ever come to pass. But I thank you for asking that question.

Mr. MCCONNELL. My final question of the Senator from Idaho: Let's assume the National Right to Life Committee contributed $100,000 to the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee. Does the Senator from Idaho—of course we are not in the best position to answer this, I don't guess, since it is not our party, but it is still interesting to speculate. Let's assume the National Right to Life Committee gave a $100,000 soft money contribution to the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee. I ask my friend from Idaho, does he anticipate at that point the Democrats in the Senate would become pro-life?

Mr. CRAIG. No. I do not believe that a majority of them would. I think their basis for what they call a pro-choice position is one firmly grounded on their philosophy. I don't criticize—I don't agree, but I don't criticize—their right to hold that. But what National Right to Life is saying is that they want to have the right to give the Democrat Party money if they choose to. What they are saying is, we want to have a right to organize individual citizens to come together to pool their money for the purpose of giving it. What McCain-Feingold says is: No, you can't do that.

National Right to Life is saying, in this instance: Give us choice, the right to choose where we want to play in the political process. Don't deny us what is our right as American citizens or an American group to participate in the political process.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I thank my friend from Idaho, not only for responding to our questions but also for another outstanding contribution to this most important debate.

We appreciate his insightful comments. I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. CRAIG. I yield the floor.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VOINOVICH). The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I am sorry my friend from Utah last left the floor. The fact is, the political balance of power is already heavily tilted toward corporations, by any study that you find. The fact is, in the last election cycle corporate interests spent about $700 million in political contributions. That is 11 times more than what unions spent. And they did not get the permission of their stockholders. While unions contributed less than 4 percent of the $1.6 billion raised by candidates and parties in 1996, corporations contributed over 40 percent.

So the disparity between corporate and union spending is not static; it is growing. In the next election cycle, instead of 11 to 1, it will probably be 14 to 1. What is so disconcerting about this is for this so-called soft money, it is even wider.

While both corporations and unions have increased their unrestricted so-called soft money contributions, since 1992 corporate spending has grown twice as fast. In 1996, as an example, corporations spent more than $176 million—19 times more than what the unions spent.

There is all this talk about the unions that represent the working men and women of this country spending 4 percent of what is spent in political campaigns. I think it is too bad that working men and women in this country do not have more of a representation. It is getting worse. That is why this legislation is before this body.

I think it is important at this time to recognize the work done by Senator FEINGOLD in making this an issue before the people of America. I applaud and congratulate Senator FEINGOLD for his position based upon what he believes is principle.

He not only talks the game; he lives the game, as indicated in his most recent election. While all over America people were spending huge amounts of soft money, and it was being spent in Wisconsin against Senator FEINGOLD, he refused to take any money even though it was available to him.

So I take this opportunity to say, first of all, let's bring in to proper perspective the disparity between corporate spending and union spending and also to congratulate my friend from the State of Wisconsin.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REID. I am happy to yield for a question.

Mr. SESSIONS. The Senator mentioned $179 million of corporate expenditures. Are those for State and local races also?

Mr. REID. Yes. The fact is, that is a lesser figure. What I did say in the beginning is that in the 1996 election cycle—the one that we have numbers on—corporate interests spent more; in fact, it is almost $700 million in political contributions, which is 11 times more than what unions spent.

Mr. SESSIONS. I do not know about that. But I know Mr. SWEENEY has indicated he had $170-some-odd million, that they would spend $46 million, I believe, on just the 34 Federal congressional races, all of which is very unregulated and underreported, inaccurately reported, of course. But I want to get those numbers straight, whether you are talking about throughout the Nation, including county commission races, State senate races, and all the races.

The numbers are hard to compare. I think the Senator would probably agree with that.

Mr. REID. I say to my friend from Alabama, if we took into consideration State and local races, the corporate skew would be even further out of whack because unions do get involved in local campaigns. But it is usually through the grassroots level and very rarely is it money; where the corporations very rarely are involved in the grassroots activities and are always involved in the money.

So if we added all that, the number may even be more than 11 times more than what the unions spent.

Mr. SESSIONS. Will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. REID. I am happy to yield for a question.

Mr. SESSIONS. The numbers I have are that labor spent $370 million per election cycle on campaigns. I am not sure where all the numbers come out, but that is quite a lot.

Would the Senator agree with that? Or does he disagree with those numbers?

Mr. REID. I do not know from where the Senator is getting his numbers. In the previous question the Senator asked, there was $40 million. And now it is how much?

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. SWEENEY said they were going to spend $46 million in 34 targeted U.S. congressional races.

Mr. REID. Where does this other number come from?

Mr. SESSIONS. The $370 million includes Federal election campaigns.

Mr. REID. Over what period of time?

Mr. SESSIONS. The last election cycle.

Mr. REID. I say to my friend the numbers that he has, I don't know from where they came. I do state that in America we have far too much money being spent, soft money and other kinds of money. The point I was trying to make in my statement in response to my friend from Utah is the fact that corporate spending, by any number you pick, is far out of whack with union spending, whether it is 19 times more or 11 times more. We all acknowledge it is a growing disparity.

The fact is, what is being attempted by my friend from the State of Wisconsin is to stop the flow of all this soft money.

The fact is, there is a lot of talk about union money coming from working men and women in this country. Remember, corporate money is also money that represents shareholders. Certainly, they get no say in how that money is spent.

So I suggest that before we start picking on organized labor, remember, is there anything wrong with the nurses of America, who are included in these numbers—the AFL–CIO, teachers, carpenters, cement finishers—being represented? The answer is, they should be able to be involved in campaigns just as much as somebody who represents tobacco interests and the very large health care industry in America. So they, too, need a voice.

I am glad that voice is being represented by this side of the aisle.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts has been waiting a long time.

I will yield to him in 1 minute. But I want to make a quick point with regard to speech comments by the Senator from Colorado.

He and I had a good discussion the other day about this issue. I enjoyed it.

But he said that a soft money ban would be unfair to the Republican Party. And this very much reflects the comments of the Senator from Kentucky, who has made similar comments, that a soft money ban would somehow unfairly limit the ability of the Republican Party, as opposed to the Democratic Party.

I find this very odd, since the comments this weekend of the chairman designate of the Democratic National Committee, the mayor of Philadelphia, Ed Rendell, who is the chair of the DNC, who said in a column, or was quoted in a column by David Broder:

''If the Republicans pass McCain-Feingold, we would be shut down,'' Rendell said.

So both parties apparently think it is the end of the line for them if we ban soft money—but only for one of them. I ask, how is it possible, since this whole soft money thing only happened 3 or 4 years ago in terms of the vast amounts of money? We certainly had political parties before this—pretty good political parties. How can both parties be right? How can the Senator from Colorado be right and Mr. Rendell be right?

The fact is, both parties have become addicted to soft money, and they do not want to give it up. There is no reality to the notion that the parties will be crippled or any particular party would be severely harmed by the soft money ban.

Mr. President, I wanted to make that point. At this point, since we are roughly trying to go back and forth, I hope the Senator from Massachusetts could proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I notice other colleagues wanting to address the Senate. I would hope and ask consent—I see my colleague on the floor.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Will the Senator yield for a moment? Will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. Without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Without losing his right to the floor.

In terms of order, I gather we are still rotating. I ask unanimous consent that on our side I be able to follow Senator KENNEDY. Senator LEVIN may come, in which case I can talk with him about how to proceed. I ask unanimous consent that on our side I be allowed to follow Senator KENNEDY.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Reserving the right to object, I know the occupant of the chair was here to speak earlier. Is the Senator from Ohio going to be in the chair until 3?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I have no problem with the Senator's consent agreement, then, if I may ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Ohio be recognized at 3 to make some remarks. I think that would help accommodate him. Nobody is trying to quiet anyone. I just want to give the Senator from Ohio a chance to get in the debate at 3. Does anybody have a problem with that?

Mr. REID. I have no problem. We will begin rotating at this time. The Senator from Kentucky knows we have already had several speeches from Republicans. We will start now rotating.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I have no objection.

Mr. REID. So after Senator KENNEDY speaks, Senator VOINOVICH may speak. If necessary, you may cover the floor for him.

Mr. MCCONNELL. We will work that out.

Mr. KENNEDY. Reserving the right to object, I only planned to speak for 15 or 20 minutes. I think what the Senator from Kentucky has proposed will certainly be agreeable, if that is all right.

Mr. MCCONNELL. The Senator from Ohio will be recognized after the Senator from Minnesota. We will make sure somebody gets in the Chair and gives him an opportunity to make his remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I will put in the RECORD the excellent summaries of total contributions according to the Center for Responsive Politics. That is a nonpartisan watchdog group. We can talk about numbers here and numbers there. However, I think it is important for the RECORD that we have summaries from the nonpartisan groups that have assessed the contributions by unions and corporations—hard money/soft money. As the Senator from Nevada, the Senator from Wisconsin, and others have pointed out, the ratio is about 11 to 1. You can slice it any way you want but the fact remains—it is basically the difference between the contributions, according to nonpartisan groups. Others have other ways of adding and subtracting figures; all well and good.

I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD the summary provided by the Center for Responsive Politics because I think it is helpful to have the findings of those who have no ax to grind.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[AFL–CIO Fact Sheet]

CORPORATE VS. UNION SPENDING ON POLITICS—THERE'S TOO MUCH MONEY IN POLITICS—BUT IT'S NOT UNION MONEY

The political balance of power is already tilted heavily in favor of corporations. In the 1996 election cycle, corporate interests spent more than $677 million on political contributions—11 times more than unions spent. So while unions contributed less than 4 percent of the $1.6 billion raised by candidates and parties in 1996, corporations contributed more than 40 percent.

The disparity between corporate and union spending is growing. Since 1992 (when the ratio was 9-to-1), corporate political contributions have increased by $229.8 million, while union contributions rose by only $12.1 million.

In ''soft money'' contributions, the gap is even wider. While both corporations and unions have increased their unrestricted, so-called ''soft money'' contributions since 1992, corporate spending grew twice as fast. In 1996, corporations spent more than $176 million—19 times more than unions did.

Corporate special interests are pushing initiatives that would skew the balance even further. By backing special restrictions on unions while imposing no such limits on themselves, big corporations are trying to remove working families and their unions from the political playing field.

Corporations, right-wing foundations and anti-union lobbying groups are raising hundreds of millions of dollars to ''de-fund'' unions. At a recent meeting of the Republican Governors Association, proponents of the initiatives noted that the de-funding ploy has two strategic benefits: If it works, unions will lose funding. Even if it doesn't, unions will be forced to spend millions of dollars in the fight.

Year	Corporations	Unions	Ratio
Total contributions:			
1996	$677,442,423	$60,352,761	11 to 1
1994	492,956,181	48,319,054	10 to 1
1992	447,594,985	48,152,256	9 to 1
Soft money contributions:			
1996	176,108,186	9,505,745	19 to 1
1994	64,753,971	4,293,459	15 to 1
1992	66,342,241	4,251,334	16 to 1
Hard money contributions:			
1996	501,334,237	50,847,016	10 to 1
1994	428,202,210	44,025,595	10 to 1
1992	381,252,744	44,067,720	9 to 1

Source: Center for Responsive Politics.

Mr. SESSIONS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes, briefly, without losing my right to the floor.

Mr. SESSIONS. On the number that the Senator said the unions spent, what was that number?

Mr. KENNEDY. According to the Center for Responsive Politics, in 1996, $60 million; 1994, $48 million; 1992, $48 million. On the corporations, $677 million in 1996; $492 million in 1994; and $447 million in 1992. That is total contributions. It works out to a ratio of 11 to 1 in 1996, 10 to 1 in 1994, and 9 to 1 in 1992.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I note the Washington Post article I was just looking at indicated there was a $46 million commitment by Mr. Sweeney in this election cycle for just 34 House of Representatives races, so those numbers don't sound accurate to me.

Mr. KENNEDY. In 1996, the unions spent $50 million; the corporations, $501 million. So we are talking 1997, 1998, 1999. That figure may still be consistent with the 10 to 1 or 11 to 1 figure. I don't find that there would be any inconsistency if that were the figure being spent.

I was interested to hear our good friend from Idaho, Senator CRAIG, talking about people worrying at the dinner table about these issues. He mentioned people are much more concerned about what is happening down the street or near the school with regard to a shooting incident. I say that is right. And it is very interesting that I was not able to get a report, as a member of the conference committee on the juvenile violence act, that deals with the availability and the accessibility of

guns to children in our society and of the criminal element. That has been locked up now for some 6 weeks. I don't think anyone on this floor is prepared to say the National Rifle Association doesn't have something to do with that.

He talked about taxes—people are concerned about taxes. People are concerned about tax loopholes as well. How do the tax loopholes get into the Internal Revenue budget? We have $4 trillion of what are called tax expenditures in the IRS at the present time. That is the fastest growing expenditure we have in the Federal budget, the expansion of tax expenditures, tax loopholes. We don't have any debate on it. Many of us have said, let's do for tax expenditures what we do for direct expenditures—when we are cutting back on education and health care; let what is good for the goose be good for the gander. Do you think you can get those issues raised here on the floor of the Senate? Of course not. We all understand why.

It is kind of interesting that those who have been the strongest spokespersons against this proposal also raise incidents in terms of what is on people's minds. It comes back, in many instances, to what the Senator from Arizona and the Senator from Wisconsin have talked about.

This country has waited long enough for campaign finance reform. The current system is shameful, benefiting only the big corporations and lobbyists who have seemingly bottomless barrels of money to spend, while the voice of average citizens goes unheard in the special interest din.

I commend Senator MCCAIN and Senator FEINGOLD for their consistent leadership on this issue. Their commitment to reform gives us an opportunity to join the House of Representatives and cleanse our campaign financing system of special interest abuses. The House took effective action earlier this year, transcending partisan differences to adopt long overdue reforms. The large margin by which the Shays-Meehan bill passed, 252 to 177, demonstrates that the public feels strongly about the need for reform. The Senate should act now to support the McCain-Feingold proposal and give the country clean elections in the years to come.

Effective reform must include a ban on soft money. The McCain-Feingold bill does just that. Soft money contributions are increasing at alarming rates, while hard money contributions are barely rising. In the 1992 Presidential election cycle, both parties raised a total of $86 million in soft money. Compare this to the $224 million total raised in the 1998 election cycle—a 150-percent increase of soft money contributions in only 6 years. A more recent survey shows figures from January to June 1999, soft money contributions totaled $46.2 million—and $30.1 million of that total was given by corporations and business interests. In the 1996 elections, the consumer credit industry alone gave $5.5 million in soft money. True reform means closing this flagrant loophole that allows so many special interests to bypass legal limits on giving money directly to candidates. Until we close it the special interests will continue to strengthen their hold on the political process.

The House reforms also ended other serious abuses in campaign financing. It ends the sham of the so-called issue ads loophole, which permits special interests to spend big money on campaign advertising obviously designed to support a candidate, as long as the ads do not specifically call for the candidate's election. The House bill treats these ads as the campaign ads they really are, and rightly subjects them to regulation under the campaign finance laws.

The Senate should learn from the House, and join in ending these abuses that make a mockery of our election laws. Instead, the Senate Republican leadership is bent on preserving the status quo. They oppose campaign finance reform because they do not want to lose the support they currently receive from their special interest friends.

Our Republican friends say they want to help working families—but their support of the Paycheck Protection Act demonstrates their antilabor bias, because that measure is designed to silence the voice of the American workers and labor unions in the political process. It is revenge, not reform—revenge for the extraordinary efforts by the labor movement in the 1996 and 1998 election campaigns. It imposes a gag rule on American workers, and it should be defeated.

The act's supporters claim they are concerned about union members' right to choose whether and how to participate in the political process. But we know better. The Paycheck Protection Act should really be called the Paycheck Destruction Act. It is part of a coordinated national antilabor campaign to lock American workers and their unions out of politics.

And who is behind this campaign? It is not the workers, unhappy with the use of their union dues for political purposes. It is businesses and their allies, anxious to reduce the role of labor. It is organizations like Americans for Tax Reform, which supports Social Security privatization, vouchers for private schools, and huge tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans. It is think tanks such as the American Legislative Exchange Council and the National Center for Policy Analysis, which support so-called right-to-work laws, the TEAM act, the flat tax, private school vouchers, medical savings accounts, and other antiworker legislation. And it is right-wing Republicans in Congress and in the states.

We know that unions and their members are among the most effective voices in the political process. They support raising the minimum wage, protecting Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid, improving education, and ensuring safety and health on the job.

Silencing these voices of working families will make it easier for those with antiworker agenda to prevail. Sponsors of this legislation support prevatizing Social Security. They favor private school vouchers instead of a healthy public school system. They would undermine occupational safety and health laws, end the 40-hour work week and permit sham, company-dominated unions. They oppose the Family and Medical Leave Act. They want to restrict Medicare eligibility and deny millions of workers an increase in the minimum wage. They are not trying to help working Americans. To the contrary—they are trying to silence the workers' participation in the political process so they can implement an agenda that workers strongly oppose.

Campaign abuses abandon other issues as well. The tobacco industry has made extensive PAC and soft money contributions, and the Senate Republican leadership has rejected much needed antitobacco legislation. The Campaign for Tobacco-Free Kids reports that in the last 10 years, Senators who voted consistently against tobacco reform legislation took far more money from the industry—four times more—than those who supported the bill.

The dabate on the Patients' Bill of Rights is another vivid example of the obstructionist influence of industries and special interests. Since 1997, the health insurance industry has been making huge political contributions to Republicans. Blue Cross/Blue Shield and its state affiliates made $1 million in contributions in the 1997–1998 cycle, with four out of every five dollars going to Republicans. Managed care PACs—including the American Association of Health Plans, the Health Insurance Association of America, and Blue Cross/Blue Shield—gave $77,250 to leadership political action committees. According to the Center on Responsive Politics, all but $1,500 went to the Republican majority.

These contributions bought the industry at least 2 years worth of stall and delay tactics in Congress. And, when the Senate finally passed legislation this year, it was not what patients needed, but an industry bill that places HMO profits ahead of patients' health.

Contributions from the credit card and banking industries have had a similar effect on the bankruptcy reform debate. Master Card, Visa, and others doubled, tripled, or even quadrupled their spending to encourage passage of the bill they wanted. Visa increased its 1998 lobbying to $3.6 million from $900,000 in 1997. Master Card wasn't far behind—their lobbying expenses rose from $430,000 in 1997 to $1.8 million in 1998. In the 1997–1998 election cycle, commercial banks and financial service companies gave $20.8 million in large individual contributions, PAC money and soft money to candidates—

and two-thirds of that total went to Republicans. The result? Legislation that House Committee Chairman HENRY HYDE described as ''pages and pages and pages of advantages [for] the creditor community * * *''

Honest campaign finance reform does not include phony proposals that seek to eliminate political expression by average families. It does include eliminating the flagrant abuses that enable big corporations and special interests to tilt the election process in their favor.

Real reform means giving elections back to the people and creating a level playing field on which all voters are equal, regardless of their income. Broad campaign finance reform is within the Senate's reach. We should follow the example set for us by the House. The greatest gift the Senate can give to the American people is clean elections.

Over the course of debate, we have learned what the other side is against. We rarely learn what they are for. Senator MCCAIN and Senator FEINGOLD have laid out something I think we should be for. In the next few days, hopefully, the American people will speak through their representatives and support those efforts.

One of the provisions we heard a good deal about, again from my friend from Idaho, was the whole question about workers and whether they have control over their dues. Of course, what exists in the McCain-Feingold provision is an incorporation of the Beck decision, which permits workers to check off, at the time they pay their dues, that they are not interested in the political process.

Today, evidently, they want something that is going to be harsher on working men and women. Those forces that are pressing to restrict the voice of working men and women are actually the major interest groups that are strongly opposed to the agenda of working families, whether it has been an increase in the minimum wage, whether it has been HMO reforms, whether it has been education and increasing the education budget. These groups are opposed to workers participating because, in many instances, the workers have been the ones to try to advance these interests on our national agenda.

I think it is important. I don't know how many of us are getting the communications from workers on these particular issues. Yet we have seen what has happened over this past year, whether it has been on the HMO reform—the change in expenditures by the insurance companies at the time when this body was debating whether doctors are going to be the ones who are going to make the decisions on health care for the particular patients, rather than the accountants and insurance industry. Nobody could deny when we were debating those issues that the contributions and expenditures by the insurance companies skyrocketed dramatically, escalated significantly. This is the kind of thing that we are talking about in terms of the impact that campaign finance reform can have.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I have a couple of unanimous consent requests, cleared on both sides.

As in executive session, I ask that, at 5:45 today, the Senate proceed to executive session to consider Calendar No. 270, the nomination of Florence-Marie Cooper to be United States District Judge for the Central District of California.

I further ask unanimous consent that the Senate then immediately proceed to a vote on the confirmation of the nomination and, following that vote, the President be immediately notified of the Senate's action and the Senate then return to legislative session.

Mr. MCCAIN. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kentucky yield the floor?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I believe we have a consent agreement under which Senator WELLSTONE was to be recognized next. Am I correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is what I understand.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, as I said earlier, when Senator LEVIN came to the floor I would be pleased to yield the floor to him. Senator MCCAIN is here. I ask unanimous consent that Senator LEVIN be allowed to speak, that we then go in order—I understand Senator MCCAIN wants to speak, and I also know that the Chair, Senator VOINOVICH, seeks recognition—and I be allowed to speak after Senator VOINOVICH.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak after Senator LEVIN.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Then Senator VOINOVICH, and I would follow Senator VOINOVICH.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Reserving the right to object, the Senator from Arizona was not here at the time, but Senator VOINOVICH was waiting patiently a little bit earlier. Would he have any objection to Senator VOINOVICH following Senator LEVIN?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, Senator LEVIN, then a Republican, and then a Democrat.

Mr. MCCONNELL. On this issue.

Mr. MCCAIN. Maybe I can sort it out. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator LEVIN, then Senator VOINOVICH, then Senator WELLSTONE, and then Senator MCCAIN be recognized.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, may I add to the request that Senator BENNETT be recognized after Senator MCCAIN.

Mr. MCCAIN. I object to that because we are going back and forth from one side to the other.

Mr. MCCONNELL. The two sides are not parties. The two sides are the issue, and by adding Senator BENNETT and Senator VOINOVICH we get some balance on the issue back and forth, which is what we had been trying to do earlier.

Mr. REID. I think that is appropriate.

Mr. MCCAIN. I agree.

Mr. BENNETT. I renew my unanimous consent request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. Could I hear the unanimous consent, just to be sure. Parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senator LEVIN, Senator VOINOVICH, Senator WELLSTONE, Senator MCCAIN, followed by Senator BENNETT.

The Senator from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. LEVIN. I thank the Chair and all my colleagues. I particularly thank Senator WELLSTONE for allowing me to go at this time.

Mr. President, our Federal election laws are broken, and the issue before the Senate is whether we want to fix them.

In the 1970s, we passed laws to limit the role of money in Federal elections. Our intent was to protect our democratic form of government from the corrosive influence of unlimited political contributions.

We wanted to ensure that our Federal elected officials were, neither in reality nor in perception, beholden to special interests who were able to contribute large sums of money to candidates and their campaigns.

Our election laws were designed to protect the public's confidence in our democratically elected officials. And for many years our election laws worked fairly well. The limits they set were clear, and those laws are on the books today.

Individuals aren't supposed to give more than $1,000 to a candidate per election, or $5,000 to a political action committee, or more than $20,000 a year to a national party committee, or $25,000 total in any one year. Corporations and unions are prohibited from contributing to any campaign. That is the law on the books today. This is the election law: $1,000 per individual to a candidate in an election; $5,000 to a PAC. It is right in these laws—$5,000 PAC contribution to a candidate.

We are supposed to be limiting contributions to candidates. Yet, over the last few years, we have heard story after story about contributions of hundreds of thousands of dollars from individuals, corporations, and unions, and even about contributions from foreign sources. Then the question is, How is it possible, when the law says $1,000 to a candidate per election, that people can give $100,000, which effectively helped that candidate in that election? How is it possible?

This pretty good law of ours has holes in it, and both parties have taken

advantage of them. There are no longer any effective limits on contributions. That is the bottom line. That is why we hear about a $1 million contribution to the RNC from a corporation, or a half-million-dollar contribution from one couple to the DNC.

The Supreme Court in Buckley surely did not have this in mind. They understood the limits to mean that individuals can't contribute more than the overall $25,000 limit for a calendar year. Look at what they said when they upheld that provision in the law. The Buckley Court described the $25,000 limit as a modest restraint which ''serves to prevent evasion of the $1,000 contribution limitation by a person who might otherwise contribute massive amounts of money to a particular candidate through the use of unearmarked contributions to political committees likely to contribute to that candidate or a huge contribution to the candidate's political party.'' Yet that is exactly what is happening today under the soft money loophole.

So the Supreme Court foresaw that people would try to evade the $1,000 limit unless the Congress put in a $25,000 limit. They said that is one of the reasons the $25,000 limit per year is appropriate.

Yet, under the soft money loophole, precisely what is happening today is that the $1,000 limit has been obliterated, for all intents and purposes. Our task is to make the law whole again and, in making it whole, to make it effective. If we don't, we risk losing the faith the American people have that we represent their interests and that each citizen's voice counts fairly.

The principal culprit in this erosion of our laws is the soft money loophole. Soft money has blown the lid off the contribution limits of our campaign finance system. Soft money is the 800,000-pound gorilla sitting right in the middle of this debate.

Look at the most recent data with respect to soft money contributions. In the 1996 Presidential election year, Republicans raised $140 million in soft money contributions; Democrats raised $120 million. In 1998, even without a Presidential election, Republicans raised $131 million in soft money contributions and Democrats raised $91 million. The 1997–1998 combined soft money total was 115 percent more than the 1993–1994 total. We are told that the soft money contributions in the first half of 1999 have increased 55 percent over the same period in 1997, and they are 75 percent higher this year than they were in the first half of 1995.

The increases are stunning when we look at specific examples. One corporation contributed $270,000 in soft money contributions in the first 6 months of 1997; it contributed $750,000 in the first 6 months of 1999. One union contributed $195,000 in soft money contributions in the first 6 months of 1997; it has contributed $525,000 in the first 6 months of 1999.

Those are the increases we are experiencing. They are out of control. The limits are effectively gone. There are effectively no more limits on contributions that get into campaigns and support candidates.

That is not what the Supreme Court said in Buckley. The Supreme Court said in Buckley it is perfectly appropriate for Congress to limit contributions to candidates and to effectuate that by limiting the total contribution to $25,000 a year that could be made overall as a way of implementing, assuring, that the $1,000 contribution would be upheld and not evaded. Yet with the soft money loophole, we have wiped out the $25,000 contribution limitation. For all intents and purposes, there are no more limits on contributions that effectively assist candidates in campaigns.

One case was discussed in the 1997 hearings. Roger Tamraz was a large contributor to both parties who became the bipartisan symbol for what is wrong with the current system. Roger Tamraz served as a Republican Eagle during the 1980s during the Republican Administrations and as a Democratic trustee in the 1990s during Democratic Administrations. Tamraz's political contributions were not guided by his views on public policy or his desire to support people who shared those views. He was unabashed in admitting his political contributions were made for the purpose of getting access to people in power. Tamraz showed in stark terms the all too common product of the current campaign finance system—using unlimited soft money contributions to buy access. Despite the condemnation by the press of Tamraz's activities, when asked at the hearing to reflect on his $300,000 contribution to obtain access, Tamraz said: I think next time I'll give $600,000.

How do the parties entice wealthy contributors to make large soft money contributions? What they often do is offer access to decision makers in return for tens or hundreds of thousands of dollars in a single contribution. The parties advertise access. It is blatant. Both parties sell access for large contributions, and they do it openly. The larger the contribution, the more personal the access to the decision maker.

We all know about large contributors to the Democratic National Committee being invited to radio addresses given by the President, or to sleep in the Lincoln Bedroom, or to attend one of dozens of coffees with the President at the White House.

Look at this invitation to be a DNC trustee. I believe this is from 1996. For $50,000, or if you raise $100,000, the contributor gets two events with the President, two events with the Vice President, ''invitations to join party leadership as they travel abroad to examine current and developing political and economic issues in other countries,'' and monthly policy briefings with ''key administration officials and Members of Congress.''

It is an open sale of access for large contributions. Does anyone want to defend that at a town meeting in our home States? Does anyone want to hold up this invitation from the Democratic National Committee in a town meeting and ask people whether or not they like this system? If any Members who oppose this bill banning soft money think their position is credible with the public, I challenge those Members to go back to a town meeting and hold up this invitation from the Democratic National Committee or from the Republican National Committee and ask our constituents if they think it is right for $50,000 or for $100,000 a year, if they raise it, to get two meetings with the President in Washington, two meetings with the Vice President in Washington, and have annual meetings with policy makers and elected officials in Washington.

Take a look at the Republican National Committee's 1997 Annual Gala. For $250,000, one gets breakfast with the Majority Leader and the Speaker of the House and a luncheon with the Republican Senate or House Committee Chairman of your choice. By the way, they get that for $100,000; some of the other perks they don't get. All the way down to, I think $45,000, they get lunch with the Republican Chairman of their choice.

How many Members of this body want to take home these invitations, and in a town meeting with a cross section of constituents, hold up that invitation and say, ''is this the way we want to fund campaigns?'' I don't think many Members want to do that.

Mr. BENNETT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEVIN. I am happy to yield to the Senator.

Mr. BENNETT. I ask the Senator if he is saying that this is the only source of access and that only those who give have access?

Mr. LEVIN. No, I don't think that is true.

Mr. BENNETT. When I was on the committee with the Senator, we were debating this issue. I said the best way to get access to me is to be registered to vote in the State of Utah. Then I asked the Senator from Michigan, is that the same thing for himself—that he pays more attention to constituents from Michigan than he does to contributors who come from outside the State.

Mr. LEVIN. I hope so, but that doesn't answer my point.

My point is whether or not we believe for 100,000 bucks we ought to sell access to the President of the United States. That is my question. It is not whether one gets access in other ways. It is whether or not constituents ought to be able to buy, for $100,000, access to the President or have a lunch with the Committee Chairman of their choice.

My question is, How many Members opposing the ban on soft money want to take that invitation to a town meeting and justify it? That is my question. There is an answer to it. The answer will come in whether or not any of my colleagues take these invitations to

town meetings and say: Yes, nothing wrong with saying for $100,000 you can have lunch with the Republican Committee Chairman of your choice.

Try to sell that to the public back home. I don't think we can. I cannot in Michigan; I won't speak for any other State.

That is not what we intended when we put limits on campaign contributions and that is not what the Supreme Court intended in Buckley when they upheld the contributions because they specifically said in Buckley that the $25,000 annual limit on all contributions was intended to avoid evasion of the $1,000 contribution to an individual campaign to make sure they cannot, in effect, give it to a candidate or his or her campaign through a political party.

The answer to my question will come in whether or not any of the opponents to the ban on soft money on these large contributions take these invitations home. And I mean both parties. We have a lot of other invitations, too. We will give Members an invitation of their choice and see whether or not they are comfortable going home to their constituents in a town meeting and saying: I'll defend this $100,000 to buy a meeting with the President, or the Vice President, or a Committee Chairman of choice.

I don't think Members will. We will find out. I want to hear from any of the opponents of the soft money ban as to whether or not they do take that kind of an invitation home—selling access for large contributions—and defend it at a town meeting. I am interested as to whether or not your constituents say there is nothing wrong with that; that is free speech.

That is not what the Supreme Court said in Buckley. They upheld contribution limits as being consistent with the First Amendment. Our institutions in this democracy depend upon the public having confidence in our institutions. When access is sold for a large contribution and someone is told they can have lunch with a Committee Chairman of their choice for $40,000 or a meeting with the President at the White House for $100,000, I think the public is so totally turned off by that kind of flow of money for access that I believe very few will take me up on my challenge to take this invitation back to a town meeting.

One invitation in 1997 to a National Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee event promised that contributors would be offered ''plenty of opportunities to share [their] personal ideas and vision with'' some of the top Republican leaders and senators. Failure to attend, the invitation said, means that ''you could lose a unique chance to be included in current legislative policy debates—debates that will affect your family and your business for many years to come.''

The letter from the Chairman of the National Republican Senatorial Committee invites the recipient to be a life member of the Republican Senatorial Inner Circle: ''$10,000 will bring you face-to-face with dozens of our Republican Senators, including many of the Senate's most powerful Committee Chairmen.'' It goes on and on. That's access. That's what we're opening offering for sale for large contributions and that's what contributors are often buying. There are dozens of examples.

I ask unanimous consent that some of these invitations that are similar to the ones I have read be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

1997 RNC ANNUAL GALA, MAY 13, 1997,
WASHINGTON HILTON, WASHINGTON, DC

GALA LEADERSHIP COMMITTEE

Co-Chairman—$250,000 Fundraising Goal—Sell or purchase Team 100 memberships, Republican Eagles memberships or Dinner Tables.

Dais Seating at the Gala.

Breakfast and Photo Opportunity with Senator Majority Leader Trent Lott and Speaker of the House Newt Gingrich on May 13, 1997.

Luncheon with Republican Senate and House Leadership and the Republican Senate and House Committee Chairmen of your choice.

Private Reception with Republican Governors prior to the Gala.

Vice-Chairman—$100,000 Fundraising Goal—Sell or purchase Team 100 memberships, Republican Eagles memberships or Dinner Tables.

Preferential Seating at the Gala Dinner with the VIP of your choice.

Breakfast and Photo Opportunity with Senator Majority Leader Trent Lott and Speaker of the House Newt Gingrich on May 13, 1997.

Luncheon with Republican Senate and House Leadership and the Republican Senate and House Committee Chairmen of your choice.

Private Reception with Republican Governors prior to the Gala.

Deputy Chairman—$45,000 Fundraising Goal—Sell or purchase three (3) Dinner Tables or three (3) Republican Eagles memberships.

Preferential Seating at the Gala Dinner with the VIP of your choice.

Luncheon with Republican Senate and House Leadership and the Republican Senate and House Committee Chairmen of your choice.

Private Reception with Republican Governors prior to the Gala.

Dinner Committee—$15,000 Fundraising Goal—Sell or purchase one (1) Dinner Table.

Preferential Seating at the Gala Dinner with the VIP of your choice.

VIP Reception at the Gala with the Republican members of the Senate and House Leadership.

(*Benefits pending final confirmation of the Members of Congress schedules.)

DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE

DNC TRUSTEE EVENTS AND MEMBERSHIP REQUIREMENTS

Events

Two Annual Trustee Events with the President in Washington, DC.

Two Annual Trustee Events with the Vice President in Washington, DC.

Annual Economic Trade Missions—Beginning in 1994, DNC Trustees will be invited to join Party leadership as they travel abroad to examine current and developing political and economic in other countries.

Two Annual Retreats/Issue Conferences—One will be held in Washington and another at an executive conference center. Both will offer Trustees the opportunity to interact with leaders from Washington as well as participate in exclusive issue briefings.

Invitations to Home Town Briefings—Chairman Wilhelm and other senior Administration officials have plans to visit all 50 states. Whenever possible, impromptu briefings with local Trustees will be placed on the schedule. You will get the latest word from Washington on issues affecting the communities where you live and work.

Monthly Policy Briefings—Briefings are held monthly in Washington with key administration officials and members of Congress. Briefings cover such topics as health care reform, welfare reform, and economic policy.

VIP Status—DNC Trustees will get VIP status at the 1996 DNC Convention with tickets to restricted events, private parties as well as pre- and post-convention celebrations.

DNC Staff Contact—Trustees will have a DNC staff member specifically assigned to them, ready to assist and respond to requests for information.

The ''Morning'' Briefing—DNC Trustees will receive daily legislative and executive fax alerts, word on upcoming and current political activities and member survey opportunities.

Multi-Program privileges-participation in BLF and NFC events.

Annual Membership Requirements

A general Trustee membership requires a contribution of $50,000 a year or $100,000 raised.

Mr. LEVIN. One solicitation offered, for a contribution of $10,000, the choice of ''attending one of 60 small dinner parties, limited in attendance to 20 to 25 people, at the home of a Senator, Cabinet Officer, or senior White House Staff member.''

One offer for the Republican Senatorial Trust said, ''Trust members can expect a close working relationship with all Republican Senators, top Administration officials and other national leaders. Personal relationships are fostered at informal meetings throughout the year in Washington, D.C. and abroad.''

Another solicitation went so far as to say that, ''Attendance at all events is limited.'' Listen to this one, ''Benefits are based on receipts''; ''Benefits are based on receipts.'' You can't pledge money—cash must be in hand for that meeting with the chairman of your choice. That's how blatant these offers to purchase access have become.

It is largely because of soft money. The amounts we see on these solicitations, selling access, are not the $1,000 and $2,000 contributions. They are large—$25,000 and $50,000 and $100,000 in soft money contributions. The soft money loophole has increased and intensified the sale of access.

Do these large money contributions create an appearance of personal access and improper influence by big contributors? This is what the Supreme Court said in Buckley v. Valeo. I think they answered that question. The Supreme

Court said there is an appearance of corruption that is created from the size of the contribution alone. They didn't even get to the question of the sale of access. They just said that unlimited contributions inherently create an appearance of impropriety. It is inherent in unlimited contributions. That is the Supreme Court answering, I believe, for the American people. The Court in Buckley upheld contribution limits as a reasonable and constitutional approach to deterring, not actual corruption, but the appearance of corruption. This is what the Court said:

> It is unnecessary to look beyond the Act's primary purpose—to limit the actuality and appearance of corruption resulting from large individual financial contributions—in order to find a constitutionally sufficient justification for the $1,000 contribution limitation. Under a system of private financing of elections, a candidate lacking immense personal or family wealth must depend on financial contributions from others to provide the resources necessary to conduct a successful campaign. To the extent that large contributions are given to secure political quid pro quos from current and potential office holders, the integrity of our position of representative democracy is undermined.

And then the Supreme Court said this, ''Of almost equal concern''—the Supreme Court is saying:

> Of almost equal concern to actual quid pro quos is the impact of the appearance of corruption stemming from public awareness of the opportunities for abuse inherent in a regime of large individual financial contributions. . . . Congress could legitimately conclude that the avoidance of the appearance of improper influence is also critical . . . if confidence in the system of representative government is not to be eroded to a disastrous extent.

I want to repeat a few of those words:

> The impact of the appearance of corruption stemming from public awareness of the opportunities for abuse inherent in a regime of large individual financial contributions. . . .

And that, I believe, is what the American people are most deeply concerned about. We, according to the Court, can correct it.

The Court went on to say:

> . . . And while disclosure requirements serve many salutary purposes, Congress was surely entitled to conclude that disclosure was only a partial measure, and that contribution ceilings were a necessary legislative concomitant to deal with the reality or appearance of corruption inherent in a system permitting unlimited financial contributions, even when the identities of the contributors and the amounts of their contributions are fully disclosed.

The Buckley Court repeatedly endorses the concept that the issue of contributions without limits, alone, is enough to create the appearance of corruption and to justify the imposition of limits. Selling access in exchange for contributions would only take the Court's concerns and justifications for limits a step further.

The Buckley Court also said:

> Not only is it difficult to isolate suspect contributions but, more importantly, Congress was justified in concluding that the interest in safeguarding against the appearance of impropriety requires that the opportunity for abuse inherent in the process of raising large monetary contributions be eliminated.

Add to the equation the actual sale of access for a large contribution and you have an even greater ''opportunity for abuse'' and the appearance of corruption.

Mr. BENNETT. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LEVIN. I will be happy to yield.

Mr. BENNETT. I will confess, this whole question of the appearance of corruption bothers me a very great deal. I do not know that the drafters of the first amendment talked about the appearance of free speech or the appearance of a vigorous political debate. So I ask the Senator this question.

Hypothetically, if the Senator from Michigan were to meet with the head of the United Auto Workers on a Monday, in advance of casting a vote on the union's position on the following Tuesday, and vote in favor of the union's position within 24 hours of that meeting, and then on the following Wednesday, within another 24 hours, the union made a very large soft money contribution to the Democratic National Committee—in the opinion of the Senator from Michigan, A, would that be the appearance of corruption; and, B, would that be something he would seek to ban in the name of appearance of corruption?

Mr. LEVIN. Does the question assume that I solicited the UAW for that contribution? That was not clear in the question of the Senator.

Mr. BENNETT. Let us assume the Senator from Michigan did not solicit; that the solicitation came from the Senator from New Jersey in his position—changing it, therefore, from the Democratic National Committee to the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee, the solicitation came from the Senator from New Jersey in his posture as chairman of the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee.

Mr. LEVIN. The fact I had a meeting with anybody within a day or a week or an hour and voted as that person would have urged me to vote is not the appearance of corruption, in my judgment.

Mr. BENNETT. Nor in mine. But the fact is, there is a chain of events.

Mr. LEVIN. I believe in the view of the American people, and it is a reasonable view which has been sustained by the Supreme Court: Inherent in unlimited campaign contributions, inherent, is an appearance of impropriety which undermines public confidence in our institutions. I believe the same thing. More important, the American people believe the same thing. The timing of it is not the issue. The issue is that the solicitation of unlimited amounts, huge amounts of contributions, and frequently or very often in exchange for access, is inherently inappropriate in a democracy and creates public disrespect and a lack of public support for our democratic institutions.

That is, No. 1, my own belief very deeply. I believe the American people believe that very deeply. Most important, though, in addition to what the American people believe, the Supreme Court has directly said that inherent in unlimited contributions is an appearance of impropriety. The Supreme Court has specifically said that in Buckley. When you put on top of that these kind of sales of access for $50,000 and $100,000 to the President or Committee Chairmen around here, you have, it seems to me, made it triply clear what the Supreme Court did not even need to see or find. They did not even look at the access issue. That was not even in Buckley. But it sure adds fuel to the fire, and that fire is a fire which can burn the institutions of this Government.

That is my judgment. Maybe a majority of us do not feel that way. But, again, I challenge my good friend from Utah. I challenge him, take home one of these invitations and try a town meeting; $100,000 for a meeting with the President, $50,000 for a meeting with the Committee Chairman of your choice. Give it a try at a town meeting. See what they think about it.

I think I know what you will find. Maybe not; I don't represent Utah. I think you will find they would tell my good friend from Utah that this is wrong. This is wrong. Unlimited huge contributions, buying access—which is frequently the case—is wrong. I happen to agree with them.

(Ms. COLLINS assumed the chair.)

Mr. MCCAIN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LEVIN. I will yield for a question.

Mr. MCCAIN. Was he aware on Friday Senator KERREY of Nebraska came to the floor and said:

> I had the experience of going inside the beast in 1996, 1997, and 1998, when I was chairman of the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee. I don't want to raise a sore subject for the Senator from Maine. It changed my attitude in two big ways. One, the apparent corruption that exists. People believe there is corruption. If they believe it, it happens. We all understand that. If the perception is it is A, it is A, even though it may not be. And the people believe the system is corrupt.

The Senator is aware of the statement of the Senator from Nebraska yesterday, which I think is a very precise and informed opinion?

Mr. LEVIN. I thank my good friend from Arizona.

Madam President, what these soft money contributions allow the parties to do is many things, but more and more, pay for ads, TV ads, which are claimed to be about issues but in reality are ads to help candidates.

I want to look at two ads: A Republican ad and a Democratic ad. They both have the same problem.

First, Bob Dole's ad. In this TV commercial, Mr. Dole said: ''We have a moral obligation to give our children in America the opportunity and values of the Nation that we grew up in.''

Then it talks a lot about Bob Dole and his very strong personal qualities. Then it ended by Bob Dole saying, ''It all comes down to values. What do you believe in? What do you sacrifice? And what do you stand for?''

That ad was paid for with soft money contributed by the Republican National Committee. It is viewed as permissible under current law because that ad does not explicitly ask the viewer to vote for or support Bob Dole. It spends its whole time talking positively about his character.

If it added four words at the end, which said, ''Vote for Bob Dole,'' it would be treated as a candidate ad, not an issue ad, and would be subject to hard money limits. Any reasonable person looking at that ad at that particular time in the Presidential season would say: It's not an ad about welfare or wasteful spending; it is an ad about why should we elect that particular nominee.

Democrats avail themselves of the same loophole.

In the 1996 Presidential campaign, the Democratic National Committee ran ads on welfare and crime and the budget which were basically designed to support President Clinton's reelection.

At our hearings on campaign finance reform, Harold Ickes was asked about these DNC ads and to the extent to which people looking at the ads would walk away with the message to vote for President Clinton. And here is what Harold Ickes said. And my good friend from Utah, I think, is nodding because I think he remembers this.

Harold Ickes was asked: Do you think people looking at these ads would walk away from these ads with the message that they should vote for President Clinton? His answer: ''I would certainly hope so. If not, we ought to fire the ad agencies.''

Those kinds of ads are paid for with soft money—so-called—unregulated, unlimited money. They are not supposed to be candidate ads.

So we should not delude ourselves either about what the American people believe this system is all about, and how it is run, and how it sells access for huge contributions. They are not deluded, and we should not be deluded about their feelings about this system. And we should not be deluded about how this money is spent. We should not kid ourselves.

People are arguing that unless we can get the entire original bill which was introduced by Senators McCain and Feingold, we should simply not accept half a loaf, which is what the revised version does. And my answer to that simply is this: I would prefer the original McCain-Feingold bill because I think it is important that we not kid ourselves about issue ads, how they are funded, and what their purpose and intent is. But the sponsors of the bill have indicated—and they are very honest, smart people, with tremendous integrity—that we do not have a chance of getting the original McCain-Feingold approach passed, that our best chance of passing a bill with campaign finance reform in it is to try to ban soft money, to close that loophole, to stop parties and candidates from either soliciting, themselves or through their employees, or through their agents, money which is not regulated by law. And I accept that.

I think if that is the best we can get, if that is going to be the most we can accomplish, that would be a significant accomplishment. It is not my preference, but it would be a significant accomplishment.

I would only say this: To a nation that is hungry for reform, a half a loaf is better than no loaf. I hope that, at a minimum, we will be able to achieve that success this year.

The only way we will do it, I believe, is that when people —if they do—filibuster against this approach, against the ban on soft money, that those of us who support this reform not withdraw from the field.

The civil rights days proved that the only way to get these very difficult reforms achieved is by telling the filibusterers: You have a right to filibuster. That is your right, and we'll protect it. But we don't have to withdraw because you are filibustering. With voting rights, it took four cloture votes and about 6 weeks before cloture was able to be invoked and voting rights passed.

I would hope we would act with the same kind of determination as they did in those days and the same kind of passion as the opponents have against this reform.

Finally, I want to close with a tribute to Senators MCCAIN and FEINGOLD. I know of no two people in this body who have taken an issue as they have and tried as long and as hard as they have to bring this to the fore, to bring this to national attention. They are entitled to the thanks of the Nation for what they are doing.

I want to end my remarks with a personal thank you to our two good colleagues for the fight that they are waging on this reform. It cannot happen without them, without their integrity, without their determination. And they have shown it in the past. I am personally very much in their debt. Much more important, the Nation will always be in their debt for the fight they have waged and are waging and will wage for campaign finance reform.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LEVIN. I would be happy to yield.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator be willing to include me in the statement just made regarding Senators FEINGOLD and MCCAIN?

Mr. LEVIN. Include you in which way? Someone joining me in congratulating and thanking them, or including you as one of the reformers? I am happy to do either one.

Mr. REID. Including me in underlining and underscoring your support for these two men who have done so much to focus attention on this very badly needed reform.

Mr. LEVIN. I do.

Mr. REID. I just completed a campaign where, in the small State of Nevada, with less than 2 million people, we don't know how much was spent, probably about $23 million on the two candidates.

So I certainly, as I had tried to do earlier, direct my attention to the good work they have done. But you said it in a way that I think was graphic. And I want to join your support, if you will allow me.

Mr. LEVIN. I thank my good friend from Nevada, and I think everybody who is supporting this cause thanks him for his support of this effort, as well.

So, Mr. President, this kind of candidate advertising, which should clearly be subject to contribution limits, escapes those limits through the soft money loophole. And it's that soft money loophole that the two amendments before us would close.

Now some of my colleagues argue that if we only close the soft money loophole to political parties, the money we cut off to the parties will be redirected to special interest groups. Well if the Daschle amendment could pass, I would prefer it and I've supported similar proposals for years, because it not only stops the soft money loophole to parties, it stops the use of sham or phony issue ads by third party organizations. But I also say if all we can do is stop soft money to the parties and that money then goes to outside groups, so be it. Candidates and public officials running for reelection won't be raising it, the parties won't be raising it, and the contributors won't be buying access to us with it. This bill would preclude a candidate or office holder from soliciting soft money for private organizations running issue ads. Under this legislation, I couldn't go and solicit money for an outside group to use for issue ads in some campaign. This bill would bar that. Will contributors of these large sums want to buy access to the Sierra Club or the National Rifle Association? Perhaps. If so, let them do it. Will they be able to buy access to us through these unlimited contributions to third parties? No. If that were to occur, then it would be in direct violation of the law. Under this soft money ban, public officials and candidates will be out of the soft money fundraising loop, and that's the important step we'll be taking with this legislation.

To a nation hungry for reform, a half of loaf is better than no loaf.

Mr. President, we've been here before—trying to pass campaign finance reform, trying to stop the explosion of soft money. The question is—will it be different this time? 70% of the American people want campaign finance reform. 70% of the American people want us to clean up our act. We're the only ones who can do it.

The soft money loophole exists because we in Congress allow it.

It is time to stop pointing fingers at others and take responsibility for our share of the blame. Congress alone writes the laws. Congress alone can shut down the loopholes and reinvigorate the federal election laws.

Mr. President, the Reid amendment closes the biggest loophole in our campaign financing system and it restores that system to what Congress intended in the 1970's—that there should be reasonable limits to what a person can contribute to a candidate, a PAC or a party and that unions and corporations should not be allowed to contribute to either parties or candidates. It's that simple. We had that system in the 1970's; it operated pretty well for many years; soft money has torn apart that system, and the Reid amendment puts it back together.

The public is appalled at these huge contributions which buy access to candidates and office holders and fund television ads which are for all intents and purposes about candidates. As the Supreme Court said in Buckley, the appearance of corruption is ''inherent in a system permitting unlimited financial contributions.'' And permitting the appearance of corruption undermines the very foundation of our democracy—the trust of the people in the system. We have the right to protect our democratic institutions from being undermined by the open sale of access for large contributions which people believe reasonably translates into influence. And the greater the purchase price, the greater the perception that access yields influence.

Mr. President, we can't afford to give Mr. Tamaraz a next time. We've got to stop this practice of selling access now. And the amendment before us is the way to do it. It is time to enact campaign finance reform. That is our legislative responsibility. Otherwise we will be haunted by the words of Roger Tamraz that in the next election he will give $600,000.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Ohio, Mr. VOINOVICH, is recognized.

Mr. VOINOVICH. Madam President, this legislation before us today has presented me a dilemma, and that dilemma is that I have been publicly in favor of banning soft money. At the same time, I understand, in my State particularly, our labor unions would not be impacted by this legislation, and for all intents and purposes, they are the Democratic Party in terms of things a party would do traditionally.

I also recognize the fact that we need to raise money for our own campaigns and we need to also support our parties so they can do the job a party should be doing in our respective States and nationally. I recall during my campaign for the Senate, I raised my money the hard way, hard dollars. But I kept worrying, toward the end of the campaign, whether or not soft money would appear from somewhere and whether or not I would be able to counteract that soft money coming into our State. In my particular case, it didn't. I suspect maybe it didn't because they thought I was going to win.

The fact is, I thought about this last weekend. I had intended to come here today and present an amendment that I think would improve the McCain-Feingold piece of legislation. Unfortunately, I understand no amendments are going to be accepted. I was going to ask that the Daschle amendment be laid aside, but I understand such requests have been objected to.

I ask unanimous consent that the amendment I was going to send to the desk be printed in the RECORD and I be given a few minutes to explain what the amendment would have accomplished.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. ___. MODIFICATION OF CONTRIBUTION LIMITS.

(a) CONTRIBUTION LIMIT FOR CANDIDATES AND POLITICAL PARTIES.—Section 315(a)(1) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441a(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''$1,000'' and inserting ''$3,000''; and

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''$20,000'' and inserting ''$25,000''.

(b) AGGREGATE INDIVIDUAL LIMIT.—Section 315(a)(3) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441a(a)(3)), as amended by section 3(b), is amended by striking the first sentence and inserting the following: ''An individual shall not make contributions described in subparagraphs (A) and (C) of paragraph (1) in an aggregate amount in excess of $25,000 during any calendar year.''.

(c) INDEX OF CERTAIN AMOUNTS.—Section 315(c) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441a(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking ''subsection (b) and subsection (d)'' and inserting ''paragraphs (1) and (3) of subsection (a) and subsections (b) and (d)''; and

(2) in paragraph (2)(B), by striking ''means the calendar year 1974.'' and inserting ''means—

''(A) in the case of subsections (b) and (d), calendar year 1974; and

''(B) in the case of subsection (a), calendar year 1999.''.

SEC. ___. WORKERS' POLITICAL RIGHTS.

Section 316 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441b) is amended by adding the following:

''(c)(1) Except with the separate, prior, written, voluntary authorization of a stockholder, employee, member, or nonmember, it shall be unlawful—

''(A) for any national bank or corporation described in this section to collect from or assess such stockholder or employee any dues, initiation fee, or other payment as a condition of employment if any part of such dues, fee, or payment will be used for political activities in which the national bank or corporation, as the case may be, is engaged; and

''(B) for any labor organization described in this section to collect from or assess such member or nonmember any dues, initiation fee, or other payment if any part of such dues, fee, or payment will be used for political activities.

''(2) An authorization described in paragraph (1) shall remain in effect until revoked and may be revoked at any time.

''(3) For purposes of this subsection, the term 'political activities' includes communications or other activities which involve carrying on propaganda, attempting to influence legislation, or participating or intervening in any political campaign or political party.''.

Mr. VOINOVICH. My amendment would have leveled the playing field by empowering average Americans over special interests in their ability to participate in the electoral process. I believe the bill before us doesn't do that. I think it further tilts the balance toward a handful of powerful individuals, individuals who have the ability to determine how to spend the dues of some 16 million hard-working men and women. I am quite surprised we haven't heard more about that.

The good thing about this bill is that it will end the enormous corporate donations to political parties, donations that reach into six figures. I was glad the Senator from Michigan made a point of the fact that soft money from corporations does not go only to the Republican Party but goes to the Republican Party and the Democratic Party. Editorially, I suggest the invitations to join the Democratic National Committee or the Republican Committee, in terms of belonging to the club, regardless of what happens to McCain-Feingold, ought to be something to which all of us stand up and object.

I recall, being Governor of Ohio, I never had a fundraiser in the Governor's residence. I tried not to use my office to take money out of the pockets of people who were encouraged to contribute either to my campaign, someone else's campaign, or to the Republican Party. I hope after this is over, all of us will indicate to our parties that the days of the clubs and the rest of it should be over so that people such as Senator LEVIN can't get up and show the ways people are being asked to contribute. I think that is horrible. It sends a bad message to the American people. It certainly adds to the cynicism and is one of the reasons we have fewer people show up on election day.

Unfortunately, a soft money ban without other reforms has the potential to severely impact the ability of our parties to continue their worthwhile activities, including grassroots mobilization and party building. Banning party soft money is an objective I support. However, I am concerned about the devastating impact it could have on the ability of our national parties to cover operating expenses and grassroots activities.

Current contribution limits must be updated. Under current law, an individual can give up to $25,000 per year total in campaign contributions, with a sublimit of $20,000 of that amount to the parties. If we ban soft money contributions to the parties without adjusting total contribution limits, the parties will have to compete with their own candidates for a limited supply of money.

My amendment would fix the problem. It would eliminate soft money and

would create two separate aggregate limits for yearly hard dollar contributions—I am talking about hard dollar individual contributions—a $25,000 limit to candidates and a $25,000 limit to parties. These limits would be indexed to inflation, so once they went into effect, they would go up each year.

In addition to creating new aggregate limits, my amendment would adjust individual campaign contribution limits. As my colleagues know, our current campaign contribution limits are not indexed to inflation; they have remained the same since the law was enacted 25 years ago. Under current law, an individual cannot give more than $1,000 to the general election campaign of a particular Federal candidate in a given year. If this limit had been indexed to inflation, it would be approximately $3,000 today.

Adjusting the individual contribution limits is important for three reasons. That is what my amendment would have done. It would have increased it from $1,000 to $3,000, and then it would have indexed it up each year.

First of all, it would reduce the amount of time candidates spend raising money. The people in this country should know about the hours and hours candidates running for national office and local office spend dialing for dollars. I have already started to raise money for my next campaign for the Senate because I know if I don't spread it out over a long period of time, I will be unable, during my last 2 years in this body, to do the job the people of the State of Ohio have asked me to do. We need to increase that campaign contribution limit.

Second, it would level the playing field for candidates competing against wealthy opponents who are bankrolling their own campaigns. With all due respect to many Members of this body, if we keep going the way we are, people such as GEORGE VOINOVICH will not be able to be in the Senate because we are seeing more and more campaigns bankrolled by individuals who can win primaries and, once the primary is over, they can put their own money into the campaign. Money does have an impact on the results of an election.

Third, it also would relieve the pressure for groups to seek out loopholes to circumvent the campaign finance laws. In fact, many experts believe the reason we have the increase in sham issue ads in the past few years is the tightening of the amount individuals can give in hard dollars. My amendment would address these concerns by increasing the individual campaign contribution limit from $1,000 to $3,000 per election and then adjust it, as I say, each year.

Lastly, one of the greatest areas of abuse in the current campaign finance system is the involuntary use of membership dues by union leaders for political purposes. In addition to making soft money contributions to parties and engaging in issue advocacy, labor leaders also spend millions of unauthorized dollars each election cycle in order to explicitly advocate for labor's preferred candidates among its rank and file, a rank and file which is over 16 million. That doesn't include the millions more that are in their families.

These express advocacy activities include phone banks, get-out-the-vote drives, newsletters, and scorecards. In my State, the Democratic Party does not do it; it is the labor unions that do it. No one, not even union members, is exactly sure how much union leaders spend for these campaign activities because this money is unregulated and thus soft. It is all soft money.

Under McCain-Feingold, party soft money would be prohibited, just as it should be. However, MCCAIN-FEINGOLD would allow this key form of union money to remain entirely unchecked. I just can't understand why those who are promoting McCain-Feingold haven't been willing to take on this particular issue that seems to be put over on the side as not being something that is very important. It is really important to many of us around this country, particularly individuals such as myself who have been the victim of that soft money effort.

Union leaders would be allowed to continue spending millions of dollars of membership dues to support the candidates of their choice and to influence elections, thereby tilting the playing field in favor of union-backed candidates.

We have heard this over and over again today. According to AFL–CIO president John Sweeney, some $46 million in union funds is going to be used to influence this coming election. In the 1996 cycle alone, $30 million was spent. This $46 million is a 53-percent increase in spending from just a few years ago. Think of it, a 53-percent increase in the use of union dues for political purposes.

McCain-Feingold would not regulate any of that incredible amount of money—$46 million. That is just for the Federal candidates. It doesn't talk about the money that is going to be used at the State and local level.

I believe an effective and constitutional way to address this issue is by requiring union leaders to get written authorization from each of their members before they use any portion of their dues for political activities.

I heard earlier about the codification of the Beck decision. While the Beck codification contained in McCain-Feingold bill is a step in the right direction, it would only protect a very small group of people: dues-paying, nonmembers in non-right-to-work States. However, no one should be compelled to give campaign contributions without explicit approval.

I do not come from a right-to-work State. I have people in my State who, in order to get a job, must join the union. Many of those individuals complain to me that they have no control over how their union dollars are being spent. I think those individuals, those hard-working men and women, ought to have the opportunity to say whether or not they want their union dues to be used for political purposes. I can't help but believe that, if they did that, it would not be the great problem some think it would be. But it would cause the unions to go out and really get their people involved and let them make their own decision as to whether or not they want their dues to be used for political purposes.

My amendment would give them the right to know where their hard-earned dollars are being spent. Unfortunately, I have been denied the opportunity to offer that amendment.

The proponents of this bill have utilized parliamentary tactics designed to tie up the Senate without any meaningful discussion of some of these alternatives. That is their right. However, if we don't have a full discussion of this bill—with the ability to amend and make the bill stronger—the proponents of this legislation should not expect Senators to support its passage.

We can debate this bill, amend this bill, and pass this bill in the hope we can get some real change in our current campaign finance system. Unfortunately, it appears that some of my colleagues—and we see this a lot in this body—are interested in scoring political points. This is a problem, and I respect those who have tried to do something about it. But, from my perspective, if we don't allow working men and women who belong to labor unions, the opportunity to decide how their union dollars should be spent, this bill is flawed to the extent that I would vote against it.

I thank the Chair.

Mr. MACK. Madam President, as Congress considers various plans to overhaul the current campaign finance system, I think everyone can agree on one fact: the status quo is indefensible. The system needs to change in order to restore the American people's faith in their government.

The imbalances which exist in our election laws today were created by the Federal Election Campaign Act in the name of equality. They resulted in unfair advantages which are institutionalized in the name of fairness, protecting some forms of political speech while criminalizing others. Enacting more laws along the same lines will only lead us further down the path of destruction. Freedom matters. Freedom works. Free speech works. Free participation works. The current system does not. If we want real reform, we will scrap this bill, repeal current law, and start over.

Campaign finance reformers think the solution is new regulations and methods that I believe work only to preclude participation in politics. They believe that new laws, more restrictions, and additional bureaucracy are the answer. This position is based upon the assumption that current laws are working and they just need a few modifications to make them better. I

strongly disagree. Freedom of expression is an end in itself and can not be subordinated to any other goals of society. Information is the backbone to freedom, ignorance is the backbone to oppression.

Reformers tolerate these inequalities because they believe they will result in lower-cost elections, less influence in the process by special interests, and will make the electoral system more accessible to challengers. Even if these goals could be achieved in this way, the trampling of the First Amendment in the process is unacceptable.

The fact is, current laws do not work. Let's admit that. We wouldn't be debating this issue if they did. They were passed in haste, as a knee-jerk reaction to the Watergate era, and while they were enacted with good intentions, their result has been a disaster. We should recognize that a mistake was made when the Federal Election Campaign Act was enacted, and no modifications to this law will improve the system.

Campaign finance laws restricting free speech should be repealed, and the absolute freedom to engage in the political process should be promoted and defended. The American people should know that their participation is encouraged, respected, and welcome. If that participation includes fully disclosed contributions to candidates and parties, so be it. Disclosure is the key factor here. Let's give the American people some credit. They are smart enough to judge for themselves where conflicts of interest lie. They do not need the bureaucracy of the Federal Elections Commission to police their speech and thwart their involvement. The only job of the FEC should be the posting and reporting of all contributions in a timely manner so that the American people can judge for themselves. Current law is an insult to the intelligence of the American people.

Soft money is perceived as a loophole in current law. Banning soft money is only one more step toward the elimination of free speech in elections. The First Amendment right to freedom of speech is not a loophole. It is a fundamental freedom that protects, among other things, political speech. Again, let Americans decide whether and to what extent they want to participate.

We should be protecting freedom of speech over everything else. We should not enact legislation to preclude the public from voicing their opinions on the work we do here. We may not like what is said about us, but we can all agree that people have a right to speak their mind, especially their political mind.

This bill also recognizes that current law does not protect working Americans' ability to decide which causes they will support. While this bill codifies the Beck decision which enables non-union workers to request a refund for the portion of their union fees used for political causes. If it does not address the concerns of union members who are forced to participate in political causes without their consent.

No American should be faced with the direct or indirect threat of losing their job because of their political beliefs. No one should be forced to participate in advocating for a cause or causes they find repugnant. The rights of individuals to be free certainly extends to their political beliefs and the way in which they choose to participate or not to participate. No forced participation under any guise should be tolerated or encouraged. Let individuals make choices for themselves. That is the most fundamental freedom in a democracy.

A vibrant democracy depends on the ability of all voices to be heard, and how loudly one may wish to speak should be limited only by that individual, not by government. If an individual can and is willing to expend over $1,000 in support of a candidate, they should be able to do so. If they wish to express their support with their time or in any other fashion, then this, too, should be applauded and encouraged. And if individuals wish to ignore the political process altogether, then this, too, is a right to be defended. To tinker with this fundamental right gives power to some at the expense of others.

Finally, I would submit, that we need to re-examine our attitude toward money in the electoral process, and I would propose that spending money to communicate one's message is not the root of all evil in politics. Candidates for public office have the important task of getting their message out to the voters. In statewide races across the country, candidates must spend substantial amounts of money for print and electronic media, since it is the best current method of reaching the maximum audience.

Take a moment and think about the power of the media today—television, newspapers and radio frame the debates of important issues. A candidate must be able to raise enough money to get his or her message out to the public.

When I was campaigning for my Senate seat back in 1988, I faced enormous opposition from the newspapers. Newspapers have vast resources to openly campaign for a candidate. Had I not had the freedom and ability to counter their message, I would not be a Senator today.

True reform will not strip candidates, parties, or individuals of their ability to counter the messages in the media. True reform should recognize the imbalance current law has created, and would seek to level the playing field between candidates and the media. Remember, the First Amendment protects freedom of the press, but it also protects the freedom of individuals to speak loud and clear.

Madam President, I believe in the First Amendment. Protecting that right must be our primary goal.

Mr. WARNER. Madam President, it is unfortunate that the procedural structure that has been erected stands in the way of moving forward on significant and thoughtful reform to our campaign finance laws. I would like to have the opportunity to debate and vote on some of those reforms, particularly the measure offered by Senator HAGEL, but we are precluded from doing so. Today, I want to speak about campaign finance reform legislation I introduced earlier this year and about an amendment I am prepared to offer.

This past May I introduced the Constitution and Effective Reform of Campaigns Act of CERCA, which I first introduced during the 105th Congress. This legislation is the product of 2 years of hearings during my chairmanship of the Rules Committee, discussions with numerous experts, party officials, and candidates, and nearly two decades of participating in campaigns and campaign finances debates in the Senate.

I view my legislation as an opportunity for bipartisan support. It is a good faith effort to strike middle ground between those who believe public financing of campaigns is the solution, and those who believe the solution is to remove current regulations. If offers a package of proposals which realistically can be achieved with bipartisan support and meet the desire of the majority of Americans who believe that our present system can be reformed. In my judgment, we will not succeed with any measure of campaign reform in this complicated field without a bipartisan consensus.

In drafting this legislation, I began with four premises. First, all provisions had to be consistent with the first amendment: Congress would be acting in bad faith to adopt provisions which have a likelihood of being struck down by the Federal courts.

Second, I oppose public financing and mandating ''free'' or reduced-cost media time which in my mind is neither free nor a good policy idea. Why should seekers of Federal office get free time, while candidates for State office or local office—from governors to local sheriffs—do not receive comparable free benefits? Such an inquity and imbalance will breed friction between Federal and State office seekers.

Third, I believe we should try to increase the role of citizens and the political parties.

Fourth, any framwork of campaign reform legislation must respect and protect the constitutional right of individuals, groups, and organization to participate in advocacy concerning political issues.

The McCain-Feingold bill has been debated thoroughly in the Senate, and any objective observer of the Senate would agree that we are genuinely deadlocked. This body needs to move beyond the debate of McCain-Fiengold. I hope that all Members will review my bill as an objective and pragmatic approach to current problems with our campaign system. I commend other Members for coming forward, as I have,

with proposals which objectively represent pragmatic approaches to what can be achieved.

Several of the issues addressed in my legislation have been raised by other Members in the context of this debate. Amendments have been proposed on foreign soft money, increasing the hard dollar contribution limits, and disclosure of last-minute expenditures, among others.

My focus today is how can we expand participation in the political process—both by voters and by potential candidates. I hope that any reform carries with it the opportunity for more small contributors to participate in the political process. And, I hope that reform will bring more candidates into the arena.

To this end, I want to focus on two reforms contained in my original legislation. First, we need to ensure that the average voter can, and will, contribute to the candidate of their choice. The influence of voters on campaigns has been diminished by the activities of political action committees and interest groups. Therefore, I propose a $100 tax credit for contributions made by citizens, with incomes under specified levels, to Senate and House candidates in their states. This credit should spark an influx of small dollar contributions to balance the greater ability of citizens with higher incomes to participate. In addition, the increased individual contribution limit, as proposed by others, should balance the activities of political action committees.

Second, we need to remove barriers to challengers. Compared to incumbents, challengers face greater difficulties raising funds and communicating with voters, particularly at the outset of a campaign. My solution is to allow candidates to receive ''seed money'' contributions of up to $10,000 from individuals and political action committees.

This provision should help get candidacies off the ground. The total amount of these ''seed money'' contributions could not exceed $100,000 for House candidates or $300,000 for Senate candidates. To meet the constitutional test, this provision would apply to both challengers and incumbents alike, but in the case of an incumbent with money carried over from a prior cycle, those funds would count against the seed money limit. In addition, Senate incumbents would be barred from using the franking privilege to send out mass mailings during the election year, rather than the 60-day ban in current law.

But elective office should not be for sale. Campaigns should be competitive. Candidates with personal wealth have a distinct advantage through their constitutional right to spend their own funds. Therefore, if a candidate spends more than $25,000 of his or her own money, the individual contribution limits would be raised to $10,000 so that candidates could raise money to counter that personal spending. Again, to meet constitutional review, this provision would apply to all candidates.

Mr. President, if we can do these two things—enhance citizen involvement, and level the playing field for condidates—we will have made significant progress. Again, I hope the Senate will have the opportunity to address these issues. I was prepared to offer my amendment and I hope I will have the opportunity to do so.

These are the problems which I believe can be solved in a bipartisan fashion. I look forward to working with my colleagues to enact meaningful campaign reform, by looking at creative solutions to address the real problems with our present campaign system.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill summary and the text of my amendment be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. —

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. ___. ENCOURAGING SMALL CONTRIBUTIONS TO LOCAL CONGRESSIONAL CANDIDATES.

(a) GENERAL RULE.—Subpart A of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to nonrefundable personal credits) is amended by inserting after section 25A the following:

''SEC. 25B. IN-STATE CONTRIBUTIONS TO CONGRESSIONAL CANDIDATES.

''(a) GENERAL RULE.—In the case of an individual, there shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year an amount equal to the aggregate amount of contributions made during the taxable year by the individual to any local congressional candidate.

''(b) LIMITATIONS.—

''(1) MAXIMUM CREDIT.—The credit allowed by subsection (a) for any taxable year shall not exceed $100 ($200 in the case of a joint return).

''(2) ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME.—No credit shall be allowed under subsection (a) for a taxable year if the taxpayer's modified adjusted gross income (as defined in section 25A(d)(3)) exceeds $60,000 ($120,000 in the case of a joint return).

''(3) VERIFICATION.—The credit allowed by subsection (a) shall be allowed with respect to any contribution only if the contribution is verified in such manner as the Secretary shall prescribe by regulation.

''(c) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) CANDIDATE.—The term 'candidate' has the meaning given the term in section 301 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 431).

''(2) CONTRIBUTION.—The term 'contribution' has the meaning given the term in section 301 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 431).

''(3) LOCAL CONGRESSIONAL CANDIDATE.—The term 'local congressional candidate' means a candidate in a primary, general, runoff, or special election seeking nomination for election to, or election to, the Senate or the House of Representatives for the State in which the principal residence of the taxpayer is located.

''(4) PRINCIPAL RESIDENCE.—The term 'principal residence' has the same meaning as when used in section 121.''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 642 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to special rules for credits and deductions of estates or trusts) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(j) CREDIT FOR CERTAIN CONTRIBUTIONS NOT ALLOWED.—An estate or trust shall not be allowed the credit against tax provided by section 25B.''.

(2) The table of sections for subpart A of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 25A the following new item:

''Sec. 25B. In-State contributions to congressional candidates.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1999.

SEC. ___. SEED MONEY TO ENCOURAGE NEW CANDIDATES AND COMPETITIVE CAMPAIGNS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 315 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441a) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)(1), by striking ''No person'' and inserting ''Except as provided in subsection (i), no person'';

(2) in subsection (a)(2), by striking ''No multicandidate'' and inserting ''Except as provided in subsection (i), no multicandidate''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(i) MODIFICATION OF LIMITS.—

''(1) SEED MONEY.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—In the case of a candidate for nomination for election to, or election to, the Senate or House of Representatives, the limits under paragraphs (1)(A) and (2)(A) of subsection (a) for any calendar year shall be an amount equal to 4 times such limit, determined without regard to this section, until such time as the aggregate amount of contributions accepted by a candidate during an election cycle exceeds the applicable limit for a candidate.

''(B) CANDIDATE'S APPLICABLE LIMIT.—The applicable limit under subparagraph (A) with respect to a candidate shall be—

''(i) an amount equal to—

''(I) in the case of a candidate for the Senate, $300,000; and

''(II) in the case of a candidate for the House of Representatives, $100,000,

reduced (but not below zero) by

''(ii) the aggregate amount determined under subsection (j)(1) that the candidate and the candidate's authorized committees have available to transfer from a previous election cycle to the current election cycle.

''(C) TIME TO ACCEPT CONTRIBUTIONS UNDER MODIFIED LIMIT.—A candidate and the candidate's authorized committees shall not accept a contribution under the modified limits of this subsection until the candidate has received notification of the aggregate amount under subsection (j)(2).''.

(b) DETERMINATION OF CONTRIBUTIONS TRANSFERRED FROM PREVIOUS ELECTION CYCLE.—Section 315 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441a) (as amended by subsection (a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(j) DETERMINATION OF CONTRIBUTIONS TRANSFERRED FROM PREVIOUS ELECTION CYCLES.—

''(1) DETERMINATION.—For purposes of subsection (i)—

''(A) in the case of an individual elected to the Senate or the House of Representatives, after the receipt of the individual's post-general election report under section 304(a)(2)(A)(ii) for the election cycle in which the individual was elected, the Commission shall determine the aggregate amount of contributions that is available to be transferred from 1 or more previous election cycles to the current election cycle of the candidate (regardless of whether the amount has been so transferred); and

''(B) in the case of any other individual, the aggregate amount of contributions available shall be zero.

''(2) NOTIFICATION.—The Commission shall notify each candidate of the amount determined under paragraph (1) with respect to the candidate.

''(3) ADJUSTMENT.—On receipt of notification under paragraph (2), the limits under paragraphs (1)(B) and (2)(B) of subsection (i) shall be adjusted accordingly with respect to the candidate.''.

SEC. ____. MODIFICATION OF CONTRIBUTION LIMITS IN RESPONSE TO EXPENDITURES FROM PERSONAL FUNDS.

(a) MODIFICATION OF CONTRIBUTION LIMITS IN RESPONSE TO EXPENDITURES FROM PERSONAL FUNDS.—Section 315(i) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441a) (as added by section ____) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(2) INCREASE IN LIMIT TO ALLOW RESPONSE TO EXPENDITURES FROM PERSONAL FUNDS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The applicable limit under paragraph (1) for a particular election shall be increased by the personal funds amount.

''(B) PERSONAL FUNDS AMOUNT.—The personal funds amount is an amount equal to the excess (if any) of—

''(i) the greatest aggregate amount of expenditures from personal funds (as defined in section 304(a)(6)(B)) in excess of $25,000 that an opposing candidate in the same election makes; over

''(ii) the aggregate amount of expenditures from personal funds made by the candidate in the election.''.

(b) NOTIFICATION OF EXPENDITURES FROM PERSONAL FUNDS.—Section 304(a)(6) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 434(a)(6)) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subparagraph (B) as subparagraph (D); and

(2) by inserting after subparagraph (A) the following:

''(B) NOTIFICATION OF EXPENDITURE FROM PERSONAL FUNDS.—

''(i) DEFINITION OF EXPENDITURE FROM PERSONAL FUNDS.—In this subparagraph, the term 'expenditure from personal funds' means—

''(I) an expenditure made by a candidate using personal funds; and

''(II) a contribution made by a candidate using personal funds to the candidate's authorized committee.

''(ii) INITIAL NOTIFICATION.—Not later than 24 hours after a candidate seeking nomination for election to, or election to, the Senate or the House of Representatives makes or obligates to make an aggregate amount of expenditures from personal funds in excess of $25,000 in connection with any election, the candidate shall file a notification stating the amount of the expenditure with—

''(I) the Commission; and

''(II) each candidate in the same election.

''(iii) ADDITIONAL NOTIFICATION.—After a candidate files an initial notification under clause (ii), the candidate shall file an additional notification each time expenditures from personal funds are made or obligated to be made in an aggregate amount of $5,000 with—

''(I) the Commission; and

''(II) each candidate in the same election.

''(iv) CONTENTS.—A notification under clause (ii) or (iii) shall include—

''(I) the name of the candidate and the office sought by the candidate;

''(II) the date and amount of each expenditure; and

''(III) the total amount of expenditures from personal funds that the candidate has made, or obligated to make, with respect to an election as of the date of the expenditure that is the subject of the notification.''.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—Section 301 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 431) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(20) ELECTION CYCLE.—The term 'election cycle' means the period beginning on the day after the date of the most recent general election for the specific office or seat that a candidate is seeking and ending on the date of the next general election for that office or seat.

''(21) PERSONAL FUNDS.—The term 'personal funds' means an amount that is derived from—

''(A) any asset that, under applicable State law, at the time the individual became a candidate, the candidate had legal right of access to or control over, and with respect to which the candidate had—

''(i) legal and rightful title; or

''(ii) an equitable interest;

''(B) income received during the current election cycle of the candidate, including—

''(i) a salary and other earned income from bona fide employment;

''(ii) dividends and proceeds from the sale of the candidate's stocks or other investments;

''(iii) bequests to the candidate;

''(iv) income from trusts established before the beginning of the election cycle;

''(v) income from trusts established by bequest after the beginning of the election cycle of which the candidate is the beneficiary;

''(vi) gifts of a personal nature that had been customarily received by the candidate prior to beginning of the election cycle; and

''(vii) proceeds from lotteries and similar legal games of chance; and

''(C) a portion of assets that are jointly owned by the candidate and the candidate's spouse equal to the candidate's share of the asset under the instrument of conveyance or ownership but if no specific share is indicated by an instrument of conveyance or ownership, the value of ½ of the property.''.

SEC. ____. LIMIT ON SENATE USE OF THE FRANKING PRIVILEGE.

Section 3210(a)(6) of title 39, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A)—

(A) in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking ''Congress may not'' and inserting ''the House of Representatives may not''; and

(B) in clause (i), by striking ''60 days (or, in the case of a Member of the House, fewer than 90 days)'' and inserting ''90 days''; and

(2) by striking subparagraph (C) and inserting the following:

''(C)(i) A Member of the Senate shall not mail any mass mailing as franked mail during a year in which there will be an election for the seat held by the Member during the period between January 1 of that year and the date of the general election for that office, unless the Member has made a public announcement that the Member will not be a candidate for reelection to that office in that year.

''(ii) A Member of the Senate shall not mail any mass mailing as franked mail if the mass mailing is postmarked fewer than 60 days before the date of any primary election or general election (whether regular, special, or runoff) for any national, State, or local office in which the Member is a candidate for election.''.

S. 1107—CONSTITUTIONAL AND EFFECTIVE REFORM OF CAMPAIGNS ACT OF 1999

TITLE I—ENHANCEMENT OF CITIZEN INVOLVEMENT

Section 101: Prohibits those ineligible to vote (non-citizens, minors, felons) from making contributions (''hard money'') or donations (''soft money''). Also bans foreign aliens making independent expenditures and codifies FEC regulations on foreign control of domestic donations.

Section 102: Updates maximum individual contribution limit to $2000 per election (primary and general) and indexes both individual and PAC limits in the future.

Section 103: Provides a tax credit up to $100 for contributions to in-state candidates for Senate and House for incomes up to $60,000 ($200 for joint filers up to $120,000).

TITLE II—LEVELING THE PLAYING FIELD FOR CANDIDATES

Section 201: Seed money provision: Senate candidates may collect $300,000 and House candidates $100,000 (minus any funds carried over from a prior cycle) in contributions up to $10,000 from individuals and PAC's.

Section 202: ''Anti-millionaires'' provision: when one candidate spends over $25,000 of personal funds, a candidate may accept contributions up to $10,000 from individuals and PAC's up to the amount of personal spending minus a candidate's funds carried over from a prior cycle and own use of personal funds.

Section 203: Bans use of Senate frank for mass mailings from January 1 to election day for incumbents seeking reelection.

TITLE III—VOLUNTARINESS OF POLITICAL CONTRIBUTIONS

Section 301: Union dues provision: Labor organizations must obtain prior, written authorization for portion of dues or fees not to be used for representation: Establishes civil action for aggrieved employee. Requires employers to post notice of rights. Amends reporting statute to require better disclosure of expenses unrelated to representation.

Section 302: Corporations must disclose soft money donations in annual reports.

TITLE IV—ELIMINATION OF CAMPAIGN EXCESSES

Section 410: Adds soft money donations to present ban on fundraising on federal property and to other criminal statutes.

Section 402: Hard money contributions or soft money donations over $500 which a political committee intends to return because of illegality must be transferred to the FEC and may be given to the Treasury as part of a civil or criminal action.

Section 403: ''Soft'' and ''hard'' money provisions. Soft money cap: no national party, congressional committee or senatorial committee shall accept donations from any source exceeding $100,000 per year. Hard money increases: limit raised from $25,000 to $50,000 per individual per year with no sublimit to party committees.

Section 404: FEC regulations banning conversion of campaign funds to personal use.

TITLE V—ENHANCED DISCLOSURE

Section 501: Additional reporting requirements for candidates: weekly reports for last month of general election, 24-hour disclosure of large contributions extended to 90 days before election, and end of ''best efforts'' waiver for failure to obtain occupation of contributors over $200.

Section 502: FEC shall make reports filed available on the Internet.

Section 503: 24-hour disclosure of independent expenditures over $1,000 in last 20 days before election, and of those over $10,000 made anytime.

Section 504: Registered lobbyists shall include their own contributions and soft money donations and those of their employers and the employers' coordinated PAC's on lobbyist disclosure forms.

TITLE VI—FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION REFORM

Section 601: FEC shall develop and provide, at no cost, software to file reports, and shall issue regulations mandating electronic filing and allowing for filing by fax.

Section 602: Limits commissioners to one term of eight years.

Section 603: Increases penalties for knowing and willful violations to greater of $15,000 or 300 percent of the contribution or expenditure.

Section 604: Requires that FEC create a schedule of penalties for minor reporting violations.

Section 605: Establishes availability of oral arguments at FEC when requested and two commissioners agree. Also requires that FEC create index of Commission actions.

Section 606: Changes reporting cycle for committees to election cycle rather than calendar year.

Section 607: Classifies FEC general counsel and executive director as presidential appointments requiring Senate confirmation.

TITLE VII—IMPROVEMENTS TO NATIONAL VOTER REGISTRATION ACT

Section 701: Repeals requirement that states allow registration by mail.

Section 702: Requires that registrants for federal elections provide social security number and proof of citizenship.

Section 703: Provides states the option of removing registrants from eligible list of federal voters who have not voted in two federal elections and did not respond to postcard.

Section 704: Allows states to require photo ID at the polls.

Section 705: Repeals requirement that states allow people to change their registration at the polls and still vote.

Mrs. MURRAY. Madam President, I rise today in support of meaningful campaign finance reform. It is high time that this Congress act to improve our political process and to restore faith in our democracy. In fact, it is past time.

When I was elected by the people of my State in 1992, one of the key things they asked me to do was to help fix our campaign finance system. I have been part of the reform effort since I walked through these doors.

Well, here it is, 7 years later. And it's the same old story. Campaigns still cost too much money. And too often, the power of ideas is pushed aside by the power of money. That is not the way our system should work. We need to do all we can to show the American people that their voices count—and to provide that their voices will be heard over the roar of special interest money.

Overall, I do think we have made some positive changes in the way the Capitol operates since my election. I do think we have addressed some of the issues families care about. But our campaign finance system still undermines our best efforts—draining public interest in our political process and sapping the energy from American voters in ways that will affect our democracy for years to come.

The opponents say the public doesn't care about campaign finance reform. But, in fact, the role of money in our elections and the rise of special interest influence have a profound—and very negative—effect on public perception of politics. Many people believe that Members of Congress are controlled by special interests and wealthy donors—and are no longer listening to their concerns. It keeps them from voting and from participating in the decisions that affect their lives.

We are here to represent the people of our States. As a representative of working Americans, I have felt from the beginning that it is my duty to ensure their voices and concerns are heard loudly and clearly in the political process. If my constituents believe they aren't being heard and that is partially due to the influence of special interests, then I must do something about it. This legislation is an opportunity to act.

I think this legislation could go further, for example, in the way it treats types of advocacy. Express advocacy is designed to get the public to vote for or against a specific candidate. For that reason, express advocacy is regulated. There is another type of advocacy that is not regulated. It's called ''issue advocacy.'' Issue advocacy campaigns were intended to allow groups and individuals to communicate their support or opposition to particular policy issues. Unfortunately, these activities have become organized campaigns run by partisan groups to influence the election or defeat of a particular candidate. At a minimum, the public has a right to know who is funding these so-called ''independent expenditures'' by requiring the producers of these campaigns to disclose their contributors. A earlier version of this bill would have made issue advocacy subject to similar restrictions as express advocacy. That is one of the improvements I would like to see as we go through the amendment process.

But there are other amendments that would weaken the bill's provisions and could kill this legislation. One is the so-called Paycheck Protection Act. It is a poison pill to kill true campaign finance reform. This provision would defund unions by setting up barriers to their obtaining union dues to spend on political activities. However, the Republican Paycheck Protection Act misses the target. Despite the rhetoric, no worker is ever forced to join a union or pay for political and legislative activities with which he or she does not agree. Never. But the vast majority of unions—and their supporters—believe their voices are critical to a strong healthy economy and to strong, healthy families. And I agree with them.

I am not optimistic about this process. We have some very determined foes who oppose any attempt at reform. While we have 100 percent of the Democratic caucus and a handful of brave Republicans, it appears we do not have 60 votes to stop a filibuster against reform. This makes me unhappy, but not willing to give up.

I will continue to participate in the coalition of those Senators pushing for reform. I will keep my commitment to bring public faith back into our political system and to return political power to our citizens. And I will anxiously await the day when 60 of my Senate colleagues agree with the American people that now is the time for campaign finance reform.

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, last Thursday, I listened aghast to the exchanges among Senators MCCAIN, BENNETT, FEINGOLD, MCCONNELL, and GORTON concerning the implication that an appropriation was provided to a project in my home in exchange for campaign money.

While my junior colleague from Utah made the case commendably, I do feel compelled to respond for myself since I have actively sought and promoted these appropriations for my State.

The Senator from Arizona seems to have confused representation with corruption.

Since when does standing up for one's State, its local governments, or its people constitute corruption?

I was under the impression that this is what we were sent here to do.

The Senator from Arizona is way out of line when he suggests that my colleague, Senator BENNETT, has done even one thing even remotely improper in advocating for our State and for the help necessary to host the 2002 Winter Olympic Games. He should include me in that accusation as well.

My definition of ''pork'' is an appropriation that is unjustified (i.e., unneeded), not meritorious (i.e., the proposal is poorly conceived or too expensive), or it is solely to benefit the entity receiving the appropriation. The project that the Senator has labeled as ''pork'' is none of those things.

First, Salt Lake City was America's choice to host the Olympic games. These are America's games. There are certain things we are going to need help with and that can appropriately be done by the federal government.

The so-called pork barrel project he has cited was for Ogden, UT, for water, sewer, and storm water improvements. The Senator from Arizona has intimated on his website that this project received appropriated funds because members of the Senate—and I presume he means me and Senator BENNETT—have been improperly influenced by soft money.

I wonder if my colleague has actually thought about that. Does he really believe that Ogden, UT, is so tremendously wealthy that it can make campaign contributions or that its citizens would even countenance such a thing to achieve this project grant? Does the Senator from Arizona hear how ridiculous this sounds?

I have thought, while listening to the Senator's remarks, that we have been debating that old question about the tree falling in the forest. If a dollar flows into a campaign chest, but no one takes any action in relation to it, does that make it corrupt? Is acceptance of any campaign contribution de facto corrupt? That certainly seems to be what Senator MCCAIN is saying.

I was stunned by the personal nature of the Senator's remarks last week, particularly as regards my colleague Senator BENNETT, and most particularly since Senator MCCAIN could not

seem to cite any specific evidence that this line item for sewer improvements was included as a payoff for a soft money—or hard money for that matter—contribution.

No, the best he could do is to say that the appropriation was not authorized.

I am the chairman of the Judiciary Committee—it is an authorizing committee. And, I can't tell you the number of times I have debated jurisdiction with the Senator from Arizona. I am well aware of how strongly he feels about the authorization process. I agree with him on that.

But give me a break. The Judiciary Committee is not going to authorize every individual grant to a law enforcement agency. I can't believe the Senator wants to authorize $2 million for water, sewer, and storm water improvements in Ogden, UT.

And, I suspect that, if he were to be a spectator at the Olympic downhill in 2002, and he needed to use the restroom, he would appreciate those sewer improvements.

Moreover, the authorization process is not the good housekeeping stamp of approval. If campaign contributions can taint the appropriations process, they can also taint the authorization process. The logic of the Senator from Arizona is false on this point.

I will second the remarks made by Senator MCCONNELL with respect to the tenor of this debate. One would have hoped that we could debate our respective ideas about campaign finance reform without getting into accusing one another of soft money-for-pork deals.

But, I hope my colleagues will listen carefully when the Senator from Arizona and the Senator from Wisconsin attempt to smooth things over by saying, ''we're not accusing you; it's the system.''

If these colleagues are not accusing us, then why do we need this bill? If members have not engaged in abuses—then this bill has no basis.

When I was a youngster I remember being terribly irritated when the teacher made the whole class stay after school because a couple of my classmates misbehaved. I remember too that sometimes the punishment was that the rules governing library privileges or playground activity became stricter because certain classmates broke the old ones.

Today, our Government reacts much the same way when there have been abuses of freedome—we want to legislate a means of prevention. We want to tighten up the rules.

Because the people are justifiably outraged at abuses, particularly at breaches of their trust, we feel compelled to respond.

We think if we rail loudly in sympathy with their outrage and introduce bills to address the cause of it, the people will think we are above it and have nothing to do with the dirty business. But, me thinks some doth protest too much. (So there will be no misunderstanding, I refer here to the Clinton administration which has yet to sanction the appointment of an independent counsel to investigate the alleged campaign finance violations involving contributions to the Democratic National Committee.)

At the end of the day, the people will not be fooled. While there is no doubt in my mind that those who favor the McCain-Feingold legislation do so with the purest of motives, and I respect their views, I believe that what the people really want is not new law, but honest politicians. And, that, I say to my colleagues, cannot be legislated.

Moreover, to the extent that there have been abuses of campaign integrity, let alone existing law, the problem is not the lack of regulation, but the violation of it. Our efforts might be better spent in toughening both public and private oversight, enforcement, and penalties on the offenders.

But, we are instead debating legislation that would impose significant new regulations on the way we undertake the most fundamental of all American freedoms—elections for public office.

What on earth are we doing? Why are we even contemplating such sweeping changes—changes that would inevitably dampen free speech in our country? Changes that would damage the ''checks and balances'' that are inherent in our two-party system?

Well, in light of recent abuses of freedom in campaign fundraising and in light of what we politicians perceive to be mounting dissatisfaction among the electorate, we are debating a proposal for a new law.

That'll fix it. We will all put out our press releases. We will congratulate each other on our so-called ''reform'' legislation. And, if it's a ''reform'' bill, it must be good, right?

With all due respect to my colleagues Senators MCCAIN AND FEINGOLD, who have been working on this legislation for a long time and who I know are sincerely dedicated to improving our campaign process, I must say that, if we pass their bill, we will deliver broad-based reforms which we perceive to be popular at the moment. But, we will also be fundamentally changing the relationship between those running for public office and those who elect them for the long term. We will be imposing significantly more regulation governing who can give what to whom as well as how support can be given and how it can be received.

Let me comment briefly on this relationship. We all understand it—or we should.

When we throw our hats in the ring for public office, we do so because we believe we have ideas and a point of view that would benefit our home state constituents and our country. And, I think it is safe to say that we don't do it for the money—and we have pretty well ''deperked'' this place as well.

But, our success depends on the support of others. Our candidacies all began in someone's office or living room. There may have been 3, 5, 10, 15 people in the room. The first order of business was to get our views and ideas before the people with the hope that our platform would appeal to enough people that they would join our bandwagon.

How do you grow a campaign? First, people have to know who you are. So, you print some posters and campaign buttons. I might add that when I first ran in 1976, having never held public office before and running against a 3-term incumbent senator, I needed a lot of signs.

Then, since you can't really get much substantive information on a yard sign or button, you need some brochures. You need to put out some press releases. You need to buy some TV and radio advertising.

Assuming you get some positive response from the people to your views, you will need to hire some staff to organize volunteer efforts and precincts. Later on, you will need to have some phone banks and a get-out-the-vote program.

All of this requires money—that people who believe in your candidacy donate to your campaign. This is not money that is taxed and apportioned by some governmental entity. It is money voluntarily given because, in giving it, people are expressing their preferences for those who will represent them. It could be one dollar or a thousand dollars, but the act of contributing to a candidate for public office is an exercise of political freedom.

Now, the McCain-Feingold bill, for all of its good intentions, fails this crucial test: it imposes new restrictions on how people can participate financially in campaigns.

Previous incarnations of the McCain-Feingold bill would have outlawed all soft money contributions and issue advocacy by special interest groups.

The argument goes that sophisticated organizations are manipulating candidates and elections by donating large amounts of money. And, the argument goes further that this manipulation is poisoning the political process for all citizens.

So-called coffees at the White House, nights in the Lincoln Bedroom, receptions at Buddhist temples, fundraising from taxpayer-maintained territory, specious connections to foreign governments—that is what has affected people's faith in the electoral process. It isn't the direct mail letter, the cocktail reception, or the $10 per person summer weinie roast. People are pretty savvy. They know we have to raise the money to run, and they know it's not cheap.

But, this year, Senators MCCAIN and FEINGOLD have apparently accepted that their proposed ban was blatantly unconstitutional. They have opted for a half-ban—a ban on soft money contributions from political parties, but not on non-party organizations.

Let's be clear about one thing: political parties are already regulated by

law and regulation. These contributions and expenditures are already controlled. The Republican or Democratic National Committees cannot so much as buy a legal pad with 100 percent soft money.

This ban on party soft money merely elevates the importance of special interest soft money, which Senators MCCAIN and FEINGOLD have declared to be society's biggest evil. The League of Women Voters, which previously supported the McCain-Feingold bill, has now asked Senators to oppose it because it not only fails to correct the problem of soft money influence as they see it, but exacerbates it.

Additionally, this half-ban on soft money from political parties and its concomitant increase in the importance of special interest groups, serves to weaken our political parties.

I recognize that many Americans are frustrated with both parties—and, I admit, often for good reason. But, the fact is that a strong two-party system is what keeps American government working. Nations with multiparty systems often have extreme difficulty finding consensus and are plagued with frequent reversals in ministerial leadership, national policy, and unstable markets given political uncertainty.

The American two-party system is a healthy competition of ideas and viewpoints. And, national parties should not be curtailed in their efforts to build their state and local infrastructures and to support their slates of candidates.

A ban on the ability of national parties to send money to state and local parties and to candidates is like telling a major league baseball team that it cannot support its farm teams or give a bonus to its promising players.

Last, but certainly not least, the revised McCain-Feingold bill remains constitutionally specious.

Despite the sponsors recognition that the ban on all soft money violated free speech rights under the Supreme Court's decision ion Buckley v. Valeo, the half-ban still skates on very thin ice.

The Court stated:

> The First Amendment denies government the power to determine that spending to promote one's political views is wasteful, excessive, or unwise. In the free society ordained by our Constitution, it is not the government but the people—individually as citizens and collectively as associations and political committees—who must retain control over the quantity and range of debate on public issues in a political campaign.

But, the bottomline for today is that, quite simply, political parties are entitled to promote their views. The McCain-Feingold bill would compromise that right.

Medicare, Social Security, tax cuts, balanced budgets, and health care have all been the subject of issue advertising. And, neither Republicans nor Democrats should be ''gagged'' by the provisions of this bill. Since a political party exists to promote a particular viewpoint or philosophy of government, the McCain-Feingold proposal quite simply infringes on its right to do so.

But, unlike my school teacher's withholding recess, the McCain-Feingold proposal is not a simple trade-off of privileges for accountability. It asks Americans to exchange a fundamental freedom, which is coveted throughout the world, for the vague promise of curtailing the influence of special interests in elections.

But, here again, the McCain-Feingold proposal misses the mark. Who are the special interests? I submit that the ''special interests are us.''

One man's greedy special interest is another man's organization standing up for truth and the American way. It is impossible for this Congress—or any Congress—to make this distinction.

The prohibition on party soft money suggested by the McCain-Feingold bill does not even allow the people to exercise their own judgments about the propriety of an expenditure or even about the candidates or the issue. It simply outlaws soft money activity out of hand.

Some have said to me, ''But this is a bipartisan bill. It is a good compromise.'' My response must be that just because a measure is bipartisan and called ''reform'' does not make it good.

Moreover, I remind my colleagues that the original plaintiffs in this suit included James Buckley, the conservative Senator from New York and Eugene McCarthy, liberal former Senator from Minnesota.

The diverse coalition of groups who have led the opposition to previous versions of McCain-Feingold include the National Right to Life Committee and the American Civil Liberties Union.

In my view, Mr. President, this is not campaign finance reform. No legislation, certainly nothing called ''reform,'' should leave the people with less freedom.

Let's look at this issue.

Many pundits and many colleagues here in Congress perceive that the American people think that our government has become too fraught with special interest influence, bought with special interest campaign contributions. We have all heard voters voice their frustrations about government. Given some of the games we play up here that affect necessary legislation—such as the bankruptcy bill to name just one example—this attitude is not surprising or unwarranted.

It may be a mistake to interpret these frustrations as widespread cynicism about the influence of special interests rather than about the government's inability to enact tax relief, inertia on long-term Social Security and Medicare reforms, and the tug-of-war on budget and appropriations.

Nevertheless, it goes without saying that maintaining the integrity of our election system and citizens' confidence in it has to be among our highest priorities. The question is: what is the right reform?

The best way to reform our campaign finance system is to open it up to the light of day and to allow citizens to make the judgments about how much influence is too much.

For example, some people may believe that a single dollar from a tobacco PAC, an environmental lobby, or the AFL–CIO is too much. For others, such contributions may not be as much of a concern.

Under a system of more prompt, user-friendly disclosure, people can compare the source of contributions with votes cast by the candidate. They can decide for themselves which donations are rewards for faithfulness to a principle and representation of constituents and which contributions might be a quid pro quo for special favors.

I had planned to offer a substitute amendment to S. 1593. I called my proposal the ''Citizens' Right to Know Act.'' It would require all candidates and political committees to disclose every contribution they receive and every expenditure they make over $200 within 14 days on a publicly accessible website. This means people will not have to wade through FEC bureaucracy to get this information, and the information will be continuously updated.

Further, my proposal would encourage—not require—non-party organizations to disclose expenditures in a constitutionally acceptable manner the funds that they devote to political activity. Organizations that chose to file voluntary reports with the FEC would make individual donors to their PACs eligible for a tax deduction of up to $100.

This provision is designed to encourage voluntary disclosure of expenditures of organizational soft money. Those organizations that did so would be shedding light on campaign finance not because they have to, but because it furthers the cause of an informed democracy.

An article in the Investor's Business Daily quoted John Ferejohn of Stanford University as writing that ''nothing strikes the student of public opinion and democracy more forcefully than the paucity of information most people possess about politics.''

The article goes on to suggest that ''many reforms, far from helping, would cut the flow of political information to an already ill-informed public.''

Citing a study by Stephen Ansolabehere of MIT and Shanto Iyengar of UCLA, which demonstrates that political advertising ''enlightens voters,'' the IBD concludes that ''well-informed voters are the key to a well-functioning democracy.'' [Investor's Business Daily; 9/20/99]

Morton Kondracke editorializes in the July 30, 1999, Washington Times, ''Full disclosure would be valuable on its merits—letting voters know exactly who is paying for what in election campaigns. Right now, campaign money is going increasingly underground.''

This is precisely the issue my amendment addresses. My amendment, rather than prohibit the American people from having certain information produced by political parties, it would open up information about campaign finance. Knowledge is power. My proposal is predicated on giving the people more power.

Additionally, my legislation will raise the limits on individual participation in elections. Special interest PACs sprung up as a response to the limitations on individual participation in elections. The contribution limit for individuals is $1000 and it has not been adjusted since it was enacted in 1974.

Why are these limits problematic? The answer is that if a candidate can raise $5000 in one phone call to a PAC, why make 5 phone calls hoping to raise the same amount from individuals? My legislation proposes to make individuals at least as important as PACs.

My bill also raises the 25-year-old limits on donations to parties and PACs. It raises the current limits on what both individuals and PACs can give to political parties.

As the League of Women Voters has correctly pointed out, the activities of political parties are already regulated, whereas the political activities of other organizations are not. If we are concerned about the influence of ''soft'' money—that is, money in campaigns that is not regulated and not disclosed—and cannot be regulated or subject to disclosure under our Constitution—then we ought to encourage—not punish—greater political participation through our party structures.

We need to put individuals back as equal players in the campaign finance arena. Special interests—both PACs and soft money—have become important in large part because current law limits are not only a quarter century old, but are also higher for special interests than individuals.

The McCain-Feingold approach represents a constitutionally specious barrier to free speech. It would, by law, prohibit political parties from using soft money to communicate with voters.

My amendment, in contrast, does not prohibit anything. It does not restrict the flow of information to citizens—it does not restrict freedom. On the contrary, my amendment recognizes that citizens are the ultimate arbiters in elections. They should have access to as much information as possible about the candidates and the positions they represent.

Thus far, the information that is available to voters about campaign finance has been difficult to obtain and untimely. My amendment, by empowering votes with this information, will put the role of special interests where it rightfully belongs—in the eye of the beholder, not the federal government.

I regret very much that Senator DASCHLE has elected to use this parliamentary tactic—filling the amendment tree and objecting to consideration of other amendments—to foreclose all other amendments. He has put the Senate in a take-it-or-leave-it situation.

Some of us had ideas for amendments to the McCain-Feingold bill—or, such as the ''Citizens' Right to Know Act,'' a proposal for a complete substitute. The opportunity for amendments, however, has been scuttled.

The proponents evidently believe they have done such a marvelous job that they refused to consider any other amendment when Senator MCCONNELL asked consent to do so last Friday.

The proponents of McCain-Feingold will no doubt hit the airwaves and say that the opponents do not support reform. They will say that we voted to keep the status quo, that we support the so-called insidious corruption of soft money.

These would be false statements. Many of us do support reform—we simply want it to be fair and respectful of constitutional protections.

There is no righteousness whatsoever in voting for a reform bill that limits freedom.

I would have liked to offer my proposal. I would have liked the Senate to consider the merits of its approach.

But, inasmuch as I will not be able to do that, and other senators who may have supported my alternative will not be able to vote for it, we are left with the Reid amendment, which does not even contain the amendments offered by the Senator from Kentucky to beef up internal procedures for accountability.

We are left with an unamended, constitutionally flawed piece of legislation that has the effect of further bureaucratizing our electoral processes and gagging our two most prominent political organizations, thus shielding the people from information as if they are incapable of making evaluations on their own.

If this is ''reform,'' it is not reform worthy of support.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Will my friend yield for a moment for me to make a comment to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. WELLSTONE. Yes.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I thank my friend from Ohio. I listened carefully to his remarks. He accurately pointed out that labor unions are the only organizations in America that can raise political funds and spend them on whatever they choose to without the consent of the donor, which is an aberration. Everybody else in the political system has to raise money from voluntary donations. They have to ask for it. I thank my friend for pointing out that there really can't be any campaign finance reform that is meaningful without addressing this extraordinary abuse. I appreciate very much his comments on this debate.

Mr. VOINOVICH. I thank the Senator from Kentucky. While I am in this body, I am going to continue to try to work with other people to see if we can't come up with something to ban soft money and deal with some of the problems I discussed, which would have been in my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Minnesota, Mr. WELLSTONE, is recognized.

AMENDMENT NO. 2306 TO AMENDMENT NO. 2298

(Purpose: To allow a State to enact voluntary public financing legislation regarding the election of Federal candidates in such State)

Mr. WELLSTONE. Madam President, I send an amendment to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The legislative assistant read as follows:

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. WELLSTONE] proposes an amendment numbered 2306 to amendment No. 2298.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that reading of the amendment be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The amendment is as follows:

At the end of the language proposed to be stricken, add the following:

SEC. . STATE PROVIDED VOLUNTARY PUBLIC FINANCING.

Section 403 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 453) is amended by adding at the end the following: ''The preceding sentence shall not be interpreted to prohibit a State from enacting a voluntary public financing system which applies to a candidate for election to Federal office, other than the office of President or Vice-President, from such State who agrees to limit acceptance of contributions, use of personal funds, and the making of expenditures in connection with the election in exchange for full or partial public financing from a State fund with respect to the election, except that such system shall not allow any person to take any action in violation of the provisions of this Act.''.

Mr. MCCONNELL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Minnesota yield for an inquiry?

Mr. WELLSTONE. I don't yield the floor, but I will yield for an inquiry.

Mr. MCCONNELL. My inquiry is this: Is the Senator from Kentucky correct that this amendment is offered to what we call around here the other side of the tree?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Is the Senator from Kentucky also correct that if cloture were invoked on either of the cloture motions tomorrow, this amendment would be wiped out?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair informs the Senator that the amendment would not fall if it is germane.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Germane, postcloture?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Madam President, first of all, let me say to my colleagues that I wanted to bring this amendment to the floor because I thought we should get on with business and have up-or-down votes on amendments that deal with this, I think, critically important question.

Let me start out with some context. This is an editorial from the New York Times, which actually was written Tuesday, October 20, 1998. The title is ''A Grass-Roots Message On Reform.''

This deals with some of the victories that have taken place around the country; namely, two initiatives; one was in Massachusetts and one in Arizona. Of course, the Presiding Officer knows this all started with Maine, and then there was Vermont. I am talking about the clean money/clean election option. This is an editorial that talks about the momentum at the State level.

What has happened is, a good many States in our country have partial public financing. In Maine, Vermont, Massachusetts, and also Arizona, citizens of those States have decided that if people running for office will agree, it is on a voluntary basis, they are going for a clean money/clean election option. If a State desires a States rights option, they should be able to apply it to House and Senate races. I point this out to the Chair because I think it is all positive about her.

I notice in this paragraph, it says that it is no surprise that two of the seven Senate Republicans who challenged their leadership on this issue came from Maine, where similar public financing legislation was passed in 1996. It has been important to see what is happening at the State level.

I ask unanimous consent this editorial be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Oct. 20, 1998]

A GRASS-ROOTS MESSAGE ON REFORM

In the weeks since campaign finance reform was killed in Washington, it has been fashionable to say that the issue never had much popular support. But that cynical view is belied by the momentum behind two important initiatives this fall, in Massachusetts and Arizona, where voters are being asked to create publicly financed campaign systems that would free politicians of their dependence on money from special interests. Approval of these measures would provide a model for how to clean up local political races and send a strong signal to Washington to enact reform legislation next year.

Both initiatives call for extensive public money to pay for political campaigns, to be awarded after the candidates have raised modest sums on their own. Many state and local governments, including New York City, have provisions for public financing. The post-Watergate laws governing national elections also provide for public subsidies. But in these cases, the money kicks in only when the candidates themselves have raised large sums. As the last round of scandals shows, candidates have also circumvented the law by accepting public money and then using unregulated ''soft money'' contributions for their campaigns.

Even though it will cost them money, the voters in both states are responding positively. In Massachusetts, the money would come in part from taxpayers checking off a box on their income-tax returns, and in part from legislative appropriations. In Arizona, the money would be raised by increasing the fee for lobbyists, a voluntary tax checkoff and a surcharge on criminal and civil fines.

Another encouraging sign is that these reforms are occurring in one of the most conservative states in the country as well as in one of the most liberal. It is perhaps no accident that the main sponsors of campaign reform in Washington include Senator John McCain of Arizona and Representative Martin Meehan of Massachusetts. Nor is it surprising that two of the seven Senate Republicans who challenged their leadership on the issue this year came from Maine, where similar public financing legislation was enacted in 1996.

Success in Arizona, Massachusetts and other states with more limited campaign reform measures on their ballots could build momentum, for change in Washington next year. Many incumbent lawmakers have long argued that the public will not tolerate public financing, by which they usually mean that they do not want to give their challengers an equal chance. They need only be reminded that voters can speak even more loudly than campaign donations.

Mr. WELLSTONE. There was a piece also that David Broder wrote, on July 18, 1999, in the Washington Post, ''Federal Lag, State Reform.'' David Broder, a highly respected journalist, talks about the energy at the State level. He talks about the work of public campaigns and victories in Maine and Vermont and Massachusetts and Arizona. He also talks about some of the activity around the country, the energy of grassroots people, people in our States, at the State level, who say, don't tell us we don't care about good government; don't tell us we don't care about clean elections. They are passing these initiatives.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, July 18, 1999]

FEDERAL LAG, STATE REFORM

(By David S. Broder)

While Congress continues to procrastinate on changing the campaign finance laws—the House will not take up the issue until September; the Senate, who knows when?—things are changing in the states.

More and more of them are moving beyond the regulatory approach embodied in most of the proposals in Washington and are deciding that public financing of elections is the best way to reduce the influence of interest groups and wealthy individuals—while satisfying the maze of legalities laid down by the courts.

The latest and in some ways most surprising development comes in Wisconsin, where Gov. Tommy Thompson, the dean of the 50 governors and a staunch Republican, is making headway with a proposal for partial public funding of state campaigns.

An appropriation of $750,000, urged by Thompson as part of a reform plan devised by a bipartisan commission, has been approved by the Senate-House finance committee and is awaiting final action by the legislature. The full plan has not yet passed and faces strong opposition, but Wisconsin could become the second state in recent years, following Vermont, to move to public financing by action of elected officials.

Since 1996, three others—Maine, Massachusetts and Arizona—have done the same thing by voter initiatives, bringing the total of states with full or partial public financing systems to 24, according to Ellen Miller, the head of Public Campaign, a Washington, DC-based group supporting these efforts. Missouri and Oregon may have such initiatives in 2000, she says.

What is interesting about this phenomenon is that public financing is considered beyond reach in the Washington debate on campaign reform. Twenty-five years ago, Congress approved partial public financing of presidential campaigns by a checkoff on individual income tax returns—with matching funds available to candidates accepting spending limits in the primaries and a full subsidy available for the general election.

But in recent years, it has been accepted wisdom on Capitol Hill that voters rebel at the idea of more of their tax dollars being used to pay for those TV spots everyone despises. And yet, when measures to subsidize campaigns from public sources are put to a vote of the people in states as diverse as Arizona and Massachusetts, they pass—despite the reluctance of many local political leaders to endorse them.

In Massachusetts, both Republican Gov. Paul Celluci and leaders of the Democratic legislature looked askance at the 1998 initiative, but it passed by a 2 to 1 margin. Even with that big win, there was doubt whether the legislature would appropriate the money to begin funding the first publicly financed elections, scheduled for 2002.

Celluci put no request in his budget, but, the legislature—a bit squeamish about defying a public mandate—did so, with the House voting for $10 million and the Senate for $13 million. The House could not resist adding a joker—a requirement that another initiative be passed in 2000 reaffirming that voters really want tax money used for campaigns—but it's not certain whether that will be in the final version of the budget.

For now, backers of the measure told me, they are confident that a series of annual appropriations plus voluntary checkoffs will produce the $40 million kitty needed to fund 85 percent of the expenses of Massachusetts candidates who accept spending limits in 2002.

In Arizona, where the initiative barely passed by a 51 percent to 49 percent margin over the opposition of Republican Gov. Jane Hull and others, opponents have filed two lawsuits challenging the measure. The state Supreme Court threw out the first one; the second is pending in a lower court. Meantime, the financing machinery has begun to function. Lobbyists are being asked to pay higher registration fees, and a surcharge is being added to civil and criminal penalties assessed in Arizona courts. Next year, people filing their state income taxes will be told that, for the first time, they can claim a tax credit of up to $500 for political contributions—and, barring mishaps, public financing will begin in 2002.

The Wisconsin move is particularly interesting because Thompson, like most other Republicans, was initially opposed to taxpayer-financed campaigns. He endorsed the package of other reforms recommended by the bipartisan commission he had named. But when that measure was stymied by partisan battling in the legislature, Thompson endorsed the direct subsidy as a way of breaking the deadlock. In a phone call from Alaska, where he was vacationing, he told me that he hopes Wisconsin, which pioneered welfare reform under his leadership, ''can be a model for the country'' on campaign reform as well.

It will take more courage than Washington usually displays for that wish to be fulfilled.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Finally, Madam President, I wish to read from a letter that asks Senators to support this amendment which would allow States to enact voluntary public financing legislation, commonly referred to as clean money/clean election initiatives regarding the election of Federal candidates in the States.

Historically, the states have been ''laboratories of reform.'' (a term coined by Supreme Court Justice Louis Brandeis) where innovative public policies have been created and tested. We believe, therefore, that the U.S. Senate, which has been a champion of states' innovative efforts in a number of policy efforts in recent years, should also support the right of individual states to determine the campaign finance system for their candidates for federal elections.

This letter goes on to talk about the great victories in Arizona, Maine, Massachusetts, and Vermont, and also goes on to cite a recent poll undertaken by the Mellman Group in Iowa—you know everybody is focused on Iowa with the Presidential races—pointing out that voters, 72 percent of Democrats and 63 percent of Republicans, support a system of voluntary full public financing and spending limits for campaigns. Not only did the support cut across party lines, but also there was support among ideologies within the political party.

I ask unanimous consent this letter, which is signed by about 50 different organizations that are working on reform at the State level, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIFTY PLUS CITIZEN GROUPS IN SUPPORT OF WELLSTONE ''STATES RIGHTS'' AMENDMENT TO S. 1593, THE ''BIPARTISAN CAMPAIGN REFORM ACT OF 1999''

October 14, 1999.

DEAR SENATOR. As the Senate prepares to debate S. 1593, the ''Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act of 1999,'' we the undersigned urge you to support Senator Paul Wellstone's amendment to allow states to enact voluntary public financing legislation regarding the election of Federal candidates in such states.

Historically, the states have been ''laboratories of reform'' (a term coined by Supreme Court Justice Louis Brandeis) where innovative public policies have been created and tested. We believe, therefore, that the U.S. Senate, which has been a champion of states' innovative efforts in a number of other policy areas in recent years, should also support the right of individual states to determine the campaign finance system for their candidates for federal elections.

The states are already moving in this direction with regard to their own state elections. Twelve states currently offer partial public financing to candidates for state offices. In addition, four states have gone even further and have recently passed full public financing systems for their state elections—Arizona, Maine, Massachusetts and Vermont. Three of the four states will have such a system in place for the 2000 election cycle.

Finally, the American people, according to survey after survey, say that the current campaign finance system is out of control and they want it overhauled. A recent poll undertaken by The Mellman Group in Iowa revealed that voters (72 percent of Democrats, 63 percent of Republicans) support a system of voluntary full public financing and spending limits for campaigns. Not only did support for such a voluntary system cut across party lines, but it also maintained strong support from all ideologies within the parties.

Again, we urge you to support Senator Wellstone's amendment to S. 1593 and allow the states to have the right to decide for themselves whether a voluntary public financing program makes sense for the election campaigns of their own Members of Congress.

Sincerely,

Arizona Clean Elections Institute
Citizen Action of New York
Coalition to Stop Gun Violence
Colorado Progressive Coalition
Connecticut Citizen Action Group
Democracy South
Dollars and Democracy Project/Ohio
Episcopal Church
Equality State Policy Center/Wyoming
Florida Consumer Action Network
Florida League of Conservation Voters
Friends Committee on National Legislation
Georgia Rural-Urban Summit
Illinois Citizen Action
Indiana Alliance for Democracy
Iowa Citizen Action Network
League of United Latin American Citizens
Lutheran Office of Governmental Affairs—Evangelical Lutheran Church in America
Maine Citizen Leadership Fund
Mass Voters for Clean Elections
Michigan Citizen Action
Minnesota Alliance for Progressive Action
Missouri Alliance for Campaign Reform
Missouri Voters for Fair Elections
National Voting Rights Institute
NETWORK: A National Catholic Social Justice Lobby
New Hampshire Citizens Alliance
New Jersey Citizen Action
North Carolina Alliance for Democracy
North Dakota Progressive Coalition
Northeast Action
Ocean State Action
Ohio Valley Environmental Coalition
Oregon Political Accountability Network
Pennsylvania Consumer Action Network
Public Campaign
South Carolina Progressive Network
Southeast Forest Project
Texans for Public Justice
Texas Public Citizen
Union of American Hebrew Congregations
Unitarian Universalist Association of Congregations
United Vision for Idaho
United We Stand—Arizona
U.S. PIRG
Utah Progressive Network
Vermont PIRG
West Virginia Peoples' Election Reform Coalition
West Virginia Citizen Action
Western States Center
Wisconsin Citizen Action
Working Group on Electoral Democracy

Mr. WELLSTONE. Madam President, before I get started in arguing my brief to this amendment, I appreciated the comments of my colleague from Ohio. I appreciate the sincerity in which he made his case, but there are a couple of points on which I am in disagreement. I don't know if this amendment will come up. I certainly hope it doesn't. We have been focusing on soft money. I join Senator LEVIN in thanking Senators MCCAIN and FEINGOLD for continuing to be a strong voice for reform. I understand the pragmatism of their initiative. I think if we could ban soft money it would be a significant step for our country—a good step forward, not a great leap sideways. I thank them.

But I also want to point out for Senators, Democrats and Republican, that there is also the hard money issue. People who are listening—soft money/hard money—I think are wondering what all of this is about.

When I hear other Senators say we ought to raise the limit from $1,000 to $3,000, actuality it would be $2,000 to $6,000 counting primary and general elections. I want to point out a couple of figures.

This year, a spectacularly small portion—in the Presidential race—of U.S. citizens have contributed more than $200. So far this year, only 4 out of 10,000 Americans have made a contribution higher than $200 to the Presidential race. That is .037 percent. As of June 30, 1999, only .022 percent of all Americans have given $1,000 or more to a Presidential candidate. In the 1998 election, .06 percent of all Americans gave $1,000. That was roughly 1 in 5,000 citizens.

If you say money is speech, then I guess we know who the people are who are going to do all of the talking. I cannot believe that Senators—Republicans, Democrats—whoever they are, believe this will give ordinary people more confidence and more faith in the political process.

Again, what we have right now, when you are talking about contributions of over $1,000 this year, is .022 percent. Even over $200, it is only .037 percent. People do not have this kind of money. People can't afford to make these kinds of contributions.

Now what we are going to do is raise this from $1,000 to $3,000—actually $2,000 to $6,000, counting primary and general elections—and we are going to call this a reform.

I want to say to everybody that in my not so humble opinion, about 90 percent of the people in the country will not view this as reform. They will view this as a huge step backward, and they will view this as an effort to enable the wealthiest and high-income citizens to have even more influence and more say over the political process than they have right now.

This amendment is a States rights amendment to this underlying bill. I hope it will have broad bipartisan support. This amendment allows States to set up voluntary systems of full or partial public financing for Federal congressional candidates that involve voluntary spending limits on both personal and outside contributions as long as those systems otherwise are not in conflict with the Federal Election Campaign Act. Again, it is entirely up to the candidates. It is only if they agree to it. Clearly, we set a floor, which is the Federal Election Campaign Act.

Again, the letter I read to you was on the mark. States have been the laboratories for reform. This States rights amendment would allow these laboratories to do this work but in a safe way because we make it clear that the Federal law remains the floor. No State can violate existing Federal law. No State can be in violation of existing Federal law. But if a State wants to do better—if Kentucky or Minnesota or Nebraska or Arizona—Arizona has already done better, and Minnesota tried—they want to apply some system of partial or full public financing to Federal offices, and they say: we are sick and tired of waiting for you all to pass this kind of legislation; we have the sneaking suspicion that those interest groups that have the power have too much say in the Senate and you are not going to pass it; let us have a go at it, then we ought to let States do so.

The Federal law is the floor. But it is a very low floor. We had this debate the other day. I don't want to go over again in great detail the definition of corruption. Let me simply say one more time that I, for one, I say to my colleague whom I have a lot of affection for, the Senator from Utah, that I am not going to make any arguments about a one-to-one correlation between fundraising and ''corruption.'' I am not going to make any of those arguments, but I will say that to me corruption is more serious than wrongdoing of individual officeholders. It is systemic. That is what we have. It is simply a case of those people who make these big contributions, the big soft money contributions and the big hard money contributions—they are the investors. They are the heavy hitters. They are the players. They are the ones who are well connected. They are the ones who have too much influence. And most citizens believe there is a connection between big special interest money and outcomes in American politics.

I am very sad to say that most citizens who believe that are right. People know that who has the money determines who wins and who has the money determines all too often what even gets put on the table in the first place. That is why people are turning away from the political process. That is why people are disillusioned. That is why people are disengaged. That is why people feel, I will say it again, if you pay, you play; if you do not pay, you don't play. That is what is going on.

Recent polls: 92 percent of all Americans believe special interest contributions buy votes of Members of the Congress—92 percent. Again, I say to colleagues, I am not agreeing with that kind of thing, but it is one of the reasons we should want to change this system. It really doesn't matter in the last analysis. If you get more money from oil companies, or labor unions, or environmentalists, or citizen groups, or financial institutions, the fact is people can always have that concern. Why don't we try to break that?

Eighty-eight percent of people believe those who make large contributions get special favors from politicians. Sixty-seven percent believe their own representatives in Congress would listen to views of outsiders who made major political contributions before they would listen to their own constituents' views. And then, finally, nearly half of all registered voters believe lobbyists and special interests control the Government.

I know the sponsors of the new McCain-Feingold bill have stripped the bill down in the hope that we are going to have the votes to achieve cloture and that we can move this long-stalled debate forward. I am in agreement. However, given the inability of Congress to agree on a lot of the incremental changes, which is important, let alone comprehensive reform—this is a stripped down bill. The authors will admit that. But they are saying, let's try to move something forward. Let's take a step forward that will lead to improvement. I agree. But what I am saying about this amendment is that it is also an ideal time to let States take the lead. We should not allow States to undermine Federal election law. They won't do that. But the law should also not be an artificial ceiling that prevents States from setting up systems of public financing such as Maine has done, such as Vermont has done, such as Arizona has done, and such as Massachusetts has done that would allow them to address this obscene money chase, that allows them to address voter apathy; that allows them to address the kind of corruption that I have talked about—both actual or corruption that is perceived.

Mr. BENNETT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WELLSTONE. I am happy to yield to the Senator.

Mr. BENNETT. Madam President, I am interested and pleased to hear the Senator say he does not agree with those polled who say money buys votes and that the individual Members of the Senate are not corrupt.

My question to the Senator, since he is a teacher by profession is, if that perception in the public is not true, why shouldn't this teacher spend his time trying to educate the public as to what is true rather than to fall in with the sentiment expressed in the poll which is inaccurate?

Mr. WELLSTONE. Madam President, I actually have not finished laying out the amendment.

To my colleague from Utah, I was saying the huge percentage of people who believe this to be the case troubles me. I certainly do not believe that in a majority of cases of Senators whom I know, to the extent I know them—and I think I do—that that is the case, the ''money'' vote way. I don't think that is the link.

That is my sense, not in an individual way.

I have also argued, and the Senator has heard me say this many different times, I do think we have a more serious kind of corruption, and it is the imbalance of power. It is systemic.

Therefore, from my point of view, my colleague from Utah could be referring to one of two things: Either the statement I gave on the floor the other day in which I said we have to change this system in order to give citizens faith in this political process—and they have every reason to believe that; unfortunately, it is dominated by the few—or the Senator could be referring to this amendment. I hope not because all this amendment says is, whether one agrees or not with the perception, if people in Utah or people in Minnesota decide they want to put into effect comprehensive reform and cover our Federal elections, House and Senate races, as they are doing in the State elections, they should have the right.

Mr. BENNETT. If I may, I was responding to the statement made by the Senator from Minnesota on the floor today when he talked about the poll.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I am yielding for a question.

Go ahead. I want to be clear I have the floor.

Mr. BENNETT. Absolutely, and I appreciate the courtesy of the Senator, and I shall not interrupt again.

I have had the experience, the polls in Utah show a very large percentage of people holding the same opinion as the Senator from Minnesota has subscribed. Because I am convinced that McCain-Feingold is, (a) unconstitutional, and (b) unworkable, I have——

Mr. McCAIN. I ask for the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota has the floor and may yield for a question.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I am pleased, for my colleague from Utah, to yield for a question.

Mr. BENNETT. I thank the Senator for his courtesy.

I have had the experience of explaining my position and once explaining, being endorsed.

My question to the Senator is, again, if he disagrees with the position stated in the poll, even though it is held by 92 percent of the respondents to that poll, inasmuch as he is a skilled, trained, and professional teacher, would he not spend his time well using his skills as a teacher educating these people in his State, as I have tried to do with the people in my State, rather than simply going along with them and saying if that is your position, I will follow it legislatively even though I disagree with it? Would that not be a better use of the Senator's obvious teaching skills?

Mr. WELLSTONE. Madam President, the first part of the question I appreciate.

The second part of the question I might have a slightly different interpretation. To the first part of the question I want the Senator from Utah to know—for that matter, the Senator from Kentucky—that I believe in public service, and I am honored to be here.

I reject the across-the-board denigration of public service and people in public service when and if anyone does

that. I haven't seen that done on the floor of the Senate. However, I hear people talking that way and I go out of my way to say to people that there are many Senators whom I have met, including those who have a very different viewpoint, who I think have a highly developed sense of public service, who believe in what they are saying, and believe in what they are doing.

If the Senator were to ask me whether or not I tried as a Senator or teacher to speak to this notion that there is all this corruption and wheeling and dealing and everything is cynical and everything is corrupted, absolutely I do because I don't think that is true.

On the second point, I think my time is well spent supporting the McCain-Feingold effort, and for that matter, supporting even more comprehensive reform. I do believe the money chase and the mix of money and politics—especially big money politics—has undercut what I hold most dear, which is this very noble and grand, wonderful, over-200-year experiment in self-rule that we have had in this country.

I think this is a debate about representative democracy. I believe we have to change the way we finance campaigns if we are to have a healthy, functioning, representative democracy.

I thank my colleague for his question.

Madam President, if the American people, according to survey after survey, are going to say this system of financing is out of control and they want an overhaul, then we owe it to them to get out of the way and let the States go ahead and move forward and do what we as a Congress have been unable to do. Just because the Senate can't move on comprehensive reform doesn't mean we should tie the hands of States. My colleagues can agree or disagree with what States will do, but give them the option.

Let me give the legal context. My own State of Minnesota attempted to set up a system of public financing, a system for Federal candidates, 9 years ago in 1990 when the State legislature passed the law offering partial public financing to candidates, the congress of Minnesota. Unfortunately, the Federal Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit struck down Minnesota's law in 1993 in Weber v. Heaney. The court ruled because the Federal Election Campaign Act did not specifically allow States to create this kind of voluntary public financing program, then FECA prohibited it.

The amendment I am introducing corrects that by adding one simple sentence to FECA which specifically allows States to set up voluntary public financing programs for the election of their own members to the House or the Senate as long as no program violates any provision of the current Federal Election Campaign Act.

The court said, given what we are dealing with, given existing law, we cannot go forward. If we change the law, it could very well be a different court decision. In other words, if a State wants to create a public financing fund and give its congressional candidates the option; it is a voluntary option of financing their campaigns wholly or partially with public money rather than the private contributions, then that State would be able to do so, again, provided there are no violations in the FECA provisions.

I want to emphasize this amendment makes these programs strictly voluntary, as the system of public financing for the Presidential campaign is voluntary. Some States are already moving in this direction with regard to State and local elections. There is a lot of energy for this. Twelve States already offer partial public financing to candidates for State offices. In fact, one of the most advanced is in the State of Kentucky. In addition, four States have gone even further and recently passed full or nearly full public financing systems for their State elections—Maine, Vermont, Massachusetts, and Senator MCCAIN's State, the State of Arizona.

Local and State elected officials, along with citizen activists in nearly 40 States around the country, have launched the Elected Leadership Project 2000. And this is an all-out effort for comprehensive reform.

I say to colleagues, if the people in our States want to strengthen American democracy, if they have the gumption and they have the citizen politics to go forward with real reform that would get so much of the big money out of politics—that would really create a level playing field, that would reinforce people's faith in the elections, that would mean people could say these elections belong to us, this political process belongs to us—and that is why there has been so much support for the clean money/clean elections initiative—then my amendment says to Senators: Let them do it. You might not agree. But if your State wants to do what Maine has done and Maine says we want to apply this to Congress as well, then Maine should be able to do it; Minnesota should be able to do it; Kentucky should be able to do it, Utah should be able to do it.

This legislation goes to the root cause of a system which is founded on private special interest money, and it cures the disease.

I hear colleagues talking about the need to tighten up campaign finance laws. The problem is not what is illegal; the problem is what is legal. The real problem is that most of what is wrong with this current sick system is perfectly legal. It is perfectly legal, those huge amounts of money, hundreds of thousands of dollars in soft money contributions that Senator FEINGOLD and Senator MCCAIN are trying to prohibit and which prohibition too many Senators are trying to block—huge amounts of personal, individual contributions that really, basically, very-high-income and wealthy people are able to contribute but the vast majority of people are not—all of which determine who gets to run, who gets elected; all of which determine the people who have the most access.

We have moved so far away from the principle that each person should count as one, and no more than one, it is absolutely frightening. We do not have elections any longer; we have auctions.

Why don't we get the big interested money out? We had this debate about corruption. Again, maybe it is only the appearance of corruption. But my friend Phil Stern, who is no longer alive, once wrote a book, ''The Best Congress Money Can Buy.'' He made the following argument in the book. I just thought of it. Bill Moyers, in a speech he gave called ''The Soul Of Democracy,'' made the same argument.

Imagine what it would be like—maybe some people had a chance to watch the ball games last night—imagine what it would be like if umpires or referees received huge contributions from the players of the different teams before the baseball game or before the football game. Would you have any confidence that they would be rendering impartial decisions? You might be worried that they would not be. In a way, we have something similar to that here. We make all these different decisions about health care and health insurance reform, about telecommunications legislation, banking legislation, where we are going to make budget cuts, labor legislation—across-the-board. At the same time we receive all these contributions, we are the referees; we are the umpires; we are going to make the decisions. It looks terrible. It looks awful. It looks awful to people in the country.

What I am saying is that if, in fact, we want to give people an opportunity to have more confidence in their political process, then I think we ought to go forward and we ought to agree to this amendment.

I have two final points. I have been waiting for a long time. I will be done, but I want to make two final points.

First of all, I have heard it said that people do not care.

I do not think that is true at all. I think people have reached the conclusion that when it comes to their concerns, they are of little matter in the Congress. I think people have reached the conclusion that the influence of private wealth and power is strongly felt; that it shapes the acts and policies of government; that money crawls the halls of the Capitol and the halls of the White House.

No one in politics today can deny the shaping influence of money on public acts. Few people who contribute vast sums of money to political campaigns do it just out of profound ideological beliefs. They do it in part because they do have some hope for gain. It is an understandable ambition for those individual figures, but one to which public figures should not yield their larger commitment to all Americans. That is what this debate is about, whether or

not we as public figures maintain a larger commitment to all the people in our country, not just the people who have the financial wherewithal to make these contributions. That is what this debate is about.

In my view, until we take the big money out of politics, our historic drive for more opportunities for citizens, for more justice, for a better life for all the people, for improving the standard of living for all the people in our country, for really investing in children's lives, for making our country a better America, that drive will continue to be diverted and frustrated and ultimately denied.

This issue is the core issue, and this amendment I have introduced simply says to my colleagues we ought to, if we are not going to go forward with comprehensive reform but at the State level our States want to have clean money/clean elections, and they want to apply it on a voluntary basis to races to the House of Representatives and the Senate, then they ought to be able to do so.

I do not see why we would not have strong bipartisan support for this amendment because, frankly, I think, along with the efforts of Senator FEINGOLD and Senator MCCAIN—Senator MCCAIN and Senator FEINGOLD—the energy for the reform is going to come at the grassroots level; it is going to come at the State level. That is what this public campaign has been about all across this country. That is what the victory in Arizona was about. That is what the victories in Massachusetts, Vermont, and Maine were all about. That is what people in my State tried to do 9 years ago. Let's just pass a law that would enable States to move forward.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Arizona, Mr. MCCAIN, is recognized.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I move to table amendment No. 2299 and ask consent the vote occur at 5:45.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky reserves the right to object.

Is the Senator objecting?

Mr. REID. I could not hear. The Senator moved to table the Reid amendment; at what time would the vote occur?

Mr. MCCAIN. It was agreeable to the leadership. I was told they wanted a vote at 5:45, but I would be willing to set the time for that vote at any time. I am told by staff, 5:45 is the time for the vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. MCCONNELL. May I inquire which amendment we are talking about.

Mr. MCCAIN. I will be glad to explain to the Senator from Kentucky. It is basically the soft money amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Reid amendment, No. 2299.

Mr. MCCONNELL. And the request is——

Mr. MCCAIN. Table.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Table the Reid amendment.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There was a unanimous request pending to have the vote occur at 5:45. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCONNELL. To have the tabling vote on the Reid amendment occur at 5:45?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the request.

Mr. MCCONNELL. That is the request of the Senator from Arizona?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the request. Is there objection?

Mr. MCCONNELL. Reserving the right to object.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, in the interest of time, I would be glad to move to table the Reid amendment, which does not require unanimous consent, and ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona has the floor.

Mr. REID. If the Senator from——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. MCCAIN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. I ask unanimous consent that the tabling motion occur at 5:45.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I want my colleagues to know this is a defining vote of this debate. This is a defining vote because it all has to do with soft money. This is the fundamental proposition that the Senator from Wisconsin and I are propounding.

There has been parliamentary maneuvering. There has been substitutes. There has been a filling up of the tree. There have been a lot of things that have been going on which have sort of not surprised me but disappointed me.

Friday, on the other side, for reasons that are still not clear to me, the Senator from Nevada, and others, chose not to allow the amending process to go forward. On this side, we have had some delays, which I would argue were not particularly helpful to the process.

So this tabling motion of the Reid amendment is basically a defining vote on whether or not we want to ban soft money. I intend to vote not to table the Reid amendment. I would hope that my colleagues would vote not to table the Reid amendment. Then we will have the Senate on record as to whether we are for or against soft money in American political campaigns.

On Friday, Senator KERREY of Nebraska—it is funny; we were talking about this today at the Vietnam Veterans Memorial luncheon today that Senator HAGEL and I attended, that there is kind of an interesting relationship that exists between those of us who had the privilege of serving in that conflict.

One of the traits I find true with Senator HAGEL, Senator CLELAND, Senator ROBB, and Senators KERREY and KERRY, is that there is a certain degree of honesty and straightforwardness which I find extremely attractive.

Senator KERREY, on Friday, who is also the former chairman of the Senatorial Campaign Committee, said:

> There will be all kinds of amendments offered to change the bill, some of which I support strongly. It seems to me our only chance of getting this legislation passed is to stick as closely as possible to the bill we currently have in front of us.

He went on to say, in an exchange with the Senator from Wisconsin:

> I wonder if the Senator from Wisconsin will tell me if what I am saying is true. I like Shays-Meehan. I like the bill. The junior Senator from Nebraska, Mr. HAGEL, has an amendment I like as well.

He goes on to talk about:

> . . . It makes it much more likely we will fail to break a filibuster and, as a consequence of that failure, fail to enact legislation, and as a consequence of that, we will never go to conference and never change the law.

Then Senator KERREY of Nebraska went on to say:

> . . . The Senator is very kind to say I have always been a supporter. Actually, I have not always been a supporter . . . Speaking of campaign finance reform.

He says:

> When I came to the Senate in 1989, this was not a very important issue. Indeed, at one point, I joined the Senator from Kentucky, Mr. MCCONNELL, to defeat campaign finance reform.
>
> Then I had the experience of going inside the beast in 1996, 1997, and 1998 when I was Chairman of the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee—I do not want to raise a sore subject for the Senator from Maine. It changed my attitude in two big ways: One, the apparent corruption that exists. People believe there is corruption. If they believe it, it happens. We all understand that. If the perception is it is A, it is A, even though we know it may not be, and the people believe the system is corrupt.
>
> Equally important to me, I discovered in 1996, 1997, and 1998 that there are men and women who would love to serve. They say: I can't be competitive; I can't possibly raise the money necessary to go on television; Oh, and by the way, my reputation could get damaged as a consequence of what could be said on television against me.

He went on to say:

I am persuaded this law needs to be changed for the good of the Republic, for the good of democracy. I hope Members, such as myself, who are enthusiastic about changing that law will take the advice of the Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from Arizona to heart because we may have to vote against things we prefer in order to make certain we get something that not only we want but the Nation desperately needs.

Madam President, it is impossible for me to elaborate on that kind of comment from my esteemed colleague and American hero, BOB KERREY of Nebraska.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Will the Senator from Arizona yield for a question?

Mr. MCCAIN. I would be glad to yield for a question.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Let me clarify what the Senator from Arizona is attempting in moving to table the Reid amendment.

I would ask the Senator from Arizona, when we take this vote on tabling, will you regard this vote on the Reid amendment as a true test of the question we have been asking our colleagues, and that question is, Are you for or against soft money?

Would the Senator from Arizona regard that vote as a procedural vote or a vote up or down on the question of whether you are for or against soft money?

Mr. MCCAIN. I would like to respond to my friend.

I am hearing that the distinguished majority leader may try to remove the bill from the consideration on the floor of the Senate tomorrow. We know that it is cluttered with various amendments, some of them very important. The Senator from Minnesota spoke very eloquently in favor of his amendment, which I am sure has some merit.

But the crux and heart of this matter is soft money. We all know that. I worry if we do not get this vote, that we could possibly reach a situation where the Senate is gridlocked; and eventually, over time, obviously, we would not even have recorded votes on this important and crucial issue.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Can the Senator recall any other occasion in which the Senate has voted up or down on the question of whether to ban party soft money?

Mr. MCCAIN. It is my understanding the Senate has never voted up or down on that specific issue, at least since 1907, when, thanks be to one of the greatest Republicans and greatest Presidents in history, Theodore Roosevelt, who alleged there was corruption at that time—and I will include many of his remarks in the RECORD—because of the influence of major corporations and robber barons and special interests on the American political process, I believe the Senate did vote to ban soft money. And I believe that statute is still on the books.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Again, I ask a further question. I appreciate that answer because I think the problem we have had is we have not had a chance to get to the question of whether you are for or against unlimited contributions. For year after year, it appears that—and I ask the Senator from Arizona to confirm—we keep trying to get to this vote, but we never seem to be able to get right at it; the bill is pulled or a tabling motion is made on the overall bill or something, a cloture motion is filed. It is amazing, after 5 years, we have never gotten to this. But apparently we are about to.

Let me ask one other question, if I could, because the Senator from Oregon consulted me on this. Senator WYDEN, who does not limit himself to supporting our efforts, has been, in my mind, one of the strongest advocates of campaign finance reform in this body. He has been creative and has a number of interesting ideas of his own that I like very much. He asked me—and I certainly think you will answer the same way I did—whether or not, after this motion is disposed of one way or another, Senators will still have the chance to amend the bill.

Mr. MCCAIN. Of course. Of course. I hope that would move the process forward, once we are on record. And perhaps that might increase our chances of reaching 60 votes, I would say to my friend.

Mr. FEINGOLD. I thank the Senator for bringing us to the point where finally we can have an up-or-down vote on soft money.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MCCAIN. I would be glad to.

Mr. REID. I offered an amendment on Friday to establish a procedure whereby there would be a vote to determine whether or not we would invoke cloture on the so-called soft money ban. Is the Senator aware of that? The Senator from Arizona has indicated and I may be paraphrasing the words; that there were games being played and Senators were not being allowed to offer amendments.

I say to my friend from Arizona, the Senator from Minnesota offered an amendment today. Amendments could have been offered Friday. Will the Senator acknowledge that having the two amendments, one being ''McCain-Feingold lite'' and the original version of the McCain-Feingold bill, that we should be able in this body to vote on both those matters?

Mr. MCCAIN. I say to my friend, first of all, I never argued that games were being played. I would not make that allegation. I believe the Senator from Kentucky and I had a colloquy on Friday where it was clear that the situation was such that even if an amendment were considered on Friday and adopted, it would have fallen with a vote on the underlying legislation that was pending, which I think correctly, in the view of the Senator from Kentucky, made further amendments and debate meaningless. I see the Senator from Kentucky is on the floor. I think that was his comment. If he disagrees, I will be glad to yield for a question from him in that respect. On Friday, I was disappointed, and I think the Senator from Kentucky was, that we didn't move forward with genuine amendments that would have stood or fallen on their own merit.

I am glad to yield to the Senator from Kentucky for a question on that.

Mr. REID. If I could just ask one more question, maybe the Senator could respond to both of them. I say to my friend from Arizona, I have stated publicly and privately, both outside these Chambers and inside these Chambers, about the work that is being done by the Senator from Arizona and the Senator from Wisconsin, and indeed it has been a tremendous effort bringing this very important issue before this body. You have been undying in your efforts to bring this forward. You would acknowledge, would you not, that there are others in this body, other than the Senator from Wisconsin and the Senator from Arizona, who believe strongly that there should be some campaign finance reform? Would you acknowledge that?

Mr. MCCAIN. Absolutely.

Mr. REID. And would you also acknowledge that your method in obtaining campaign finance reform may not be the best way to go?

Mr. MCCAIN. Absolutely.

Mr. REID. I guess the point I want to make is that I am not sure I can put my many efforts on behalf of campaign finance reform next to that of the Senator from Arizona. He has done so much to move this issue forward. But I would say to my friend from Arizona—and I would like the Senator to either acknowledge whether or not this Senator believes strongly that there should be campaign finance reform. Even though my qualifications for asserting the need for campaign finance reform would not meet those of the Senator from Arizona, I think I am in the top 10 of members of this body who have been a strong advocate for reform. For example, I have given speeches on the Senate floor, since I came here with the Senator from Arizona in 1986, about the need for campaign finance reform. Would the Senator acknowledge that?

Mr. MCCAIN. I not only acknowledge it, but it is worthy of mention; the Senator from Nevada and I have been close and dear friends for nearly 20 years. One thing I have tried to do during the course of this debate is keep it from in any way personalizing or showing any disrespect to any individual, no matter where they stand on this issue.

I thank the Senator from Nevada.

Did the Senator from Kentucky want to make a comment?

Mr. MCCONNELL. I say to the Senator from Arizona, he is correct. My understanding Friday was and remains that the right side of the tree, which is what we normally amend around here, was filled by the two amendments and the two cloture votes. That effectively made additional amendments somewhat an exercise in futility. What I recommended to our side—and it has

been happening today—is that they discuss their amendments—I know Senator HAGEL is here to discuss his—and indicate that they would like to have had a vote, a meaningful vote, which would have been on the right side of the tree.

So the Senator from Arizona does correctly state my opinion of Friday, which remains my opinion today.

Mr. MCCAIN. I thank the Senator from Kentucky.

I agree with the Senator from Nevada; there are many ways to approach the issue of campaign finance reform. I agree with him; there are many laudable aspects of campaign finance reform that deserve serious consideration.

One that doesn't seem to surface as much as it should is free television time for candidates. The broadcasters receive $70 billion worth of free digital spectrum. It seems to me there should be some obligation along with one of the great rip-offs in the history of the United States of America.

But we really are down to soft money, I say to the Senator from Nevada. We are really down to that. We can build on that. There is no reform that could have any meaning unless it meant, at its fundamental heart, the banning of soft money. We have been through a number of debates about what independent campaigns do.

By the way, before I leave the issue, I heard the Senator from Ohio say that banning of soft money does not in any way affect labor unions. Yesterday or the day before, there was a notice in the paper that the labor unions plan on spending $45 million in soft money in the upcoming campaign. I am afraid the Senator from Ohio is misinformed because this banning of soft money does enormous damage to the ability of labor unions to engage in the kind of practices we are trying to eliminate, just as much as it does the other side.

I want to make perfectly clear, the reason that I and the Senator from Wisconsin are seeking to table or asking for a vote on a tabling motion is so we can have the Senate on record on the issue of soft money. If the Senate, in its wisdom, decides that we should table the Reid amendment and that we should, therefore, not ban soft money, then obviously this entire exercise is largely futile. I think there are about three Members on the other side who may not be voting who would vote for us, and I would take that into account in this vote because, really, this vote is about the intentions and the will of the Senate.

The soft money reports from Common Cause: Soft money, CWA-COPE, $2,593,000; American Federation of State and County Municipal Employees, $2,334,000—these are obviously all Democrats—Service Employees Union, $1.5 million. I hope the Senator from Ohio will take a look at the enormous amount of money that is coming in from labor unions that he somehow believes would not be affected by a ban on soft money.

Also, recently information came out that the Democratic Party is raising now as much soft money as the Republican Party, a very interesting turn of events.

We have, at most, 48 hours left on this legislation. We have not made a lot of progress. It is time we did. I believe having the Senate on record on soft money is a very defining vote. I talked extensively with Senator FEINGOLD about this before we decided to make this move. I hope my colleagues will vote not to table the Reid amendment, which bans soft money. I hope my colleagues will vote not to table the McCain tabling motion of the Reid amendment.

I believe Senator BENNETT is next under the unanimous consent agreement. I believe both Senators HAGEL and WYDEN have been waiting. I don't know what the disposition of that is.

Senator REID?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, Senator BENNETT is to be recognized at the conclusion of Senator MCCAIN's speech.

Mr. REID addressed the Chair.

Mr. MCCAIN. I think Senator HAGEL was here first. Is that OK?

Mr. REID. If the Senator from Utah will yield.

Mr. MCCAIN. I haven't yielded the floor.

Mr. REID. Madam President, what we should do, in keeping with what we have done earlier in the day—Senator BENNETT is opposed to the legislation; he is going to speak next. Senator WYDEN, who is in favor of the legislation, should speak next after the Senator from Utah, and then we should go to Senator HAGEL.

Mr. FEINGOLD. I ask that I may follow after Senator HAGEL.

Mr. REID. For the information of Members, Senator BENNETT—how long is he going to speak?

Mr. BENNETT. I was planning to——

Mr. REID. He has been here for 2 days.

Mr. BENNETT. I was planning to discuss the amendment that I was unable to offer. I want to spend 15 minutes or so on that. Then I want to make a general statement about the bill. I will try not to get overly enthusiastic about my arguments, but I might get carried away for another 20 minutes or so about that, so between 30 or 40 minutes. I will do my best to restrain myself.

Mr. MCCAIN. Madam President, I still have the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Arizona has the floor.

Mr. REID. I am sorry. If I may——

Mr. MCCAIN. I think I have consumed 7 or 8 minutes. I hope the Senator from Utah will recognize that both the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from Oregon have been here for a long time. I hope he would give them the opportunity to speak before the 5:45 vote.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator from Arizona making a unanimous consent request that after the Senator from Utah has finished his remarks, the Senator from Oregon would be recognized, followed by the Senator from Nebraska, followed by the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is the Senator making such a request?

Mr. MCCAIN. I am glad to make that request.

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object, the Senator from Oregon wishes to speak for 15 minutes. This is so other Members will have an idea about what is going on. The Senator from Nebraska wishes how much time?

Mr. HAGEL. Twenty minutes.

Mr. REID. I do not object.

Mr. MCCAIN. I amend the unanimous consent agreement. The Senator from Utah would like how many minutes?

Mr. BENNETT. I will be happy to do 20 minutes on the bill itself and delay my 20 minutes on the amendment.

Mr. MCCAIN. I thank the Senator from Utah for his courtesy. I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Utah be recognized for 20 minutes, the Senator from Oregon for 15 minutes, the Senator from Nebraska for 20 minutes, and then the Senator from Wisconsin for 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Reserving the right to object, I only ask if there is enough time to get us to 5:45.

Mr. MCCAIN. Roughly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MCCAIN. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah is recognized.

Mr. BENNETT. Madam President, I appreciate the opportunity. I have been following this debate and, indeed, have been involved in it with great interest ever since it began.

While I appreciate and, indeed, salute the sincerity with which the Senator from Arizona and the Senator from Wisconsin pursue their efforts to achieve what they sincerely believe will be good for our country, I must begin by stating that I am absolutely convinced that what they are pursuing would be bad for our country, would be bad for our political system, would be bad for campaigns in general, and would raise, rather than lower, the sense of frustration and disgust with the political system overall.

That has been the history of campaign finance reform. It has gone on in this town for decades. Every time, the reformers end up making things worse. I say that with all respect for the sincerity with which they pursue their goal. But, in my opinion, the goal they are pursuing is not available to them through the route they are following.

I wish to begin by quoting a column that appeared last week in the Washington Post written by Robert Samuelson. Robert Samuelson is not known as one of the more partisan of the political commentators. He is basically considered an objective commentator,

spending more of his time on economics than other issues. But what he has to say about this issue captures what I believe about it so well that I am going to quote him at some length.

He says:

Few subjects inspire more intellectual conformity than ''campaign finance reform.'' All ''right-thinking'' people ''know'' that election spending is ''out of control,'' that the present system of campaign finance is corrupt and that only reactionaries block ''reform.''

I think that captures exactly what we have been hearing on the floor—that all ''right-thinking'' people ''know'' that election spending is out of control and the present system is corrupt and only reactionaries block ''reform''.

Then he goes on:

Who cares if these common beliefs are either wrong or wildly exaggerated—or that most ''reforms'' would do more damage to democracy than any harm they might cure? The case against ''reform'' is almost impossible to make, because people's minds are closed.

That beginning of Mr. Samuelson's column, as I say, perfectly captures how I feel about this issue. Here is the history—again, in previous debates, I have gone through the history at some length. Mr. Samuelson summarized well:

The history of ''campaign finance reform'' is that every limit inspires new evasions. One possibility is that interest groups will finance more independent campaigns . . . to elect or defeat targeted candidates. ''Reformers'' view such ''issue ads'' . . . as shams. And so, the next step would be to curb such advertising, even if curbs flout the First Amendment.

Mr. Samuelson then goes on with this very insightful quote from one of the reform groups that summarizes how this debate has crystallized:

''Any effort to reform issue advocacy spending in connection with federal elections must strike a regulatory balance between protecting political speech and protecting the integrity of our electoral process,'' says one reform group.

Well, as Mr. Samuelson says:

The First Amendment says that ''Congress shall make no law . . . abridging the freedom of speech.'' There's no mention [in the First Amendment] of ''regulatory balance.'' And if elections and ''issue ads'' aren't about political speech, what are they about? ''Right thinking'' people minimize the conflict between ''campaign finance reform'' and free speech, because it is inconvenient.

Then Mr. Samuelson summarizes, and I think, again, this is the ultimate summary of the debate:

As long as we have the First Amendment, the effort to regulate elections—under the guise of ''campaign finance reform''—is futile, self-defeating, and undesirable. The hysteria about money's corrupting power worsens the very problem that reformers claim to deplore: public cynicism. But right-thinking people are oblivious to evidence or logic. They are at ease with their own respectable conformity.

I could not have done it better, so I didn't try. That is why I quoted it at that length. Let's go to the debate for a minute. By the way, I ask that I be informed when I have 5 minutes left.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will be informed.

Mr. BENNETT. I thank the Chair. The Senator from New Jersey, Mr. TORRICELLI, took the floor a day or two ago to give us a glimpse of the real world that we are facing if certain portions of this bill go forward. He was arguing that we should not pass the substitute, commonly known as Shays-Meehan, because he said it will limit the speech of political parties and leave us to the mercies of special interest groups. I wrote down some of the things he said.

He said, ''The debate will be fought by surrogates over our heads in a far larger context.'' I agree with that absolutely. If political parties are limited in the amount of soft money advocacy in which they can be involved but special interest groups are not, special interest groups will simply ignore the political party by the ads themselves.

Mr. TORRICELLI laid out for us in great detail some of the stratagems that would be followed, thus validating the comments Robert Samuelson made about political money finding another way around, finding a new way to come into the arena. That is the real world we will face, and the junior Senator from New Jersey was exactly right in outlining how it will work. Yet we seem to go plowing ahead on the assumption that somehow the real world will be different if we just show how honest and anxious we are to appear not to be corrupt.

Let me give you some real-world examples. We have heard that from other Members of the Senate. People have talked about their own elections. I want to talk about several real-world examples from elections in which I have participated.

Let's go back to the 1998 election when I got reelected. My opponent complained about this very issue. He complained often and he complained as loudly as he could that somehow there is something broken about the system because, he said: I can't raise enough money to compete with Senator BENNETT. What is the matter with a system where ordinary people can't compete?

We pointed out to him in one of the debates that on the ticket with him was a sixth-grade schoolteacher running for Congress who raised more money than her incumbent opponent. What is the difference? The candidate for the Senate can't raise enough money, he says, to compete with me, whereas another Democrat in the same State, a sixth-grade schoolteacher, can raise enough money to compete against a sitting Congressman.

My opponent, by the way, according to his financial disclosure, is a millionaire. The sixth-grade schoolteacher clearly is not. The sixth-grade schoolteacher clearly depends upon her paycheck very heavily. The difference was not because of my personality or his personality. The difference was that the people who are involved in providing money for political races make a very cold calculation as to what your chances are.

When I first ran for the Senate, and I came to this town, and I did the circuit of all of these terrible places we have been hearing about on this floor asking them for money, they did not ask me what I believed. They didn't ask me, what will our access be if we give you money? They didn't say to me, gee, we want to know your positions before we decide. They wanted to know if I had a chance of winning because, they said: We don't back losing horses. And they were convinced I was a losing horse, and they didn't give me any. I went out of this town empty-handed.

I was outspent 3 to 1, with my opponent in a primary in the State of Utah spending $6.2 million. That sets a record on a per vote cast that I don't think has ever been broken. I was able to put my message across with a third of that amount, and I beat him, at which point people started to say: All right, now we will talk to you, because now that you have won the Republican nomination, it looks as if you may have an opportunity.

The problem my opponent had had nothing to do with his positions, had nothing to do with his own bank account, had nothing to do with his own personality. It was simply that he was perceived as a loser and the people who were giving money decided they didn't want to back a loser.

But here comes a sixth-grade schoolteacher with no money in the bank and no political experience of any kind, and they thought she might be a winner, so she got all the money she needed. She didn't win. One of the reasons she didn't win is very appropriate to this debate. She signed the term limit pledge; her opponent did not.

So Americans for Term Limits—or whatever they are called—came into that congressional district with a whole series of issue ads attacking her opponent, attacking him for his failure to sign the term limit ad. This is a special interest group with soft money. We have no idea where it came from. We have no idea in what amounts it was raised. We have no idea who signed on because they are not under the FEC. But they exercised their constitutional right. They came into the Second Congressional District in the State of Utah, and they flooded the airwaves with some of the nastiest, most vicious political ads I have ever seen attacking the incumbent Congressman.

What happened? Early polls showed that the sixth-grade schoolteacher was going to beat the incumbent Congressman. She had more money than he did. She had momentum. Then these ads started to run, and the reaction on the part of the voters in the second district—I heard it everywhere I went campaigning—was: We hate those ads. How can Lily Eskelson be so vicious as to run those ads?

She then went on the air, and she said: I am not running them. I don't

have anything to do with them. This is a special interest group. All I did was sign the term limit pledge, and Congressman COOK didn't.

Congressman COOK went on the air and said: I am the victim of a smear campaign. And in the minds of many voters, it was Lily Eskelson who was doing the smearing. She had absolutely no control over the ads. If she had, she would have pulled them. But she didn't. It was the special interest group that was exercising its constitutional right, and there was nothing she could do about it.

Congressman COOK appropriately protested: How can you attack me for violating term limits when I am running for my first reelection? He had only been in Congress one term. They were attacking him for being part of the system and not signing the term limit pledge that would have given him three terms. He said: Don't come after me until I have served at least the three terms you think are appropriate.

I think the special interest ads in the second district had a significant impact on the outcome of that election.

I point this out. Here is a sixth-grade schoolteacher with no money who is able to outspend and outfundraise her opponent because those who put up the money thought she has a chance to win. That is the criterion, nothing else. She lost the race because a special interest group came in and flooded the district with their ads, thinking they were helping her but were in fact hurting her.

If we say that political parties cannot defend themselves against these special interest ads, we will do exactly the thing about which the Senator from New Jersey talked. We will create a situation where the candidates become unimportant, and the special interest, in the words of the Senator from New Jersey, ''fight over our heads in a far larger context.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. BENNETT. I thank the Chair.

This is the real world. The real world is a world in which attempts to get around the first amendment and attempts to find ways to regulate political speech backfire against the reformers, and they do not work.

One last description out of the real world. We have heard a lot on this floor this afternoon about access. All right, maybe we are not corrupt. We had that debate earlier last week whether or not we are all corrupt. So now we are being told, well, no, we are not corrupt. At least we have made that clear—not to Maureen Dowd, but to a lot of other people we are at least not corrupt. But we are somehow tainted by virtue of the fact that we can't control this access, and access becomes the issue rather than corruption.

As I said once before, the easiest way to get access to me is to be a voter registered in the State of Utah. I will take your call, and I will have you come into my office. But my opponent in this last election raised this issue of access in this context. As it so happens, he has been lobbying me for the entire time I have been in the Senate about a program of which he is in favor. He successfully lobbied me. I agree with him on their program. It is microcredit. I have done everything I can as a member of the Appropriations Committee to increase the appropriations for microcredit. And, frankly, I have been successful. All I did during the campaign was ask him this one question: Every time you came to see me to try to lobby on behalf of microcredit, did anyone in my office ever ask you if you had made a political contribution to Senator BENNETT?

He immediately said: No, no one ever asked me that question.

I said: Then why do you stand here and claim that access is for sale when you, now my opponent in this race, have had full access to my office for the entire 6 years I've been here?

It boils down to those who are corrupt will be corrupt regardless of the system; those who are not corrupt will not be corrupt regardless of the system.

For those who say we are now far worse than we ever were, I offer two last comments. No. 1, when I moved into the Dirksen Building, I noticed there was a safe in every Senator's office. My father was here when the Dirksen Building was built. Let me state why there is a safe in every office—for the Senators to put the cash they receive in their offices from people who come to see them. That doesn't mean they are corrupt. My father was not corrupt. But I watched him receive an envelope full of cash in his office in the Dirksen Building, and I watched him open the safe and put it in there. It happened, by the way, to have come from one of the senior Senators on the Democratic side of the aisle who said, ''I don't want any other Republican to be the ranking member of my committee; I want you to win, Wallace, and I raised this money for you.''

It was $5,000, which in those days was in excess of 5 percent of the total cost of a campaign. Dad put it in his safe in the Dirksen Building. When my office was renovated recently in the Dirksen Building, what did I do? I took the safe out because I have never used it, and I don't think any other Senators ever use it. We don't get offered cash in our offices anymore.

Second, David McCullough wrote the biography of whom many considered the most incorruptible President we have ever had, Harry Truman. In his biography of Harry Truman, David McCullough reports that the highest paid individual on Harry Truman's staff was Bess Truman, who lived in Missouri and never came to Washington or entered the Senator's office. Why was she his highest paid staff member? Because Senators routinely did that in order to be able to live on their salaries.

According to Mr. McCullough, Harry Truman was terrified the people of Missouri would find out he was paying Bess the highest permissible salary so he and Bess could handle the financial challenges of serving in the Senate. Was Harry Truman corrupt? No. Even in a corrupt system, and I am sure there are Senators who were, he was not a corrupt man. There may have been an appearance but the appearance did not mean the reality.

They changed the system. We are now paid a living wage. We don't do that anymore. We don't put our relatives on the payroll and have them not show up. But let Members not sit here and say the system is far worse now than it ever used to be. Politics in America is as clean as it has ever been and far cleaner than it used to be. Let's not do what Robert Samuelson warns against: In the name of campaign finance reform make things worse again.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Oregon, Mr. WYDEN, is recognized.

Mr. WYDEN. I thank our colleague from Nebraska for his thoughtfulness. He has been waiting a long time, as well.

I am a supporter of the McCain-Feingold bill, this iteration, as with all others. It is an important step in the right direction. However, I believe the biggest problem is that campaigning in America has become a never-ending money chase. There is an election the first Tuesday in November. People sleep in on Wednesday and all the fundraising starts all over again on Thursday. It is truly a permanent campaign.

If I had my way, if I could write my version of what the Senate ought to do on campaign finance, we would look at some sort of approach along the lines of what is used in several countries in Europe. They confine their elections to several months over a period of a couple of years. Money can be raised. It has to be disclosed. It is spent. They have their election, and, heaven forbid, after a few months of campaigning, they go back to tackling the issues that all Members get an election certificate for—to improve health care, education, to try to stuff the nuclear genie back into the bottle, to create an opportunity for people who work hard and play by the rules.

We are, obviously, not going to get that kind of reform, although I have been amazed in the last few days when I have colleagues on both sides of the aisle say they like that and wish there was a bipartisan Senate task force to look at something similar. That really would be reform. We could spend most of our time doing a job for which we were elected.

For now, we are limited to steps that can be taken immediately that are effective. I have come to the floor this afternoon to talk about a step that Senator JEFF BINGAMAN and I have developed. It is an important step in the view of Senator BINGAMAN and myself. It limits negative campaigning.

My view from personal experience is negative ads are similar to a virus.

They infect everyone with whom they come in contact. In the special election to replace Bob Packwood in the Senate, unfortunately I didn't say no to some of those media consultants who told me to win, I had to just rip in to our colleague, my friend, Senator GORDON SMITH, with negative ads. I should have known immediately that all those negative ads run contrary to everything I got involved with when I began the Gray Panthers in Oregon to try to practice good government, but I didn't step in when I should have on the negative ads, and I regret it to this day.

With a month to go before that special election, I did tell my consultants I could not stand any longer the stench of the negative ads, and I told them to take them off the air. Moreover, I apologized to the people of Oregon. I said I made an error in judgment and it would not happen again. I ran my 1998 campaign, I am proud to be able to say, without mentioning my opponent at all.

I believe candidates ought to stand by their ads. They ought to be directly responsible for their ads. What Senator BINGAMAN and I will propose later this week is an approach we call "stand by your ad." Specifically, the Bingaman-Wyden proposal says a candidate who mentions his or her opponent in a campaign ad must do so in person in order to get the lowest unit rate for advertising. Under current Federal communications law, broadcasters are required to sell commercial air time to candidates for Federal office at the lowest available price, known as the lowest unit broadcast rate. That means for 45 days prior to a primary or primary runoff, for 60 days prior to a general election. In effect, everybody else in town—the car dealership, the restaurant, the tire manufacturer—has to subsidize politics. Their ad costs are greater because broadcasters have to give these cheaper rates during the election cycle.

I think it is time to hold candidates personally responsible for their ads. I am amazed to find that all across the political spectrum I am joined in support of this idea. For example, in the House of Representatives, my Oregon colleague, GREG WALDEN, is a broadcaster by profession. He doesn't think this is bureaucratic or hard to comply with. He introduced in the House, as I did in the Senate, the "stand by your ad" approach that says candidates who mention their opponent have to do it in person to get the lowest unit rate. No first amendment violation here.

I recently received from the Library of Congress a legal opinion stating it would be constitutional to put in place the Bingaman-Wyden amendment, and I ask unanimous consent that legal opinion be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESSIONAL RESEARCH SERVICE,
LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
Washington, DC, October 18, 1999.

Memorandum To : Honorable Ron Wyden. Attention: Jeff Gagne, Legislative Assistant.

From: L. Paige Whitaker, Legislative Attorney, American Law Division.

Subject: Constitutionality of Conditioning Receipt of Lowest Unit Rate for Federal Candidate Broadcast Communications on Compliance With Attribution Requirements.

This memorandum is furnished in response to your request for an analysis of the constitutionality of a proposed amendment to S. 1593 (106th Cong.), "McCain/Feingold II," which would amend 47 U.S.C. §315(b) to restrict the availability of the lowest unit rate for campaign advertising, in which a federal candidate directly references an opponent, to only those radio and television broadcasts where the candidate personally makes the reference. That is, in the case of a television broadcast directly referencing an opponent, the candidate would be required to make a personal appearance and, in the case of a radio broadcast directly referencing an opponent, the candidate would be required to make a personal audio statement identifying the candidate, in order to qualify for the lowest unit rate. Such personal appearance and personal audio statements are often referred to as broadcast attribution requirements.

In the landmark decision, *Buckley* v. *Valeo*, the Supreme Court made it clear that the right to associate is a "basic constitutional freedom"[1] and that any action that may have the effect of curtailing that freedom to associate would be subject to the strictest judicial scrutiny.[2] The Court further asserted that while the right of political association is not absolute,[3] it can only be limited by substantial governmental interests such as the prevention of corruption or the appearance thereof.[4]

Employing this analysis, the Court in *Buckley* upheld the disclosure requirements of the Federal Election Campaign Act (FECA), noting that the "ability of the citizenry to make informed choices among candidates for office is essential."[5] Also of relevance, the *Buckley* Court upheld the FECA presidential public financing provisions, which condition a candidate's receipt of public funding on the candidate voluntarily agreeing to limit spending.[6] The Court found that the provisions did not infringe on free speech, but rather constituted a proper means of promoting the general welfare by actually encouraging public discussion and participation in the electoral process.[7]

In view of the Supreme Court's holdings in *Buckley* v. *Valeo*, it appears that the proposed amendment, to condition federal candidate receipt of the lowest unit rate for broadcast communications on candidates' voluntarily agreeing to comply with certain attribution requirements, would be upheld as constitutional. Similar to the FECA disclosure requirements and presidential public financial provisions, the proposal could be found to provide important candidate information to the voting citizenry. Moreover similar to the presidential public financing provisions, due to its voluntary nature,[8] the proposed amendment could be found not to infringe on free speech, but rather to promote the general welfare by increasing public discussion.

In addition, it appears that, requiring a radio or television broadcaster to condition providing federal candidates with the lowest unit rate for broadcast communications on candidates' voluntarily agreeing to comply with certain attribution requirements would also pass constitutional muster under Supreme Court precedent upholding reasonable access and equal time requirements.[9] For example, in C.B.S. v. Federal Communications Commission, The Supreme Court considered a federal statute allowing the FCC to revoke a broadcast license if the broadcaster willfully or repeatedly failed to grant a federal office candidate reasonable access to airtime or denied a federal office candidate the ability to purchase reasonable amounts of airtime. Although the Court did not rule that there is a general right of candidate access to the broadcast media, the majority held that the reasonable access statute constitutionally provided, on an individual basis, legally qualified federal office candidates with special access rights.[10] Moreover, as the Supreme Court found in Red Lion Broadcasting Co. v. F.C.C., "it does not violate the First Amendment to treat licensees given the privilege of using scarce radio frequencies as proxies for the entire community, obligated to give suitable time and attention to matters of great public concern."[11]

It is arguable that the subject proposal is a less onerous burden on broadcast licensees than the equal time and reasonable access provisions. As the Supreme Court has upheld the constitutionality of the equal time and reasonable access requirements, it is likely that the proposed requirement, that broadcast licensees condition providing federal office candidates with the lowest unit rate for broadcast communications on candidate compliance with certain attribution restrictions, would likewise be upheld.

L. PAIGE WHITAKER,
Legislative Attorney.

Mr. WYDEN. We have a proposal the law division of the Library of Congress believes is constitutional which has been introduced by broadcaster GREGG WALDEN, a conservative Republican serving in the other body. It is a chance to take a practical step to deal with these negative ads. I believe it is possible to have a real debate about public issues without taking an approach that coarsens the public dialog and alienates so many people from the political process.

I am very proud that Senator SMITH and I put out a bipartisan agenda for the people of our State. We said, on important things for our State, that politics is going to stop at the State's borders. We said we do not want a part of the negative politics practiced in that special election to replace Bob Packwood. Frankly, Senator GORDON SMITH

[1] 424 U.S. 1, 25 (1976) (quoting Kusper v. Pontikes, 414 U.S. 51, 57 (1973)).

[2] *Id.* at 25 (quoting NAACP v. Alabama, 357 U.S. 449, 460–61 (1958)).

[3] *Id.* (citing CSC v. Letter Carriers, 413 U.S. 548, 567 (1973)).

[4] *Id.* at 27–28.

[5] *Id.* at 14–15.

[6] *Id.* at 57, fin. 65 (noting that "[j]ust as a candidate may voluntarily limit the size of the contributions he chooses to accept, he may decide to forgo private fundraising and accept public funding.")

[7] *Id.* at 97–104 (finding also that conditioning receipt of public funding on complying with spending limits was a less onerous restriction than those in the ballot access cases with respect to minor and new parties.)

[8] That is, a candidate could legally not choose to comply with the broadcast attribution requirements and still purchase broadcast time at a price higher than the lowest unit rate.

[9] 47 U.S.C. §312(a)(7).

[10] 453 U.S. 367 (1981). See also, Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union v. WDAY, 360 U.S. 525 (1959) (upholding F.C.C. equal time requirements.)

[11] 395 U.S. 367, 394 (1969).

summed it up pretty well when we talked about those negative ads after he was elected to the Senate and people were talking about our working together. He asked me how I felt when he ran his ads; how my kids looked at those ads?

I said: Well, GORDON, they were pretty upset by those ads.

He said: What did you tell your daughter?

I said: GORDON, I said when you ran those ads, me looking like I hadn't shaved for a couple of weeks, like a convict who had just gotten out of prison, I told my daughter Lilly, ''GORDON SMITH doesn't mean those things. He's just kidding, Lilly. He doesn't mean those negative ads.''

GORDON, to his credit, said on television to the people of Oregon: I want to tell Lilly Wyden she's right. I didn't really mean those things I was saying about her dad.

Madam President, colleagues, we all know that this system is out of kilter. We all know that. Clearly we are going to have to take some bold steps in a bipartisan way to put it back on track. But I ask my colleagues to look seriously at the proposal that Senator BINGAMAN and I will bring to the floor later this week. It is a practical step that we could take against the virus of negative ads, negative ads that produce this spiraling effect where each side runs one that is more negative than the previous one, and the public is alienated.

Our proposal, based on the analysis done by the law division of the Congressional Research Service, is constitutional. Frankly, it is a lot less intrusive than a variety of requirements imposed on broadcasters right now. Broadcast licensees have to comply with equal time and reasonable access provisions. The Supreme Court has upheld them. The proposal we made that broadcast licensees providing the lowest unit rate available to candidates actually make the candidates offer their statements in person is one I am absolutely convinced the Supreme Court will uphold. They upheld the equal time and reasonable access provision. They will uphold this one as well.

It is time to change the current communications law and require, when candidates reference their opponent in a radio or television ad, that they have to appear in order to qualify for the lowest unit rate. If they do not want the lowest unit rate, they can go about the business of having various anonymous groups and sources continue to attack their opponent. But I do not think there ought to be a constitutional right to a broadcasters subsidy—that is what we have today—and, fortunately, the Library of Congress agrees with me. I think candidates ought to stand by their ads. Candidates for public office in the future ought to have greater direct responsibility for their ads.

The amendment Senator BINGAMAN and I have prepared would do just that. It is a complement to the proposal offered by Republican Congressman GREGG WALDEN in the other body. I hope my colleagues will look favorably on it. As one who comes to the floor today to talk about this negative ad question with personal experience, I will tell you I believe this issue, this question of the corrosive, ugly pettiness that has dominated so much of television advertising, ought to be at the top of the list of the reforms we pursue in this body. It ought to be at the top of our priority list, to look at ways to root out of American politics the negative nature of so much of this debate.

We can have profound differences of opinion. We can have sharp and profound differences of opinion without letting politics fall into the gutter of the negative, petty, ugly kind of politicking, as we have seen so many good people—good people—get caught up in across this country.

My colleague, Senator BINGAMAN, will have more to say about our joint proposal when he comes to the floor. I ask, again, when we get to this issue later in the debate, our colleagues look favorably on a proposal that I think will make a real difference in American politics and will begin to drain the swamp that has contaminated so much of our public dialog.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senator from Nebraska, Mr. HAGEL, is now recognized.

Mr. HAGEL. Madam President, I rise in support of campaign finance reform. I first commend my colleagues, Senators MCCAIN and FEINGOLD, for their tireless efforts in keeping campaign finance reform alive and forcing the Senate to deal with its responsibilities.

The debate about campaign finance reform is one we need to have. All of us who have the high privilege to hold office have a responsibility to bring open and accountable government to the American people. This begins with an open and accountable campaign financing system. The American people must have confidence in such a system. Confidence in our political system is the essence of representative government. Our challenge has been to reform the excesses of the system while preserving the first amendment rights of all Americans to express themselves and engage in the political process.

In recent years, this challenge has caused Congress to shrink from serious attempts at campaign finance reform. We are better than that. America deserves more than a vacuous sleepwalk through this debate.

The Supreme Court has said Government can regulate how campaign finances are regulated as long as, No. 1, regulations are kept to a reasonable minimum, and, No. 2, they are designed to prevent corruption or the appearance of corruption. The appearance of corruption is a significant part of this debate.

My colleagues are not a bunch of campaign finance bandits or thugs, but in a democracy where citizens freely choose their leaders, perception does matter because perception is directly connected to confidence. Voters lose faith in the integrity of the political system when they lose confidence in the system. As they become demoralized and detached, citizens lower their expectations and standards for public officeholders. That produces a problem that goes beyond any remedy we can offer here on the floor of the Senate.

No amount of legislation can prevent scoundrels from exploiting campaign finance laws or any laws. We need to rise above partisan, ideological, personal rivalries and find common ground on campaign finance reform, elevate the debate, and enact relevant reforms.

For me, disclosure is the core of campaign finance reform. The overriding purpose of the campaign finance reforms enacted in the 1970s was to increase transparency and accountability in the political system. Disclosure rules for all who participate in the political process need to be a part of whatever reform package we produce. The public needs to see who is writing the checks, and for how much. The voter needs to be aware of the flow of campaign dollars. We should not fear an educated and informed body politic. All elected officials have an obligation to be part of that educational process.

In recent years, interest groups have come crashing into races in the home stretch, pouring huge amounts of money into radio and TV ads. All of us know stories of outside groups launching a late blitz of ads, moving poll numbers in the final weeks or days of a campaign, and then disappearing without the public knowing who they were and how much they spent for or against the candidate.

It is time to end this type of political stealth raid on campaigns. If individuals and organizations are going to participate in the electoral process—and they should; we encourage all individuals and organizations to participate—then the extent of their participation should be revealed to the public. As long as the voter can see where the money is coming from, and where it is going, our system will retain its integrity. I trust the American people to elevate this debate and evaluate the flow of money in campaigns.

In addition to the disclosure, we need to look at soft money contributions to national party committees. I appreciate the legitimate free speech and constitutional concerns in this area. Our purpose here is not to anticipate or resolve every hypothetical constitutional challenge. Our job here is to make policy. If complications or honest differences of interpretation and opinion result, that is why we have a judicial system.

What I do know is this. The unaccountable status quo on soft money

needs to be changed. Most constitutional experts say an outright ban on soft money probably is unconstitutional. Every court decision rendered so far on this issue has come down against an outright ban on soft money. But this unaccountable, unlimited flood of soft money cascading over America's politics should be checked. We have constitutional limits on individual contributions—so-called hard money. Why then should it be so outrageous to examine limits on soft money? What are we afraid of?

We need to find a middle ground between the extremes of banning soft money and leaving it unlimited, a middle ground where compromise is possible. We should also raise limits on donations of hard money by individuals and political action committees. This can be done by indexing individual contributions to inflation.

Raising the limits would have beneficial effects. Individual contributors would have an impact comparable to what Congress intended when reforms were first enacted in the 1970s. There would be more focus on individual participation in campaign financing. More campaign money would be under the direct control of candidates, making them more accountable for the spending and the conduct of their campaigns. Remember, this is hard money, accountable money.

These are the general principles behind the amendment I wanted to talk about today. But before getting to the specifics of this amendment, I have to say a word about the current process. We need campaign finance reform, but we are not going to get it through the predicament in which we find ourselves today—limited opportunities for debate, no opportunities for additional amendments, and no votes on those amendments.

My colleagues, Senators ABRAHAM, DEWINE, GORTON, and THOMAS, and I had planned to offer amendments to McCain-Feingold today. Now we are left only with the opportunity to talk about the amendments we would have offered if we had been given a chance to do so.

The amendments my colleagues and I intended to offer contained several significant changes in current campaign finance law. I will focus on the ones my colleagues and I believe are most important. Our amendment, first, would limit to $60,000 a year the total amount of soft money the national party committees combined could receive from an individual, PAC, corporation, or union.

A donor could give all $60,000 to one committee or spread the $60,000 over several committees. But the aggregate soft money donation could not exceed $60,000 per year. The limit would be indexed for inflation in future years. All union and corporate donations still would be treated as soft money to be used only for party-building activities. Union and corporate donations would not be treated as hard money for use in express advocacy or transfers to Federal candidates.

This is not a ban on financial support of parties. It is a return to the original intent of the campaign finance reforms of the 1970s, which worked until they were exploited and abused by, I might add, both parties. Nor is this a ban on political speech. There would remain many options. Donors who wanted to give more money for political speech could contribute to third party organizations.

I appreciate the legitimate free speech and constitutional concerns many of my colleagues and I have about these kinds of caps. This amendment offers a compromise that addresses the constitutional concerns while moving forward with reform legislation.

If the cap were challenged in court within 30 days after taking effect, the cap would be suspended until the conclusion of the court challenge. It is time now to adjust and index hard money contributions to inflation. For an individual, contribution limits would increase, for example, from $1,000 to $3,000 per candidate per election—and so it would go, for PACs and all committees. In future years, all limits would be indexed for inflation.

I have heard the argument that raising the hard money limits would give the wealthy too much influence and access. If we cap soft money and do not adjust the hard money limits, we will chase more money into the black hole of third party ads, where the public cannot view the flow of money. I want to bring more of that money into the sunlight, into the daylight, where the American people have access to who is giving money and how much. They can decide for themselves if a candidate has been ''bought'' by anyone.

Financial disclosure is the core of any campaign finance reform. This amendment would take the rules on broadcast ads that apply now to candidates and extend them to all political broadcast ads.

Under current Federal regulations, when a candidate places a political ad with a broadcaster, the broadcaster is required to keep a file on the ad that is open to any member of the public who wants to see it. In that file is a record of the following: The time the spots are scheduled to air, the overall amount of time purchased, and the rates at which the ads were purchased. This information must be recorded immediately and made available for public inspection.

Under current Federal regulations, when an interest group places a political ad with a broadcaster, it does not have to meet the same requirements. The public cannot find out: Who bought the ad, when the ad will run, how much time was purchased, and how much was paid for the ad. It is closed from public view.

This amendment would require that interest group ads relating to any Federal candidate or issue also must go into the broadcaster's public file. For those types of ads, the broadcaster would be required to record the same information it does for ads by candidates and parties, including the amount spent on the ad.

As with candidates and party ads, the information on these political ads would be recorded immediately and made available for public inspection. There would be no added burden on the broadcaster. The broadcaster would simply use the same form already used for candidate and party ads.

Full disclosure should apply to a political ad by an interest group just as it does for a political committee or candidate because the objectives, after all, of all the ads are the same.

Let me make clear one thing this amendment does not do. It does not require unions, corporations, or any organization to identify individual donors or provide membership lists. This amendment preserves a reasonable balance between the public's right to know which groups are attempting to influence an election and the privacy rights of individual donors to an interest group.

In conclusion, we have before us a unique opportunity to accomplish something relevant, reasonable, and meaningful. We have an opportunity to restore some of the confidence the American people have lost in their political system.

All of us in this noble profession of politics have a responsibility to set high standards in American politics. Improving our system that selects American leaders—who formulate and implement Government policy that frames the governance of our Nation—is a worthy challenge. We can elevate the process and make it better—more open and more accountable—which leads to a more informed public through a more relevant public debate, leading to a more accountable Government. Let us not squander this opportunity or debase our responsibility.

Before I yield the floor, Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Michigan be allowed to follow me.

Mr. McCONNELL. Will the Senator from Nebraska allow me to make a couple quick comments?

Mr. FEINGOLD. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. HUTCHISON). The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. FEINGOLD. I understand I am to speak for 20 minutes following the speech of the Senator from Nebraska. Or does he have additional time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska has 7 minutes remaining. Was the Senator from Kentucky going to ask a question of the Senator from Nebraska or was he asking him to yield the floor?

Mr. McCONNELL. Does the Senator from Nebraska agree with me that since he has 7 minutes left, it would not interfere unduly with the Senator from Wisconsin, who has spoken a

number of times over the last few days, to allow his cosponsor, Senator ABRAHAM, to have the remainder of his time? Would the Senator from Nebraska agree with the Senator from Kentucky that would be a good way to proceed?

Mr. HAGEL. I agree with the Senator from Kentucky and yield my remaining 7 minutes to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. FEINGOLD. With that understanding, I have no objection. I want to be sure that we are not adding additional time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Michigan is recognized for the remaining 7 minutes.

Mr. McCONNELL. Will the Senator from Michigan give me a moment to make an observation?

Mr. ABRAHAM. I will withhold.

Mr. FEINGOLD. I assume this is off the time of the Senator from Nebraska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. McCONNELL. I want to commend the Senator from Nebraska. Some day we are going to pass real campaign finance reform. I think the proposal that my friend from Nebraska has outlined is very close to what someday, I hope, the Congress will pass. I commend him for an outstanding amendment.

Mr. ABRAHAM. May I inquire, in terms of the queue, what additional unanimous consent agreements have been entered into with respect to time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Following the approximately 5 minutes 15 seconds remaining for the Senator from Michigan, Mr. FEINGOLD will be recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. ABRAHAM. May I ask, before the 5:45 vote that is slated, are there any other unanimous consent agreements that have set aside time?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There are none.

Mr. ABRAHAM. I ask the Senator from Wisconsin if he would be willing to enter into a unanimous consent agreement which would allow me to speak for up to 10 minutes and then have his 20 minutes following because we would still be within the timeframe for the vote.

Mr. McCONNELL. Reserving the right to object, I am only interested in having about a minute right before the vote. Does the Senator from Wisconsin have any problem with that?

Mr. FEINGOLD. I have no objection to either request.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Then I ask unanimous consent that I have up to 10 minutes, followed by 20 minutes for the Senator from Wisconsin, followed by 1 minute for the Senator from Kentucky.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Michigan.

Mr. ABRAHAM. I thank my colleagues for their consideration.

I rise today in support of what I believe is a real, substantive solution to the vexing question of campaign finance reform. To my mind that question is this: how do we revive voter confidence in the electoral process without violating the fundamental guidelines laid down in our Constitution? The answer, I believe, lies in public exposure and voter knowledge. The more voters know about the sources of a particular candidate's campaign funding, the better able they will be to determine whether that funding has or will interfere with the candidate's ability to represent them.

The solution I support is in the nature of a substitute amendment. I have cosponsored this amendment along with Senators HAGEL, DEWINE, GORTON, and THOMAS.

It was my hope that my colleagues and I would be able to introduce this substitute on the floor and call for a vote. However, procedural barriers have been created which have undermined meaningful debate on this issue. In the end, these procedural barriers have prevented my colleagues and I from submitting our substitute for a vote. However, because I believe campaign finance reform is a critical issue which will be with us for some time to come, I feel compelled to say a few words about the contents of the substitute.

I believe that provisions in the substitute correct key, perceived problems in our campaign financing system. The first section of the substitute would increase disclosure. It would ensure that the public, and the candidates' constituents in particular, are made immediately and continuously aware the sources of candidates' financing. It also would ensure public notification of any candidate financing by an outside organization or interest seeking to influence the election.

How would the substitute accomplish these ends? By requiring additional monthly and quarterly disclosure reports for federal candidates and for national political parties. The substitute would also require national party committees to disclose their receipts and disbursements from non-federal accounts—as they are currently required to do so for their federal accounts. A variety of other disclosure components is also included in the legislation.

The second section of the substitute imposes reasonable restrictions on soft money. I am very concerned about the constitutional implications of a complete ban on soft money. Thus, our substitute would place a $60,000 cap on soft money, pending an expedited review by the Supreme Court. I believe this approach deals responsibly with the issue of soft money, without ignoring potentially serious conflicts with the first amendment.

Also included within the substitute is a provision that would raise individual and PAC contribution limits to adjust for inflation. The present limits have been in place since 1974, when the first law regarding campaign finance was passed by the Congress. It is clearly justifiable that these limits be raised to reflect the present economic realities while maintaining the disclosure provisions so that the public can continue to be informed about the sources of financing.

In addition, I would have liked to have been given the opportunity to submit an additional amendment to campaign finance legislation. I would have introduce an amendment limiting non-constituent contributions to 50 percent of the total raised by the candidate. This amendment would accomplish a multitude of goals. It would instill a guideline for the candidates, instill confidence in the voters, and would help dispel the all too common notion that candidates are improperly influenced by campaign contributions. In my view it is not difficult for a politician to arrange financing in a way that avoids the appearance as well as the reality of corruption.

In the context of my amendment, all federal candidates would have to follow the same rules, dictating that they receive no more than 50 percent of overall contributions from PACs and out of state donors. Political committees that do not have their national headquarters within the candidate's state would be considered ''out of state'' contributions for these purposes. Any individual who is not a legal resident of the candidate's state and contributes $200 or more to a candidate would also be considered an ''out of state'' donor.

Why do I suggest such an approach? Because I don't think we are addressing the serious perception problems that exist with respect to campaign reform when we stand on the floor and focus all of the amendments on who gives money to the national parties.

The fact is the party is not the individual who is on the floor of the Senate casting votes. It is the 100 Members of the Senate. I believe what is relevant is who supports us. Can we claim to represent constituents if more than 50 percent of the money we receive from our campaigns come from people we don't represent? I argue the answer to that is no.

I think much more than contributions to the national parties undermines our constituents' confidence that when we are on the floor we are acting in the best interests of our constituents and our States. In my judgment, this type of amendment—one that, unfortunately, will not be voted on—is an important and integral part of any legitimate campaign reform proposal. I am certain Federal candidates would find that they can run successful campaigns with this 50-percent imposed limit. More importantly, these limits would increase politicians' accountability to their own constituents and decrease the appearance of out-of-State special interest influence.

I ask unanimous consent the text of my proposed amendment be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the amendment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 6. LIMITATION ON OUT-OF-STATE CONTRIBUTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Title III of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 431 et seq.), as amended by section 2, is amended by adding at the end the following:

"SEC. 324. LIMIT ON OUT-OF-STATE CONTRIBUTIONS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—A candidate for nomination to, or election to, the Senate or House of Representatives or the candidate's authorized committees shall not accept an aggregate amount of funds during an election cycle from individuals that are not legal residents of and political committees (other than a national political committee of a political party or a Senatorial or Congressional Campaign Committee of a national political party) that do not have their national headquarters within the candidate's State in excess of an amount equal to 50 percent of the total amount of contributions accepted by the candidate and the candidate's authorized committees during the election cycle.

''(b) EXCEPTION.—For purposes of the limit under subsection (a), a contribution in an aggregate amount of less than $200 in an election cycle from an individual who is not a legal resident of the candidate's State shall not be taken into account.

''(c) TIME TO MEET REQUIREMENT.—A candidate shall meet the requirement of subsection (a) on the date for filing the post-general election report under section 304(a)(2)(A)(ii).

''(d) NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS.—In the case of a political committee which is a separate segregated fund under section 316(b)(2)(C), the term 'national headquarters' means the national headquarters of the entity which establishes and maintains such fund.''.

(b) DEFINITION OF ELECTION CYCLE.—Section 301 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 431) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(20) ELECTION CYCLE.—The term 'election cycle' means the period beginning on the day after the date of the most recent general election for the specific office or seat that a candidate is seeking and ending on the date of the next general election for that office or seat.''.

Mr. ABRAHAM. I believe the substitute, which I cosponsored with Senators HAGEL and THOMAS and GORTON and DEWINE, along with my proposed amendment, is the better way to reform campaign financing. I think it strikes a reasonable balance between addressing the issues of corruption with the constitutional concerns. I only wish these amendments had been allowed to reach the floor. I can assure my colleagues that I will continue to support real constructive campaign finance reform.

As I say, it is unfortunate that the structure of our procedures won't allow us to offer these variations. I think it is obvious to all Americans that right now we have an impasse.

The reason we have an impasse is because we have essentially only one alternative that is being treated as the only option available with respect to campaign finance reform. Clearly, the way to break a legislative logjam is to consider other alternatives. That is what the Senator from Nebraska and I are trying to do. Perhaps it won't happen in the context of this year's debate, but I hope in future debates we will go beyond the simple all-or-nothing approach that we have had in recent debates and give the rest of us a chance to have our amendments considered and voted on. I think that is the only way we are going to get to a conclusion that does, in fact, change the process, and for the better.

Mr. McCONNELL. Will the Senator yield for a comment?

Mr. ABRAHAM. Yes. If there is time remaining, I am happy to yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 2 minutes.

Mr. McCONNELL. I commend the Senator from Michigan, one of the Members of this body who truly understands this issue. I think the amendment he and the Senator from Nebraska have offered is a very important step in the direction that I ultimately think we will take—if we ever get serious about doing this on a bipartisan basis, rather than in a way that advantages one side and disadvantages another.

So I wanted to commend the Senator from Michigan for his outstanding work.

Mr. ABRAHAM. I thank the Senator from Kentucky. I haven't used all of my time, so I am happy to yield back the remainder of my time and I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Madam President, in a few minutes, the Senate, for the first time—let me reiterate that—for the first time, the Senate will go on record on the central issue in this debate: Should the Senate ban soft money?

It is a simple question that has a simple answer. And soon, finally, we will see where each Senator stands.

The fact that our current campaign finance system has created an appearance of corruption justifies Congress acting to ban soft money. In fact, if we don't act, we create the appearance that we don't care about corruption. Creating a legislative record of the appearance of corruption is critical because the Supreme Court has held that not just actual corruption but an appearance of corruption is adequate reason for the restrictions on the speech represented by campaign contribution limits.

Madam President, this is the central misunderstanding or flaw in the opposition's position. They have premised everything in this debate on the idea that you have to show individual Senators who are guilty of corruption. Well, of course, that isn't the standard at all. That isn't the law. Let me quote from the Supreme Court's opinion in Buckley v. Valeo because this is a crucial concept that opponents of reform often seek to ignore. The Court said:

> Of almost equal concern as the danger of actual quid pro quo arrangements is the impact of the appearance of corruption stemming from public awareness of the opportunities for abuse inherent in a regime of large individual financial contributions.

Madam President, I really don't think there is any doubt that our current system presents the appearance of corruption. And it isn't just soft money. We see it every day in the newspapers, and we hear it on television talk shows. It is portrayed as common knowledge, conventional wisdom, on radio talk shows that the votes of politicians are bought and paid for by special interests. When the Senator from Kentucky stands up and says that ''people contribute to our campaigns because they agree with what we are doing,'' I am sure he is sincere, but the public thinks there is something more than general feelings of support or like-mindedness at work when somebody hands over hundreds of thousands of dollars.

Let me give some examples of news stories in just the last three weeks that drive this point home. All of them make it perfectly clear to me, and I think to almost any American, that political donations are generally a way of attempting to buy influence and access. All of them add to the record that there is an appearance of corruption out there that justifies the Congress taking action to ban soft money.

Madam President, if this applies to hard money contributions, it surely must apply far more easily and obviously to soft money contributions.

Exhibit A is a story from the National Journal of October 2, 1999. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the National Journal, Oct. 2, 1999]

BANKING ON PAXON'S GOP CREDENTIALS

(By Peter H. Stone)

It sure didn't take long for former Rep. Bill Paxon, R-N.Y., to shake up Akin, Gump, Strauss, Hauer & Feld, the home of Democratic superstars Robert S. Strauss and Vernon E. Jordan. At Paxon's behest, the blockbuster law and lobbying firm has joined the Republican National Committee's elite Team 100, whose members give $175,000 to the party every four years.

Since he joined Akin, Gump in January, after sifting through a score of job offers, Paxon, the former chairman of the National Republican Congressional Committee, has worked diligently to boost the firm's standing in GOP circles. Moreover, Paxon's arrival at Akin, Gump reflects the determination of K Street firms loaded with Democratic ties to adjust to the GOP's control of Congress.

It was no secret that Akin, Gump needed a GOP star. After the 1996 presidential elections, the firm courted Bob Dole, the GOP nominee and a former Senate Majority Leader. But instead he joined another heavily Democratic firm, Verner, Liipfert, Bernhard, McPherson and Hand. Two years later, Akin, Gump recruited Paxon aggressively and nabbed him as a ''senior advisor'' for an annual salary of about $750,000. Paxon gets an office next to Strauss, to boot.

Paxon, who was instrumental in the GOP's 1994 takeover of the Congress, enhances Akin, Gump's credibility among Republicans. After all, he has raised big bucks for House GOP leaders, the party committees, and the leading presidential contender George W. Bush, the Texas Governor. He has already attracted roughly a dozen new clients to the firm, including Americans for Affordable Electricity—a coalition of energy

producers, led by Enron Corp., and large users, such as the chemical industry—which backs quick utility deregulation. Paxon also earns his keep by advising several longstanding Akin, Gump clients on lobbying strategy.

Paxon conceded that Akin, Gump had a lot of fence-mending to do with the GOP. ''The firm had a reputation as a Democratic firm, unfairly so,'' he said. Despite the presence of such GOP stalwarts as Donald C. Alexander, Smith W. Davis, and Barney J. Skladany, the firm's superstars are former Democratic National Committee Chairman Strauss and President Clinton's golfing buddy Jordan. Joel Jankowsky, who heads the firm's lobbying team, is also a Democrat. ''We have needed to ratchet up our Republican profile to another level,'' Paxon added.

Paxon, 45 and a nonlawyer, is certainly trying. Since coming on board, Paxon has helped host 20 fund-raisers for House Speaker J. Dennis Hastert of Illinois, House Majority Whip Tom DeLay of Texas, Senator Majority Whip Don Nickles of Oklahoma, and others in the GOP. What's more, Paxon and his colleagues raised more than $250,000 for an NRCC dinner earlier this year and another $150,000 for a GOP Senate-House dinner. In late August, Paxon helped Hastert during the Speaker's successful fund-raising trip to Las Vegas.

Not surprisingly, NRCC Chairman Tom Davis of Virginia is a huge Paxon fan. ''Bill is still a very integral part of the culture over here,'' said Davis, who talks to Paxon a couple of times a week. ''He's been helpful in building bridges to groups. I consider him a right arm up here.''

Paxon is also one of a small number of K Streeters who meet regularly with Hastert to discuss party strategy and to swap information. He does the same with Chief Deputy Majority Whip Roy Blunt, R–Mo., who holds weekly meetings with lobbyists. During a recent session, Paxon maintained that the GOP should not worry too much about its record on Capitol Hill this year, because the party's generic poll numbers remain high as a result of the public's ''fatigue'' with the Clinton Administration and other factors.

Nationally, Paxon has proved to be a key fund-raiser and strategist for Gov. Bush. Paxon has raised more than $100,000 for Bush, with a major slice of the money coming from New York state. On Oct. 4, Paxon will cohost events in Buffalo and Rochester that are expected to pull in close to $500,000 for the Bush campaign. Campaign sources say that Paxon is likely to be named a member of Bush's national finance committee when the panel is expanded later this year.

Paxon has helped to secure congressional endorsements for Bush, whom he has visited three times in Austin. Paxon was instrumental in lining up Blunt as the point man for the Bush campaign in the House. In addition, he has advised the campaign on tapping various House members for fund-raising and other help.

Paxon's fund-raising skills, plus the experience he gained during five terms in Congress, have seemingly proved magnets for new business. Although he is barred by ethics rules from lobbying on Capitol Hill until next year, Paxon said he offers clients a cornucopia of other services. ''I help clients understand what kind of lobbying, grass-roots, and PAC (political action committee) programs they need to be effective in Washington.''

As for clients, Paxon is doing well. Americans for Affordable Electricity, for example, is paying the firm approximately $500,000 a year for Paxon's services, according to coalition sources. Paxon is the group's national chairman. What does Paxon do to merit such fees? For the AAE, Paxon has offered advice about how to approach members and what arguments sell well on Capitol Hill. He has also helped organize fund-raisers that the coalition has held for key members of the House Commerce Energy and Power Subcommittee, including its chairman, Joe Barton, R-Texas. Paxon is a former member of the panel.

In late September, Paxon and Marc D. Yacker, a member of the coalition's steering committee and a lobbyist for the Electricity Consumers Resource Council, attended a luncheon with aides to roughly a dozen Governors to discuss utility deregulation. Paxon has helped at the coalition's press conferences and been a guest on several radio talk shows. Paxon's name is also featured in the coalition's advertising campaign.

Several coalition leaders give Paxon high marks. ''The very fact that his name is on all the ads and that he's associated with the issue and the cause is a major boost to the coalition's legislative efforts,'' Yacker said.

But another coalition source complained that Paxon has failed to raise enough money to enable the coalition to compete with the utility industry's lobbying and advertising efforts.

Paxon, a Buffalo native, has corralled new clients in areas ranging from financial services to construction. Not surprisingly, some of that business comes from the Empire State. For instance, Paxon brought in the New York State Health Facilities Association, which is seeking additional Medicare reimbursement money. Moreover, Paxon is permitted to lobby lawmakers outside Washington, and he has already done some work in Albany, N.Y., for PG&E Generating Co., a unit of Pacific Gas & Electric Co.

Paxon also devotes a fair chunk of his time to helping the firm's longtime clients, such as AT&T Corp. In late September, Paxon participated in a morning press briefing hosted by the Competitive Broadband Coalition—of which AT&T is a key member—to introduce a multimillion-dollar television ad drive that will run in about 23 states and inside the Beltway. The coalition's ad message is aimed at countering lobbying by some Baby Bells, which want to revise the 1996 Telecommunications Act to allow them to provide high-speed data services in the long-distance market. Paxon will also advise the coalition on legislative strategy.

The lobbying battle has a personal dimension for Paxon. His wife, former Rep. Susan Molinari, R–N.Y., represents iAdvance, a coalition that includes several Baby Bells. ''Every now and then, we square off,'' quips Paxon. ''It's not exactly (James) Carville and (Mary) Matalin.''

According to Paxon, his move from Capitol Hill has proved to be relatively smooth. ''In the leadership, we spent a lot of time strategizing on legislative issues, working on the public angles, and trying to keep an eye on the big picture,'' he added. ''It's the same downtown.''

Of course, Paxon's transformation from congressional leader to thriving lobbyist, a success greased by plenty of campaign cash, has provoked some indignation from longtime critics of the money game. ''Bill Paxon may have changed jobs, but he doesn't appear to have changed his role as a big-time player in the Washington influence-money game,'' said Fred Wertheimer, the president of Democracy 21, a group that advocates campaign finance reform.

But at Akin, Gump, legendary lobbyist bob Strauss is bursting with pride about the success of the firm's Republican hire. ''He fit in from day one,'' crows Strauss. ''He's a franchise player. He'll continue to make contributions, not just to the business of the firm, but the character and the culture of the firm.''

Akin, Gump is banking on that.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Madam President, this article reports that former Representative Bill Paxon, who retired last year, has signed with the law firm of Akin, Gump, Strauss, Hauer and Feld. Akin Gump is one of the powerhouse lobbying firms in Washington. Its partners include big name Democrats Robert Strauss and Vernon Jordan. Paxon is not a lawyer, so his title is ''senior advisor.'' What that means is that he will be a lobbyist and ''rainmaker'' for the firm.

Apparently, Akin Gump, a firm known for its Democratic Party ties, hired Mr. Paxon to ''mend fences'' with the Republican Party. And how does Mr. Paxon do that? According to this article, the main thing he does is raise money for Republican Members of Congress and the Republican Party. The National Journal reports that Paxon has helped host 20 fundraisers for the Speaker of the House, the House majority whip, the assistant majority leader in the Senate, and other Republican office holders. He has also raised more than $250,000 for an NRCC dinner, and another $150,000 for a Republican House-Senate dinner this year. He has raised over $100,000 for Presidential candidate George W. Bush.

Let me quote from the article:

> Not surprisingly, NRCC chairman, Tom Davis of Virginia, is a huge Paxon fan. ''Bill is still a very integral part of the culture over here,'' said Davis, who talks to Paxon a couple of times a week. ''He's been helpful in building bridges to groups. I consider him a right arm up here.''

The article reports that Mr. Paxon participates in a weekly meeting that lobbyists hold with Majority Whip DELAY and meets regularly with Speaker HASTERT.

The article continues:

> Paxon's fundraising skills, plus the experience he gained during five terms in Congress, have seemingly proved magnets for new business. Although he is barred by ethics rules from lobbying on Capitol Hill until next year, Paxon said he offers clients a cornucopia of other services.

Madam President, let's leave aside the revolving door problems in Mr. Paxon participating in weekly meetings that Mr. DELAY holds with lobbyists. Can there be any question that that is an appearance problem? Here we have a former Member of Congress whose stock in trade is raising big money for congressional leaders and candidates. Do we really blame the public for thinking he is getting special treatment for his clients?

Mr. DAVIS calls him an integral part of the culture over here. Just what kind of culture is this? Certainly not the kind of culture I would be proud to tell my children and grandchildren about. Certainly not a culture that we should nourish and preserve for the future of our democracy.

He is a right arm for the congressional leadership? The public might be excused for asking: Just who is the right arm for whom in this relationship?

Exhibit B. On October 5, the day before the House considered the Patients'

Bill of Rights, according to press reports, officials for Cigna, Blue Cross-Blue Shield, and Aetna held a $1,000 per plate breakfast fundraiser for the Speaker of the House. Press reports the next day said that 15 or 17 health insurance industry lobbyists attended the event. Atlanta Constitution columnist Tom Baxter wrote the following:

The condition of the political ground could be judged by the keen attention of all the television networks to a breakfast fund-raiser this week at which insurance lobbyists arrived with checks for Hastert and others. Not that such scenes aren't common these days, but the timing made this a photo-op for campaign finance reform.

Indeed. I remember seeing reports on the national TV news about this event. And I thought to myself: ''what can the average American watching on TV think about this scene?'' ''How can anyone not think this is wrong?'' Actual corruption? We will never know. The appearance of corruption? Without a doubt. The headline of this AP news story tells it all: ''Insurers Give Speaker Thousands on Eve of Vote.''

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that this article from the Bergen County Record on this fundraiser be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Bergen County (NJ) Record, Oct. 6, 1999]

INSURERS GIVE SPEAKER THOUSANDS ON EVE OF VOTE

(By David Espo)

One day before a closely watched vote on health care, House Speaker Dennis Hastert attended a fund-raising breakfast Tuesday with industry representatives who gave $1,000 apiece to his political war chest.

''I'd like to ask them about sitting down with America's families instead,'' President Clinton chided from the White House as he sought to build support for legislation granting patients the right to sue their health insurance companies.

Hastert, who opposes the bill, defended his previously scheduled meeting and sought to turn the tables on the White House. ''Mr. President, I hope you will say no to helping trial lawyers, and say yes to helping the 44 million Americans who want health-care coverage,'' the Illinois Republican said in a written statement.

The exchange underscored the deep philosophical and political gulf between the two parties on health care at a time when government statistics show the number of uninsured continues to increase.

The White House, most Democrats, and some Republicans are supporting legislation to strengthen patients hands in dealing with their managed care companies. Among prerogatives would be the ability to sue for damages when prescribed care was denied.

Republicans counter that such provisions will merely raise the cost of insurance and prompt some employers who now offer insurance to their workers to drop it.

Facing a likely setback on that measure, the GOP leadership is proposing a companion bill that provides numerous tax breaks to make health insurance more affordable.

Their ''access'' bill also includes a provision opposed by many Democrats to expand a current small program allowing medical savings accounts. Another would give small businesses the option to buy health insurance under federal rather than state regulation. That would exempt them from state mandates that bigger self-insured companies avoid.

''It's not the severe poor who don't have health care,'' Hastert told reporters. ''There are government programs that reach out. It's working people today, who are working for small business or who run their own shop or they go from job to job, who need the ability to get health care.''

Hastert pledged a ''fair and open debate of the health-care issue'' today when the legislation reaches the House floor.

The debate will come against a backdrop of a fresh government report that estimates 44.3 million Americans, one in six, had no health insurance coverage in 1998.

The Census Bureau survey found the number without coverage grew by nearly a million, but overall population growth kept the rate about steady, 16.3 percent in 1998, compared with 16.1 percent in 1997. In 1996, 15.6 percent lacked coverage.

Public opinion polls show the issue is high on the public's list of priorities, and GOP leaders have struggled for months in a narrowly divided House to keep control of it.

Hastert held the fund-raising breakfast for his political action committee a few blocks from the Capitol.

Aides said it was scheduled several weeks ago. There was no word on whether there was consideration of rescheduling the event given the close proximity to the House's debate.

''I've listened to everybody in the health-care business for a long time,'' the Speaker told reporters in the Capitol.

''The die is cast already on what the health legislation is going to be. So there's no influence there whatsoever.''

An invitation to the event was issued in the name of officials of Cigna, Blue Cross-Blue Shield, and Aetna.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Madam President, an article that appeared in the Capitol Hill newspaper The Hill on September 29. Here's another great headline: ''Why 30 top Democratic lobbyists attended GOP chairman's bash.''

This article reports however, that 30 top Democratic lobbyists attended a fundraising dinner for a Republican committee chairman at the home of Democratic super-lobbyist Tommy Boggs.

I bring this article to the attention of the Senate not to cast aspersions on any Senator. My interest in this article is in the views of lobbyists on fundraising, and the appearance it creates for the public that reads about it.

Let me quote from the article: ''Indeed, it would be tantamount to political suicide for Democratic lobbyists—or Republican lobbyists for that matter—who specialize in the [the issues] that are the focus of [the chairman's] committee and the lifeblood of their corporate clients, if they desert him in his hour of need.''

Here are a few quotes in this article from lobbyists who were questioned on the irony of Democratic lobbyists making contributions to a powerful Republican chairman of a Senate committee. One said: ''In situations like this, I tend to be a strong fan of incumbency.'' Another said, ''Most lobbyists know which side their bread is buttered on.'' And this is what a staffer on the House side had to say: ''Any time you have a chairman of [a committee] running for reelection, and you're lobbying . . . issues before the committee, you risk having your issue blown out of the water if you don't contribute to his campaign. The game in this town is to support the incumbent.

Mr. President, I don't suggest that these lobbyists bearing gifts have swayed or will sway a chairman on substantive issues, but they sure are trying. And I have avoided using the Senator's name because I don't think he has been swayed. But we all have to admit that these kind of comments create a perception, an appearance, that campaign contributions are given because of the effect they will have on policy.

Madam President, let me anticipate a question by the Senator from Kentucky. Most of the fundraising in these articles is hard money fundraising, isn't it? It is all legal under our system. Thousand-dollar checks to candidates are permitted under the Federal election laws, aren't they? The answer, of course, is yes. But what strikes me is the obvious appearance of corruption that is present when a lobbyist specializes in throwing fundraisers for candidates or when members of Congress solicit even these relatively small donations from people with an interest in legislation, especially on the eve of a crucial vote.

Madam President, can there be any doubt that an outrageous appearance of corruption arises when the same Members of Congress are involved in raising hundreds of thousands of dollars of soft money in a single phone call for the political parties? As Justice Souter said just a few weeks ago at the oral argument in the Missouri case—''Most people assume, and I do certainly, that someone making an extraordinarily large contribution gets something extraordinary in return.''

That brings me to another exhibit in our legislative record of the appearance of corruption—a story that appeared yesterday in the Washington Post about the effort that the Democratic party—my party—is making to raise soft money in order to retake the Congress. According to the article, the Democrat Congressional Campaign Committee increased its soft money fundraising from $5.1 million in 1994 to $16.6 million in the '98 cycle. It is now going after the really big givers with an innovation called Team 2000. The Post story describes Team 2000 as ''[A] new club for $100,000 and over donors who would be feted by the party at exclusive events, including a weekend of clambakes and sightseeing.''

The article describes the wooing of Steven Wynn, owner of Mirage Resorts in Las Vegas, who gave a $250,000 contribution to the DCCC in May of this year. The article indicates that Wynn is angry about the impeachment of the President and with the Republican failure to stop the antigaming crusade of a Member of the House.

Incidentally, this information is not included in this particular article, but

I have learned that the Mirage Resorts gave an identical $250,000 amount to the National Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee in July of this year.

So I guess Mr. Wynn got over his anger and realized that he had better play both sides of the fence, as many big soft money donors do.

Madam President, I ask unanimous consent this Washington Post story be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 17, 1999]

DEMOCRATS' FAST TRACK IS 'SOFT MONEY'

(By Susan B. Glasser)

The House Democrats' courtship of Steve Wynn—owner of Mirage Resorts, grandiose prophet of the new Las Vegas, and major Republican donor—began four years ago with a cold call from David Jones, Minority Leader Richard A. Gephardt's top fund-raiser.

Wynn took the call, and soon Jones was flying out to breakfast at his golf course mansion along with Rep. Charles B. Rangel. The gravelly voiced New Yorker became the Democratic point man, reciprocating Wynn's hospitality with a tour of his Harlem district.

By last February, when Jones and Rangel met with Wynn in his Las Vegas office, they didn't even have to make their pitch. Wynn had told friends he was angry at ''mean-spirited'' House Republicans for impeaching President Clinton. Besides, he complained, they had neglected him, and hadn't stopped Rep. Frank R. Wolf's (R–Va.) anti-gaming crusade. He was ready, Wynn said, to help the Democrats regain control of the House.

How much, Wynn asked, do you need me to help raise out of Nevada for the 2000 election? Jones knew that during the entire 1998 election, the House Democrats' campaign arm had only collected about $110,000 from Vegas, so his answer was an audacious one: $1 million to $1.5 million. Done, Wynn replied.

The first installment—a $250,000 corporate check from Mirage Resorts—was Wynn's downpayment on a bet that Democrats will take back the House next year. It also suggests one reason why they might succeed. With the Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee as their vehicle, they are raising record amounts of money for next year's races, trading on their new electoral competitiveness to raise funds earlier and in larger amounts than ever before.

''Soft money''—the term of art for the unlimited contributions that corporations, unions and wealthy individuals can give for so-called ''party building''—has fueled an explosive growth in fund-raising for both parties since the 1996 elections, when campaign operatives figured out a way to legally spend it on TV ads that focused on individual candidates.

But this year it is the House Democrats who have been most aggressive in increasing the amount of soft money they raise, even as they lead the campaign in Congress to eliminate it. Driven by Gephardt and Rep. Patrick J. Kennedy (D–R.I.), the chairman handpicked by Gephardt, the DCCC is out to reverse its traditional status ''at the bottom of the fund-raising food chain,'' as former Rep. Vic Fazio (D–Calif.) put it.

In just the first six months of this year, the DCCC raised $17 million total—$9 million of that in soft money. That marks a stunning 373 percent increase in soft money compared with the first six months of 1997—the highest rate of growth for any party committee. The fund-raising escalation foreshadows an election season next year when both parties will pour a million dollars or more into more than 30 House races whose outcome will determine control of Congress.

Some of the money is from businesses like Wynn's Mirage Resorts; some is from well-heeled individuals giving $100,000 each, such as Slimfast founder S. Daniel Abraham, National Enquirer heiress Lois Pope and Florida Marlins owner John W. Henry. As of June 30, Democrats had attracted 21 six-figure soft-money givers compared with 14 for Republicans, according to data compiled by the Campaign Study Group. Those checks came from groups or individuals who had never before made such a financial commitment so early.

Since individual members can't raise soft money for their own campaigns, the DCCC and the National Republican Congressional Committee do it for them. This embrace of soft money—legally meant to go only for ''nonfederal'' purposes—is particularly ironic since the two campaign committees exist for the sole purpose of electing federal candidates.

In recent years, the soft money powerhouse on Capitol Hill has been the NRCC. Since the beginning of 1997, a new Common Cause study found, the House Republican committee has raised more of it than any other congressional committee: a total of $37.8 million. So far this year, the NRCC has outraised the DCCC overall $27 million to $17 million. And in House Majority Whip Tom DeLay (R–Tex.), the subject of a story Monday, the Republicans have the single most effective fund-raiser in Congress.

But slightly less than a year before the congressional elections, the House Democrats have significantly cut into the GOP's fund-raising advantage.

The DCCC is running essentially even with the NRCC in soft money raised this year, and Democrats are ahead for the first time ever in cash on hand: $10.7 million to the NRCC's $10.1 million.

''Republicans have experienced growth,'' said David Plouffe, the Gephardt strategist who is now executive director of the DCCC. ''We've experienced much greater growth.'' By design, the Democratic growth strategy has focused on soft money, seeking contributions from a new club—''Team 2000''—for $100,000 givers, and on what several sources said was an organized effort to get labor unions to ''frontload'' their contributions by giving as much as possible early in the election cycle.

Republicans have hardly ignored big givers. After the Democrats upped the ante, NRCC Chairman Tom Davis (Va.) imitated them with his own $100,000 program—the ''Business Leadership Trust,'' a name reflective of the GOP's financial base. The GOP is also starting a new national finance committee to recognize corporate CEOs and top lobbyists. And when it comes to big checks, the NRCC lays claim to the biggest single donation of the year: $300,000 from Chiquita banana king Carl Lindner.

''Soft money follows power,'' said Davis, recognizing that the Republicans' takeover of Congress in 1994 has immeasurably boosted their fund-raising capacity. But he argued that Democrats have benefited most, leveraging the power of the presidency for their financial gain.

ERODING THE GOP EDGE

For decades, Democrats have gone into campaigns knowing they would be outspent. Taking over the DCCC in 1981, when Republicans had a fund-raising lead of 13 to one, Rep. Tony Coelho (D–Cal.) cut into that edge by convincing businesses they should invest in what was then the congressional majority. Coelho, now Vice President Gore's campaign chairman, also professionalized the DCCC, insisting for example that a campaign hire pollsters before it could receive a dime from the committee.

But the game then was hard money—strictly limited contributions of no more than $20,000 a year to party committees. At the time, before a succession of court rulings and Federal Election Commission cases, soft money was an add-on, used to finance building projects and television studios but never contemplated as a thinly veiled way around the contribution limits to specific races. And so the dollar amounts were low, amazingly so compared with the current checks.

''In retrospect, we were pikers,'' said one former Coelho adviser. ''We thought we were pushing the envelope when we were asking people for $5,000.''

And yet Coelho was a transformative figure, his close ties to S&L power brokers and aggressive style memorialized in a book, ''Honest Graft,'' by journalist Brooks Jackson that showed members how the DCCC and the NRCC could become fund-raising powerhouses and use that money to wield more influence over campaigns. New York Republican Bill Paxon, who took over an NRCC deeply mired in debt in 1993, said flatly, ''Coelho was my model'' as he reinvented the committee in time for House Republicans to win the majority for the first time in 40 years.

In 1994, the last election before soft money's rise, the NRCC raised $7.4 million in soft money, compared to $5.1 million by the DCCC.

When Texas Rep. Martin Frost became chairman of the DCCC in 1995, he knew the Democrats were going to have to raise money differently. In the minority after four decades of power, they no longer had the legislative club that Coelho had taught them to wield with the K Street lobbyists who controlled business giving.

''Once we went into the minority, we had to reach beyond the PAC community in Washington,'' said Frost, who led the DCCC in the 1996 and 1998 elections and is now the Democratic Caucus chairman. ''We really had to work the rest of the country aggressively.''

Clinton and his advisers supplied the blueprint, using the Democratic National Committee to fund an unprecedented $35 million ad campaign to boost his reelection and paying for the ads with mix of hard and soft money. On Capitol Hill, members quickly grasped the implications: soft money could now be used to launch candidate-specific TV ads that were legal as long as they avoided the magic words ''vote for'' or ''vote against.''

Frost was planning to raise more soft money—but only to fund more traditional activities, like election-day turnout and overhead expenses. To start, he had to confront a party committee without much of a national donor base. ''We weren't really thinking about soft money,'' said Matt Angle, Frost's top aide. ''We were thinking about new money.

When they arrived at the DCCC, Angle said, they found that only 100 or so individuals had ever given more than $1,000 to the DCCC. Democratic House members, still stunned by their party's defeat, were reluctant to hit up their own big donors for the committee. And most donors had never heard of the DCCC, assuming it was an affiliate of the DNC.

''We had one guy who was a $100,000 giver,'' Frost said, New Jersey businessman Grover

Connell, a rice broker who figured in the Koreagate scandal of the late 1970s and as long ago as the Coelho days was already giving $50,000 a year to the DCCC.'' ''He was the only one we ever had,'' Frost said. ''I said, 'Well, if Grover will give that much, we should start asking other people for larger figures.' ''

Meanwhile, the predicted switch in business giving was coming to pass—Republicans, led by Speaker Newt Gingrich (R–Ga.) and DeLay, made an aggressive push to shut down Democratic money on K Street. By the 1998 election, about 65 percent of business funds were going to the House GOP.

Overall, the DCCC raised $16.6 million in soft money to the NRCC's $27.8 million for last year's election—225 percent more for the Democrats and 274 percent more for the Republicans since 1994.

Gephardt was already a top fund-raiser, a master of ''the big ask,'' and yet, said Frost, ''we didn't have 100 percent of his attention.''

But last fall's election, when Democrats shocked even themselves by whittling the House GOP's majority to just six seats, galvanized Gephardt, a believer in the power of political soft money since his 1988 presidential campaign sputtered to a finish on Super Tuesday, several million dollars in debt.

GEPHARDT AIMS FOR SPEAKER

Two days after last year's election, Gephardt convened his top advisers and started planning for the 2000 campaign. His goal, it was clear, was to become speaker—not to run for president. While he didn't announce that decision until February, Gephardt quickly began planning his DCCC strategy, deciding to transfer virtually all his political operation to the committee.

As chairman, Kennedy would be Gephardt's ''director of sales and marketing,'' in the words of banking lobbyist Tom Quinn, a longtime Kennedy family backer. Unabashed about trading on his family name, Kennedy was seen by Gephardt's team as a financial asset. ''Patrick being chairman means an additional $10 million to $20 million for the DCCC,'' argued a leading party fund-raiser.

Jones, Gephardt's top money man, was put on contract at the DCCC. So was Richard J. Sullivan, the young lawyer who had served as the DNC's finance director in the 1996 election and was the lead-off witness in hearings held by Sen. Fred D. Thompson (R–Tenn.) about the influx of foreign money to the DNC in 1996.

The idea was to personalize the committee, selling donors on the future speaker. Kennedy said he often tells would-be contributors: '' 'This is the Dick Gephardt for Speaker committee.' They get that. It personalizes it.''

Gephardt himself calls big donors, not just to ask but also to thank. ''He's the kind of guy who understands that in order to get dessert, you have to eat your vegetables,'' said Erik Smith, a Gephardt aide who is now the DCCC's communications director.

Determined to take advantage of the political momentum generated by the November election gains—and to play off the outrage felt by Democratic donors about the GOP House's impeachmnent of Clinton—the DCCC decided to focus its efforts on soft money and to push earlier than ever for major checks.

But Kennedy himself proposed the most audacious innovation, according to his aides. Until then, the biggest dollar program at the DCCC had been the Speaker's Club, price of entry: $15,000 in hard money. Kennedy created ''Team 2000,'' a new club for $100,000 and over donors who would be feted by the party at exclusive events, including a weekend of clambakes and sightseeing at the Kennedy family compound in Hyannisport last month.

Big donations began to roll in: $250,000 from the Communications Workers of America, whose political director considers herself Kennedy's ''fairy godmother'' in the labor movement; $210,000 from AFSCME; $102,000 from AT&T; $100,000 from Texas trial lawyer Walter Umphrey's firm, Price Club founder Sol Price and others.

The Democrats are eagerly keeping score: according to the sheet handed out at each week's Democratic Caucus meeting, Gephardt has already collected $6.8 million for the DCCC and House candidates this year, followed by Kennedy at $6.2 million, aspiring Ways and Means Chairman Rangel at $1.9 million and Frost at $670,000.

Contributors who have dramatically increased their help to the House Democrats this year cite everything from personal loyalty to Gephardt to disaffection with the Republicans to a sense that the Democrats may lose the White House and therefore need to go all-out to retake control of at least one branch of government.

Richard Medley, a Wall Street analyst and former congressional aide, mentioned all three. ''I've been a friend of Gephardt's for probably ten years,'' said Medley, who hosted a July dinner in New York with former treasury secretary Robert E. Rubin that raised $300,000. But he also referred to pessimism about Vice President Gore's chances to win next November: With GOP front-runner ''George W. Bush doing so well, it's important to take out an insurance policy hoping to have at least one branch controlled by Democrats.''

Personal service from Gephardt and Kennedy also helps land donors. That certainly was the case with the $100,000 check from David Alameel, a wealthy Dallas dental clinic owner. Alameel was already on the radar of Frost and his team, but they had no idea he would become a six-figure contributor.

Frost duly set up the meeting with Kennedy and, in the end, he said, ''Patrick was the one who convinced him.'' The $100,000 check came in on June 21.

Indeed, Kennedy has produced a number of eye-popping checks from unexpected sources, like the $100,000 from Lois Pope, the Palm Beach heiress to the National Enquirer fortune. The wooing of Pope included Kennedy flying to Florida to present her with an award for her charity work.

''One of the great joys of my job is meeting people who inspire me,'' Kennedy gushed as he presented her with a ''distinguished service award'' from Citibank Private Bank of Florida. ''I feel the energy that they feel for this country. Those of you who know Lois know that energy comes through.'' That was on April 7. On May 28, the DCCC received Pope's $100,000 check.

An even larger amount came as the result of his friendship with John J. McConnell Jr., a trial lawyers for Ness Motley Loadholt Richardson & Poole, a South Carolina-based firm that has earned millions of dollars from representing states in the tobacco settlement. Operating out of the firm's Rhode Island office, McConnell worked hard to introduce Kennedy to colleagues, flying him on the corporate jet so he could spend time with senior partner Ronald L. Motley and hosting a dinner on Capitol Hill for Kennedy, Gephardt and other trial lawyers with deep pockets.

On June 30, the courtship paid off—with a check for $250,000. ''No question about it,'' McConnell said, ''that was a personal contribution to Patrick.''

SPENDING IN NEW WAYS

That check—and all the others—will go into a new pot of soft money that the DCCC will be able to spend next year in ways not envisioned by the 1974 election law, which restricts the parties to direct and coordinated gifts to their House candidates of only about $100,000 each. The idea behind the law was ''to take fund-raising out of the hands of the party committees and give control of it to candidates themselves,'' as GOP pollster Brian Tringali put it.

Instead, with soft money issue ads and sophisticated voter identification programs, the parties are planning to spend upwards of $500,000 or $1 million each in next year's key districts. That gives the parties more say over how campaigns are run, what they are saying and who they are saying it to.

''Practically speaking,'' said a top Democratic fund-raiser, ''you can take a race that is a $1 million House race and turn it into a $3.5 million race with soft money. In a day and age when parties themselves are not as strong, individual party committees are stronger than ever.''

For Kennedy and his staff, the new emphasis on soft money is simple political pragmatism. ''You can really draw a direct correlation between the amount of money in a campaign committee and the impact it has in terms of getting members elected,'' he argued.

To win, Kennedy said, ''we need to raise an even greater amount of money. In practical terms, that means we need to raise it in bigger chunks.''

Mr. FEINGOLD. Madam President, how can we close our eyes to the appearance of corruption that this enormous fundraising effort provides? How can we close our eyes to the appearance of corruption that the double givers list that I have shown on this floor a number of times represents? Mirage Resorts is now on the list. Companies give hundreds of thousands of dollars to both political parties—hundreds of thousands of dollars to both political parties. What game are they playing here?

The Senator from Kentucky said on the floor last week, ''Well, they have a right to be duplicitous.'' Actually, Madam President, they are not being duplicitous. We all know they are giving to both sides. They are just playing by the rules as we have set them up. They are not doing anything that is dishonest. They are simply trying to cover their bases. Surely, the Senator from Kentucky doesn't think when AT&T gives a big contribution to the National Republican Senatorial Campaign Committee that it won't give money to the Senator from New Jersey's Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee as well.

We all know why they do it, too—because in the candid words of a lobbyist, ''They know which side their bread is buttered on.'' Both sides—the bread is buttered on both sides. They play both sides of the fence so they can get their calls returned and their positions heard. That, my friends, is on its face an appearance of corruption. And if we are so caught up in this fundraising game that we can't see it, the disenchantment the public feels in its elected officials is well warranted.

Last week, the Senator from Kentucky suggested that press reports about the connection between campaign donations and legislative actions arise from the desire of newspapers to

sell more copies or talking heads to get air time. But the newspapers didn't create the appearance problem. We did.

I am reminded of what the great Senator, Robert La Follette, from my home State of Wisconsin, said in response to those who argued that the press of his day—the early 1900s—was somehow spreading hysteria about the power of the railroads over Congress. La Follette said:

> It does not lie in the power of any or all of the magazines of the country or of the press, great as it is, to destroy, without justification, the confidence of the people in the American Congress. . . . It rests solely with the United States Senate to fix and maintain its own reputation for fidelity to public trust. It will be judged by the record. It can not repose in security upon its exalted position and the glorious heritage of its traditions. It is worse than folly to feel, or to profess to feel, indifferent with respect to public judgment. If public confidence is wanting in Congress, it is not of hasty growth, it is not the product of ''jaundiced journalism.'' It is the result of years of disappointment and defeat.

Years of disappointment and defeat—that is what the American people have had as the soft money system has grown and Congress has done nothing about it. The system of soft money looks corrupt. Indeed, it is corrupt. And it makes us, as its beneficiaries, look corrupt.

There is no other way to put it. There is an appearance of corruption. There is an appearance of cravenness. There is an appearance of a smug confidence that the American people will not laugh out loud in disgust at the assertion that there is no corruption near. There is an appearance of something terribly, terribly wrong that we refuse to fix.

If that offends people in this Chamber, so be it. We had better get rid of this system so they won't be offended anymore because I am not going to stop talking about it until we do.

Madam President, how much time do I have remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 6 minutes 19 seconds.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Madam President, the Senator from North Carolina asked if I will yield.

Mr. EDWARDS. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. FEINGOLD. I yield.

Mr. EDWARDS. I know the Senator has spent a great deal of time moving across his home State of Wisconsin. How many counties are in Wisconsin?

Mr. FEINGOLD. Seventy-two counties.

Mr. EDWARDS. Seventy-two counties, and the Senator has been in every one.

Mr. FEINGOLD. I go to listening sessions in every one every year.

Mr. EDWARDS. I wonder what the Senator would think what someone in rural Wisconsin, a farmer in rural Wisconsin, would believe in terms of their influence, vis-a-vis someone who gave $100,000 in soft money to, in our case as fellow Democrats to the Democratic Party, or to the DNCC, whether that rural farmer in Wisconsin would believe that they have the same voice in the Senate that a $100,000 soft money contributor has.

Mr. FEINGOLD. I thank the Senator from North Carolina for his question.

The example of the farmer is a wonderful example, because of what has happened in Wisconsin in the last 18 years. We have lost something like 18,000 dairy farmers, so farmers in my State are in no position to be giving even $10 or $25 contributions.

When they hear, as the Senator is suggesting, that a person can give even $1,000, the possibility of doing that is pretty much off the charts. When they hear that somebody can actually for the first time in this century give $100,000, it is absolutely disappointing. And it must make them even more despondent. They have enough problems already.

But to think they can't have their vote count for what it used to count—we always had in Wisconsin the notion that the farm vote kind of shifted the balance, it is the swing vote traditionally in Wisconsin. But in this kind of system where soft money ads can make a farce out of an election, they feel—I know from firsthand conversations—quite left out of the process and quite dispirited.

Mr. EDWARDS. How does the Senator think that farmer would feel in his gut about whether this representative democracy is working the way it ought to work in a situation where he or she has at best one vote, and that position vis-a-vis another individual who has given $100,000, when he is working on his farm on a day-to-day basis? Does the Senator think that farmer believes he has the same equal voice that he is supposed to have in his representative democracy as somebody who wrote a $100,000 check.

Mr. FEINGOLD. I don't think there is any possibility that he feels his voice is as strong as it used to be. A typical farmer in Wisconsin with a certain amount of cows and a certain amount of acreage and a family, those are things that he had. He knew he had those things, and he had his vote counting the same as everybody else's. That is where the whole progressive movement in Wisconsin and the efforts of Robert La Follette came from—a lot of these farmers who were able to put their votes together to elect people who would really represent them.

Mr. EDWARDS. If I could ask a followup question, there has been a lot of debate on the floor and a lot of private conversations about whether there is any usefulness associated with simply banning soft money.

Let me ask the question again, using the example of this dairy farmer from Wisconsin. Does the Senator think it is important for the Senate to send a message to that farmer in rural Wisconsin that we are trying to do something real and meaningful to clean up campaign finance in this country?

Mr. FEINGOLD. We absolutely have to. I don't know how we convinced ourselves in the end of the 20th century of something that was the opposite conclusion at the end of the 19th century, early 20th century; and that is that unlimited contributions corrupt the process and make the individual farmer or individual homemaker or any other person almost a nonfactor in the political process.

We have to send this message and we have to do even better. We have to actually pass a ban on soft money as a first signal to that farmer that we will do the rest of the job and actually return the notion of one person-one vote to that farmer.

Mr. EDWARDS. Will the Senator agree that even if we are not able in this Congress in this session to pass across-the-board comprehensive reform that it is critically important that we send a message to Americans all over this country that this Senate and this Congress is willing to take a strong and courageous step to do something real and meaningful in terms of cleaning up campaign finance and that one of those steps would be the banning of soft money?

Mr. FEINGOLD. There is nothing more important than passing a ban on soft money in this Congress. In a few minutes we will have the first vote, I say to the Senator from North Carolina, the first vote ever on the question of whether we are going to allow party soft money or not. This is not one of these votes that you have every once in a while, a bed check vote on a Monday night. This is the real thing.

I thank the Senator from North Carolina for distilling it down to the perspective of one farmer in Rice Lake, WI, who might be watching and saying: Are these guys going to clean this place up or not?

Mr. EDWARDS. Let me ask the Senator one last question. I agree. One last question: In the Senator's mind, is this a party issue? Is this a Democratic or Republican issue?

Mr. FEINGOLD. Clearly not. In fact, the only thing that can defeat us on this is partisanship. That is why I worked for 5 years, not only with Senator MCCAIN but I have gotten to know a number of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle—people such as Senator THOMPSON of Tennessee and Senator COLLINS of Maine. These are Republicans who I have grown to know and enjoy working with who together have worked to try to do something to ban soft money. So this is an example of how this institution can work well in terms of our cooperation and bipartisanship.

Let's make sure that partisanship doesn't defeat our efforts.

Mr. EDWARDS. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin and Senator MCCAIN for their courageous leadership on this critical issue.

Mr. FEINGOLD. I certainly thank the Senator from North Carolina who in the few months he has been here has become a strong voice in the campaign finance reform debate.

I yield the floor.

Mr. McCONNELL. Madam President, parliamentary inquiry. Is the Senator from Kentucky correct that the Wellstone amendment and any other amendments that might be offered this evening would fall because they were not filed by 1 p.m., if we ultimately get cloture?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture occurs tomorrow. Amendments not filed by 1 p.m. today would be out of order if they are first-degree amendments

If cloture is invoked tomorrow, amendments not filed by 1 o'clock today would not be in order.

Mr. McCONNELL. Since Friday, the open and fair process which was sought and agreed to has been derailed by parliamentary maneuvering.

Let me say to all of my colleagues, particularly those on my side of the aisle who share the view of the majority leadership and myself on this issue, this motion to table is a meaningless vote and should reflect that fact. Consequently, I urge all of my colleagues to vote against tabling on behalf of the majority leader, Senator BENNETT, and myself.

I yield the floor.

Mr. REID. With the remaining minute, I say to my friend from Wisconsin who is still on the floor, I appreciate very much the Senator's attempt to make this a bipartisan issue. The fact is, Democrats have voted time, after time, after time to invoke cloture on campaign finance reform, and we have been thwarted by the majority; is that not true?

Mr. FEINGOLD. I say to the Senator from Nevada, we have not been thwarted by the majority, only thwarted by that portion of the majority which is actually a minority seeking to filibuster this issue and defy the will of the majority of the people, which, of course, involves more Democrats than Republicans.

Mr. REID. By a considerable number, is that not true?

Mr. FEINGOLD. That is true.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FEINGOLD. I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion to table the Reid amendment numbered 2299 to the Daschle amendment numbered 2298. The yeas and nays have been ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. ROTH), and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. SMITH) are necessarily absent.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. KOHL), and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) are necessarily absent on official business. I also announce that the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) is absent because of family illness.

The result was announced—yeas 1, nays 92, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 329 Leg.]

YEAS—1

Hollings

NAYS—92

Abraham	Feingold	Mack
Akaka	Feinstein	McCain
Allard	Fitzgerald	McConnell
Ashcroft	Frist	Mikulski
Baucus	Gorton	Moynihan
Bayh	Graham	Murkowski
Bennett	Gramm	Murray
Bond	Grams	Nickles
Boxer	Grassley	Reed
Breaux	Gregg	Reid
Brownback	Hagel	Robb
Bryan	Harkin	Roberts
Bunning	Hatch	Rockefeller
Burns	Helms	Santorum
Byrd	Hutchinson	Sarbanes
Campbell	Hutchison	Schumer
Chafee	Inhofe	Sessions
Cleland	Inouye	Shelby
Cochran	Jeffords	Smith (NH)
Collins	Johnson	Snowe
Conrad	Kennedy	Specter
Coverdell	Kerrey	Stevens
Craig	Kerry	Thomas
Crapo	Kyl	Thompson
Daschle	Landrieu	Thurmond
DeWine	Leahy	Torricelli
Domenici	Levin	Voinovich
Dorgan	Lieberman	Warner
Durbin	Lincoln	Wellstone
Edwards	Lott	Wyden
Enzi	Lugar	

NOT VOTING—7

Biden	Kohl	Smith (OR)
Bingaman	Lautenberg	
Dodd	Roth	

The motion was rejected.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I move to reconsider the vote and move to lay that motion on the table.

The motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to a period of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

Mr. McCAIN. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FITZGERALD). Objection is heard.

Mr. LOTT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative assistant proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

Mr. McCONNELL. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

The legislative clerk continued with the call of the roll.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Ben Lawsky, a Judiciary Committee detailee in Senator SCHUMER's office, be granted floor privileges for the remainder of the 106th Congress.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENNETT). Without objection, it is so ordered.

FINDING ''COMMON GROUND'' TO PROTECT OUR UNDERGROUND INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, in January of this year I reported on an important public-private partnership to protect our nation's underground infrastructure—electric power and fiber optic cables, telephone lines, water and sewer mains and pipelines. This partnership is based on S. 1115, the Comprehensive One-Call Notification Act, which I introduced in 1997 with the Minority Leader, Senator DASCHLE. The bill passed the Senate unanimously and became law as part of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century, TEA 21.

Among other things, the bill called on the Secretary of Transportation to convene a comprehensive study of best practices in underground damage prevention. This study was completed and released by Secretary Rodney Slater on June 30, 1999. The study has been a model for conducting a cooperative effort between the public and private sectors. All those with an interest in underground damage prevention—the excavation community, one-call notification center representatives, locating contractors, railroads and underground facility operators worked together to produce the 250-page ''Common Ground'' report. This report is a veritable gold mine of practical real-world advice for all those involved in protecting our underground infrastructure in government and in the private sector.

The study is so valuable because of the 160 people with hands-on experience in underground damage prevention who worked together to write it. Nine teams covered the key aspects of underground infrastructure protection: one-call center practices, excavation, mapping, locating and marketing, compliance, planning and design, reporting and evaluation, public education, and emerging technologies. The full study is available at the DOT's Office of Pipeline Safety web page http://ops.dot.gov.

Steps are underway to keep this valuable and cooperative spirit alive and make the Common Ground process a continuing one, but this time with private leadership. This year's Senate Appropriations Committee Report on

Transportation Appropriations (S. Rept. 106–55) including the following:

The Committee believes that the group effort, dubbed ''Common Ground'', has the potential to serve as a basis for a self-sustaining entity that can advance underground damage prevention by identifying and encouraging best practices, providing badly needed public education, and collecting and disseminating information on damage to underground facilities. The Committee directs OPS to use existing resources to support the formation and initial operation of a non-profit organization that will further the work of ''Common Ground'' and implement other innovative approaches to advance underground damage prevention.

On October 28, the Office of Pipeline Safety will respond to this direction by convening a public meeting of the Common Ground participants and an even wider group of interests to lay the foundation for the non-profit organization described in this Report language. This non-profit damage prevention organization could be the key to a far more robust and effective national effort to protect our underground infrastructure that would be led and funded by the private sector.

To Secretary Slater's credit, the Department understands the importance of letting the private participants take the lead. The Department of Transportation will provide the initial resources for startup, but will then step back, so the private participants can be responsible for defining the path forward for underground damage prevention. In order to succeed, the new non-profit organization cannot be federally run or federally controlled. To succeed it cannot be run or controlled by any one of the interests in underground damage prevention. It must be a cooperative, power sharing enterprise in which excavation community, one-call notification center representatives, locating contractors, railroads, underground facility operators and other important interests join together to make decisions democratically.

The potential for such an organization to get things done is simply enormous, because it can include all the important affected interests from the beginning. The private effort and resources devoted to underground damage prevention today are very significant, but fragmented. This non-profit damage prevention organization is the missing piece that can pull these efforts together in a constructive way to create a powerful national impact on the largest preventable threat to our underground infrastructure. I urge all those in attendance at the October 28 meeting to keep this big picture vision firmly in mind. This is a tremendous opportunity that should not be missed.

Mr. President, I congratulate Secretary of Transportation Rodney Slater for seizing the opportunity offered by the Common Ground initiative. It seems to me that Secretary Slater, Research and Special Programs Administrator Kelley Coyner and Office of Pipeline Safety head Richard Felder all have this exactly right. This effort will be most effective if it is privately led and privately funded. This is an instance, all too rare, where the Federal Government is seeking to return power to the private sector. I urge all the Common Ground private participants—the excavation community, one-call notification center representatives, locating contractors, railroads, insurance providers, equipment manufacturers and underground facility operators to take up the leadership responsibility the Secretary is offering.

I will continue to monitor developments in underground damage prevention and the efforts to set up the non-profit privately led organization envisioned in the Senate Appropriations Committee Report. I look forward to working with all involved to further improve protection of our vital underground infrastructure.

PATIENTS' BILL OF RIGHTS

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, as we reach the end of this session of Congress, it's essential that we act on the Patients' Bill of Rights before we adjourn. In passing the Norwood-Dingell bill two weeks ago, a solid, bipartisan majority of the House of Representatives voted for strong protections for patients against abuses by HMOs. Despite an extraordinary lobbying and disinformation campaign by the health insurance industry, the House approved the bill by a majority of 275–151. Sixty-eight Republicans as well as almost every Democrat in the House stood up for patients and stood firm against industry pressure.

Last Friday, the Senate appointed its conferees. Speaker HASTERT has said that the House will appoint its conferees this week. Prompt action on strong reforms is clearly within our grasp. But a series of recent statements and actions provide ominous signs that the insurance industry and its friends in the Republican leadership are at it again. Their emerging strategy seems once again to be to delay and deny the relief that American families need and that the House overwhelmingly approved.

The House vote was a major milestone toward enacting needed reform. It came after the Senate passed legislation with only sham protections by a narrow, partisan majority.

It came after years of delay and denial by the Republican leadership in both Houses of Congress, working hand-in-hand with the health insurance companies and HMOs to block reform.

Patients and doctors won a clear victory in the House. But now, the insurance industry and their allies in the House and the Senate Republican leadership are once again mobilizing to deny patients and doctors the protections they deserve. The ink is barely dry on the dramatic House vote, and opponents of reform are already talking about a new strategy of delay and denial—a strategy once again to put HMO profits first and patient protections last.

The first part of this emerging strategy is to delay the work of the House-Senate conference committee as long as possible. A precondition for appointing conferees and beginning the conference is formal transmission of the House-passed bill to the Senate. That process normally takes a day or two at most.

In fact, of 252 bills passed by the House in this Congress, the overwhelmingly majority were delivered to the Senate the day they were passed or the day after they were passed. Except for a few bills passed just before the beginning of a long recess, every bill passed by the House had been received by the Senate by the sixth day after passage. Yet, on the seventh day after the passage of the Norwood-Dingell bill, the legislation was still being held in the House of Representatives.

Only after the release of a CRS study documenting the extraordinary delay in transmission of the legislation was the bill forwarded to the Senate and Senate conferees appointed.

According to the Los Angeles Times, Senator LOTT's response to passage of the House bill was that ''House-Senate conferences on other legislation have a higher priority and that resolving differences on this bill would take some time.''' According to the Baltimore Sun, Senator LOTT also indicated that Congress might not have time to work out the differences and approve a final bill before it adjourns for the year. According to the New York Times, aides to Senator NICKLES said that ''the conference committee will probably not begin serious work until early next year.'' And just this past Friday, CongressDaily reported that ''a Senate GOP aide said . . . Republicans do not plan to start the conference before the end of this year's session, despite the appointment of conferees.''

Some Republicans are already beginning to lay the groundwork for a failed conference. Comparing the Senate and House bills, Congressman BILL THOMAS said, ''You don't see many cross-breeds between Chihuahuas and Great Danes walking around.''

And, of course, the fingerprints of Republican-industry collaboration are there to see for anyone who cares to look. As Bruce Josten of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce put it, ''To see nothing come out of the conference is my hope. The best outcome is no outcome.''

Even if the strategy of delay and denial fails, the Republican leadership once again has an alternative to try to weaken the House bill as much as possible.

As the Baltimore Sun reported, ''House Majority Whip TOM DELAY suggested that the Republican-dominated House conference would not fight vigorously for the House-approved measure in the Conference Committee.'' Mr. DELAY said, ''Remember who controls the conference: the Speaker of the House.''

A conference that produces legislation that looks like the Senate Republican bill would break faith with the American people, make a mockery of the overwhelming vote in the House of Representatives, and cause unnecessary suffering for millions of patients.

That is why more than 300 groups representing patients, doctors, nurses, and other caregivers, and families support the Norwood-Dingell bill, but only the insurance industry supports the Senate proposal.

For every patient right in the Senate Republican bill, there is an industry loophole. If the truth in labeling law applied to legislation, every page of the bill would flunk the test, because every promise of patient protection comes with loopholes to protect HMOs and health insurers. The promise to patients is always broken.

At its most basic level, the decision before Congress is whether critical medical decisions will be made by doctors and patients, or HMO accountants.

It is time to protect families against abuses by a faceless insurance bureaucracy that can rob average citizens of their savings and their peace of mind, and often their health and their very lives.

For the millions of Americans who rely on health insurance to protect them and their loved ones when serious illness strikes, the Norwood-Dingell bill is a matter of life and death, and deserves to be passed by Congress.

Every day we delay in passing these reforms means that more patients will suffer and die. Congress has an obligation to act and to act now.

The abuses that take place every day should have no place in American medicine. Every doctor knows it. Every nurse knows it. Every patient knows it. The American people know it—and it is time the Republican leadership heeded their views.

The first test of the sincerity of the Republican leadership will come this week when the House conferees are appointed. Will a majority of the House conferees come from those who supported the Norwood-Dingell bill, not just on final passage, but on the critical vote to replace it with the leadership-backed alternative?

The second test will come in the conference itself. The danger is that the process will go into slow motion so that nothing happens until Congress adjourns for this session. There is ample time for genuine bipartisan negotiations to produce a strong, bipartisan bill that Congress can pass and the President can sign before the session ends.

The issues are well-known. There is no need for the conference to be time-consuming—no need unless the objective is to pass a watered down bill, or nothing at all. The Norwood-Dingell bill received overwhelming bipartisan support in the House of Representatives. The Senate conferees should do the right thing and simply accept that bill.

The choice is clear. Prompt action to protect patients and their families—or more delay and denial. Those who profit from the status quo have delayed action long enough. It is time for Congress to provide every family the protection they deserve.

Mr. President, Friday, we had the appointment of the conferees to represent the Senate with the House of Representatives on the HMO bill, the Patients' Bill of Rights legislation.

We want to let the Senate know we are prepared to meet today, tomorrow, the next day, and every single day to try to get a resolution of that issue because we know that every single day we do not act and have strong legislation, like the House of Representatives, American families are endangered and Americans are being hurt. That is wrong. We have the chance to act. On our side of the aisle, we are prepared to take action. We are prepared to meet. We believe this is one of the most important efforts we will have in this Congress.

We will continue to challenge our colleagues on the other side to move ahead and have a conference. We have debated these issues. We have had a long time to debate them. We have had extensive debates in committee and for over a week on the floor of the Senate.

Let's get about protecting the American citizens on that Patients' Bill of Rights—letting doctors make decisions rather than accountants. Every day, as I mentioned, that we fail to do so, we fail to protect American families. We want to go about America's business and families' business on health care. We are prepared to meet in conference now and every day in the future.

I thank the Chair.

ON THE 1999–2000 AMERICA'S CUP

Mr. CHAFEE. Mr. President, today I call to the attention of my colleagues the battle for the America's Cup, which begins this week in the Hauraki Gulf off Aukland, New Zealand. Five American and six international challengers are competing for the right to face Team New Zealand in races beginning next February.

This competition, which promises to be a long, hard-fought affair, gives me an opportunity to share with my fellow Senators some thoughts on Rhode Island's celebrated history in yachting. It began in London in 1851, when the America's Cup was designed and crafted as a trophy for a race around the Isle of Wight. The cup was named after the yacht *America* which first won the trophy by beating the British yachts at Cowes. Yacht racing had only recently begun in North America at the time; John Cox Stevens had founded the New York Yacht Club in 1844 and in 1851 was still its first Commodore.

But yacht racing was not so new in Britain, where forms of yachting had been a sport for about 250 years. In the mid-1850's, Britannia ruled the waves in all respects, and it would never have occurred to them that an American outfit could challenge their yachting dominance.

In 1857, John Stevens decided that the cup would be better in the hands of the New York Yacht Club for safekeeping and for organizing challenges. The cup, which graced the halls of the New York Yacht Club, became known as the America's Cup and this has continued for 145 years. Until 1983, the New York Yacht Club successfully defended the cup in races off Newport, Rhode Island, a venue which deservedly has come to be considered one of the sailing capitals of the world.

During these years, a great many Rhode Islanders stood out and earned outstanding reputations in this sport. Most notably, Nathanael Greene Herreshoff, ''The Wizard of Bristol,'' joined his visually impaired brother in the manufacture of boats and went on to design six successful America's Cup defenders—*Vigilant* (in 1893), *Defender* (1895), *Columbia* (1899 and 1901), *Reliance* (1903) and *Resolute* (1920). In addition, the celebrated sailmaker and designer Ted Hood had more to do with the development of the America's Cup from the 1950's to the 1970's than any other person. Hood also won the Cup, helming *Courageous* in 1974.

Today, Hood's shipyard and many others in Rhode Island continue this proud tradition in the sailing world and have made the state's boatbuilding industry second to none. The east shore of Narragansett Bay has 13 boatyards representing some of yachting's most famous labels. In the words of one expert, ''people across the world think of quality boats when they think of Rhode Island.'' Combined with tourism from recreational boating, the state's marine industry generates about $1.2 billion annually and employees about 6,000 workers. Rhode Island yards built boats for three America's Cup syndicates in 1995 and two more this year.

One of the American challengers is of particular interest to me and to my constituents in Rhode Island. Young America, a two-boat syndicate put forward by the New York Yacht Club, is one of the strongest challengers in these races. The club has stated its intent to bring America's Cup back to Newport, Rhode Island if—or should I say ''when''—it dethrones Team New Zealand next March. Many, many Rhode Islanders eagerly look forward to the return of this great tradition to Newport, where it had such an outstanding record of success for one hundred and thirty-two years.

Young America's president, John Marshall, has been long involved with world-class sailing. Marshall won a bronze medal at the 1972 Olympics, and has been involved with eight America's Cups since 1974. Marshall is a former president of and serves on the Board of Directors for North Sails, the largest sailmaker in the United States.

Young America is skippered by Ed Baid, who played a key role in winning the 1995 America's Cup as coach, trial

horse skipper and sparring partner for Team New Zealand. Baird was the 1995 World Champion of Match Race Sailing and placed second at the Worlds in 1997, 1996 and 1993. He is the only American to ever reach No. 1 in the World. The 1995 Rolex U.S. Yachtsman of the Year, Baird is a multiple world champion.

Let me also pay tribute to the several Rhode Islanders that have been named to the Young America team. They include Newport sailors Ed Adams, Tom Burnham, Jamie Gale, Jerry Kirby, Tony Rey and Joan Touchette. The shore support and technical team includes Stewart Wiley of Portsmouth; Ken Bordin, Steve Connett, Matthew Gurl and Bernie Roeder of Newport; Wolfgang Chamberlain of Bristol; and Michael Spiller of Jamestown.

Young America's two boats were built by Bristol, Rhode Island's Eric Goetz shipyard, recognized as one of the world's foremost manufacturers of racing sailboats. I had the pleasure of visiting and touring the Goetz shipyard last April, and was greatly impressed with what I saw.

Goetz has built seven America's Cup contenders for the last two series of America's Cup races—including boats commissioned by competing U.S. racing teams. This year's boats, which cost about $3 million each, are the product of a first-rate team of technicians and employ the most modern design and technology. Included is a keel developed by one of Rhode Island's most storied companies, Browne & Sharpe Manufacturing. The competitors in New Zealand are no doubt fixated on the technological advancements being introduced by Young America.

Three sets of round robin races begin this week and end on December 14. The challenger semifinals and finals take place next January 2 through February 4 to determine which syndicate will face the defending New Zealanders. The Finals of this grueling competition do not end until March 4.

So I hope all Senators can take a moment today to recognize the commencement of one of the world's most prestigious sporting traditions, the America's Cup. I wish good luck to all eleven competitors, but particularly to the Young America syndicate. For many of my state's enthusiasts, it has been a long sixteen years waiting for this moment.

HATE CRIMES

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, violent acts of bigotry based on race, religion, ethnic background, sexual orientation, gender, and disability continue to plague the nation. These vicious crimes are a national disgrace and an attack on everything this country stands for, and it is essential for Congress to act against them.

Earlier this year, the Senate added important provisions to combat hate crimes to the Commerce-Justice-State Appropriations Act. This afternoon, Senate-House conferees will meet to vote on a conference report that does not contain the hate crimes provision. Behind closed doors, the conferees have tentatively decided to drop the provision, and I urge them to reconsider. It is essential for Congress to take a stand against bigotry, and do all we can to end these modern-day lynchings that continue to occur in communities across the country.

Many of us are aware of the most highly-publicized incidents, especially the brutal murders of James Byrd in Jasper, Texas, and Matthew Shepard in Laramie, Wyoming. But these two killings are just the tip of the iceberg. Many other gruesome acts of hatred have occurred this year:

January 14, 1999, El Dorado, California—Thomas Gary, 38, died after being run over by a truck and shot with a shotgun. The assailant claimed that Mr. Gary had made a pass at him.

January 17, 1999, Texas City, Texas—Two black gay men, Laaron Morris and Kevin Tryals, were shot to death and one of the men was left inside a burning car.

February 7, 1999, Miami, Florida—Three young women stalked, beat and stabbed a gay man while yelling anti-gay epithets.

February 19, 1999, Sylacauga, Alabama—Billy Jack Gaither, a gay man, was abducted, beaten to death with an ax handle, and set on fire on burning tires in a remote area.

February 24, 1999, Ft. Lauderdale, Fla.—A black woman, Jody-Gaye Bailey, died after being shot in the head by a self-proclaimed skinhead. Minutes before the shooting the perpetrator reportedly boasted of wanting to go out and kill a black person. Bailey and her boyfriend, who is Caucasian, were stopped at a red light when the killer fired at Bailey seven times. The boyfriend was uninjured.

February 1999, Yosemite National Park, California—An individual charged with the murder of four women—one of whom was a 16-year old girl—in Yosemite National Park told police investigators that he had fantasized about killing women for three decades.

March 1, 1999, Richmond, Virginia—A gay, homeless man was killed and his severed head was left atop a footbridge in James River Park near a popular meeting place for gay men.

May 1999, Kenosha, Wisconsin—A 27-year-old man intentionally swerved his car onto a sidewalk to run over two African-American teens. After hitting the two cyclists, he left the scene and kept driving until stopped by police. Eight years earlier the same man rammed his car twice into a stopped van carrying five African-American men and drove away.

June 2, 1999, West Palm Beach, Florida—Two teenagers admitted that they beat a gay man, Steven Goedereis, to death on April 27, 1998 because he called one of them ''beautiful.''

June/July 1, 1999, Northern California—Three synagogues in the Sacramento area were destroyed by arson. Two brothers, who have links to an organized hate group, are suspects in the arson as well as the shotgun murders of two gay men in Redding, Calif., Winfield Scott Mowder and Gary Matson.

July 4th weekend, 1999, Illinois/Indiana—An individual associated with a racist and anti-Semitic organization, Benjamin Smith, killed an African-American man, Ricky Byrdsong, and wounded six orthodox Jews in Chicago before killing a Korean student, Won-Joon Yoon, in Bloomington, Ind.

July 24, 1999, San Diego, California—Hundreds of people were tear-gassed when a military style tear-gas canister was released near the Family Matters group at the San Diego gay pride parade. The 70-person group included small children and babies in strollers.

August 10, 1999, Los Angeles, California—A former security guard for a white supremacist organization, Buford O. Furrow, wounded five individuals, including young children, at a Los Angeles Jewish community center, and later killed a Filipino-American postal worker, Joseph Illeto.

Clearly, the federal government should be doing more to halt these vicious crimes that shock the conscience of the nation.

Dropping the bipartisan Senate provisions from the DJS conference report is a serious mistake. For too long, the federal government has been forced to fight hate crimes with one hand tied behind its back. Congress must speak with a united voice against hate-based violence. All Americans deserve to know that the full force of federal law will be available to punish these atrocities.

Congress has a responsibility to act this year. The continuing silence of Congress on this festering issue is deafening, and it is unacceptable. We must stop acting as if somehow this fundamental issue is just a state and local problem. It isn't. It's a national problem, and it's an outrage that Congress has been missing in action for so long. I urge the conferees to reconsider their action, and include a strong provision on hate crimes in the conference report.

Mr. President, I make these remarks because the timeliness of them is so important. I see my friend and colleague from Oregon, who shares these concerns. Again, we wanted to address this issue, which will be before the conference committee on the State-Justice appropriations this afternoon. We will be faced with this issue in a conference report in these next 2, 3 days. It is regarding the inclusion or exclusion of the hate crimes legislation.

We passed hate crimes legislation as part of the State-Justice-Commerce appropriations. It is in conference at a time when this country has been faced with a series of acts that have been violent on the basis of bigotry—based on race, religion, ethnic background,

sexual orientation, gender, and disability. These challenges continue to plague the Nation. These vicious crimes are a national disgrace and an attack on everything for which this country stands. It is essential for Congress to act against them.

Just in the very recent times, we have seen the brutal murders of James Byrd in Jasper, TX, and Matthew Shepherd in Wyoming. These two killings are the tip of the iceberg. Many other gruesome acts of hatred have occurred this year.

On January 14, Thomas Gary died after being run over by a truck and shot with a shotgun. The assailant claimed that Mr. Gary had made a pass at him.

On January 17, 1999, Texas City, TX, two black gay men, Laaron Morris and Kevin Tryals, were shot to death, and one of the men was left inside a burning car.

On February 7, 1999, three young women, stalked, beat, and stabbed a gay man while yelling antigay epithets.

On February 24, in Fort Lauderdale, a black woman, Jody-Gaye Bailey, died after being shot in the head by a self-proclaimed skinhead. Minutes before the shooting, the perpetrator reportedly boasted of wanting to go out and kill a black person.

In February 1999, Yosemite National Park, California, an individual charged with the murder of four women—one of whom was a 16-year-old girl—in Yosemite National Park, told police investigators that he had fantasized about killing women for three decades.

The list goes on and on, and that is happening in communities all across the country. This legislation has been taken into consideration. A number of the points have been raised by Members over the last 3, 4 years. The statistics are very clear. This kind of problem is escalating, not decreasing. All we are asking is, in the very selected cases that would qualify under this legislation, that we not deny the Federal Government from participating with the State and local prosecutors in order to be able to solve these problems. These crimes are not just crimes against individuals, they are rooted in bigotry and hatred so deep that they have an important and dramatic and horrific affect upon a community.

We will see the opportunity, hopefully, for that Commerce Committee conference this afternoon to vote on these issues. We should at least have a vote on these matters and, hopefully, the Commerce Committee will not disappoint America's march toward justice.

Mr. WYDEN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes, I am happy to.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I think the distinguished Senator has made a very eloquent statement on this matter of hate crimes. As we have seen so often on these issues of justice for gay folks, and when we are talking about issues relating to race, the issue always is brought out that in some way we are advocating ''special rights,'' or ''preferences,'' or something of this nature. I think what the Senator from Massachusetts is asking for—and perhaps he can speak to this—is simply to make it clear the U.S. Congress is going to draw a line in the sand against violence borne out of bigotry and prejudice.

We are not talking about special rights. We are not talking about preferences for one group because of their sexual orientation or race; we are talking about Americans' right to be free from violence borne out of prejudice and hatred. Is that what the Senator from Massachusetts is talking about?

Mr. KENNEDY. The Senator has stated it well and accurately. These kinds of crimes, as I mentioned very briefly, rip at the heart and soul of all Americans. No one could read about these extraordinary acts of violence directed toward specified groups, such as those that took place in Yosemite, where that individual had in his mind one purpose and one purpose only, and that was to kill women. That was it. It wasn't against someone with whom he had a difference. That is the kind of vicious intent we have seen. We have seen that regarding race, religion, and sexual orientation.

All we are saying is, in the prosecution of those crimes, we are not going to fight it with one hand behind our backs. We are not going to deny it in the very selective numbers that will be in—I think you are looking at each group, and there are something like maybe 20, 30 cases a year—probably even less—in the testimony of those who represent the Justice Department in any of these areas. But they are so vicious and so horrific that we are going to say we are not going to permit that to take place in this country.

We have the opportunity to make a positive commitment in that area in our conference before we leave this year, and we don't want to lose that opportunity. The Senator from Oregon has been a leader on this issue, and our friend and colleague from New York, Senator SCHUMER, and Senator SPECTER have been strong leaders. This has been a bipartisan effort for a long period of time. We don't want to deny the chance of having success.

Mr. WYDEN. Will the Senator yield for one last point?

Mr. KENNEDY. Yes, I am happy to.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I think what the Senator from Massachusetts said is very important for our colleagues to focus on as we go to this conference, which I think will be starting in a few minutes.

My understanding is that the bipartisan proposal of the Senator from Massachusetts and Senator SPECTER does not, in any way, preempt State and local authority in this area. My understanding is that it is only if and when State and local authorities don't act against these morally repugnant crimes that the Senator from Massachusetts has described—that only then would the Federal Government come in. I will say, from my standpoint, what the Senator from Massachusetts is talking about certainly meets my definition of what ought to constitute compassionate conservatism.

I am very pleased that my colleague from Oregon, Senator SMITH, has joined with Senator SPECTER and others on the other side of the aisle. I so appreciate the leadership of the Senator from Massachusetts. I want him to know that I plan to stand shoulder to shoulder with him until we get this law passed. This is unacceptable. It is grotesque that this Congress would not take up this issue, and we cannot allow this issue to be ducked any further.

I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, one of the most significant amendments that the Senate adopted as part of the Commerce-Justice-State appropriations bill is the Hate Crimes Prevention Act. This legislation amends the federal hate crimes statute to make it easier for federal law enforcement officials to investigate and prosecute cases of racial and religious violence. It also focuses the attention and resources of the Federal Government on the problem of hate crimes committed against people because of their sexual orientation, gender, or disability. I commend Senator KENNEDY for his leadership on this bill, and I am proud to have been an original cosponsor.

It is time to pass this important legislation. It has been over a year since the fatal beating of Matthew Shepard in Laramie, Wyoming, and the dragging death of James Byrd in Jaspar, Texas—brutal attacks that stunned the Nation.

Since those incidents, we have seen other acts of violence motivated by hate and bigotry, including the horrific incident two months ago in Los Angeles, when a gunman burst into a Jewish community center and opened fire on a room full of young children. When the gunman surrendered, he said that his rampage had been motivated by his hatred of Jews. The month before, a murderous string of drive-by shootings in Illinois and Indiana left two people dead and nine wounded. Again, the motivation was racial and religious hate.

These are sensational crimes, the ones that focus public attention. But there also is a toll we are paying each year in other hate crimes that find less notoriety, but with no less suffering for the victims and their families.

All Americans have the right to live, travel and gather where they choose. In the past we have responded as a nation to deter and to punish violent denials of civil rights. We have enacted federal laws to protect the civil rights of all of our citizens for more than 100 years. The Hate Crimes Prevention Act continues that great and honorable tradition.

When the Senate passed the Commerce-State-Justice appropriations bill

last month, there seemed to be general agreement about the need to strengthen our national hate crimes laws. Both the Hate Crimes Prevention Act and a more limited hate crimes bill sponsored by Senator HATCH were included in the managers' amendment by unanimous consent. These bills complement and do not conflict with each other, and Senator KENNEDY and I have been working hard to address Senator HATCH's concerns about our legislation.

I had hoped that a consensus provision would be worked out in time for us to report as part of this appropriations bill, and I am disappointed that we have been unable to meet this deadline.

Five months ago, Matthew Shepard's mother testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee and called upon Congress to pass the Hate Crimes Prevention Act without delay. Let me echo her eloquent words:

> Today, we have it within our power to send a very different message than the one received by the people who killed my son. It is time to stop living in denial and to address a real problem that is destroying families like mine, James Byrd Jr.'s, Billy Jack Gaither's and many others across America. . . . We need to decide what kind of nation we want to be. One that treats all people with dignity and respect, or one that allows some people and their family members to be marginalized.

There are still a few weeks left in this session; we should pass the Hate Crimes Prevention Act this year.

FAIR TRADE LAW ENFORCEMENT ACT OF 1999

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I join my colleagues, Senators DURBIN, HATCH, SANTORUM, BYRD and HOLLINGS in introducing the Fair Trade Law Enforcement Act of 1999. Unfortunately, because of the long and important debate on campaign finance reform last Friday, I was unable to make a statement with the rest of my colleagues when the bill was introduced. However, I stand today to praise this legislation which will take significant steps to update and enhance critical U.S. trade laws. It has been far too long, well over a decade in fact, since the last general reform of our trade laws, and current circumstances—including global recessions, economic turmoil and our surging trade deficit—necessitate the prompt action of Congress.

The trade laws in question, particularly the safeguard, countervailing duty and anti-dumping laws, are vital to the manufacturing sector of our economy. They are often the first and last line of defense for U.S. industries injured by unfairly or illegally traded imports. Companies, workers, families and communities rely heavily on these laws to prevent the ill-effects of unfair trading by our trading partners. Unfortunately, recent events like the steel import crisis have demonstrated how painfully inadequate our current trade laws are in responding to rapid import surges. The flooding of U.S. markets with unfairly or illegally traded goods causes severe and often irreparable harm to our workers and domestic injury, and it is high time we revisit our trade laws in an effort to make our laws more responsive to the changing landscape of the global economy and international trade.

The reforms we are proposing today fall into three categories. The first are improvements to our safeguard laws. Current U.S. safeguard standards are often more strict than the corresponding standards in the WTO Safeguards Agreement. This means U.S. manufacturers are playing at a disadvantage to their foreign trading partners. Whereas a foreign trading partner must prove only that an import surge, like the steel import crisis we have seen since July of 1997, is a cause of injury, domestic producers are hindered by U.S. trade laws which require our domestic industry to prove that the imports are a substantial cause of injury. This inequity hampers the ability of our domestic industry to receive relief from unfairly traded imports, and creates an unequal playing field on which our foreign trading partners have an advantage. It also contributes to making the U.S. the dumping ground for illegal and unfairly traded imports. Our trading partners know the U.S. standard is high, and they exploit that fact. This bill simply brings U.S. safeguard laws with respect to causation standards and injury factors into line with WTO laws, and puts our domestic industries on equal footing with the rest of the world.

Second, this legislation amends our anti-dumping and countervailing duty laws. It establishes a presumption of threat and of critical circumstances when imports surge and prices fall to an extraordinary degree. A critical circumstances determination, which is provided for under WTO standards, allows the ITC and the Department of Commerce to apply relief to imports entering before the preliminary determination in a trade case when investigating authorities find a history of injurious dumping or such a dramatic surge in imports that, absent retroactive relief, the effect of an anti-dumping measure would be severely undermined. One of the proposals in this legislation simply provides for the Department of Commerce and the ITC to apply these rebuttable presumptions when drastic import surges are coupled with sharp domestic price declines. Again, these presumptions are rebuttable, meaning all of our trading partners have the right to appeal the determination of threat or critical circumstances. All this provision suggests is that we give our domestic industry the benefit of the doubt regarding the injury they are suffering when huge spikes in imports are accompanied by a rapid decline in domestic prices. We saw first hand last year how effective the presumption of threat and critical circumstances can be. When the Commerce Department determined critical circumstances existed on numerous steel trade cases, the decline in imports for the following months was immediately visible. The specter of a retroactive tariff or duty is a powerful deterrent to continuing unfair and illegal trading practices.

This bill makes still other improvements in our anti-dumping and countervailing duty laws. Our legislation will make it tougher for our trading partners to circumvent an anti-dumping or countervailing duty order. No longer will foreign nations be able to skirt around our laws by making slight alterations to the products they are exporting to the U.S. We clarify that these AD/CVD orders include products that have been changed in only minor respects. The captive production clarification is an important provision to ensure fainrness as well.

Also, the Fair Trade Law Enforcement Act of 1999 prevents AD/CVD cases from being terminated by suspension agreements against the wishes of the injured U.S. industry. As we saw during the steel crisis, the Administration reached suspension agreements on trade cases that the domestic industry was confident of winning. Those cases would have provided significant relief for the injured U.S. steel industry by imposing tariffs and or duties which would have ''priced out'' many of our guilty trading partners from the U.S. steel market. Instead, foreign nations which were facing the prospect of having zero or very restricted access to the U.S. market were guaranteed a significant share of our market as a result of negotiated suspension agreements. The reforms in this bill will require the consent of a majority of the injured industry, both companies and workers, in order for the suspension agreement to be finalized. This particular piece of the bill has already been reported out of the Finance Committee, and it is critical to ensuring that any domestic industry injured by unfair or illegal imports is afforded proportional relief.

Finally, this bill also creates a steel import monitoring program designed to act as an early notification system when imports begin flooding the U.S. market. When the steel import surge began in July of 1997 it was many months, even close to a year, before anyone in the Administration would even admit that the spike in imports was occurring and that it was potentially harmful to the domestic industry. During that time businesses went bankrupt and thousands of employees were laid off. The amendment we propose in this bill will make it much easier to track imports and will provide much quicker notification of potentially harmful import surges. Quite simply, the sooner we learn of unfair import surges, the sooner the Administration, Congress and the industry itself can take the necessary steps to provide the industry, companies and workers with the relief they deserve.

This bill being introduced today provides much need adjustments to our trade laws. Too many of the provisions

currently designed to provide relief to our domestic manufacturing sector have been antiquated by recent changes in the global economy and the structure of international trade. It is time we reaffirm our commitment to our manufacturing base by updating and enhancing the very laws designed to protect U.S. manufacturers from unfair and illegal imports from abroad.

I should note to my colleagues that I remain an ardent supporter of open and fair trade. Exports have become an engine of growth for the U.S. economy. The numbers speak for themselves. Last year, Americans exported over $688 billion worth of goods and services. In saying this, I proudly can point to my own state's experience, and how it proves in a powerful way that we must pursue the opportunities of the global economy. In the past decade, West Virginia has gone about, deliberately and energetically, changing its perception of the outside world in a way that has had tremendous economic payoff. In just the past five years, our exports have increased by 40%. We have large and small companies alike exporting to China, Korea, Taiwan, and Japan. These companies exported over $2.2 billion worth of goods just last year. In percentage of products made which are exported abroad, West Virginia ranks 4th among all 50 states. Perhaps the most stunning number to me is that every billion dollars in exports supports about 17,000 U.S. jobs—that means that more than 35,000 jobs in West Virginia are directly linked to exporting.

I know that trade is critical to my state's continued economic development. West Virginia's case proves that even small economies can use expanded trade opportunities as a mechanism for further growth and prosperity. However, our increasingly globalized and ever expanding economy requires our finding new ways to adapt to change. Americans thrive in that environment and will therefore excel in this New Economy. But transitions are almost always hard. I think how a country deals with the dislocations of change says a lot about its priorities and about its ultimate success as we move into a new world and a new century.

I fully recognize that much in this bill will provoke debate. I welcome it. The Finance Committee can and must begin to consider how best to update our trade laws. I am confident that as trade becomes unquestionably one of the most powerful economic determiners in our economy, we will do so.

My efforts to deal with the real world consequences for West Virginia steel families, communities and manufacturers when they were hit with an unprecedented deluge of steel imports in late 1997 and 1998 resulted in my proposal of a steel quota bill that was considered on the Senate floor and rejected largely on the grounds that we weren't playing by the world's rules. I'm here to let my colleagues know that as the world changes, we must change with it—we must support the expanded opportunities for trade by guarding against the acquiescence to circumstances where our workers end up hurt with no recourse but to promote isolationism.

THE FY 2000 HUD/VA APPROPRIATIONS ACT

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I express my strong support for the VA/HUD Appropriations Act for FY 2000, which passed the Senate last Friday. I commend Chairman BOND and Ranking Member MIKULSKI for their skilled work on resolving the important issues involved in this legislation. We could not have achieved such an excellent measure without their leadership and commitment.

I am pleased that the legislation includes significant new funding allocations for some of HUD's most critical programs. We have promised America's citizens to stand up for their priorities, and this legislation is an important part of keeping that promise.

The bill includes an additional 60,000 Section 8 vouchers. These vouchers are critical for struggling families across the country, many of whom pay more than half their income in rent.

The bill also restores $70 million for Round II Empowerment Zones. This restoration honors our promise to the communities who have worked hard to build partnerships to revitalize their communities, based upon the promise that they would have HUD resources to leverage the funds they have raised in private-sector investments. The City of Boston and many other communities will benefit from this effort, and I am pleased that we support their initiative with these well-deserved resources.

I am also pleased that the Community Builders program is supported in the Act. The program provides a single point of contact with HUD for clients and customers, and streamlines access to HUD resources. With these improvements, HUD will be serving citizens more ably and expeditiously, and the preservation of this important program is an essential part of the legislation.

These initiatives offer hope to many distressed communities and low income families who are still left behind in this period of extraordinary economic growth. We must never forget our commitment to safe and affordable housing for our neediest citizens. I commend my colleagues for their skillful work which has led to this major legislation.

CORRECTION OF THE RECORD

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, today I rise to correct the RECORD by noting that Senator BARBARA BOXER was erroneously listed as having signed the letter Senator WARNER and I wrote on October 12, 1999, regarding the Senate's need to postpone voting on the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty. Her name should therefore be excised from this letter.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business Friday, October 15, 1999, the Federal debt stood at $5,664,657,029,541.87 (Five trillion, six hundred sixty-four billion, six hundred fifty-seven million, twenty-nine thousand, five hundred forty-one dollars and eighty-seven cents).

One year ago, October 15, 1998, the Federal debt stood at $5,537,594,000,000 (Five trillion, five hundred thirty-seven billion, five hundred ninety-four million).

Fifteen years ago, October 15, 1984, the Federal debt stood at $1,590,669,000,000 (One trillion, five hundred ninety billion, six hundred sixty-nine million).

Twenty-five years ago, October 15, 1974, the Federal debt stood at $478,586,000,000 (Four hundred seventy-eight billion, five hundred eighty-six million) which reflects a debt increase of more than $5 trillion—$5,186,071,029,541.87 (Five trillion, one hundred eighty-six billion, seventy-one million, twenty-nine thousand, five hundred forty-one dollars and eighty-seven cents) during the past 25 years.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Williams, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations which were referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(The nominations received today are printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

REPORT OF THE UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION FOR FISCAL YEAR 1998—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 65

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 307(c) of the Energy Reorganization Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5877(c)), I transmit herewith the Annual Report of the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission, which covers activities that occurred in fiscal year 1998.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 18, 1999.*

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

At 5:05 p.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by

Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills:

H.R. 3036. An act to restore motor carrier safety enforcement authority to the Department of Transportation.

H.R. 2684. An act making appropriations for the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.

H.R. 356. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain property from the United States to Stanislaus County, California.

The enrolled bills were signed subsequently by the President pro tempore (Mr. THURMOND).

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

Pursuant to the order of August 4, 1977, the following bill was discharged from the Committee on the Budget, and placed on the calendar:

S. 1214. A bill to ensure the liberties of the people by promoting federalism, to protect the reserved powers of the States, to impose accountability for Federal preemption of State and local laws, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC–5663. A communication from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety/Security Zone Regulations; Chesapeake Bay, Hampton, VA (CGD05–99–090)'' (RIN2115–AA97) (1999–0065), received October 7, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5664. A communication from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety/Security Zone Regulations; Mile 94.0 to Mile 96.0, Lower Mississippi River, Above Head of Passes (COTP New Orleans, LA 99–026)'' (RIN2115–AA97) (1999–0066), received October 7, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5665. A communication from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Drawbridge Regulations; Passaic River, NJ (CGD01–99–171)'' (RIN2115–AE47) (1999–0047), received October 7, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5666. A communication from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Drawbridge Regulations; Inner Harbor Navigation Canal, LA (CGD08–99–0111'' (RIN2115–E47) (1999–0048), received October 7, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5667. A communication from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Drawbridge Regulations; Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Algiers Alternate Route, LA (CGD08–99–057)'' (2115–AE47) (1999–0046), received October 7, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5668. A communication from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Drawbridge Regulations; Suwannee River, FL (CGD07–98–054)'' (2115–AE47) (1999–0045), received October 7, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5669. A communication from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Rules of Practice, Procedure, and Evidence for Administrative Proceedings of the Coast Guard (USCG–1998–3472)'' (2115–AF59) (1999–0003), received October 7, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5670. A communication from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''User Fees for Marine Licensing, Certificates of Registry, and Merchant Mariner Documents (USCG–1997–0002)'' (2115–AF49) (1999–0002), received October 7, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5671. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Closure of the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska for Pacific Cod by the Inshore Component'', received October 13, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5672. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock by Vessels Catching Pollock for Processing by the Inshore Component in the Bering Sea Subarea'' received October 13, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5673. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Vessels Catching Pollock for Processing by the Inshore Component in the Bering Sea Subarea'' received October 5, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5674. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher Vessels Using Trawl Gear in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands'' received October 5, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5675. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Closure of the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska for Pacific Cod by the Inshore Component'', received October 8, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5676. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Closure of the Eastern Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska to Retention of Shortraker and Rougheye Rockfish'', received October 8, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5677. A communication from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries off West Coast States and in the Western Pacific; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; End of the Primary Season and Resumption of Trip Limits for the Shore-based Whiting Sector'', received October 5, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–5678. A communication from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder Fishery; Notification of Waiver of Annual Federal Summer Flounder Recreational Measures'', received October 5, 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CHAFEE, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works, without amendment:

S. 1119. A bill to amend the Act of August 9, 1950, to continue funding of the Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection and Restoration Act (Rept. No. 106–193).

By Mr. CHAFEE, from the Committee on Environment and Public Works, without amendment:

S. 1744. An original bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to provide that certain species conservation reports shall continue to be submitted (Rept. No. 106–194).

By Mr. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, without amendment:

S. 1275. A bill to authorize to Secretary of the Interior to produce and sell products and to sell publications relating to the Hoover Dam, and to deposit revenues generated from the sales into the Colorado River Dam fund (Rept. No. 106–195).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second time by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. CRAPO (for himself and Mr. CRAIG):

S. 1742. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit certain skilled nursing facilities to participate in the 3-year transition period under the prospective payment system for skilled nursing facility services; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CLELAND:

S. 1743. A bill to amend the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century to authorize the State of Georgia to participate in the State infrastructure bank pilot program; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. CHAFEE:

S. 1744. An original bill to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to provide that

certain species conservation reports shall continue to be submitted; from the Committee on Environment and Public Works; placed on the calendar.

By Mr. REED:

S. 1745. A bill to establish and expand child opportunity zone family centers in elementary schools and secondary schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. MOYNIHAN:

S. 1746. A bill to authorize negotiation of a free trade agreement with the Republic of Turkey, to provide authority for the implementation of the agreement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. CLELAND:

S. 1743. A bill to amend the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century to authorize the State of Georgia to participate in the State infrastructure bank pilot program; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

STATE INFRASTRUCTURE BANK PILOT PROGRAM LEGISLATION

Mr. CLELAND. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation which would allow my home state of Georgia to participate in the State Infrastructure Bank (SIB) program. Prior to the enactment of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA–21) all 50 states were eligible for SIB revolving funds, which are capitalized with federal and state contributions and used to provide loans and other forms of non-grant assistance to transportation projects. TEA–21, however, limited an enhanced SIB program to four states (California, Florida, Missouri, Rhode Island). My bill would add Georgia as a fifth state for participation in the SIB program.

Georgia and Metro Atlanta, I believe, can be a national model on how to meet clean air standards and manage suburban sprawl without compromising economic growth. Governor Roy Barnes and the Georgia General Assembly deserve a great deal of credit for grabbing the bull by the horns when they enacted historic legislation creating the Georgia Regional Transportation Authority (GRTA). GRTA will work with other state agencies and organizations to solve the traffic, pollution, and sprawl problems that plague Metro Atlanta.

In order to carry out its legislative charge in conjunction with the Georgia Department of Transportation (GDOT), the Metropolitan Atlanta Rapid Transit Authority (MARTA), the Atlanta Regional Commission (ARC), and other transportation agencies, GRTA will need sufficient financial resources to become a regional authority with teeth. To assist in procurement of these resources, the legislation I am introducing today would extend the State Infrastructure Bank program to include Georgia. I believe that this program can be a vital component in funding such important projects as the multi-state high speed rail corridor.

The SIB program authorizes loans to a public or private entity to cover the partial or complete cost of an approved project, and it allows for innovative planning and development of funding streams for repayment, which does not begin until five years after the completion of the project. Additionally, TEA–21 allows for the creation of a multistate infrastructure bank system among the pilot states. In so doing, states would be encouraged to share not only funds but also ideas for combating pollution and traffic problems and encouraging alternative forms of transportation. Georgia would be a perfect addition to this mix.

Georgia can be a model for the nation—an example for other states that are facing similar problems of balancing growth and livability. Georgia's participation in the SIB program would provide more options to fund the solutions that will allow the proper balance to be struck. GRTA, GDOT and the other transportation entities in Georgia have expressed to me their enthusiasm over the possibilities that are presented by Georgia's participation in the SIB program. I hope that my Senate colleagues will join with me in support of this legislation which will allow Georgia to participate in the SIB program and in doing so it will illustrate to the country the full potential of this program.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1743

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

SECTION 1. STATE INFRASTRUCTURE BANK PILOT PROGRAM.

Section 1511(b)(1)(A) of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (23 U.S.C. 181 note; 112 Stat. 251) is amended by inserting ''Georgia,'' after ''Florida''.

By Mr. REED:

S. 1745. A bill to establish and expand child opportunity zone family centers in elementary schools and secondary schools, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

CHILD OPPORTUNITY ZONE FAMILY CENTERS ACT

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce legislation to encourage communities to foster school-based or school-linked family centers. These centers would provide a comprehensive array of information, support, services, and activities to improve the education, health, mental health, safety, and economic well-being of children and their families.

As we strive to ensure the academic and future success of our students, we must recognize that the increasingly complex needs of children cannot be met by the education system alone.

Some facts to illustrate this point:

Today, 11.3 million children—more than 90 percent of them in working families—have no health insurance.

7.5 million children under the age of 18 require mental health services, while the National Institute of Mental Health estimates that fewer than one in five receive the help they need.

It is estimated that nearly five million school-age children spend time without adult supervision during a typical week. Meanwhile, FBI data show that the peak hours for violent juvenile crime occur during the after-school hours of 3:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.

Also according to the FBI, juveniles accounted for 17 percent of all violent crime arrests in 1997, and juveniles are victims in nearly 25 percent of all crimes.

To address these and other serious issues facing our children and families, a few states and localities have established centers and developed programs designed to provide families with access and linkages to needed social services in a location that is easily accessed by families—their children's school. All too often, the programs and services currently available to assist children and families, like health and mental health care, nutritional programs, child care, housing, and job training, exist in a fragmented fashion, making it difficult for many families to find a point of entry. The aim of my legislation is to bring these vital services under one familiar roof so children and families have easy access to needed services.

Research indicates that school-linked family center programs are a cost-effective way to provide supports to children and families. According to a report by the Northeast and Islands Regional Educational Laboratory, school-linked services can also ''help to increase student achievement, save money and reduce overlapping services, reach those children and families most in need, make schools more welcoming to families, increase community support for the school, and help at-risk families develop the capacity to manage their own lives successfully.''

My legislation, the Child Opportunity Zone Family Centers Act, builds on a successful model in my home state of Rhode Island, the Rhode Island Child Opportunity Zone (COZ) Family Center initiative.

The Child Opportunity Zone Family Centers Act would provide grants on a competitive basis to partnerships consisting of a high poverty school; school district; other public agency, such as a department of health or social services; and non-profit community organizations, including a family health center that provides mental health services. Partnerships would be required to complete a needs assessment, and then use this information to provide children and families with linkages to existing community prevention and intervention services in the core areas of education, health, and family support. In addition, partnerships would provide violence prevention education to children and families and training to enable families to help their children

meet challenging standards and succeed in school.

The guiding principle of Rhode Island's COZ Family Centers is to help children and families get the assistance they need. This principle is reflected in my legislation, which contains accountability provisions to ensure that partnerships focus on improvements in student achievement, school readiness, family participation in schools, access to health care, mental health care, child care, and family support services and work to reduce violence-related problems, truancy, suspension, and dropout rates in order to continue to receive funding.

As we prepare to work on the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, I believe that it is critical that we do all we can to provide a seamless, integrated system of support for children and families. By giving families an opportunity to get the support they need, we can truly help children succeed in school and life. I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this important legislation and work for its inclusion in the upcoming reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this legislation be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1745

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

SECTION 1. CHILD OPPORTUNITY ZONE FAMILY CENTERS.

Title X of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8001 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"PART L—CHILD OPPORTUNITY ZONE FAMILY CENTERS

"SEC. 10995A. SHORT TITLE.

''This part may be cited as the 'Child Opportunity Zone Family Center Act of 1999'.

"SEC. 10995B. PURPOSE.

''The purpose of this part is to encourage eligible partnerships to establish or expand child opportunity zone family centers in elementary schools and secondary schools in order to provide comprehensive support services for children and their families, and to improve the children's educational, health, mental health, and social outcomes.

"SEC. 10995C. DEFINITIONS.

''In this title:

''(1) CHILD OPPORTUNITY ZONE FAMILY CENTER.—The term 'child opportunity zone family center' means a school-based or school-linked community service center that provides and links children and their families with comprehensive information, support, services, and activities to improve the education, health, mental health, safety, and economic well-being of the children and their families.

''(2) ELIGIBLE PARTNERSHIP.—The term 'eligible partnership' means a partnership—

''(A) that contains—

''(i) at least 1 elementary school or secondary school that—

''(I) receives assistance under title I and for which a measure of poverty determination is made under section 1113(a)(5) with respect to a minimum of 40 percent of the children in the school; and

''(II) demonstrates parent involvement and parent support for the partnership's activities;

''(ii) a local educational agency;

''(iii) a public agency, other than a local educational agency, including a local or State department of health and social services; and

''(iv) a nonprofit community-based organization, including a community mental health services organization or a family health center that provides mental health services; and

''(B) that may contain—

''(i) an institution of higher education; and

''(ii) other public or private nonprofit entities.

"SEC. 10995D. GRANTS AUTHORIZED.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may award, on a competitive basis, grants to eligible partnerships to pay for the Federal share of the cost of establishing and expanding child opportunity zone family centers.

''(b) DURATION.—The Secretary shall award grants under this section for periods of 5 years.

"SEC. 10995E. REQUIRED ACTIVITIES.

''Each eligible partnership receiving a grant under this part shall use the grant funds—

''(1) in accordance with the needs assessment described in section 10995F(b)(1), to provide or link children and their families with information, support, activities, or services in core areas consisting of—

''(A) education, such as child care and education programs for children below the age of compulsory school attendance, before- and after-school care, and school age enrichment and education support programs;

''(B) health, such as primary care (including prenatal care, well child care, and mental health care), preventative health and safety programs, outreach and referral, screening and health promotion, and enrollment in health insurance programs; and

''(C) family support, such as adult education and literacy programs, welfare-to-work-programs, job training, parenting skills programs, assistance that supports healthy child development, and access to basic needs, including food and housing;

''(2) to provide intensive, high-quality, research-based instructional programs that—

''(A) provide violence prevention education for families and developmentally appropriate instructional services to children (including children below the age of compulsory school attendance), such as education and services on nonviolent conflict resolution, pro social skills and behaviors, and other skills necessary for effectively relating to others without violence; and

''(B) provide effective strategies for nurturing and supporting the emotional, social, and cognitive growth of children; and

''(3) to provide training, information, and support to families to enable the families to participate effectively in their children's education, and to help their children meet challenging standards, including assisting families to—

''(A) understand the accountability systems, including content standards, performance standards, and local assessments, in place for the State involved, the participating local educational agency, and the participating elementary school or secondary school;

''(B) understand their children's educational needs, their children's educational performance in comparison to State and local standards, and the steps the school is taking to address the children's needs and to help the children meet the standards; and

''(C) communicate effectively with personnel responsible for providing educational services to the families' children, and to participate in the development, amendment, review, and implementation of school-parent compacts, parent involvement policies, and school plans.

"SEC. 10995F. APPLICATIONS.

''(a) IN GENERAL.—Each eligible partnership desiring a grant under this part shall submit an application to the Secretary at such time, in such manner, and containing such information as the Secretary may require.

''(b) CONTENTS.—Each application submitted pursuant to subsection (a) shall—

''(1) include a needs assessment, including a description of how the partnership will ensure that the activities to be assisted under this part will be tailored to meet the specific needs of the children and families to be served;

''(2) describe arrangements that have been formalized between the participating elementary school or secondary school, and other partnership members;

''(3) describe how the partnership will effectively coordinate and utilize Federal, State, and local educational agency sources of funding, including funding provided under part I of title X and under the Safe Schools/Healthy Students Initiative (jointly funded by the Departments of Education, Justice, and Health and Human Services), that provide assistance to families and their children in the areas of job training, housing, justice, health, mental health, child care, and social and human services;

''(4) describe the partnership's plan to—

''(A) develop and carry out the activities assisted under this part with extensive participation of parents, administrators, teachers, pupil services personnel, social and human service agencies, and community organizations and leaders; and

''(B) connect and integrate the activities assisted under this part with the education reform efforts of the participating elementary school or secondary school, and the participating local educational agency;

''(5) describe the partnership's strategy for providing information and assistance in a language and form that families can understand, including how the partnership will ensure that families of students with limited English proficiency, or families of students with disabilities, are effectively involved, informed, and assisted;

''(6) describe how the partnership will collect and analyze data, and will utilize specific performance measures and indicators to—

''(A) determine the impact of activities assisted under this part as described in section 10995I(a); and

''(B) improve the activities assisted under this part; and

''(7) describe how the partnership will protect the privacy of families and their children participating in the activities assisted under this part.

"SEC. 10995G. FEDERAL SHARE.

''The Federal share of the cost of establishing and expanding child opportunity zone family centers—

''(1) for the first year for which an eligible partnership receives assistance under this part shall not exceed 90 percent;

''(2) for the second such year, shall not exceed 80 percent;

''(3) for the third such year, shall not exceed 70 percent;

''(4) for the fourth such year, shall not exceed 60 percent; and

''(5) for the fifth such year, shall not exceed 50 percent.

"SEC. 10995H. CONTINUATION OF FUNDING.

''Each eligible partnership that receives a grant under this part shall, after the third year for which the partnership receives funds through the grant, be eligible to continue to receive the funds if the Secretary determines that the partnership has made significant progress in meeting the performance measures used for the partnership's local evaluation under section 10995I(a)(4).

"SEC. 10995I. EVALUATIONS AND REPORTS.

''(a) LOCAL EVALUATIONS.—Each partnership receiving funds under this part shall conduct annual evaluations and submit to the Secretary reports containing the results of the evaluations. The reports shall include—

''(1) information on the partnership's activities that are assisted under this part;

''(2) information on the number of families and children served by the partnership's activities that are assisted under this part;

''(3) information on the partnership's effectiveness in reaching and meeting the needs of families and children served under this part, including underserved families, families of students with limited English proficiency, and families of students with disabilities; and

''(4) the results of a partnership's performance assessment of the partnership, including performance measures demonstrating—

''(A) improvements in student achievement, school readiness, family participation in schools, and access to health care, mental health care, child care, and family support services, resulting from activities assisted under this part; and

''(B) reductions in violence-related problems and risk taking behavior among youth, and reductions in truancy, suspension, and dropout rates, resulting from activities assisted under this part.

''(b) NATIONAL EVALUATIONS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall reserve not more than 3 percent of the amount appropriated under this part to carry out a national evaluation of the activities assisted under this part. Such evaluation shall be completed not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of the Child Opportunity Zone Family Center Act of 1999, and every year thereafter.

''(2) SCOPE OF EVALUATION.—In conducting the national evaluation, the Secretary shall evaluate the effectiveness and impact of the activities, and identify model activities, assisted under this part.

''(3) ANNUAL REPORTS.—The Secretary shall submit an annual report to Congress, regarding each national evaluation conducted under paragraph (1), that contains the information described in the national evaluation.

''(c) MODEL ACTIVITIES.—The Secretary shall broadly disseminate information on model activities developed under this part.

"SEC. 10995J. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

''There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this part $50,000,000 for fiscal year 2000, and such sums as may be necessary for each of the fiscal years 2001 through 2004.''.

By Mr. MOYNIHAN:

S. 1746. A bill to authorize negotiation of a free trade agreement with the Republic of Turkey, to provide authority for the implementation of the agreement, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

THE U.S.-TURKEY FREE TRADE AGREEMENT ACT OF 1999

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the U.S.-Turkey Free Trade Agreement Act of 1999. This bill provides traditional trade negotiating authority—we once called it ''fast track authority''—for a free trade agreement (FTA) with the Republic of Turkey. It would authorize the President to negotiate and conclude a free trade agreement with one of America's most important allies and bring that agreement and any necessary implementing legislation back to the Congress for an up-or-down vote, within a time certain.

I would begin by noting that Turkey has played a singular role at the crossroads of East and West since 1923, when the legendary Mustafa Kemal ''Ataturk'' built a western-oriented, secular state out of the ashes of the collapsed 600-year old Ottoman Empire. Its constitution establishes a democratic, parliamentary form of government with an independent judiciary. Indeed, it is the only Muslim country with a secular democracy.

Turkish-American friendship is longstanding: it was first consecrated in the Treaty of Commerce and Navigation between the United States and the Ottoman Empire in 1830. The 1929 Treaty of Commerce and Navigation cemented our commercial ties with the new republic, while the July 12, 1947 agreement on aid to Turkey, implementing the Truman Doctrine, inaugurated the very close relationship that continues today. Our friendship has since been reinforced by more than 60 agreements, treaties and memoranda of understanding.

It is time to take that relationship a step farther, and begin negotiations toward a free trade agreement with Turkey. Not only do our strategic and political interests dictate closer economic integration, but our commercial interests do so as well.

Straddling Europe and Asia, Turkey has played a central role in safeguarding the United States' security interests in the region since it first entered World War II on the side of the allies at the end of the war. Turkey was a charter member of the United Nations and joined the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in 1952. It currently has the largest military force in the Middle East, and the second largest military force in NATO.

Its geography, history, and relative economic success put Turkey in a position of potential influence in Central Asia, which is, of course, populated mainly by Turkic peoples. To the west, Turkey plays an important role in Europe, both because of its NATO membership and the situation on Cyprus. We applaud the recent improvements in Turkey's relations with Greece, and hope for more. This past summer the two countries held bilateral talks on a range of issues, talks which continued in early September. The tragedy of the recent earthquakes further reinforced this burgeoning relationship as Greece and then Turkey promptly dispatched emergency rescue crews and supplies to assist the other in dealing with these disasters.

And to the south, Turkey is, without question, one of our two most important allies in the Middle East. The other is its neighbor, Israel, with whom the United States negotiated a free trade agreement that went into effect in 1985. Less well known is the fact that Turkey and Israel negotiated a free trade agreement in 1996, which was ratified in 1997 and is in force today. A U.S.-Turkey FTA would simply complete the triangle.

Writing in the September 28, 1999 edition of The Washington Post, Dr. Isaiah Frank, the very distinguished William L. Clayton Professor of International Economics at Johns Hopkins University's School of Advanced International Studies, argued persuasively on political grounds for a free trade agreement with Turkey.

> The EU's equivocation [over Turkey's proposed membership in the European Union] has bred Turkish disaffection from Europe and plays into the political hands of the Islamists who as recently as 1996 were at the helm of the government. Clearly, the enormous U.S. stake in a secular, Western-oriented Turkey warrants action by the United States to offset the EU's arm's length treatment and to strengthen and solidify the country's Western political and economic integration.

But Dr. Frank was correct to point out as well that a free trade agreement with Turkey would also be in the United States' economic interest. Turkey is an industrial country, underpinned by strong free market principles and a vibrant private sector. It was in 1961 a founding member of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, the exclusive club—there are today only 29 OECD member countries—that serves as the principal economic forum for the industrialized world.

In the 1980's, Turkey took major steps to liberalize its economy. Progress continues to be made: earlier this year, Turkey's parliament passed a significant banking reform bill, landmark social security reform and constitutional amendments removing obstacles to foreign investment and promoting the privatization of state-owned enterprises. Turkey's increasingly open economy has produced rewards: during most of the 1990's, it has been one of the fastest growing of the OECD countries and, for the past eight years, it has had the fourth highest annual growth rate, after Ireland, Korea and Luxembourg, recording a 4.4% average annual rate of growth in GNP between 1990 and 1998.

Turkey has opened itself to the global economy in significant ways. It became a Contracting Party to the General Agreement on Tariffs in Trade in 1951 and joined the World Trade Organization as a charter member in 1995. Turkey signed a free trade agreement with the European Free Trade Association in 1991 and established a customs union with the European Union in 1996. As Dr. Frank noted, it has sought full membership in the EU, thus far without success. There has been, of late,

some limited progress in that regard: on October 13, 1999, the European Commission suggested that Turkey be made a candidate for possible EU membership, but proposed that negotiations be deferred for some unspecified time. The matter is to be discussed at the EU summit this December. In 1992, Turkey joined ten other countries (Albania, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Bulgaria, Georgia, Greece, Moldova, Romania, Russia and Ukraine) to form the Black Sea Economic Cooperation group, which aims at promoting multilateral cooperation and trade in that region.

Our own economic ties with Turkey have strengthened over the years as well. In 1986, we concluded a bilateral investment treaty and in 1998 a bilateral tax treaty. And on September 29, 1999, President Clinton and Prime Minister Bulent Ecevit signed a Trade and Investment Framework Agreement, which establishes a bilateral Council on Trade and Investment that will serve as a forum for regular discussions on commercial matters. Helpful steps all, but, I would argue, not bold enough. I agree with Dr. Frank that a free trade agreement with Turkey ought to be our goal.

Yes, our trade with Turkey is still on a small scale. In 1998, U.S. merchandise exports to Turkey reached $3.5 billion, making Turkey our 34th largest export market. Our imports from Turkey were even smaller—$2.5 billion, or less than 0.3 percent of total imports—making Turkey our 39th largest source of imports.

Certainly Turkey compares favorably with Chile, the only country with whom the United States has begun free trade agreement negotiations since the North American Free Trade Agreement entered into force. In 1998, U.S. merchandise exports to Chile totaled $3.9 billion, only slightly higher than our $3.5 billion in exports to Turkey that year, while our imports from Chile in 1998 were the same as our imports from Turkey—$2.5 billion. And both countries fall within the World Bank's grouping of ''upper middle income'' countries based on per capita GNP: in 1998's Turkey's stood at $3,160, compared with $4,810 for Chile.

Turkey's market potential is certainly greater than Chile's: Turkey's population is four times the size of Chile's population (62 million vs. 15 million) and Turkey's total imports in 1998—about $42 billion—were double Chile's total imports that year—$19 billion.

To be sure, more than 50 percent of Turkey's trade—both exports and imports—is conducted with the European Union, but the United States is Turkey's second largest single-country trading partner, after Germany. And in 1993, the Department of Commerce designated Turkey one of 10 ''Big Emerging Markets''—a focal point for U.S. export and investment promotion efforts—because of its ''outstanding growth prospects'' and growing market of 62 million consumers.

I am convinced that there are strong economic arguments for a free trade agreement with Turkey. Our negotiators will have to take care, of course, that the benefits of the FTA are restricted to the United States and Turkey. But this is a matter that will be addressed when the negotiators write the rules of origin that will apply to the FTA.

The legislation that I am introducing today would set us on the course of negotiating and implementing an FTA with Turkey, much as we negotiated an FTA over a decade ago with Turkey's neighbor, and our dear friend, Israel. And much as Turkey and Israel have seen it in their mutual interest to negotiate a free trade agreement.

Dr. Frank made the case persuasively and succinctly in his op-ed piece in The Washington Post:

In light of Turkey's strategic role as a U.S. ally in a rough neighborhood, a U.S.-Turkey free-trade agreement would help consolidate Turkey's Western orientation and contribute to stability in a highly volatile region of the world.

I am hopeful that this bill will start us down that path.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of my bill and Dr. Frank's op-ed article be inserted into the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 1746

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 ''United States-Turkey Free Trade Agreement Act of 1999''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The Republic of Turkey (in this Act referred to as ''Turkey'') has played an important strategic, political, and economic role in Europe, Asia, and the Middle East since its founding in 1923 by Mustafa Kemal ''Ataturk'' following the collapse of the 600-year Ottoman Empire.

(2) The friendship shared between the United States and Turkey dates to the late 18th century and was consecrated by the Treaty of Commerce and Navigation between the United States and the Ottoman Empire in 1830.

(3) The United States reaffirmed its relationship with Turkey by entering into the Treaty of Commerce and Navigation of 1929.

(4) The United States and Turkey have subsequently entered into over 60 treaties, memoranda of understanding, and other agreements on a broad range of issues, including a bilateral investment treaty (1986), a bilateral tax treaty (1998), and a trade and investment framework agreement (1999), as evidence of their strong friendship.

(5) Turkey is located in the strategic corridor between Europe and Asia, bordering the Black Sea and the Mediterranean Sea.

(6) Turkey has been a strategic partner of the United States since it joined the allies at the end of World War II.

(7) The strategic alliance between Turkey and the United States was cemented by—

(A) the agreement of July 12, 1947 implementing the Truman doctrine;

(B) Turkey's membership in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) in 1952; and

(C) the United States-Turkey Agreement for Cooperation on Defense and Economy of 1980.

(8) Turkey is also an important industrialized economy and was a founding member of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) and the United Nations.

(9) Turkey has made significant progress since the 1980's in liberalizing its economy and integrating with the global economy.

(10) Turkey has joined other nations in advocating an open trading system through its membership in the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and the World Trade Organization.

(11) Despite the deep friendship between the United States and Turkey, their trading relationship remains small.

(12) In 1998, United States merchandise exports to Turkey reached $3,500,000,000.

(13) In 1998, United States imports from Turkey totaled $2,500,000,000 or less than 0.3 percent of United States total imports.

(14) A free trade agreement between the United States and Turkey would greatly benefit both the United States and Turkey by expanding their commercial ties.

SEC. 3. NEGOTIATING OBJECTIVES FOR A UNITED STATES-TURKEY FREE TRADE AGREEMENT.

The overall trade negotiating objectives of the United States with respect to a United States-Turkey Free Trade Agreement are to obtain—

(1) more open, equitable, and reciprocal market access between the United States and Turkey; and

(2) the reduction or elimination of barriers and other trade-distorting policies and practices that inhibit trade between the United States and Turkey.

SEC. 4. NEGOTIATION OF A UNITED STATES-TURKEY FREE TRADE AGREEMENT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to sections 5 and 6, the President is authorized to enter into an agreement described in subsection (c). The provisions of section 151(c) of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2191(c)) shall apply with respect to a bill to implement such agreement if such agreement is entered into on or before December 31, 2005.

(b) TARIFF PROCLAMATION AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President is authorized to proclaim—

(A) such modification or continuation of any existing duty,

(B) such continuance of existing duty-free or excise treatment, or

(C) such additional duties

as the President determines to be required or appropriate to carry out the trade agreement described in subsection (c).

(2) LIMITATIONS.—No proclamation may be made under paragraph (1) that—

(A) reduces any rate of duty (other than a rate of duty that does not exceed 5 percent ad valorem on the date of enactment of this Act) to a rate which is less than 50 percent of the rate of such duty that applies on such date of enactment;

(B) provides for a reduction of duty on an article to take effect on a date that is more than 10 years after the first reduction that is proclaimed to carry out a trade agreement with respect to such article; or

(C) increases any rate of duty above the rate that applied on the date of enactment of this Act.

(3) AGGREGATE REDUCTION; EXEMPTION FROM STAGING.—

(A) AGGREGATE REDUCTION.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the aggregate reduction in the rate of duty on any article which is in effect on any day pursuant to a

trade agreement entered into under paragraph (1) shall not exceed the aggregate reduction which would have been in effect on such day if—

(i) a reduction of 3 percent ad valorem or a reduction of one-tenth of the total reduction, whichever is greater, had taken effect on the effective date of the first reduction proclaimed under paragraph (1) to carry out such agreement with respect to such article; and

(ii) a reduction equal to the amount applicable under clause (i) had taken effect at 1-year intervals after the effective date of such first reduction.

(B) EXEMPTION FROM STAGING.—No staging under subparagraph (A) is required with respect to a rate reduction that is proclaimed under paragraph (1) for an article of a kind that is not produced in the United States. The United States International Trade Commission shall advise the President of the identity of articles that may be exempted from staging under this subparagraph.

(4) ROUNDING.—If the President determines that such action will simplify the computation of reductions under paragraph (3), the President may round an annual reduction by the lesser of—

(A) the difference between the reduction without regard to this paragraph and the next lower whole number; or

(B) one-half of 1 percent ad valorem.

(5) OTHER LIMITATIONS.—A rate of duty reduction or increase that may not be proclaimed by reason of paragraph (2) may take effect only if a provision authorizing such reduction or increase is included within an implementing bill provided for under section 6(c) and that bill is enacted into law.

(c) AGREEMENT DESCRIBED.—An agreement described in this subsection means a bilateral agreement between the United States and Turkey that provides for the reduction and ultimate elimination of tariffs and nontariff barriers to trade and the eventual establishment of a free trade agreement between the United States and Turkey.

SEC. 5. CONSULTATIONS WITH CONGRESS ON NEGOTIATIONS OF A UNITED STATES-TURKEY FREE TRADE AGREEMENT.

Before entering into any trade agreement under section 4 (including immediately before initialing an agreement), the President shall consult closely and on a timely basis on the nature of the agreement and the extent to which it will achieve the purposes of this Act with—

(1) the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Finance of the Senate;

(2) the congressional advisers for trade policy and negotiations appointed under section 161 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2211); and

(3) each other committee of the House of Representatives and the Senate, and each joint committee of Congress, which has jurisdiction over legislation involving subject matters that would be affected by the trade agreement.

SEC. 6. IMPLEMENTATION OF UNITED STATES-TURKEY FREE TRADE AGREEMENT.

(a) NOTIFICATION AND SUBMISSION.—Any agreement entered into under section 4 shall enter into force with respect to the United States if (and only if)—

(1) the President, at least 60 calendar days before the day on which the President enters into the trade agreement, notifies the House of Representatives and the Senate of the President's intention to enter into the agreement, and promptly thereafter publishes notice of such intention in the Federal Register;

(2) within 60 calendar days after entering into the agreement, the President submits to Congress a description of those changes to existing laws that the President considers would be required in order to bring the United States into compliance with the agreement;

(3) after entering into the agreement, the President submits a copy of the final legal text of the agreement, together with—

(A) a draft of an implementing bill described in subsection (c);

(B) a statement of any administrative action proposed to implement the trade agreement; and

(C) the supporting information described in subsection (b); and

(4) the implementing bill is enacted into law.

(b) SUPPORTING INFORMATION.—The supporting information required under subsection (a)(3)(C) consists of—

(1) an explanation as to how the implementing bill and proposed administrative action will change or affect existing law; and

(2) a statement—

(A) asserting that the agreement makes progress in achieving the objectives of this Act; and

(B) setting forth the reasons of the President regarding—

(i) how and to what extent the agreement makes progress in achieving the objectives referred to in subparagraph (A);

(ii) whether and how the agreement changes provisions of an agreement previously negotiated;

(iii) how the agreement serves the interests of United States commerce; and

(iv) any proposed administrative action.

(c) BILLS QUALIFYING FOR TRADE AGREEMENT APPROVAL PROCEDURES.—The provisions of section 151 of the Trade Act of 1974 apply to an implementing bill submitted pursuant to subsection (b) that contains only—

(1) provisions that approve a trade agreement entered into under section 4 that achieves the negotiating objectives set forth in section 3 and the statement of administrative action (if any) proposed to implement such trade agreement;

(2) provisions that are—

(A) necessary to implement such agreement; or

(B) otherwise related to the implementation, enforcement, and adjustment to the effects of such trade agreement; and

(3) provisions necessary for purposes of complying with section 252 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 in implementing the applicable trade agreement.

SEC. 7. CONSIDERATION OF IMPLEMENTING BILL.

(a) CONGRESSIONAL CONSIDERATION OF IMPLEMENTING BILL.—When the President submits to Congress a bill to implement the trade agreement as described in section 6(c), the bill shall be introduced and considered pursuant to the provisions of section 151 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2191).

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 151 of the Trade Act of 1974 (19 U.S.C. 2191) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)(1), by inserting ''section 6 of the United States-Turkey Free Trade Agreement Act of 1999'' after ''the Omnibus Trade and Competitiveness Act of 1988,''; and

(2) in subsection (c)(1), by inserting ''or under section 6 of the United States-Turkey Free Trade Agreement Act of 1999,'' after ''the Uruguay Round Agreements Act,''.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 28, 1999]

A PLACE FOR TURKEY

(By Isaiah Frank)

As Turkish Prime Minister Bulent Ecevit visits President Clinton today, an important and highly sensitive subject belongs on the agenda.

As a staunch ally of the United States, Turkey is unique. It is the only member of NATO that has sought entry into the European Union (EU) without success. The three most recent NATO members—Poland, Hungary and the Czech Republic—are already engaged in accession negotiations with the EU, but turkey, whose NATO membership dates back to 1952, has been kept at arm's length. Is there anything the United States can do to counter the deep disappointment and alienation felt in Turkey at being excluded from full acceptance into an ever more economically integrated European community?

During the Cold War, Turkey was regarded by the United States and its Western allies as the main bulwark against the southern expansion of Soviet power. Among NATO countries, its military establishment has ranked second in size to that of the United States. Since the end of the Cold War, Turkey has continued its close security cooperation with the United States. It played a key role in the U.S.-led Gulf War, its soldiers joined U.S. troops in international peacekeeping operations in Bosnia, and its provided valuable logistical support to the recent U.S. air operation in Serbia. As the only firmly established secular democracy among Muslim states, Turkey is vital to U.S. interest in sensitive regions, including the Balkans, the Caucasus, the Middle East and Central Asia.

In order to consolidate its secular and pro-Western orientation as well as tighten its economic links to Europe, Turkey has sought full membership in the EU virtually from the organization's inception. The EU, however, has decided that Turkey does not yet meet the required criteria. Instead, the EU signed a customs union agreement with turkey, which went into effect on Jan. 1, 1996. While Turkish officials initially considered the customs union a step toward full membership, it soon became clear that the European Union regarded it as a substitute for full membership.

Despite continuing official EU reaffirmations of Turkey's eligibility for full membership, the reality of de facto rejection has increasingly sunk in. Not only is turkey omitted from the list of countries (Poland, Hungary, the Czech Republic, Slovenia, Estonia and Cyprus) with which accession negotiations have already begun, it is also left out of a project second wave of expansion that will include five additional countries: Bulgaria, Romania, Lithuania, Latvia and Slovakia.

Why is Turkey being excluded? A variety of reasons have been given, including the Kurdish problem and related issues of human rights, Turkey's macroeconomic situation, and the opposition of Greece because of the Cyprus situation. But there is some indication of a softening of the Greek position, provided Turkey does not place roadblocks in the way of Cyprus's current efforts to join the EU. As for the Kurdish problem, Turkey is making progress in working out a peaceful solution. And the EU acknowledges that the country is headed in the right direction in reforming its economy.

If EU standards for resolving these problems are ultimately met, will Turkey then be admitted? Many Turkish leaders believe this unlikely because of officially unspoken EU apprehensions. Turkey's population of 64 million is second in size only to Germany's among present and prospective members of the EU. In some European circles, this sends up several red flags. If admitted, would Turkey exert undue weight in EU decision-making? With EU membership entailing the free movement of workers, what effects would the admission of a populous and relatively

low-income country have on European labor markets? And finally, would the EU be willing to integrate fully with a country that is almost entirely Muslim? None of these considerations is discussed openly, but they are clearly in the background of the debate.

The EU's equivocation has bred Turkish disaffection from Europe and plays into the political hands of the Islamists who as recently as 1996 were at the helm of the government. Clearly, the enormous U.S. stake in a secular, Western-oriented Turkey warrants action by the United States to offset the EU's arm's length treatment and to strengthen and solidify the country's Western political and economic integration.

One such step would be for the United States to offer to negotiate a free-trade agreement with Turkey. Indeed, there is precedent for such a bilateral agreement, one motivated more by political considerations than economic advantages, and that is the 1985 U.S. free-trade agreement with Israel.

But the economic rationale for such an agreement with Turkey should not be dismissed. For Turkey the advantages are obvious; the United States ranks second as a market for its exports and third as a source of its imports. For the United States, Turkey is one of the world's 10 big ''emerging markets,'' and this country is Turkey's largest foreign investor.

A U.S.-Turkey free-trade agreement would not be a substitute for Turkish membership in the EU, a goal that Turkey should continue to pursue as it gets its political and economic house in order. But it would help compensate for a growing belief in Turkey that the country has little prospect of entry into the EU mainly because of European prejudice against a Muslim country. In light of Turkey's strategic role as a U.S. ally in a rough neighborhood, a U.S.-Turkey free-trade agreement would help consolidate Turkey's Western orientation and contribute to stability in a highly volatile region of the world.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 16

At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 16, a bill to reform the Federal election campaign laws applicable to Congress.

S. 88

At the request of Mr. BUNNING, the names of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON), and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 88, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to exempt disabled individuals from being required to enroll with a managed care entity under the medicaid program.

S. 541

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 541, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to make certain changes related to payments for graduate medical education under the medicare program.

S. 751

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 751, a bill to combat nursing home fraud and abuse, increase protections for victims of telemarketing fraud, enhance safeguards for pension plans and health care benefit programs, and enhance penalties for crimes against seniors, and for other purposes.

S. 866

At the request of Mr. CONRAD, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 866, a bill to direct the Secretary of Health and Human Services to revise existing regulations concerning the conditions of participation for hospitals and ambulatory surgical centers under the medicare program relating to certified registered nurse anesthetists' services to make the regulations consistent with State supervision requirements.

S. 882

At the request of Mr. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. ASHCROFT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 882, a bill to strengthen provisions in the Energy Policy Act of 1992 and the Federal Nonnuclear Energy Research and Development Act of 1974 with respect to potential Climate Change.

S. 922

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the names of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 922, a bill to prohibit the use of the ''Made in the USA'' label on products of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands and to deny such products duty-free and quota-free treatment.

S. 934

At the request of Mr. ROBB, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 934, a bill to enhance rights and protections for victims of crime.

S. 1017

At the request of Mr. MACK, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. KOHL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1017, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the State ceiling on the low-income housing credit.

S. 1144

At the request of Mr. VOINOVICH, the names of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) and the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) were added as cosponsors of S. 1144, a bill to provide increased flexibility in use of highway funding, and for other purposes.

S. 1178

At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1178, a bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain parcels of land acquired for the Blunt Reservoir and Pierre Canal features of the Oahe Irrigation Project, South Dakota, to the Commission of Schools and Public Lands of the State of South Dakota for the purpose of mitigating lost wildlife habitat, on the condition that the current preferential leaseholders shall have an option to purchase the parcels from the Commission, and for other purposes.

S. 1242

At the request of Mr. AKAKA, the name of the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1242, a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to make permanent the visa waiver program for certain visitors to the United States.

S. 1322

At the request of Mr. DASCHLE, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1322, a bill to prohibit health insurance and employment discrimination against individuals and their family members on the basis of predictive genetic information or genetic services.

S. 1452

At the request of Mr. SHELBY, the names of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 1452, a bill to modernize the requirements under the National Manufactured Housing Construction and Safety Standards of 1974 and to establish a balanced consensus process for the development, revision, and interpretation of Federal construction and safety standards for manufactured homes.

S. 1495

At the request of Mr. DEWINE, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1495, a bill to establish, wherever feasible, guidelines, recommendations, and regulations that promote the regulatory acceptance of new and revised toxicological tests that protect human and animal health and the environment while reducing, refining, or replacing animal tests and ensuring human safety and product effectiveness.

S. 1500

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the names of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. ASHCROFT) were added as cosponsors of S. 1500, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for an additional payment for services provided to certain high-cost individuals under the prospective payment system for skilled nursing facility services, and for other purposes.

S. 1547

At the request of Mr. BURNS, the names of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. ENZI) were added as cosponsors of S. 1547, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to require the Federal Communications Commission to preserve low-power television stations that provide community broadcasting, and for other purposes.

S. 1561

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE), the Senator from Florida (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN), and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1561, a bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to add gamma hydroxybutyric acid and ketamine to the schedules of control substances, to provide for a national awareness campaign, and for other purposes.

S. 1592

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1592, a bill to amend the Nicaraguan Adjustment and Central American Relief Act to provide to certain nationals of El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Haiti an opportunity to apply for adjustment of status under that Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1611

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. ASHCROFT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1611, a bill to amend the Internet Tax Freedom Act to broaden its scope and make the moratorium permanent, and for other purposes.

S. 1622

At the request of Mrs. LINCOLN, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. FITZGERALD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1622, a bill to provide economic, planning, and coordination assistance needed for the development of the lower Mississippi River region.

S. 1623

At the request of Mr. SPECTER, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1623, a bill to select a National Health Museum site.

S. 1649

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. COVERDELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1649, a bill to provide incentives for States to establish and administer periodic teacher testing and merit pay programs for elementary school and secondary school teachers.

S. 1680

At the request of Mr. ASHCROFT, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BOND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1680, a bill to provide for the improvement of the processing of claims for veterans compensation and pensions, and for other purposes.

S. 1683

At the request of Mr. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1683, a bill to make technical changes to the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1702

At the request of Mr. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1702, 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.

S. 1732

At the request of Mr. BREAUX, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1732, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prohibit certain allocations of S corporation stock held by an employee stock ownership plan.

S. 1738

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1738, a bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, to make it unlawful for a packer to own, feed, or control livestock intended for slaughter.

SENATE RESOLUTION 108

At the request of Mr. BREAUX, the names of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. BRYAN), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS), and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WARNER) were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 108, a resolution designating the month of March each year as ''National Colorectal Cancer Awareness Month.''

SENATE RESOLUTION 199

At the request of Mr. REED, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CLELAND), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. ABRAHAM), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. BRYAN), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SPECTER), and the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. BREAUX) were added as cosponsors of Senate Resolution 199, a resolution designating the week of October 24, 1999, through October 30, 1999, and the week of October 22, 2000, through October 28, 2000, as ''National Childhood Lead Poisoning Prevention Week.''

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

BIPARTISAN CAMPAIGN REFORM ACT OF 1999

BINGAMAN (AND WYDEN) AMENDMENT NO. 2303

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. BINGAMAN (for himself and Mr. WYDEN) submitted an amendment to be proposed by them to the bill (S. 1593) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide bipartisan campaign reform; as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 6. LIMITATION ON AVAILABILITY OF LOWEST UNIT CHARGE FOR FEDERAL CANDIDATES ATTACKING OPPOSITION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 315(b) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 315(b)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''(b) The charges'' and inserting ''(b)(1) The charges'';

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(2)(A) In the case of a candidate for Federal office, such candidate shall not be entitled to receive the rate under paragraph (1)(A) for the use of any broadcasting station unless the candidate certifies that the candidate (and any authorized committee of the candidate) shall not make any direct reference to another candidate for the same office, in any broadcast using the rights and conditions of access under this Act, unless such reference meets the requirements of subparagraph (C).

''(B) If a candidate for Federal office (or any authorized committee of such candidate) makes a reference described in subparagraph (A) in any broadcast that does not meet the requirements of subparagraph (C), such candidate shall not be entitled to receive the rate under paragraph (1)(A) for such broadcast or any other broadcast during any portion of the 45-day and 60-day periods described in paragraph (1)(A), that occur on or after the date of such broadcast, for election to such office.

''(C) A candidate meets the requirements of this subparagraph with respect to any reference to another candidate if—

''(i) in the case of a television broadcast, the reference (and any statement relating to the other candidate) is made by the candidate in a personal appearance on the screen, and

''(ii) in the case of a radio broadcast, the reference (and any statement relating to the other candidate) is made by the candidate in a personal audio statement during which the candidate and the office for which the candidate is running are identified by such candidate.

''(D) For purposes of this paragraph, the terms 'authorized committee' and 'Federal office' have the meanings given such terms by section 301 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 431).''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 315(b)(1)(A) of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 315(b)(1)(A)), as redesignated by subsection (a)(2), is amended by inserting ''subject to paragraph (2),'' before ''during the forty-five days''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to broadcasts made after the date of enactment of this Act.

HUTCHINSON AMENDMENT NO. 2304

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. HUTCHINSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill, S. 1593, supra; as follows:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. ___. DISCLOSURE BY LABOR ORGANIZATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 201(b) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 (29 U.S.C. 431(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (5), by striking ''and'' at the end; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(7) an itemization of amounts spent by the labor organization for—

''(A) contract negotiation and administration;

''(B) organizing activities;

''(C) strike activities;

''(D) political activities;

''(E) lobbying and promotional activities; and

''(F) market recovery and job targeting programs; and

''(8) all transactions involving a single source or payee for each of the activities described in paragraph (7) in which the aggregate cost exceeds $10,000.''.

(b) COMPUTER NETWORK ACCESS.—Section 201(c) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 (29 U.S.C. 431(c)) is amended by inserting ''including availability of such reports through a public Internet site or other publicly accessible computer network,'' after ''its members''.

(c) REPORTING BY SECRETARY.—Section 205(a) of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959 (29 U.S.C. 435(a)) is amended by inserting ''shall make the reports and documents filed under section 201(b) available through a public Internet site or another publicly accessible computer network. The Secretary'' after ''and the Secretary''.

SNOWE AMENDMENT NO. 2305

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Ms. SNOWE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by her to the bill, S. 1593, supra; as follows:

Strike sections 201, 202, and 203 of the matter proposed to be inserted and insert the following:

Subtitle A—Electioneering Communications

SEC. 200. DISCLOSURE OF ELECTIONEERING COMMUNICATIONS.

Section 304 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 434) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(d) ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS ON ELECTIONEERING COMMUNICATIONS.—

''(1) STATEMENT REQUIRED.—Every person who makes a disbursement for electioneering communications in an aggregate amount in excess of $10,000 during any calendar year shall, within 24 hours of each disclosure date, file with the Commission a statement containing the information described in paragraph (2).

''(2) CONTENTS OF STATEMENT.—Each statement required to be filed under this subsection shall be made under penalty of perjury and shall contain the following information:

''(A) The identification of the person making the disbursement, of any entity sharing or exercising direction or control over the activities of such person, and of the custodian of the books and accounts of the person making the disbursement.

''(B) The State of incorporation and the principal place of business of the person making the disbursement.

''(C) The amount of each disbursement during the period covered by the statement and the identification of the person to whom the disbursement was made.

''(D) The elections to which the electioneering communications pertain and the names (if known) of the candidates identified or to be identified.

''(E) If the disbursements were paid out of a segregated account to which only individuals could contribute, the names and addresses of all contributors who contributed an aggregate amount of $500 or more to that account during the period beginning on the first day of the preceding calendar year and ending on the disclosure date.

''(F) If the disbursements were paid out of funds not described in subparagraph (E), the names and addresses of all contributors who contributed an aggregate amount of $500 or more to the organization or any related entity during the period beginning on the first day of the preceding calendar year and ending on the disclosure date.

''(G) Whether or not any electioneering communication is made in coordination, cooperation, consultation, or concert with, or at the request or suggestion of, any candidate or any authorized committee, any political party or committee, or any agent of the candidate, political party, or committee and if so, the identification of any candidate, party, committee, or agent involved.

''(3) ELECTIONEERING COMMUNICATION.—For purposes of this subsection—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—The term 'electioneering communication'' means any broadcast from a television or radio broadcast station which—

''(i) refers to a clearly identified candidate for Federal office;

''(ii) is made (or scheduled to be made) within—

''(I) 60 days before a general, special, or runoff election for such Federal office, or

''(II) 30 days before a primary or preference election, or a convention or caucus of a political party that has authority to nominate a candidate, for such Federal office, and

''(iii) is broadcast from a television or radio broadcast station whose audience includes the electorate for such election, convention, or caucus.

''(B) EXCEPTIONS.—Such term shall not include—

''(i) communications appearing in a news story, commentary, or editorial distributed through the facilities of any broadcasting station, unless such facilities are owned or controlled by any political party, political committee, or candidate, or

''(ii) communications which constitute expenditures or independent expenditures under this Act.

''(4) DISCLOSURE DATE.—For purposes of this subsection, the term 'disclosure date' means—

''(A) the first date during any calendar year by which a person has made disbursements for electioneering communications aggregating in excess of $10,000, and

''(B) any other date during such calendar year by which a person has made disbursements for electioneering communications aggregating in excess of $10,000 since the most recent disclosure date for such calendar year.

''(5) CONTRACTS TO DISBURSE.—For purposes of this subsection, a person shall be treated as having made a disbursement if the person has contracted to make the disbursement.

''(6) COORDINATION WITH OTHER REQUIREMENTS.—Any requirement to report under this subsection shall be in addition to any other reporting requirement under this Act.''

SEC. 200A. COORDINATED COMMUNICATIONS AS CONTRIBUTIONS.

Section 315(a)(7)(B) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441a(a)(7)(B)) is amended by inserting after clause (ii) the following new clause:

''(iii) if—

''(I) any person makes, or contracts to make, any payment for any electioneering communication (within the meaning of section 304(d)(3)), and

''(II) such payment is coordinated with a candidate for Federal office or an authorized committee of such candidate, a Federal, State, or local political party or committee thereof, or an agent or official of any such candidate, party, or committee,

such payment or contracting shall be treated as a contribution to such candidate and as an expenditure by such candidate; and''.

SEC. 200B. PROHIBITION OF CORPORATE AND LABOR DISBURSEMENTS FOR ELECTIONEERING COMMUNICATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 316(b)(2) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441b(b)(2)) is amended by inserting ''or for any applicable electioneering communication'' before '', but shall not include''.

(b) APPLICABLE ELECTIONEERING COMMUNICATION.—Section 316 of such Act is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(c) RULES RELATING TO ELECTIONEERING COMMUNICATIONS.—

''(1) APPLICABLE ELECTIONEERING COMMUNICATION.—For purposes of this section, the term 'applicable electioneering communication' means an electioneering communication (within the meaning of section 304(d)(3)) which is made by—

''(A) any entity to which subsection (a) applies other than a section 501(c)(4) organization, or

''(B) a section 501(c)(4) organization from amounts derived from the conduct of a trade or business or from an entity described in subparagraph (A).

''(2) SPECIAL OPERATING RULES.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the following rules shall apply:

''(A) An electioneering communication shall be treated as made by an entity described in paragraph (1)(A) if—

''(i) the entity described in paragraph (1)(A) directly or indirectly disburses any amount for any of the costs of the communication; or

''(ii) any amount is disbursed for the communication by a corporation or organization or a State or local political party or committee thereof that receives anything of value from the entity described in paragraph (1)(A), except that this clause shall not apply to any communication the costs of which are defrayed entirely out of a segregated account to which only individuals can contribute.

''(B) A section 501(c)(4) organization that derives amounts from business activities or from any entity described in paragraph (1)(A) shall be considered to have paid for any communication out of such amounts unless such organization paid for the communication out of a segregated account to which only individuals can contribute.

''(3) DEFINITIONS AND RULES.—For purposes of this subsection—

''(A) the term 'section 501(c)(4) organization' means—

''(i) an organization described in section 501(c)(4) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of such Code; or

''(ii) an organization which has submitted an application to the Internal Revenue Service for determination of its status as an organization described in clause (i); and

''(B) a person shall be treated as having made a disbursement if the person has contracted to make the disbursement.

''(4) COORDINATION WITH INTERNAL REVENUE CODE.—Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to authorize an organization exempt from taxation under section 501(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 from carrying out any activity which is prohibited under such Code.''

Subtitle B—Independent and Coordinated Expenditures

SEC. 201. DEFINITION OF INDEPENDENT EXPENDITURE

Section 301 of the Federal Election Campaign Act (2 U.S.C. 431) is amended by striking paragraph (17) and inserting the following:

''(17) INDEPENDENT EXPENDITURE.—The term ''independent expenditure' means an expenditure by a person—

(A) for a communication that is express advocacy; and

(B) that is not coordinated activity or is not provided in coordination with a candidate or a candidate's agent or a person who is coordinating with a candidate or a candidate's agent.''.

WELLSTONE AMENDMENT NO. 2306

Mr. WELLSTONE proposed an amendment to the bill, S. 593, supra; as follows:

At the end of the language proposed to be stricken, add the following:

SEC. . STATE PROVIDED VOLUNTARY PUBLIC FINANCING.

Section 403 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 453) is amended by adding at the end the following: ''The preceding sentence shall not be interpreted to prohibit a State from enacting a voluntary public financing system which applies to a candidate for election to Federal office, other than the office of President or Vice-President, from such State who agrees to limit acceptance of contributions, use of personal funds, and the making of expenditures in connection with the election in exchange for full or partial public financing from a State fund with respect to the election, except that such system shall not allow any person to take any action in violation of the provisions of this Act.''.

HAGEL (AND OTHERS) AMENDMENT NO. 2307

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. HAGEL (for himself, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. GORTON, and Mr. THOMAS) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them to the bill, S. 1593, supra; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

TITLE I—DISCLOSURE

SEC. 101. ADDITIONAL MONTHLY AND QUARTERLY DISCLOSURE REPORTS.

(a) PRINCIPAL CAMPAIGN COMMITTEES.—

(1) MONTHLY REPORTS.—Section 304(a)(2)(A) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 434(a)(2)(A)) is amended by striking clause (iii) and inserting the following:

''(iii) additional monthly reports, which shall be filed not later than the 20th day after the last day of the month and shall be complete as of the last day of the month, except that monthly reports shall not be required under this clause in November and December and a year end report shall be filed not later than January 31 of the following calendar year.''.

(2) QUARTERLY REPORTS.—Section 304(a)(2)(B) of such Act is amended by striking ''the following reports'' and all that follows through the period and inserting ''the treasurer shall file quarterly reports, which shall be filed not later than the 15th day after the last day of each calendar quarter, and which shall be complete as of the last day of each calendar quarter, except that the report for the quarter ending December 31 shall be filed not later than January 31 of the following calendar year.''.

(b) NATIONAL COMMITTEE OF A POLITICAL PARTY.—Section 304(a)(4) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 434(a)(4)) is amended by adding at the end the following flush sentence: ''Notwithstanding the preceding sentence, a national committee of a political party shall file the reports required under subparagraph (B).''.

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) SECTION 304.—Section 304(a) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 434(a)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (3)(A)(ii), by striking ''quarterly reports'' and inserting ''monthly reports''; and

(B) in paragraph (8), by striking ''quarterly report under paragraph (2)(A)(iii) or paragraph (4)(A)(i)'' and inserting ''monthly report under paragraph (2)(A)(iii) or paragraph (4)(A)''.

(2) SECTION 309.—Section 309(b) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 437g(b)) by striking ''calendar quarter'' and inserting ''month''.

SEC. 102. REPORTING BY NATIONAL POLITICAL PARTY COMMITTEES.

Section 304 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 434) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(d) POLITICAL COMMITTEES.—

''(1) NATIONAL AND CONGRESSIONAL POLITICAL COMMITTEES.—The national committee of a political party, any national congressional campaign committee of a political party, and any subordinate committee of either, shall report all receipts and disbursements during the reporting period.

''(2) ITEMIZATION.—If a political committee has receipts or disbursements to which this subsection applies from any person aggregating in excess of $200 for any calendar year, the political committee shall separately itemize its reporting for such person in the same manner as required in paragraphs (3)(A), (5), and (6) of subsection (b).

''(3) REPORTING PERIODS.—Reports required to be filed under this subsection shall be filed for the same time periods required for political committees under subsection (a).''.

SEC. 103. INCREASED ELECTRONIC DISCLOSURE.

Section 304 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 434), as amended by section 102, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(e) INTERNET AVAILABILITY.—The Commission shall make the information contained in the reports submitted under this section available on the Internet and publicly available at the offices of the Commission as soon as practicable (but in no case later than 24 hours) after the information is received by the Commission.''.

SEC. 104. PUBLIC ACCESS TO BROADCASTING RECORDS.

Section 315 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 315) is amended by redesignating subsections (c) and (d) as subsections (d) and (e), respectively, and inserting after subsection (b) the following:

''(c) POLITICAL RECORD.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A licensee shall maintain, and make available for public inspection, a complete record of a request to purchase broadcast time that—

''(A) is made by or on behalf of a legally qualified candidate for public office; or

''(B) communicates a message relating to any political matter of national importance, including—

''(i) a legally qualified candidate;

''(ii) any election to Federal office; or

''(iii) a national legislative issue of public importance.

''(2) CONTENTS OF RECORD.—A record maintained under paragraph (1) shall contain information regarding—

''(A) whether the request to purchase broadcast time is accepted or rejected by the licensee;

''(B) the rate charged for the broadcast time;

''(D) the date and time that the communication is aired;

''(E) the class of time that is purchased;

''(F) the name of the candidate to which the communication refers and the office to which the candidate is seeking election, the election to which the communication refers, or the issue to which the communication refers (as applicable);

''(G) in the case of a request made by, or on behalf of, a candidate, the name of the candidate, the authorized committee of the candidate, and the treasurer of such committee; and

''(H) in the case of any other request, the name of the person purchasing the time, the name, address, and phone number of a contact person for such person, and a list of the chief executive officers or members of the executive committee or of the board of directors of such person.

''(3) TIME TO MAINTAIN FILE.—The information required under this subsection shall be placed in a political file as soon as possible and shall be retained by the licensee for a period of not less than 2 years.''.

TITLE II—SOFT MONEY OF NATIONAL POLITICAL PARTIES AND CONTRIBUTION LIMITS

SEC. 201. LIMIT ON SOFT MONEY OF NATIONAL POLITICAL PARTY COMMITTEES.

Title III of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 431 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 324. LIMIT ON SOFT MONEY OF NATIONAL POLITICAL PARTY COMMITTEES.

''(a) LIMITATION.—A national committee of a political party, a congressional campaign committee of a national party, or an entity directly or indirectly established, financed, maintained, or controlled by such committee shall not accept a donation, gift, or transfer of funds of any kind (not including transfers from other committees of the political party or contributions), during a calendar year, from a person (including a person directly or indirectly established, financed, maintained, or controlled by such person) in an aggregate amount in excess of $60,000.

''(b) INDEXING.—In the case of any calendar year after 1999—

''(1) the $60,000 amount under subsection (a) shall be increased based on the increase in the price index determined under section 315(c), except that the base period shall be calendar year 1999; and

''(2) the amount so increased shall be the amount in effect for the calendar year.''.

SEC. 202. JUDICIAL REVIEW.

(a) EXPEDITED REVIEW.—Any Member of Congress, candidate, national committee of a political party, or any person adversely affected by section 324 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as added by section 201, may bring an action, in the United States District Court for the District of Columbia, for declaratory judgment and injunctive relief on the ground that such section 324 violates the Constitution.

(b) APPEAL TO SUPREME COURT.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any order of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia granting or denying an injunction regarding, or finally disposing of, an action brought under subsection (a) shall be reviewable by appeal directly to the Supreme Court of the United States. Any such appeal shall be taken by a notice of appeal filed within 10 calendar days after such order is entered; and the jurisdictional statement shall be filed within 30 calendar days after such order is entered.

(c) EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION.—It shall be the duty of the District Court for the District of Columbia and the Supreme Court of the United States to advance on the docket and to expedite to the greatest possible extent the disposition of any matter brought under subsection (a).

(d) ENFORCEABILITY.—The enforcement of any provision of section 324 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as added by section 201, shall be stayed, and such section 324 shall not be effective, for the period—

(1) beginning on the date of the filing of an action under subsection (a), and

(2) ending on the date of the final disposition of such action on its merits by the Supreme Court of the United States.

(e) APPLICABILITY.—This section shall apply only with respect to any action filed under subsection (a) not later than 30 days after the effective date of this Act.

SEC. 203. INCREASE IN CONTRIBUTION LIMITS.

(a) INCREASE IN INDIVIDUAL AND POLITICAL COMMITTEE CONTRIBUTION LIMITS.—Section 315(a) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441a(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''$1,000'' and inserting ''$3,000'';

(B) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''$20,000'' and inserting ''$60,000''; and

(C) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''$5,000'' and inserting ''$15,000''; and

(2) in paragraph (3)—

(A) by striking ''$25,000'' and inserting ''$75,000''; and

(B) by striking the second sentence.

(b) INCREASE IN MULTICANDIDATE LIMITS.—Section 315(a)(2) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441a(a)(2)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking ''$5,000'' and inserting ''$7,500'';

(2) in subparagraph (B), by striking ''$15,000'' and inserting ''$30,000''; and

(3) in subparagraph (C), by striking ''$5,000'' and inserting ''$7,500''.

(c) INDEXING.—Section 315(c) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 441a(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking the second and third sentences;

(B) by inserting ''(A)'' before ''At the beginning''; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''(B) Except as provided in subparagraph (C), in any calendar year after 2000—

''(i) a limitation established by subsection (a), (b), or (d) shall be increased by the percent difference determined under subparagraph (A); and

''(ii) each amount so increased shall remain in effect for the calendar year.

''(C) In the case of limitations under paragraphs (1)(A) and (2)(A) of subsection (a), each amount increased under subparagraph (B) shall remain in effect for the 2-year period beginning on the first day following the date of the last general election in the year preceding the year in which the amount is increased and ending on the date of the next general election.''; and

(2) in paragraph (2)(B), by striking ''means the calendar year 1974'' and inserting ''means—

''(i) for purposes of subsections (b) and (d), calendar year 1974; and

''(ii) for purposes of subsection (a), calendar year 2000''.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to calendar years beginning after December 31, 1999.

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. PROHIBITION OF SOLICITATION OF POLITICAL PARTY SOFT MONEY IN FEDERAL BUILDINGS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 607 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking ''within the meaning of section 301(8) of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(c) DEFINITION OF CONTRIBUTION.—In this section, the term 'contribution' means a gift, subscription, loan, advance, or deposit of money or anything of value made by any person in connection with—

''(1) any election or elections for Federal office;

''(2) any political committee (as defined in section 301 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971); or

''(3) any State, district, or local committee of a political party.''.

(b) AMENDMENT OF TITLE 18 TO INCLUDE PROHIBITION OF DONATIONS.—Section 602(a)(4) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking ''within the meaning of section 301(8)'' and inserting ''(as defined in section 607(c))''.

SEC. 302. UPDATE OF PENALTY AMOUNTS.

Section 309 of the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 (2 U.S.C. 437g) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(e) ADJUSTMENT OF DOLLAR AMOUNTS FOR INFLATION.—In the case of any calendar year after 1999—

''(1) each dollar amount under this section shall be increased based on the increase in the price index determined under section 315(c); and

''(2) each amount so increased shall be the amount in effect for the calendar year.

The preceding sentence shall not apply to any amount under subsection (d) other than the $25,000 amount under paragraph (1)(A) of such subsection.''.

NOTICE OF HEARING

SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATER AND POWER

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I would like to announce that on Thursday, October 28th, the Subcommittee on Water and Power of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources will hold an oversight hearing on the Federal hydroelectric licensing process. The hearing will be held at 2:30 p.m. in room 366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, D.C.

For further information, please call Kristin Phillips or Howard Useem, at (202) 224–7875.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEE TO MEET

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE YEAR 2000 TECHNOLOGY PROBLEM

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Committee on the Year 2000 Technology Problem be permitted to meet on October 18, 1999, at 9:30 a.m. for the purpose of conducting a hearing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

CENTENNIAL OF CATHOLIC CHARITIES OF THE BROOKLYN-QUEENS DIOCESE

• Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, This year marks the centennial of Catholic Charities of the Brooklyn-Queens Diocese, the largest Roman Catholic human services agency in the nation. Perhaps on earth. The New York Times had the happy thought to mark the occasion with a profile of Bishop Joseph M. Sullivan, the vicar of the diocese, who heads Catholic Charities. The warmth and wisdom of this great churchman comes through so clearly, so forcefully. As Yeats once wrote of such a man, ''he was blessed and had the power to bless.'' I have treasured his friendship, and share his fears as to the fate of New York's poor when they begin to fall off the five-year cliff created by the so-called Welfare Reform Act of 1996. We would do well to contemplate the fact that the only major social legislation of the 1990s was the abolition of Aid to Families of Dependent Children, a provision of the great Social Security Act of 1935. We could care for children in the midst of the Great Depression of the 1930s, but somehow not in the midst of the great prosperity of the 1990s. I spoke at length about the gamble we were taking when the legislation was before us. I hope I was wrong. But if Joe Sullivan is worried I think we all should be. I know we all should be.

I ask that the story from The Times be included in the RECORD.

The story follows.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 13, 1999]

NOW PITCHING FOR THE ROME TEAM, IT'S BISHOP SULLIVAN

(By Randy Kennedy)

''The year was 1948 and a guy says to me, 'Hey listen, you think you're such a good pitcher, they're having a tryout for the Phillies. So go.' ''

And so Joe Sullivan of Bay Ridge, Brooklyn, went. ''And the guy asked me to throw the ball. And I could throw pretty hard. And I could throw a fairly decent curve.''

One thing leads to another ''and they wanted to sign me.''

If this were the made-for-television version of the life of Bishop Joseph M. Sullivan, this is where the big turning point would come: he chooses God over baseball. He gives up a brilliant pitching career to go to bat for the souls of men.

But as it turns out, Bishop Sullivan never really liked the baseball life that much anyway. ''It was essentially a boring life,'' he remembers of his one summer canvassing the South in a beaten-up bus and throwing for the Americus Phillies in Georgia. ''You played all night ball in the minor leagues, and you'd kind of lounge around most of the rest of the time.''

He had always loved the church, however. He was a standout in the choir. He missed being an altar boy only because he was much too proud to stoop to asking Sister Blanche, the nun who made the recommendations. (''Quite bluntly, I felt I wasn't going to kiss . . . you know . . . you know?) But even as a young boy and through high school, he almost never missed a daily Mass at St. Ephrem's. ''I mean,'' he said, ''I bought Catholicism as a young kid. I really believed.''

So the real turning point in his life, one not of his making, came much later, after he had spent four years at seminary and three years as the pastor of his first parish, Our Lady of Lourdes in Queens Village. The bishop needed social workers.

''I got a call on a Tuesday night to see him Wednesday morning. And I was registered for graduate school in social work by Thursday morning. I didn't know what a social worker was.''

He adds: ''When I went to school and they asked me, 'Why did you choose social work?' I said, 'Because the bishop appointed me.' The social work people's reaction to that was that I was hostile. I said, 'Well, it's the truth. I don't know whether it's hostile or not.'

''So then they asked me if I wanted to be a social worker. And the answer was, 'No!' ''

He pauses for a little dramatic effect. ''Best thing that ever happened to me.''

Yesterday, Bishop Sullivan, an imposing, tough-talking, immensely friendly man, was sitting in a makeshift television studio in Bishop Ford High School in Brooklyn. He was preparing for a live cable show in which he would talk about the centennial, this

month, of Catholic Charities of the Brooklyn-Queens Diocese, now the largest Roman Catholic human-services agency in the country, covering America's most populous diocese.

Despite not knowing what a social worker was back then, Bishop Sullivan has devoted 38 years of his life to the job, serving in welfare offices and hospitals, rising to direct the charities and now serving as vicar for human services, overseeing the charities' vast operations with their director, Frank DeStafano. (Mr. Stefano couldn't resist a dig at the boss yesterday as a reporter sat down: ''Not the baseball thing again. He was only on the team for three days! Myself, I was always dedicated to the poor. No time for any kind of fund like that.'')

Bishop Sullivan's message to the cable audience yesterday was that he could hope for nothing better during the next 100 years of Catholic charity work than for one message to be hammered home: ''To be a practicing Catholic means to be involved in the lives of others.''

But as he relaxed after the show he had another, angrier message not about personal but about public responsibility: welfare reform. He complained that too few people are talking about its effects now, which he says have hurt the poor in Brooklyn and Queens as much as anything he has seen in three decades of tumultuous change in the boroughs.

''I agree,'' he said, ''that it had to be reformed, and I agree that there had to be a change in the culture that work must be more important than relief. But I radically disagree with the way it was done.''

Four years ago, he and another bishop managed to wangle an hour and 15 minutes in the Oval Office with President Clinton, to try to talk him out of signing the welfare reform legislation. Mr. Clinton said he understood them. Then he signed the measure anyway.

''But I will tell you,'' he said, his face coloring, ''that I think most of what is being said about the success of these programs is hype including here in this city. To me it's a sham. You look at the food lines at Catholic Charities. You look at the food lines at parishes. You look at the people trying to pay their rents.''

He added: ''They haven't heard the last of this. We're only into the third year, and the reality is that there will always be dependent people who can't work.''

As he socked on a snap-brim hat to run out and give a speech about health care, he was asked whether it ever disheartens him—approaching his 70th year, his 44th as a priest, and nearly as long as a social worker—that there are still so many people suffering.

''It might not make any sense but it doesn't,'' he said. ''I really think this job as heaven on . . . way to heaven. It doesn't come in the end. It begins here.''●

THE ''LEOPOLDVILLE'' DISASTER

● Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, in a few days a small group of veterans will gather at Fort Benning, Georgia to commemorate one of the least known tragedies of World War II.

On Christmas Eve 1944, the Belgian troopship *Leopoldville* was transporting 2,235 American soldiers from the 262nd and 264th Regiments of the 66th Infantry Division across the English Channel. They were destined as reinforcements for units fighting the Battle of the Bulge. Many soldiers on board were singing Christmas carols as they watched the lights along the coast of liberated France.

The ship was designed to carry fewer than half the number on board, and the Belgian crew did not speak English. Reportedly, many of the American soldiers were not issued life jackets. Just five miles from its destination of Cherbourg, France, the *Leopoldville* was struck by torpedos from the German submarine U–486. Two and a half hours later, the ship capsized and sank. According to many survivors, the crew abandoned ship in the lifeboats and left the American soldiers to fend for themselves. Unable to free the ship's life rafts, many of the troops jumped to their deaths in the frigid heavy seas. The British destroyed HMS *Brilliant* saved some 500 troops. However, because it was Christmas Eve, no one else seemed to be around to help. By the next day, Christmas morning, 763 American soldiers were dead, including three sets of brothers. The dead represented 47 of the then 48 states.

Mr. President, seven of the victims were from my home state of North Dakota. Among them was my uncle, Pfc. Allan J. Dorgan. His body was never recovered, and neither were the bodies of 492 other soldiers who died in the incident. It was weeks before my family and the families of other victims heard the fateful knock on the door and were given the telegram that said their sons, brothers, uncles, or fathers were ''missing in action in the European Area.'' It took months more before a second telegram informed them their loved ones had been ''killed in action in the European Area.''

Due to wartime censorship, the disaster was not reported to the news media. Survivors were told by the British and American governments to keep quiet about what happened. American authorities did not even acknowledge the sinking of the *Leopoldville* until two weeks after it went down. Later, after the war, the tragedy was considered an embarrassment and all reports were filed away as secret by the Allied governments. Some say that the American and British governments conspired to cover-up the incompetence involved in the incident. For whatever reason, details of the disaster were withheld from the public for over fifty years. Some of the victims' families never learned the truth about how their loved ones perished that night.

For over fifty years, the young soldiers on the *Leopoldville* were denied their due, and never accorded the honors and respect they deserved. Finally, a few years ago, thanks to the efforts of *Leopoldville* survivor Vincent Codianni, former New York City police investigator Alan Andrade who wrote a book about the incident, and the Veterans Memorial Committee of Waterbury, Connecticut, the U.S. Army agreed to provide a site for a monument to the tragedy.

The Leopoldville Disaster Monument was dedicated on November 7, 1997 at Fort Benning, the ''Home of the Infantry.'' On the monument, the names and hometowns of those members of the 66th Infantry Division who lost their lives on the *Leopoldville* and the names of those who survived the tragedy, but were later killed in action, are etched in stone. This was the first official recognition shown to any of the victims or their families. It was long overdue.

It is almost 55 years since the sinking of the *Leopoldville*. When the survivors and their families gather again this week in Georgia, they will honor their comrades who have passed away since their first reunion two years ago. I hope all my colleagues will join me in expressing our appreciation for their courage and for the ultimate sacrifice they made for freedom.●

HONORING 150 YEARS OF CONGREGATION B'NAI ISRAEL

● Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, today I wish to recognize Congregation B'nai Israel in Sacramento, California, and to celebrate its 150th year of vitality and service to the Sacramento community.

Congregation B'nai Israel was founded in 1849 by Moses Hyman and Albert Priest. At the time, Gold rush-era optimism was everywhere in northern California, attracting opportunity seekers from as far as eastern Europe, the home to millions of Jews desperate to escape violent pogroms and rampant anti-Semitism. With his profound ability to organize people and his unrelenting desire to help the destitute, Moses Hyman began his congregation in his home, and soon became known as a pioneer of California Judaism and father of Temple B'nai Israel.

Moses Hyman, a major community philanthropist, also founded the Hebrew Benevolent Society, which assisted the sick and poor, especially during the Sacramento flood of 1850. Following that devastating disaster, Hyman purchased burial land and a nearby house of worship from a Methodist Episcopal church. Moses Hyman and Albert Priest named their new congregation B'nai Israel, which translated into English, means ''Children of Israel.'' The rebuilt temple officially opened on September 2, 1852 as the first member-owned synagogue west of the Mississippi.

Congregation B'nai Israel has suffered through many hardships. After only a decade in existence, its synagogue was destroyed by fire, and only a year later, winter floods severely damaged cemetery grounds. The congregation was tested repeatedly. They mourned but then regrouped and rebuilt, emerging stronger than before.

By the mid-1900s, the congregation outgrew its existing facilities and launched a major effort to build a new synagogue. Thanks to the generosity of congregants, its capital campaign was a huge success. In addition to a new synagogue, the congregation added an education wing, later named after Buddy Kandel, in the early 1960s.

Congregation B'nai Israel continued to grow. The year 1986 marked additional milestones for what had become a community institution. In that year, the congregation began construction of the Harry M. Tonkin Memorial Chapel and the Sosnick Library. The much-needed addition not only led to a change in place of worship, but also an ideological change for the B'nai Israel. Tikkun Olam, the Jewish belief in repairing the world through good deeds and social action became a new found interest of the congregation, pushing further their desire to help others in the Sacramento area.

Members of Congregation B'nai Israel had suffered through tremendous hardship in their history, but nothing could prepare them for the events of June 18, 1999, when a fire bomber motivated by anti-Semitic hatred destroyed their library and severely damaged the sanctuary and administration building. In an inspiring gesture of solidarity, the entire Sacramento community joined with the congregation and collectively vowed not to let violence tear Sacramento apart.

In a historic event less than three days after the bombing, more than 4,000 Sacramento residents joined congregation leaders at a unity rally to protest religious and ethnic violence. Former president of the Interfaith Service Bureau, Rabbi Bloom, called for the creation of a museum of tolerance to battle against the tide of hatred.

Mr. President, despite all kinds of adversity, Congregation B'nai Israel has survived for 150 years and has grown into a vital and beloved community institution. I send my congratulations and personal thanks for all it has done to help a diverse community find common ground in the Sacramento area.●

TRIBUTE TO CALEB SHIELDS

● Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to Caleb Shields, retired Chairman and current Councilman of the Assiniboine and Sioux Tribes of the Fort Peck Reservation in Montana. Caleb is retiring from his elected position with the Tribe, after twenty-four years of elected service. For those of you who don't know Caleb, I am sorry that you did not have an opportunity to meet this remarkable man during his many visits to discuss the myriad of issues facing Native American people. He has a strength of character and honor about him that you could not help but recognize and admire instantly when you met him.

Caleb's tenure of twenty-four years on the Board is truly a testament to his leadership and his character. As we all know, very few politicians can have a career that spans twenty-four years and even fewer can do it with the grace and dedication that Caleb has. It has been an honor to work with Caleb on the many issues that we have worked on together. His commitment and dedication to improve the lives of not only the Native Americans on the Fort Peck Indian Reservation, but the lives of Native Americans throughout the Nation, are an inspiration to me. He has worked tirelessly to improve the level of funding for Indian health care programs and Native American education programs. He has stood in the Halls of Congress, often in the face of severe opposition, defending the governmental and sovereign rights of tribes. He has stood up to the federal government when the federal government has failed in its obligation to the tribes of this country. Significantly, he did all of this without ever making an enemy and without ever treating any person with disrespect. We can all stand to learn something from this man who while he had many battles, he never made any enemies.

I will miss my friend's visits to Washington, but I will mostly miss his advice on the Native American issues. Native American Country is losing a great leader, but I am sure that the basketball teams in Poplar are regaining a loyal fan. I understand that Caleb hopes to write a book about the history of the Assiniboine and Sioux Tribes from treaty time to modern time. I wish him well in his endeavor and look forward to reading his book.●

At the request of the Senator from Connecticut, Mr. LIEBERMAN, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CENTRAL CONNECTICUT STATE UNIVERSITY'S 150TH BIRTHDAY CELEBRATION

● Mr. DODD. Mr. President, it gives me great pleasure to rise today to commemorate the 150th anniversary of the founding the Central Connecticut State University. To stand the test of time, as Central has, an educational institution must respond to the educational needs of its students. At each turn over its notable 150-year history, Central has effectively positioned itself to address the new challenges of the day. While a great deal has changed at Central—and for that matter in the world—over the years, the school's primary concern and motivating goal—educating students—has remained unaltered.

Central Connecticut State University is Connecticut's oldest publicly-supported institution of higher learning and enjoys a rich and colorful legacy. Founded by order of the Connecticut State Legislature on June 22, 1849, the institution, first known as the Normal School, was a two-year teacher training facility. On May 15, 1850, Henry Barnard, the school's first ''principal,'' as he was then called, and a handful of faculty and staff members welcomed the first class of 30 students.

The Normal School was the object of contentious political debate in Hartford and intermittent appropriation cuts during its early years. In fact, the school was closed from 1867 to 1869 due to lack of funding. Yet the school and its supporters persevered. Each passing year brought bigger classes to the Normal School and with them, greater support from the members of the citizenry who understood the vital importance of higher education to their future and the future of the state. As was common at many of the era's institutions of higher learning, the Normal School's student body was overwhelmingly unbalanced in its male to female ratio. Interestingly, however, at the Normal School women, not men, made up the majority of the student body through the late 19th Century. In fact, due to the social norms of the time, which held the teaching of elementary and grade-school children as women's work, men disappeared from the student body at the Normal School for over thirty years—a change that would forever influence the character of the institution. The loss of male students did not stop the expansion of Normal School. Growing beyond the confines of its original building at the corner of Chestnut and Main in New Britain, in 1922 the school moved to the spacious campus it now occupies in the Belvedere section of New Britain.

The institution began to blossom academically in 1933 when it started to offer four-year baccalaureate degrees, changing its name to the Teachers College of Connecticut. The expansion of academic offerings drew men back to the college during the 1930s. Following World War II, the Teachers College of Connecticut, like many academic institutions, experienced remarkable growth and expansion. That growth led the State Legislature to grant the college the right to confer liberal arts degrees and to rename the institution the Central Connecticut State College in 1959. As the needs of its students have continued to change and expand in more recent times, so too has Central. In 1983, Central began offering graduate degrees and evolved into its present form—Central Connecticut State University.

With an enrollment of nearly 12,000 graduate and undergraduate students, Central is the largest of the four Universities within the Connecticut State System. With 80 programs of study, 38 departments and 5 individual schools dedicated to disciplines across the spectrum of learning, Central Connecticut State University has emerged as one of the premier regional universities in New England.

Always on the forefront of educational trends, Central recognized the lack of emphasis placed on the historical role of women and drew upon the significant role played by women in its own development to become one of the first schools in the Nation to build, in 1977, a Women's Center. The Center, which has become a highly respected credit to the university, offers a number of services for and about women

and has become a model for universities around the country. In 1990, Central became the first school in Connecticut to offer an accredited Computer Science degree, helping to prepare Connecticut students for the Information Age. Its Robert C. Vance Distinguished Lecturer Program has drawn United States Presidents and renowned leaders from around the globe to speak in New Britain. It is clear, that through these special programs, as well as others, Central Connecticut State University provides its students with a valuable educational opportunity and has established itself as one of the Nation's finest regional universities.

So I say again, Mr. President, that I am proud to stand on the floor of the United States Senate to recognize the enduring dedication of Central Connecticut State University to its students, to its state, and to excellence in education. Today, under the adept guidance of President Richard L. Judd and with the effort of so many talented and committed faculty and staff, the university continues to grow and prosper. I believe that Central's unceasing pursuit of excellence will ensure it remains a vital academic institution for many years to come.●

ON THE LIFE OF EDWARD C. BANFIELD

● Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, Edward C. Banfield has died. This had to come. He was 83. Yet little were those who loved him prepared. Or ready, you might say.

He held, of course, Henry Lee Shattuck Chair in Government at Harvard and, as Richard Bernstein notes in his fine obituary in The Times, was most active in the Joint Center for Urban Studies of M.I.T. and Harvard in the 1960s and 1970s. For part of that time I was chairman of the Joint Center and so came to know him at the peak of his long, comparably brilliant and yet understated career. In 1970, he published The Unheavenly City, which stands to this day as the most salient and, well, heart-wrenching exposition of the intractable nature of so many urban problems. He had been there before. As early as 1955 he wrote, with Martin Meyerson, Politics, Planning and the Public Interest which argued that the near religious zeal for high-rise public housing then current in Chicago, and across the land, would be a disaster. One notes it has taken Chicago the better part of thirty-five years to realize this, and start dynamiting the projects, as they came to be known. Just so was the seminal, The Moral Basis of a Backward Society, a study of a small village in Southern Italy, which he wrote with Laura Fasano-Banfield, his radiantly intelligent wife and companion of sixty-odd years.

Now of course, none of this work was welcome, especially in academe. Not least because it made too much sense to be rejected. James Q. Wilson, once his student, now his heir, got this just right in a memorial that appeared in last week's Weekly Standard entitled ''The Man Who Knew Too Much, Edward C. Banfield, 1916–1999.'' He was onto The Mob, inside The Agency, privy to The Plan. And yet they never got him. He was, as he would say, a ''swamp Yankee,'' a tough breed.

He was also a great teacher, something Robert J. Samuelson writes about so wonderfully well in The Washington Post. Above all he taught his students to pursue the truth, ''no matter how inconvenient, unpopular, unfashionable or discomforting.'' The greatest gift a great teacher can give.

He could be indulgent if the case seemed hopeless. I went to see him at the time I was thinking of running for the Senate. What would he advise? ''Well,'' he said, ''you could do that. Who knows, you might make a good Senator.'' Those words are with me to this moment.

I ask that the obituary from The Times, the article from The Weekly Standard, and the column from The Washington Post be included in the RECORD.

The articles follow.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 8, 1999]

E.C. BANFIELD, 83, MAVERICK ON URBAN POLICY ISSUES, DIES

(By Richard Bernstein)

Edward C. Banfield, a professor emeritus of government at Harvard University whose work on urban policy and the causes of poverty gave him a reputation as a brilliant maverick, died Sept. 30 at his summer home in Vermont. He was 83 and lived in Cambridge, Mass.

Mr. Banfield, born on a farm in Bloomfield, Conn., held Harvard's Henry Lee Shattuck Chair in Government for many years. He was one of the intellectual leaders of the Harvard-Massachusetts Institute of Technology Joint Center for Urban Studies in the 1960's and 70's, when the problems of cities were prominent on the national political agenda.

His books and articles had a sharp contrarian edge. He was a critic of almost every mainstream liberal idea in domestic policy, especially the use of Federal aid to help relieve urban poverty. Mr. Banfield argued that at best Government programs would fail because they aimed at the wrong problems; at worst they would make the problems worse. He fostered generations of graduate students, some of whom became leading figures in American intellectual life. They included James Q. Wilson, who succeeded him in his chair at Harvard, and Christopher DeMuth, president of the American Enterprise Institute in Washington.

Mr. Banfield received his B.A. in English for the University of Connecticut in 1938 and went to work for the United States Forest Service. After jobs with the New Hampshire Farm Bureau and the United States Farm Security Administration in Washington and California, he went to the University of Chicago to work on his doctorate in political science. Chicago at that time, under the influence of figures like Milton Friedman and Leo Strauss, was a bastion of Laissez-faire politics, a cause that Mr. Banfield later promoted in his own work.

He served briefly on the faculty in Chicago, moving to Harvard in 1959. He taught at the University of Pennsylvania before returning to Harvard at the end of his career.

In 1955 Mr. Banfield and Mr. Meyerson collaborated on ''Politics, Planning and the Public Interest,'' which examined Chicago's public housing projects. That book was one of several in which Mr. Banfield found Government programs to be foiled by a law of unintended consequences. In the Chicago case he predicted that creating tall institutional buildings full of small apartments would have the unintended effect of racially isolating the urban poor. A major theme of Mr. Banfield's work on poverty, which was often angrily criticized in liberal circles, is that culture plays a more important role than factors like discrimination or lack of education in impeding a person's economic progress.

Among his most influential books was ''The Moral Basis of a Backward Society,'' a study of a small village in southern Italy, researched in collaboration with his wife, the former Laura Fasano. Mr. Banfield's thesis, summed up in a term he coined, ''amoral familism,'' was that the narrow focus on family relations prevented people from cooperating with those outside the family or village.

He is survived by his wife; a daughter, Laura Banfield Hoguet, a lawyer; a son, Elliott A. Banfield, an illustrator, and four grandchildren.

Mr. Banfield's emphasis on culture as the basic element in poverty drew accusations that he was promoting a ''blame the victim'' attitude. In his 1970 book ''The Unheavenly City,'' and in various papers that he published in the late 60's, he recognized the existence and harm of racism but propounded the view that economic class and not race was the essential ingredient in poverty.

In that book Mr. Banfield constructed a sociological portrait of what he called ''the lower-class individual'' as someone who was very different from the middle-class professionals who sought ways to solve his problems. ''The lower-class individual lives moment to moment,'' he wrote. ''Impulse governs his behavior either because he cannot discipline himself to sacrifice a present for a future satisfaction or because he has no sense of the future. He is therefore radically improvident.''

Mr. Banfield's role as an adviser to President Richard M. Nixon and chairman of his Model Cities Task force gave his published views an extra measure of controversy. During the Reagan Administration he served on a task force seeking ways to increase public support for the arts. But his subsequent book, ''the Democratic Muse: Visual Arts and the Public Interest,'' argued that Federal support of the arts was neither justified by the Constitution nor useful in practice.

''Affording enjoyment to people is not a proper function of organizations serving the common good,'' he wrote in that book.

[From the Weekly Standard, Oct. 18, 1999]

THE MAN WHO KNEW TOO MUCH—EDWARD C. BANFIELD, 1916–1999

(By James Q. Wilson)

In the increasingly dull, narrow, methodologically obscure world of the social sciences, it is hard to find a mind that speaks not only to its students but to its nation. Most scholars can't write, many can't think. Ed Banfield could write and think.

When he died a few days ago, his life gave new meaning to the old saw about being a prophet without honor in your own country. Almost everything he wrote was criticized at the time it appeared for being wrongheaded. In 1955 he and Martin Meyerson published an account of how Chicago built public housing projects in which they explained how mischievous these projects were likely to be: tall, institutional buildings filled with tiny

apartments built in areas that guaranteed racial segregation. All this was to be done on the basis of the federal Housing Act of 1949, which said little about what goals housing was to achieve or why other ways of financing it—housing vouchers, for example—should not be available. This was heresy to the authors of the law and to most right-thinking planners.

Within two decades, high-rise public housing was widely viewed as a huge mistake and efforts were made to create vouchers so that poor families could afford to rent housing in the existing market. Local authorities in St. Louis had dynamited a big housing project there after describing it as a hopeless failure. It is not likely that Ed and Martin's book received much credit for having pointed the way.

In 1958, Ed, with the assistance of his wife, Laura, explained why a backward area in southern Italy was poor. The reason was not government neglect or poor education but culture. In this area of Italy, the Banfields said in The Moral Basis of a Backward Society, people would not cooperate outside the boundaries of their immediate families. These ''amoral familists'' were the product of a high death rate, a defective system for owning land, and the absence of any extended families. By contrast, in a town of about the same size located in an equally forbidding part of southern Utah, the residents published a local newspaper and had a remarkable variety of associates, each busily involved in improving the life of the community. In southern Italy, people would not cooperate; in southern Utah, they scarcely did anything else.

Foreign aid programs ignored this finding and went about persuading other nations to accept large grants to build new projects. Few of these projects created sustained economic growth. Where growth did occur, as in Singapore, Hong Kong, and South Korea, there was little foreign aid and what existed made little difference.

Today, David S. Landes, in his magisterial book that explains why some nations become wealthy while others remain poor, offers a one-word explanation: culture. He is right, but the Banfield book written forty years earlier is not mentioned.

In 1970, Ed published his best-known and most controversial work, The Unheavenly City. In it he argued that the ''urban crisis'' was misunderstood. Many aspects of the so-called crisis, such as congestion or the business flight to the suburbs, are not really problems at all; some that are modest problems, such as transportation, could be managed rather well by putting high peak-hour tolls on key roads and staggering working hours; and many of the greatest problems, such as crime, poverty, and racial injustice, are things that we shall find it exceptionally difficult to manage.

Consider racial injustice. Racism is quite real, though much diminished in recent years, and it has a powerful effect. But the central problem for black Americans is not racism but poverty. And poverty is in part the result of where blacks live and what opportunities confront them. When they live in areas with many unskilled workers and few jobs for unskilled people, they will suffer. When they grow up in families that do not own small businesses, they will find it harder to move into jobs available to them or to meet people who can tell them about jobs elsewhere. That whites treat blacks differently than they treat other whites is obviously true, but ''much of what appears . . . as race prejudice is really class prejudice.''

In 1987 William Julius Wilson, a black scholar, published his widely acclaimed book, The Truly Disadvantaged. In it he says that, while racism remains a powerful force, it cannot explain the plight of inner-city blacks. The problem is poverty—social class—and that poverty flows from the material conditions of black neighborhoods. Banfield's book is mentioned in Wilson's bibliography, but his argument is mentioned only in passing.

Both Wilson and Banfield explain the core urban problems as ones that flow from social class. To Wilson, an ''underclass'' has emerged, made up of people who lack skills, experience long-term unemployment, engage in street crime, and are part of families with prolonged welfare dependency. Banfield would have agreed. But to Wilson, the underclass suffers from a shortage of jobs and available fathers, while for Banfield it suffers from a defective culture.

Wilson argued that changing the economic condition of underclass blacks would change their underclass culture; Banfield argued that unless the underclass culture was first changed (and he doubted much could be done in that regard), the economic condition of poor blacks would not improve. The central urban problem of modern America is to discover which theory is correct.

Banfield had some ideas to help address the culture (though he thought no government would adopt them): Keep the unemployment rate low, repeal minimum-wage laws, lower the school-leaving age, provide a negative income tax (that is, a cash benefit) to the ''competent poor,'' supply intensive birth-control guidance to the ''incompetent poor,'' and pay problem families to send their children to decent day-care programs.

The Unheavenly City sold well but was bitterly attacked by academics and book reviewers; Wilson's book was widely praised by the same critics. But on the central facts, both books say the same thing, and on the unknown facts—What will work?—neither book can (of necessity) offer much evidence.

Ed Banfield's work would probably have benefited from a quality he was incapable of supplying. If it had been written in the dreary style of modern sociology or, worse, if he had produced articles filled with game-theoretic models and endless regression equations, he might have been taken more seriously. But Ed was a journalist before he was a scholar, and his commitment to clear, forceful writing was unshakable.

He was more than a clear writer with a Ph.D.; everything he wrote was embedded in a powerful theoretical overview of the subject. ''Theory,'' to him, meant clarifying how people can think about a difficulty, and the theories he produced—on social planning, political influence, economic backwardness, and urban problems—are short masterpieces of incisive prose.

His remarkable mind was deeply rooted in Western philosophy as well as social science. To read his books is to be carried along by extraordinary prose in which you learn about David Hume and John Stuart Mill as well as about pressing human issues. To him, the central human problem was cooperation: How can society induce people to work together in informal groups—Edmund Burke's ''little platoon''—to manage their common problems? No one has ever thought through this issue more lucidly, and hence no one I can think of has done more to illuminate the human condition of the modern world.

A few months ago, a group of Ed's former students and colleagues met for two days to discuss his work. Our fondness for this amusing and gregarious man was manifest, as were our memories of the tortures through which he put us as he taught us to think and write. Rereading his work as a whole reminded us that we had been privileged to know one of the best minds we had ever encountered, a person whose rigorous intellect and extraordinary knowledge created a standard to which all of us aspired but which none of us attained.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 14, 1999]

THE GIFT OF A GREAT TEACHER

(By Robert J. Samuelson)

If you are lucky in life, you will have at least one great teacher. More than three decades ago, I had Ed Banfield, a political scientist who taught mainly at the University of Chicago and Harvard University. Ed's recent death at 83 saddened me (which was expected) and left me with a real sense of loss (which wasn't). Although we had stayed in touch, we were never intimate friends or intellectual soul-mates. The gap between us in intellectual candlepower was too great. But he had loomed large in my life, and I have been puzzling why his death has so affected me.

I think the answer—and the reason for writing about something so personal—goes to the heart of what it means to be a great teacher. By teacher, I am not referring primarily to classroom instructors, because learning in life occurs mainly outside of schools. I first encountered Ed in a lecture hall, but his greatness did not lie in giving good lectures (which he did). It lay instead in somehow transmitting life-changing lessons. If I had not known him, I would be a different person. He helped me become who I am and, more important, who I want to be.

When you lose someone like that, there is a hole. It is a smaller hole than losing a parent, a child or close friend. But it is still a hole, because great teachers are so rare. I have, for example, worked for some very talented editors. A few have earned my lasting gratitude for improving my reporting or writing. But none has been a great teacher; none has changed my life.

What gave Ed this power was, first, his ideas. He made me see new things or old things in new ways. The political scientist James Q. Wilson—first Ed's student, then his collaborator—has called Banfield ''the most profound student of American politics in this century.'' Although arguable, this is surely plausible.

Americans take democracy, freedom and political stability for granted. Ed was more wary. These great things do not exist in isolation. They must somehow fuse into a political system that fulfills certain essential social functions: to protect the nation; to provide some continuity in government and policy; to maintain order and modulate society's most passionate conflicts. The trouble, Ed believed, is that democracies have self-destructive tendencies and that, in modern America, these had intensified.

On the whole, he regretted the disappearance after World War II of a political system based on big-city machines (whose supporters were rewarded with patronage jobs and contracts) and on party ''bosses'' (who dictated political candidates from city council to Congress and, often, the White House). It was not that he favored patronage, corruption or bosses for their own sake. But in cities, they created popular support for government and gave it the power to accomplish things. And they emphasized material gain over ideological fervor.

Postwar suburbanization and party ''reforms''—weakening bosses and machines—destroyed this system. Its replacement, Ed feared, was inferior. ''Whereas the old system had promised personal rewards,'' he wrote, ''the new one promises social reform.'' Politicians would now merchandise themselves by selling false solutions to exaggerated problems. ''The politician, like the TV news commentator, must always have something to say even when nothing urgently needs to be said,'' he wrote in 1970. By some

years, this anticipated the term ''talking head.'' People would lose respect for government because many ''solutions'' would fail. Here, too, he anticipated. Later, polls showed dropping pubic confidence in national leaders. Ed was not surprised.

He taught that you had to understand the world as it is, not as you wished it to be. This was sound advice for an aspiring reporter. And Ed practiced it. In 1954 and 1955, he and his wife, Laura (they would ultimately be married 61 years), spent time in a poor Italian village to explain its poverty. The resulting book—''The Moral Basis of a Backward Society''—remains a classic. Families in the village, it argued, so distrusted each other that they could not cooperate to promote common prosperity. The larger point (still missed by many economists) is that local culture, not just ''markets,'' determines economic growth.

What brought Ed fleeting prominence—notoriety, really—was ''The Unheavenly City.'' Published in 1970. Prosperity, government programs and less racial discrimination might lift some from poverty, he said. But the worst problems of poverty and the cities would remain. They resulted from a ''lower class'' whose members were so impulsive and ''present oriented'' that they attached ''no value to work, sacrifice, self-improvement, or service to family, friends or community.'' They dropped out of school, had illegitimate children and were unemployed. Government couldn't easily alter their behavior.

For this message, Ed was reviled as a reactionary. He repeatedly said that most black Americans didn't belong to the ''lower class'' and that it contained many whites. Still, many dismissed him as a racist. Over time his theories gained some respectability from the weight of experience. Poverty defied government assaults; his ''lower class'' was relabeled ''the underclass.'' But when he wrote, Ed was assailing prevailing opinion. He knew he would be harshly, even viciously, attacked. He wrote anyway and endured the consequences.

This was the deeper and more important lesson. Perhaps all great teachers—whether parents, bosses, professors or whoever—ultimately convey some moral code. Ed surely did. What he was saying in the 1960s was not what everyone else was saying. I felt uneasy with the reigning orthodoxy. But I didn't know why. Ed helped me understand my doubts and made me feel that it was important to give them expression. The truth had to be pursued, no matter how inconvenient, unpopular; unfashionable or discomforting. Ed did not teach that; he lived it. This was his code, and it was—for anyone willing to receive it—an immeasurable gift.●

NOTICE

REGISTRATION OF MASS MAILINGS

The filing date for 1999 third quarter mass mailings is October 25, 1999. If your office did no mass mailings during this period, please submit a form that states ''none.''

Mass mailing registrations, or negative reports, should be submitted to the Senate Office of Public Records, 232 Hart Building, Washington, DC 20510–7116.

The Public Records office will be open from 8:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. on the filing date to accept these filings. For further information, please contact the Public Records office at (202) 224–0322.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, OCTOBER 19, 1999

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until the hour of 1:15 p.m. on Tuesday, October 19. I further ask consent that on Tuesday, immediately following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate then immediately recess until 2:15 p.m. for the weekly party conferences to meet. I further ask consent that the mandatory quorums required under rule XXII be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. GORTON. For the information of all Senators, the Senate will convene tomorrow at 1:15 p.m., and at 2:15 p.m. two cloture votes will occur with respect to amendments to the campaign finance bill. Following the vote or votes, the Senate may resume consideration of the campaign finance bill. However, debate on this legislation is coming to a close, and Senators should anticipate the consideration of the partial-birth abortion bill, the continuing resolution, and available appropriations conference reports during the remainder of this week's session of the Senate.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GORTON. If there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. FEINGOLD. I ask the Senator from Washington why the Senate is not convening until 1:15?

Mr. GORTON. The Senate is not convening until 1:15 at the direction of the majority leader.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I am wondering why. It would be a good idea to take up this bill that we have before us and work on it, take up amendments in the morning, instead of losing a half a day. Is there some substantive reason why we are not working on a Tuesday morning, after we started the voting process already on Monday night?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request?

Mr. FEINGOLD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. President. I find it hard to understand, as we have just had a vote, which was supposed to be an up-or-down vote on the question of whether or not we are going to ban soft money. The opponents of reform obviously did not want to face that vote.

Quite a number of them had come out to the floor this afternoon to say they were against banning soft money. So they had a chance to vote not to ban soft money. Why didn't they do that? They threw the vote. They all came out here and unanimously voted not to table the McCain-Feingold bill, which simply bans soft money. Now they do not want to have us meet tomorrow morning.

We are not going to do our job tomorrow morning. We are not even going to debate, not going to take up amendments. We are just going to take the morning off.

Mr. GORTON. Regular order.

Mr. FEINGOLD. We see here the unbelievable desire to avoid the issue.

Mr. GORTON. Regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The regular order has been called for. The Senator must either object or permit the unanimous consent to go forward.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I will not object, having had the chance to express my dismay at this schedule, which is nothing but a way to avoid the issue.

Mr. GORTON. Regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TUESDAY, OCTOBER 19, 1999

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:05 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, October 19, 1999, at 1:15 p.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 18, 1999:

NATIONAL SECURITY EDUCATION BOARD

HERSCHELLE S. CHALLENOR, OF GEORGIA, TO BE A MEMBER OF THE NATIONAL SECURITY EDUCATION BOARD FOR A TERM OF FOUR YEARS. (REAPPOINTMENT)

IN THE ARMY

THE FOLLOWING ARMY NATIONAL GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES OFFICER FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE RESERVE OF THE ARMY TO THE GRADE INDICATED UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 12203:

To be brigadier general

COL. WILLIAM F. SMITH III, 0000.

IN THE NAVY

THE FOLLOWING NAMED OFFICERS FOR TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE INDICATED IN THE UNITED STATES NAVY UNDER TITLE 10, U.S.C., SECTION 5721:

To be lieutenant commander

GEORGE R. ARNOLD, 0000
BUFORD D. BARKER, 0000
HAROLD T. BRADY, 0000
DARIN J. BROWN, 0000
ANTHONY C. CARULLO, 0000
CHRIS J. CLEMMENSEN, 0000
BRUCE W. GRISSOM, 0000
RICHARD S. HAGER, 0000
MARTIN H. HARDY, 0000
GREGORY R. KERCHER, 0000
ROBERT C. MILLER, 0000
JON RODGERS, 0000
RICHARD E. SEIF, 0000
STEVEN F. SMITH, 0000
TODD S. WEEKS, 0000

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE BOOKKEEPER BOOK DEACIDIFICATION PROCESS

HON. CHARLES H. TAYLOR

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1999

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the Appropriations Subcommittee on the Legislative Branch of both the House of Representatives and the Senate have actively supported for over two decades the Library of Congress' efforts to develop new paper preservation technologies aimed at ending the ''brittle book'' problem. Our joint objective has been to prevent and slow down the disintegration of ''the written word'' in the nation's libraries and archives due to the acids in modern books and manuscripts. The attached article from the Pittsburgh Business Times & Journal, dated April 2, 1999, describes the new ''Bookkeeper'' technology that chemically neutralizes these damaging acids in paper. Bookkeeper, with research, development and demonstration assistance from the Library of Congress, has perfected both a ''mass'' process for library books as well as consumer products that can be used for smaller collections.

Mass deacidification makes it possible to preserve library books and manuscripts in their original format for hundreds of years, rather than allowing these precious materials to become brittle and unusable. It is a pleasure to recognize the efforts of the Library of Congress and Preservation Technologies Inc., the Pittsburgh-area company that owns the Bookkeeper process. They have worked collaboratively and energetically to save already nearly a quarter of a million Library of Congress books so they will be available for Congress and America's citizens to use for many more generations. It should be noted that this American process is now being used by scores of other institutions in the U.S. and Europe and that several governments and companies are still actively working on related processes to save endangered, at-risk cultural materials.

James Burd, president of Preservation Technologies, said the product solves a perplexing problem facing scrapbook enthusiasts. ''They tell you not to put anything acidic in a memory book'' he said. ''They don't tell you what to do if you have something on acid paper, but you want to keep it.''

The need to use acid-free paper is a message that can't be avoided at a craft or scrapbook store. Making scrapbooks is a $3 billion annual business, part of the $20 billion craft industry, according to Mr. Burd.

Archival Mist is, in essence, an antacid for paper. A powder, magnesium oxide, that resembles crushed Tums, is suspended, not dissolved, in an expensive inert liquid. The liquid evaporates within a minute, even if a page is drenched. It is said to be safe for use on virtually anything. The Library of Congress tested it on thousands of papers, inks, glues and book covers.

But the high cost of the liquid, which is also used as a coolant poured over super computing chips, pushes the suggested retail price for Archival Mist to $40 for the 5.3 ounce bottle.

Mr. Burd knows that's not the optimum selling point for a retail product no larger than a can of deodorant.

''Everybody said $20 is the magic price point,'' Mr. Burd said. ''But there are dollars in the bottle. The chemistry is very expensive.''

A bottle of Archival Mist can treat about 40 standard sheets of paper. Since most items put in a scrapbook are much smaller, such as a newspaper wedding announcement, Mr. Burd said deacidification costs about 20 to 25 cents per item.

Ms. Higgins is convinced serious scrapbookers will spend the money.

''The thing about the $40 price is that one bottle contains enough to treat 300 typical clippings,'' she said. ''Really, if we can convince people that this is one of the best investments you can make in scrapbooking, it's not too much.''

It certainly isn't much compared with what the government spent trying to solve the problem. Charged with keeping books forever and faced with decaying acidic collections, the Library of Congress launched an all-out attack on acid in the 1980's.

After the government spent 15 years and more than $30 million developing a gas-based antacid to treat a chamber full of books, the chemical company it had working on the project gave up. Though most of the technique's kinks were worked out, it brought challenges and risks that Bookkeeper does not. Once, a chemical reaction caused a major fire at a laboratory working with the gaseous mixture.

Several other companies developed options based on dissolving an antacid in a liquid. But they required using more volatile liquids and they damaged some books.

Richard Spatz had led the development of the first generation of Bookkeeper as a Koppers Industries, Inc. executive, receiving a patent in 1985. After his 1988 retirement, he bought the patent for Bookkeeper, which at the time used freon, and tried to sell the idea to the Library of Congress. But library officials didn't become interested until they had exhausted their own research's possibilities.

[From the Pittsburgh Business Times & Journal, Apr. 2, 1999]

WHAT'S A MEMORY WORTH?

(By Ethan Lott)

Archival Mist can preserve scrapbook pages, but will the price reduce its mass market appeal?

The quick explanation of Archival Mist is that it preserves memories.

The how it works, why it's important and why someone should shell out $40 for a 5.3-ounce bottle requires an explanation that starts in the mid-1980s and covers Chemistry 101 and millions of dollars in government research.

This complexity is one reason why marketing Archival Mist presents a challenge.

So Preservation Technologies, the company launching Archival Mist as its first retail product, is turning to a market that understands the basic need to use acid-free paperscrapbook hobbyists and craft store regulars.

Archival Mist was unveiled in February at the Hobby Industry Associations trade show in Dallas. Shipments to about 100 stores began two weeks ago. Last week, the company finalized its order with the nation's largest craft chain, Michaels Stores Inc., and started shipping to its 516 stores this week.

Patrons of craft stores are more likely to already know that acidic paper becomes brittle as it ages. That's why some old books have pages that fall apart. Likewise, newspaper clippings, report cards and birth announcements may not stand the test of time in that old scrapbook in the attic.

Archival Mist makes any paper it touches non-acidic. It is the retail version of the Bookkeeper solution Preservation Technologies uses to save aging library books.

The company is in the midst of its second major contract with the Library of Congress, for which it is treating hundreds of thousands of aging books. After a dip in its pool of special liquid, acid in the book is neutralized. Within hours, the book is dry and ready to be shipped back to Washington.

Archival Mist allows consumers to do the same thing, page by page, with a hand-held spray bottle. Get it?

Becky Higgins, creative editor of Creating Keepsakes Scrapbook Magazine, sure does. She's been trying out Archival Mist and gives it a glowing endorsement.

''I use it a lot,'' Ms. Higgins said. ''Scrapbooking has become a fun hobby. A lot of scrapbookers put together these gorgeous pages, but they won't last for generations because they include products that aren't acid free.''

Finally, the library took a look at Bookkeeper. After testing the product for 18 months, the library gave Preservation Technologies a $1 million test contract in 1995. The company treated 90,000 books under that contract, then in 1997 received a four-year, $3 million contract to treat up to 300,000 books.

Ken Harris, preservation projects director at the Library of Congress, said the company's technology was the right solution at the right time.

''Aside from the fact that it works and works well, it doesn't have all these negative side effects,'' Mr. Harris said. ''The whole library community gives testimony to the Bookkeeper process by awarding contracts.''

Mr. Burd said the second contract with the Library of Congress is what finally gave the company credibility in the eyes of the library community. Though the Library of Congress is still the company's biggest customer, about 30 major research libraries, plus archive collection holders worldwide, have contracts with Preservation Technologies.

Getting into the spray market was not an entirely new idea for the company. It already sells Bookkeeper as a spray to professionals who want to test it on their own or treat items too large or brittle to ship to Cranberry Township.

Though he wouldn't give overall company revenue figures, Mr. Burd said Bookkeeper spray currently represents about 10 percent of the company's business.

He said the total spray business could account for 25 percent of revenue as Archival Mist sales grow.

Until more stores carry Archival Mist, the company will ship orders from Cranberry or direct consumers to the nearest retail store carrying the product. Information can be found at the company's Web site—www.ptlp.com.

TRIBUTE TO EDWARD BELA ''API'' UJVAGI

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1999

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the lifetime of contributions that Edward Béla Újvagi made to his family, community and to our world before his passing on Monday, October 4, 1999. A resident of the city for over forty years, Mr. Újvagi was an erudite gentleman of the first order. Popular and well loved, he embodied the ideals of a virtuous and loving generation. He will be missed by all who knew him. On behalf of Ohio's lawmakers and citizens, I wish to pay tribute to this outstanding individual.

Born in Budapest, Hungary, on March 11, 1916 Mr. Újvagi was an avid outdoorsman, taking part in activities such as ski jumping, glider flying, boxing and more. He became a precision machinist and master tool and die maker, founding a small company that specialized in producing precision analytical balances. His company, however, was eventually nationalized by the communist regime. When the people of Hungary revolted against this government in 1956, Mr. Újvagi, at the age of 40, fled to the United States with his wife and four children. A fifth would be born in America. They spent six months in an Austrian refugee camp along the way. Despite arriving in our country with little more than the clothes on their backs, the family refused to give up. Mr. Újvagi founded the Toledo Scientific Instrument Co. in his own basement with only a milling machine and lathe. A very capable man, he was able to use his skills to develop and expand this business into E & C Manufacturing Co. Inc., which has operated for more than four decades. In America, he was able to piece together again the precious shards of a dream deferred.

Edward Újvagi was truly representative of the ethnically diverse, blue-collar individuals who make up the city of Toledo. Having endured internment in a Russian labor camp following World War II, he was someone who understood freedom: he knew what it meant to have it taken away. He was not just a man who discovered a new life in another country; he was a man who embraced newfound opportunities and possibilities. He took an active role in his community, belonging to the Toledo Chamber of Commerce, St. Stephen's Catholic Church, the Hungarian Club of Toledo, Hungarian Communion of Friends and many more groups. Though fiercely proud of his heritage, he also worked hard to become an American citizen, accomplishing that in April 1965. Mr. Újvagi was also a great believer in education and urged all of his children to expand their own horizons and pursue their own dreams.

Christopher Morely once wrote, ''There is only one success—to be able to spend your life in your own way.'' Based on this, I honestly believe that Edward Újvagi was successful in life. He lived his life to the fullest and will be remembered as a man of love, faith, integrity and accomplishment. On behalf of the people of the Ninth District, I would like to extend my deepest sympathies to Mr. Újvagi's family, his wife Magda, daughters Magdalene, and Bernadette Újvagi; sons Charles Edward J. and Toledo City Council President Peter Újvagi; brother Istvan Újvagi; and 17 grandchildren. May our thoughts and prayers strengthen them in this time of reflection and profound loss and may a lifetime of memories of this rare individual sustain them today and always.

TRIBUTE TO THE B'NAI ISRAEL CONGREGATION OF SACRAMENTO

HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1999

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in tribute to the B'nai Israel Congregation of Sacramento. This year, the congregation will be celebrating its 150th year anniversary. As the members gather together to celebrate, I ask all my colleagues to join with me in saluting this commendable achievement.

B'nai Israel's humble beginning can be traced back to the ''Gold Rush'' days of 1849, when shop owners and crafts people gathered to celebrate the High Holy Days in Old Sacramento. Among these people was Moses Hyman, who invited fellow Jews into his Front Street home. Later, Hyman became known as both a pioneer of California Judaism and the father of Temple B'nai Israel.

A fire swept through Sacramento just two months after Hyman helped dedicate the congregation's first synagogue in 1852. The fire destroyed the chapel as well as 85 percent of the city. However, Congregation B'nai Israel persevered. In 1858, the congregation purchased another place of worship from the Methodist Episcopalian group, which had been built on the same property as the congregation's first chapel. Unfortunately, nature continued to conspire against B'nai Israel. After another fire and floods that destroyed the synagogue, the congregation established its third permanent home in a former concert hall for the First Presbyterian Church in Sacramento.

Here, B'nai Israel continued to grow and thrive for decades until the split of Orthodox and Reformed Jews in the early twentieth century. This split, however, only served to strengthen the congregation. Touting itself as a congregation of ''Reformed Israelites,'' Congregation B'nai Israel had grown in size to over 107 families. Their new home, on Fifteenth Street in Sacramento, served as B'nai Israel's religious home for over 30 years.

In an effort to expand the congregation, President Dalton Feinstein successfully promoted the idea of relocating to the present temple site at 3600 Riverside Boulevard. To make this dream a reality, a major fund-raising campaign was successfully launched. The new temple was finally dedicated in 1954, thanks to the dedication of volunteers who raised money and found others to donate materials. An education wing, named after Buddy Kandel, was added in the early 1960's.

Throughout the years, the congregation has been involved in several community services and causes. Such involvement includes demonstrations against pogroms after World War I, organizing institutes for Christian clergy members to improve Judeo-Christian understanding, and conducting services at Folsom State Prison.

Rabbi Lester Frazi, who took over the pulpit in January 1974 and remained over 20 years, continued the B'nai Israel tradition of service to the greater Sacramento area. In addition to serving as president of the Interfaith Service Bureau, his areas of focus included helping pregnant teenagers, feeding the hungry, and supporting the gay and lesbian community.

In 1995, Rabbi Brad Bloom was installed as Rabbi Frazi's replacement. Under this leadership, the congregation has been involved in several areas, including Shabbat food deliveries to people with AIDS, Mitzvah Day, children's book collections, High Holy Day food donations to the Sacramento Food Basket, and more.

On June 18, 1999, arson fires were set at B'nai Israel, Kenesset Israel Torah Center, and Beth Shalom. Despite this horrifying act, the congregation has remained strong. In addition, support from the community during this time of trial has been overwhelming. On June 21 at the Sacramento Community Center, over 4,000 people joined in a Unity Rally in a show of solidarity. At the rally, patrons were greeted with signs bearing the sentiment, ''We are strong. We are proud. We are together.'' Despite its many tragedies in its existence, B'nai Israel has grown stronger and stronger.

Mr. Speaker, as the members of the B'nai Israel Congregation gather to celebrate their 150th anniversary, I am honored to pay tribute to one of Sacramento's most exceptional organizations. Concerning their trials, the perseverance and dedication of this congregation are particularly incredible. I ask all of my colleagues to join with me in wishing B'nai Israel continued success in all its future endeavors.

CPA WEBTRUST

HON. ROBERT W. NEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1999

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight an excellent private sector initiative that is making cyberspace a safer place for consumers to shop: CPA WebTrust.

The Internet is transforming the way consumers across this country are buying products and services. Today, 55 percent of the population uses the Internet in the United States, and that number is expected to increase substantially by the end of 1999. Last year, 35 million households purchased something on the Internet. In addition, more than one quarter of all U.S. retailers has an e-commerce Web site, and the U.S. Department of Commerce predicts that online sales could surpass $300 billion by the end of 2002.

The Internet is a retailer's dream, taking advantage of lower overhead and transaction costs and leveraging its easy access and convenience for millions of consumers. However, online shopping raises concerns for consumers. Is it safe to buy online? Will businesses deliver on their sales promises? Are

buyers protected from fraud and privacy infringements?

Overall customer satisfaction among online shoppers is generally good. However, common complaints received about online merchants include: misleading advertising; goods or services not delivered as agreed; guarantees not honored or honored with unsatisfactory service; and credit or billing problems. Complaints about online retailers are similar to the complaints generated by traditional ''bricks-and-mortar'' businesses.

Retailers wishing to increase sales through the Internet can build consumer trust and confidence in their Web sites by using meaningful third-party assurance seal programs. One such program is CPA WebTrust, which was developed jointly by the American Institute of Chartered Accountants (CICA).

WebTrust is the only comprehensive seal of assurance program for e-commerce sites around the world. CPA's in the United States have been providing assurance services to the public for over 65 years, and WebTrust is a logical extension of their expertise onto the Internet. Uniquely qualified to offer assurance services, CPA's are trusted and respected professionals with the credibility necessary to build confidence among online buyers.

A WebTrust-licensed CPA examines online businesses at least every 90 days to make sure the site is in compliance with the rigorous WebTrust Principles and Criteria. The CPA assures that the online business is abiding by its stated privacy policies, adheres to its stated business practices, processes secure transactions, and provides resolution for customers with complaints about product or service quality. WebTrust assures customers that the Web site has met the most comprehensive e-commerce standards that protect online buyers.

By giving credibility to both small and large e-commerce sites, WebTrust helps them to access a worldwide customer base and bring global electronic commerce to its full potential. It also helps them to deliver on their sales promises and build a loyal, online customer base. WebTrust helps online businesses turn shoppers into buyers by reducing the risks of online shopping, including the potential for fraud.

Global in its focus, WebTrust is currently offered in the United States, Canada, Puerto Rico, England, Scotland, Ireland, Wales, and Australia. Discussions are underway with several other accountancy institutes in Europe and the Asia-Pacific Rim. WebTrust complies with EU data protection policies and Privacy Bill C–54 in Canada. For more information about CPA WebTrust, you can visit http://www.cpawebtrust.org

Mr. Speaker, today over 100 million Americans will surf the Internet, some wishing to make a purchase. Consumers need and deserve to be protected and private-sector programs like CPA WebTrust need to be encouraged to ensure the prosperity and vitality of America's 21st century digital economy.

HONORING JOHN WILLIAMS AS HE ANNOUNCES HIS RETIREMENT AS PRESIDENT OF THE GREATER CINCINNATI CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

HON. ROB PORTMAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1999

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor John Williams, a valued friend and constituent who has served as president of the Greater Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce since November 1, 1984, and has just announced he will step down in February, 2001. John manages the Chamber's active 7,000 member organization, a talented 80 person staff and extensive network of volunteers. Under John's guidance, the nation's fourth largest chamber has twice received the chamber of the Year Award from its peer organizations.

John has been actively involved in every significant civic issue affecting our area. He has been a leader focused on finding solutions to problems, including the campaign to retain Cincinnati's professional sports teams and build two new stadiums; the development of the Blue Chip Campaign for Economic Development and the Partnership for Greater Cincinnati; the growth of the Greater Cincinnati/Northern Kentucky International Airport, the increased importance of small business; and the Chamber's concentration on becoming more inclusive and regionally focused.

A native Cincinnatian, John grew up in Dayton and graduated from the Kent School in Connecticut, Princeton University, and the University of Cincinnati College of Law. He served in the U.S. Marine Corps for three years, including a tour in Vietnam as a rifle company commander, where he was injured twice. He was decorated with the Bronze Star with combat V for valor, and two Purple Hearts. In 1971, he joined the prestigious Cincinnati law firm of Taft, Stettinuis and Hollister, and was admitted to partnership in 1977. John practiced corporate and securities law until he left his leadership position to join the Chamber in 1984.

John insists that leading the Greater Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce is the greatest job in the world. That may be true, but only because he has made it so by his activism and success. He also serves our community as a board member of Downtown Cincinnati, Inc.; the Greater Cincinnati Center for Economic Education; the Kenton County Airport Board; the Greater Cincinnati Convention and Visitors Bureau; and the Queen City Club. John is married to Francie Woodward Williams.

All of us in the Greater Cincinnati area congratulate John on his service. We appreciate his outstanding leadership and friendship, and we wish him well in his final months of service and the new challenges to come.

IN HONOR OF THE AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF PHYSICIANS OF INDIAN ORIGIN

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1999

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the members of the American Association of Physicians of Indian Origin. The members of the Central Ohio chapter will be holding their annual meeting of the Ohio AAPI on the weekend of October 23, 1999.

The American Association of Physicians of Indian Origin represents 32,000 physicians of Indian origin practicing all over the United States. The AAPI is concerned with the treatment of International Medical Graduates as they embark on their journey of medical education and practices here in the United States. They also concentrate their efforts on the health status of the Indian American community in the United States.

There are more than 2,000 medical doctors from India who have settled in Ohio. These men and women have moved across the world from their home towns in order to provide the best medical care to the citizens of the state of Ohio. They are bringing their heritage to our great state to add to the cultural diversity. They have dedicated their lives to selfless acts of giving and deserve the utmost respect.

I urge my fellow colleagues to please join me in recognizing these men and women of the American Association of Physicians of Indian Origin for their dedication to medical care in the state of Ohio.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2684, DEPARTMENTS OF VETERANS AFFAIRS AND HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT, AND INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

SPEECH OF

HON. NANCY PELOSI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 14, 1999

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the VA–HUD conference report. I commend the conferees for the improvements they made to the House passed bill. However, I continue to be concerned that these improvements do not adequately fund America's housing needs.

The conferees provided 60,000 new Section 8 vouchers; increased the funding for operating subsidies for public housing to $3.1 billion, increased the funding for Housing for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA) to $232 million, and increased the funding by $45 million for programs to prevent homelessness and assist homeless individuals. While these increases will prove useful, we all recognize that the need for Section 8, public housing, HOPWA, and homelessness are significantly greater. For example, the Administration's budget requested 100,000 Section vouchers, and this bill falls far short. In many cities, the waiting lists for Section 8 and public housing apartments are many years long and in some cases closed. Individuals living with AIDS

need supportive housing services and despite this bill's increased funding, it falls short of President Clinton's request.

I was disappointed that the Republican House leadership initially had cut housing assistance to low-income Americans. It does not make sense to cut funding to assist homeless persons, the working poor, and persons with AIDS. We should not cut community development programs that revitalize impoverished neighborhoods and produce new affordable housing. I remain disappointed, but support this revised legislation.

It is significant that the conference decided to fund $20 million for the Clinton-Gore America's Private Investment Companies Initiative (APIC). I hope my colleagues will take the next step and pass legislation as soon as possible to authorize this needed initiative. APIC will leverage this $20 million and stimulate investments of approximately $550 million in private issued, government guaranteed loans and an additional $275 million in private equity capital.

The Community Builders program has provided HUD and America's communities with capable public servants responsive to local needs. These community builders have successfully staffed many locally driven projects and helped streamline HUD services. Their work should be commended.

Despite the accomplishments of this bill, millions of Americans still pay more than half their income for rent and too many Americans remain homeless. This improved bill is a step in the proper direction and will address some of these problems. Nonetheless, more steps are needed. I commend Secretary Cuomo for his leadership on these important housing issues. I hope future budgets will provide more funding to help low-income Americans obtain affordable housing.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE CHARLES BLOOMFIELD

HONORABLE SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1999

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to ask that we pause for a moment in honor of one of the finest people that I have ever had the pleasure of knowing. Charles Bloomfield was a dedicated family man, a hard working rancher and a model American. He gave selflessly to provide for his family and to help his community.

Charles joined the United States Army during World War II and after he returned from fearless duty, he married Dorothy Parkes in 1946. Together they had two children, Anne and Edward.

In 1949 Charles and his wife bought a beautiful ranch in Meeker, Colorado where Charles truly enjoyed working the land and raising cattle. He was a man of tradition, old fashioned in his ranching methods, which he maintained until just one week before his death.

Charles Bloomfield, aside from working long days on his ranch, gave greatly of his time to many community organizations. In 1946 he was named Water Commissioner, a position that he held for ten years. In the mid-1960's he was County Commissioner and he served as the Republican Committee chairman for many years. Charles was also very involved in his church, the American Legion and Rio Blanco Lodge #80, AF&AM where he was Past Master and lodge secretary for more than 30 years.

It is with this, Mr. Speaker, that I pay tribute to the life of Charles Bloomfield. I wish that everyone could have had the pleasure of knowing and learning from this man what I did. He was a great American and friend.

CELEBRATING THE ROLE OF WOMEN-OWNED BUSINESSES

HON. BOB FILNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1999

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call my colleague's attention to the role of women-owned businesses in our economy, particularly in my home State of California. It is with great pride that I recognize California as No. 1—both in the number of women entrepreneurs and as the fastest growing state for women minority entrepreneurs.

Representing these women in the Business Women's Network (BWN), a giant network of 2,300 women's associations representing 32 million women. I have joined in the BWN's newly formed congressional committee, spearheaded by Chris Warnke and Robin Read, to support businesswomen throughout the United States, and I want to recognize the BWN for its outstanding record in uniting businesswomen.

The entire nation will be watching the International Summit of the Business Women's Network on October 18 and 19, 1999, where women from over 90 countries and from 48 states will come together in celebration of the more than 9 million women entrepreneurs today, of which 1.1 million are minorities.

The female labor force is making great strides. The Bureau of Labor Statistics has projected that 72 million women will be working by the year 2005, representing 63 percent of women 16 and older. As the decade draws to an end and a new millennium approaches, I want to recognize women entrepreneurs as the fastest growing segment in our economy.

Congratulations to the Business Women's Network on the occasion of their International Summit.

TRIBUTE TO THE NEW HAITIAN TIMES NEWSPAPER

HON. CARRIE P. MEEK

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1999

Mr. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Yves Colon and Garry Pierre-Pierre, two budding young Haitian-American journalists who will launch, later this week, a new weekly newspaper, The Haitian Times. These two veterans of big city newspapers, Mr. Colon, a Miami Herald editor and reporter on leave from the paper, and Mr. Pierre-Pierre, a former New York Times reporter, have both taken a leap of faith to launch this new venture which is set to hit newsstands in Miami-Dade County, New York City and Port-au-Prince on October 20, 1999.

I commend Mr. Colon and Mr. Pierre-Pierre on their new venture. It's certainly an idea who's time has come. May The Haitian Times be around for many years to come.

I enter into the RECORD the attached news article from the Miami Herald announcing the launch of the Haitian Times.

JOURNALISTS LAUNCH VOICE FOR U.S. HAITIANS

(By Curtis Morgan)

Their numbers are substantial and growing—some 300,000 in South Florida and twice that in New York City. Yet Haitian-Americans remain an often overlooked ethnic group, registering only faintly on mainstream media radar.

Two journalists, both Haitian-born veterans of big city American newsrooms, hope to change that with a small but ambitious weekly newspaper, The Haitian Times, scheduled to hit stands in Miami-Dade County, New York City and Port-au-Prince on Oct. 20.

While there are already two well-established stateside papers covering Haiti, this one is designed with significant differences, said Yves Colon, a Herald reporter and editor taking leave to serve as editor. For one, its voice will be in English not French or Creole.

The target audience, said publisher Garry Pierre-Pierre, a former New York Times and Sun-Sentinel reporter, are people not unlike himself and Colon: Of Haitian heritage, educated or raised in the States, fluent in all things American.

''It is the quintessential Haitian-American, a person who really wants to be Haitian but is also very much part of the other world,'' Pierre said. Thus, the message in the masthead, ''Bridging The Gap.''

While potential readers are reserving judgment until they see the product, some believe the paper, if it succeeds, could be a social milestone.

''I think this is going to fill a vacuum,'' said Jan Mapou, director of Sosyete Koukouy, a Miami-Dade organization that mounts cultural and arts shows. The two major existing papers stateside—Haiti En Marche, published in Miami, and New York-based Haiti Observateur—are both mostly French, with limited English and Creole. Mapou writes Haiti En Marche's lone Creole page, a column about cultural events.

''Having a newspaper for the Haitian community in English, that will cover the whole community,'' he said. ''We have so many kids that are disconnected with what's going on in Haiti and the community.''

Ossmann Desir, the lone Haitian-American on the North Miami council, a city with a large Haitian population, echoed Mapou. ''We have a Haitian-American community that is increasing every day, and they're becoming more and more aware of English.''

Author Bernard Diederich, who published the English language Haiti Sun on the island from 1950 to 1963, also was enthusiastic. While he said major papers like The New York Times and The Herald do solid coverage, the country has many critical and stubbon issues that go unexamined or are reported with clear political bias by the Haitian press.

''There is a crying need for this, a real balanced newspaper that has no agenda,'' he said.

Mike McQueen, chairman of Florida International University's journalism and broadcasting department, said the paper could become ''a pretty important voice'' and provide a sense of validation for a community.

''Even though Haitians have been in Miami-Dade County for about 20 years,

they're still sort of forgotten exiles,'' McQueen said. ''They're black, but they're not African-American, they're Caribbean refugees but they're not Cuban or Dominican, and a lot of them aren't refugees.''

McQueen had a mixed reaction to the Enligh-only decision, saying it could shut out recent arrivals. But Pierre-Pierre and Colon, who both immigrated as children, called the choice key to the paper's philosophy and identity.

In Haiti, language is loaded. The Upper-class minority favors French. Creole is the language of the vast poor majority, most of whom can't read it. Most Haitian immigrants succeed by speaking English.

''For us,'' Colon said, ''English is the great equalizer.''

With Hispanics, language isn't divisive but unifying, he said. Spanish-speakers also have the benefit of larger populations in cities like Miami, which often allows new immigrants to thrive, even without mastering the new language.

Scope and approach are the things Colon hopes will really separate the paper—an approximately 40-page tabloid with an internet site also under development (www.haitiantimes.com)—from its counterparts. The staple of both French papers is politics, dry ''insider baseball,'' he said.

While the paper already has a bureau in Port-au-Prince, Colon intends to emphasize issues and personalities stateside, eventually expanding from the New York-Haiti-Miami triangle into other cities.

''I'm interested in holding up the mirror to the Haitian community, our successes and our failures to say, 'This is who we are,''' Colon said.

Colon, who has covered Haiti for The Herald and The Associated Press, said he will strive for objectivity. At the same time, he hopes to stir passions, a task he admits is difficult, given the collective cultural experience.

''The perfect word for it is that Haitians are inured. Haitians have seen so much—poverty, corruption, the brutality of their own brothers and sisters—but there is very little reaction to it.''

The bigger challenge will be luring buyers and advertisers.

John Morton, a media analyst and president of Morton Research in Maryland, said that to last, the paper will have to leap hurdles. For one, while some ethnic newspapers—particularly Spanish-language papers in major cities—have succeeded, many others are only ''marginally profitable.''

''Starting up a new publication is always fraught with a lot of heavy lifting and usually loses a lot of money initially,'' he said. ''That's often the problem that keeps these things from succeeding—they're undercapitalized.''

Because the readership is spread across the map, it also may be more difficult to attract advertisers, he said. The critical key may be expanding from Haitian businesses to mainstream advertisers.

Because the readership is spread across the map, it also may be more difficult to attract advertisers, he said. The critical key may be expanding from Haitian businesses to mainstream advertisers.

Both Colon and Pierre-Pierre agree the venture is a risk but one they say is worth it. Investors are committed, Pierre-Pierre said, reaction stateside has been strong and there's also a large audience in Haiti, a country of eight million.

The paper plans a first run of 40,000 and will ''probably level off to around 25,000 and work its way up,'' he said. ''This is an idea whose time has come.''

TRIBUTE TO V.F.W. JOHN MARTIN STEEL POST 6049

HON. JERRY WELLER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1999

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Veterans of Foreign Wars John Martin Steel Post 6049 of Morris, Illinois as it celebrates the 100th year anniversary of the VFW and the 75th year anniversary of the Ladies' Auxiliary.

On May 8, 1942, Private John Martin Steel was killed in the South Pacific. Private Steel served aboard the aircraft carrier Lexington with an anti-aircraft battalion when it was sunk. Private Steel was the first local man to be killed in the Second World War. Almost a year to the day later, the USS Steel, a destroyer escort, was launched on May 4, 1943.

The charter of this VFW Post was obtained in 1947. Among the Charter Members: William G. Stratton, former Governor of Illinois; James R. Washburn, former Mayor of Morris and Illinois State Representative; August Black, a prominent attorney; William Sackett, newspaper owner; and Clark Davis, former Coroner. Not only were these men Charter Members, as you can see, they were also pillars of the community who provided great leadership.

Today, along with honoring the men, we also acknowledge the important role of the Ladies' Auxiliary. The assistance of this organization has been critical to the members of the VFW for the past 75 years. These ladies serve as the mortar in the foundation of the VFW. Post 6049 is fortunate to have the resources of a Ladies' Auxiliary.

The naming of this VFW Post after Private John Martin Steel honors his service and his ultimate sacrifice for our country. Not only does the naming of this post honor Private Steel, it also reminds us of all of the veterans who fought for our freedom overseas. It reminds us of the brave individuals who shipped off to far away lands and put their lives on the line to insure the American way of life. It reminds us, Mr. Speaker, that freedom is not free. And it reminds us that these courageous Americans should all be remembered and should all be honored.

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is fitting and appropriate to honor the service of the men of the Veterans of Foreign Wars John Martin Steel Post 6049 in Morris, Illinois and the Ladies' Auxiliary. They have shown leadership for their country and community for the last 52 years. Without them, the community would have no backbone; but because of their service we are strong, courageous and proud of a free America.

LOUISIANA-PACIFIC AND NATURE CONSERVANCY OF TEXAS ANNOUNCE JOINT MANAGEMENT AGREEMENT TO CONSERVE ECOLOGICALLY VALUABLE WILDLIFE HABITAT

HON. JIM TURNER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1999

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to announce that this month, Louisiana-Pacific Corporation, a major U.S. building products company, put into motion a program designed to identify and proactively manage ecologically significant habitat located on the company's lands. More than 4,300 acres encompassing 12 sites in Texas and Louisiana will be reviewed for their ecological value and conservation potential as part of Louisiana-Pacific's Living Legacy Lands program. Joining in this effort is the Nature Conservancy of Texas which will assist in the identification and management of designated sites.

Louisiana-Pacific and The Nature Conservancy of Texas signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) on October 5, 1999, to establish a framework for conservation and management actions of Louisiana-Pacific lands within the Piney Woods Ecological Region of East Texas and West Louisiana. The first conservation site designated under the MOU is located in Tyler County, Texas which is located in the 2nd Congressional District of Texas. This 1,300 acre site includes an area of woodpecker nests within one of the largest great stands of traditional longleaf pine forest in the Southern United States. Additional conservation acres will be identified and designated through the mutual agreement of Louisiana-Pacific and The Nature Conservancy.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask that you and the Congress join me in congratulating Louisiana-Pacific and The Nature Conservancy of Texas for their partnership and desire to conserve lands for generations of Americans.

DEMOCRACY SUFFERS ANOTHER BLOW IN KAZAKHSTAN—PARLIAMENTARY ELECTION IS SERIOUSLY FLAWED

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1999

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, in Kazakhstan just over a week ago, on October 10, the first round of elections were held for the Mazhilis—the lower house of the Parliament. There was little suspense or excitement about the results. In fact, there was little suspense or uncertainty even before the elections were held. These elections simply confirmed the nondemocratic nature of the Kazakh government, and they raise extremely serious questions about the future of United States relations with this country.

The elections were far from democratic in substance, although there were some cosmetic efforts to make the elections appear to be free. Furthermore, the modest efforts to make the elections appear democratic were not voluntarily adopted by the government of Kazakhstan. They were taken reluctantly and only under international pressure including a Congressional Human Caucus briefing on the electoral process which was held a few months ago. The election fell far short of the standard of free and fair elections.

Mr. Speaker, in a blatant affront to democracy, the President of Kazakhstan, Nursultan Nazarbayev, presented to the out-going parliament his choice for the new Prime Minister of Kazakhstan last Tuesday—the second day after the election and the day before the results of the first round of elections were announced. Standard procedure in any democratic country would be for the newly elected

parliament to approve a new Prime Minister. This affront to democratic procedure is truly mind-boggling!

Mr. Speaker, not only was the Prime Minister approved by the lame-duck parliament, the elections themselves were seriously flawed. The Organization on Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) sent an official international observer group which monitored the elections. Their report on the parliamentary contest highlighted the gravity of the problems. According to the observer group, ''the OSCE said there was widespread official interference in the run-up to the campaign against opposition candidates and the independent media'' (Agence France Presse report from Kazakhstan, October 11, 1999).

International observers reported ''widespread abuses in the runup to Sunday's parliamentary and local elections in the Central Asian republic of Kazakhstan.'' These reports also quoted the OSCE that ''the government interfered, opposition parties faced discrimination from local authorities, and individual candidates were intimidated.'' At one polling place in Almaty, Kazakhstan's largest city, election observers uncovered duplicate tally sheets with falsified results. The majority of the electoral commissions, which are charged with monitoring and assuring the fairness of the election process, were dominated by supporters of the pro-presidential party (Deutsche Presse-Agentur, the independent German news agency, and the independent Russian news agency, ITAR–TASS both on October 11, 1999).

The official statement of the OSCE stated that several steps ''seriously undermined'' these polls. Executive officials' ''illegal interference'' and ''bias of local electoral commissions against opposition representatives and candidates'' placed parties in unequal conditions, the statement said. Opposition parties were ''intimidated and obstructed.''

The most blatant example of this outrageously flawed election is the concerted action of the government against former Kazakh Prime Minister Akezan Kazhegeldin, who established the Republican People's Party and attempted to contest the parliamentary elections. Mr. Kazhegeldin has faced government-created obstacles to every attempt he has made to participate in Kazakhstan's political life since he left office as Prime Minister in 1997 after serving three years in that post. He was disqualified from participating in the last presidential race on a technicality. Shortly after he declared his intention to run for the presidency in 1998, the government announced that he was under investigation for tax evasion. The allegations were that he owned property abroad that he had not declared on his tax forms. But as soon as a court ruled that Kazhegeldin could not run for president due to the minor offense of attending a nonsanctioned meeting, the investigation into his foreign holdings stopped.

Mr. Speaker, the campaign against Mr. Kazhegeldin started up again this past spring, at the same time that he announced his new political party, the Republican People's Party, would participate in the parliamentary elections. Mr. Kazhegeldin left Kazakhstan to acquaint leaders in other countries, notably the United States, about his party's existence. During this trip, he appeared at a briefing of the Congressional Human Rights Caucus here in Washington. Once he left the country, however, it became obvious the prosecutor general's office was moving to arrest him on tax evasion charges, and he said he would not return home unless he received a guarantee that he would not be arrested. He stayed away from Kazakhstan until last month.

The government's very public effort to brand Kazhegeldin as a tax cheat left his Republican People's Party at a serious disadvantage in contesting the election. Furthermore, party candidates complained that their campaign efforts were hampered by government forces. On September 9, just a month before the date of the election, the Central Elections Commission announced that Kazhegeldin was ineligible to run in the elections because of the tax evasion charges, and the following day, the Republican People's Party announced it was withdrawing from the election race.

Mr. Kazhegeldin, who was in Moscow for medical treatment, said the party should not boycott the elections. But he was detained that same day by Russian police because the Kazakh government had put out a warrant for his arrest. Russian authorities under great international pressure, including efforts by our own Secretary of State Madeleine Albright subsequently permitted Mr. Kazhegeldin to return to London. Meanwhile, back in Kazakhstan, the Central Elections Commission declared that it was too late for the party to withdraw from the elections, and the party's candidates were left on the ballots. The publicity surrounding Mr. Kazhegeldin's arrest in Moscow and the call for a boycott of the election insured that the Republican People's Party and its leader had minimal success at the polls last week.

Mr. Speaker, at my request on July 15 of this year, our distinguished colleague Congresswoman JAN SCHAKOWSKY of Illinois, chaired a briefing of the Congressional Human Rights Caucus on the political situation in Kazakhstan at which Mr. Kazhegeldin testified. His testimony about the threats facing advocates of democracy and human rights proved prophetic, and foreshadowed his arrest in Moscow at the request of the Kazakhstan government on trumped up charges and the appalling results of the recent election.

Mr. Speaker, I was extremely disappointed by the response of the Government of Kazakhstan to the hearings conducted by the Human Rights Caucus in July and by its subsequent actions leading up to the failed parliamentary elections. To my great dismay, the Government of President Nazarbayev has responded to neither the criticism leveled against his government by the Human Rights Caucus, nor to concerns voiced earlier this year by the Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights (ODIHR) of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE).

Mr. Speaker, the Congressional Human Rights Caucus is gravely concerned about the violations of human rights and political liberties in Kazakhstan, most clearly and convincingly demonstrated in the undemocratic elections that were held just two weeks ago. The fact that the Government of President Nazarbayev continues to ignore the concerns raised by the Human Rights Caucus, international organizations concerned with democratization and human rights, and a number of governments, including the United States, is a serious matter.

The concerns with democratization in Kazakhstan are extremely serious in their own right, Mr. Speaker, but there are also security concerns involving this country. We recently learned about the sale of about 30 MiG 21 fighter jets by Kazakhstan to North Korea, a prime sponsor of international terrorism. This irresponsible and reckless sale of advanced military equipment to North Korea calls into question the Kazakh government's commitment to building good relations with the West and its interest in international security and stability.

It is my strong view, Mr. Speaker, that United States assistance to Kazakhstan and assistance of international financial institutions should be conditioned upon fundamental improvement in political liberties and fundamental freedoms in Kazakhstan. Further, Mr. Speaker, it is my view that any visit by Mr. Nazarbayev to Washington should be postponed until such an improvement takes place.

THE TRAGIC DEATH OF MATTHEW SHEPARD

HON. NANCY PELOSI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1999

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, with great sadness I rise to recall that 1 year ago, Matthew Shepard, a gay college student, was murdered. We should all deplore his tragic death. He was a lovely young man and was courageously willing to be open about who he was. He suffered because of who he was. This is simply wrong. It is a tragedy when a young man has the courage to be open about who he is, and his life is taken for it.

Unfortunately, Mathew is not alone. His tragic death and violence toward others point out the need for hate crimes legislation. According to the National Coalition of Anti-Violence programs, in 1998, 33 Americans were murdered because they were gay or lesbian. In the United States last year, there were at least 2,552 reports of anti-gay or lesbian incidents. The number of serious assaults in which victims sustained major injuries grew by 12 percent. How many more deaths, how many assaults on the personal integrity of people, need to happen before this Congress will see the need for hate crimes legislation?

The statistics and Matthew's individual personal story demonstrate that these incidents are not isolated. Harassment of gays, lesbians, and bisexuals is not isolated to one geographic area nor to any one factor. As our country knows all to well, hate crimes take many forms and affect many different kinds of victims. We all remember the 1996 horrible murder of James Byrd, Jr., an African-American man in Texas. We all remember earlier this year, when a gunman opened fire at a Jewish Community Center and then singled out an Asian-American and shot him. These harsh stories are troubling and unfortunately, recent shootings are a constant reminder of the hate that still exists in our society.

The Hate Crimes Prevention Act would provide law enforcement officials with needed tools, and would serve as a lasting tribute to the lives of Matthew Sheppard, James Byrd, Jr., and the others who have been victimimized by hate crimes. The Hate Crimes Prevention Act would not end all violence against people because they are gay, or African-American, or Jewish, or come from another country. Nonetheless, this legislation

would allow the Federal Government to investigate and punish crimes motivated by hate.

The murder of Matthew Shepard is the manifestation of the enduring bigotry that still prevails in our society. Our Nation should take action and pass this responsible legislation which would enable Federal law enforcement officials to fight these crimes and punish the perpetrators.

IN HONOR OF RONALD J. TOBER

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1999

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Ronald Tober for his many years of service to the Greater Cleveland Regional Transit Authority. He plans to celebrate with friends and family at a farewell dinner on October 22, 1999.

Robert Tober has had a very successful career in the public transit industry. Mr. Tober has served as the General Manager and Secretary-Treasurer for the Greater Cleveland Regional Transit Authority since May, 1988. Prior to this appointment, Mr. Tober served as Director of Transit for the Municipality of Metropolitan Seattle for six years. For two years he was Deputy Transportation Coordinator for Metropolitan Dade County in Miami. He also served as Assistant Director of Operations and Chief Operations Planning Officer for the Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority in Boston.

Robert Tober is recognized nationally as one of the top transit managers in the country, having served over twenty-eight years in the public transit industry. Mr. Tober has carried his dedication to transportation into leadership positions for several transit organizations. While serving as President of the Ohio Public Transit Association, he helped develop better transportation for the citizens of the state of Ohio. He also has been noted for promoting and hiring women and minorities in the industry.

Mr. Tober has been a great asset to the state of Ohio and city of Cleveland. His innovating ideas and leadership have guided the development of the public transit industry. His wife, Terry and four children are so proud of him.

I urge my fellow colleagues to please join me in congratulating Mr. Tober on his many accomplishments and commemorate him for his dedication to the public transit industry.

HONORING CINCINNATI'S 1999 TALL STACKS CELEBRATION

HON. ROB PORTMAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1999

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Cincinnati's 1999 Tall Stacks celebration and the special national recognition it is receiving from the Library of Congress. This year, the Library of Congress is celebrating its bicentennial with an exciting new Local Legacies Project, which will document America's heritage by preserving unique cultural events and activities across the country.

From the earliest days of recorded history in Southwest Ohio, our traditions and culture have been shaped by the Ohio River. That's why I was delighted to nominate the recent Tall Stacks celebration as our region's contribution to this project.

The Tall Stacks event, which took place last week in Cincinnati, was a great celebration of our region's riverboat heritage. Nineteen riverboats from across the nation—including several classic steam-powered vessels—came to Greater Cincinnati to recreate a bygone era. And many thousands of visitors came to our region to take a step back in time and to share in this celebration.

Through its inclusion in the Local Legacies project, Tall Stacks will receive additional national recognition for its role in commemorating an important chapter in our regional and national history. And, through the National Digital Library Program, people from across the country and throughout the world will be able to share the excitement of Tall Stacks through the Library of Congress website (http://www.loc.gov).

We have a rich and distinguished history in Southwest Ohio. From our region's active involvement with the Underground Railroad to the Suspension Bridge, Fountain Square and our many well-preserved historic areas, we have a tremendous heritage of which we can all be proud. The riverboat era is an important part of that heritage, as Tall Stacks reminds us now and into the future.

TRIBUTE TO AMBASSADOR E. WILLIAM CROTTY

HON. CARRIE P. MEEK

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1999

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor that I rise to pay tribute to one of our Nation's exceptional diplomats, E. William Crotty, Ambassador to Barbados, Antigua and Barbuda, Dominica, Grenada, St. Kitts-Nevis, St. Lucia, and St. Vincent and the Grenadines. This able facilitator of American diplomacy passed on Sunday, October 10, 1999. He is survived by his loving wife, Valerie Kushner, and several outstanding children.

Ambassador Crotty was nominated by President William Clinton on April 28, 1998. Prior to this appointment, Ambassador Crotty was an attorney in Daytona Beach, FL. Ambassador Crotty served as a senior managing partner of one of the top law firms in the United States, where he was recognized as a leading lawyer in his area of practice, which included corporate and business transactions, banking and finance law, and taxation and real estate law.

Ambassador Crotty served appointments to at least 11 different commissions, including the Commission for the Preservation of America's Heritage Abroad by President Clinton in 1996 and the Judicial Foundation Board by Senate Majority Leader George Mitchell in 1989. He was quite active in the Democratic Party, serving on the National Finance Board of the Clinton-Gore Campaign, as a Democratic National Party Trustee, and as the Chairman of the Executive Committee of the Democratic National Committee Board of Directors from 1984 to 1988.

Ambassador Crotty was quite active in civil affairs, serving as chairman or member of the board of directors for numerous charitable and educational organizations, including the United Way of Volusia County, the Embry-Riddle Aeronautical University in Daytona Beach, the Father Lopez High School Board, and the Volusia County Easter Seals. His indefatigable civic service earned him the title of Outstanding Citizen of the Year and Young Man of the Year from the Daytona Beach Chamber of Commerce.

Born in Claremont, NH, Ambassador Crotty exemplified leadership at an early age. He was an exceptional high school student at Bellows Falls High School in Vermont where he was a three-time state champion in tennis and graduated salutatorian of his high school class. Ambassador Crotty graduated from Dartmouth College, where he again excelled in athletics, making captain of his tennis team while also playing varsity squash and basketball. Ambassador Crotty received his law degree from the University of Michigan and obtained a master of law in taxation from New York University Law School.

The people of the United States, as well as the people of Barbados, Antigua and Barbuda, Dominica, Grenada, St. Kitts-Nevis, St. Lucia, and St. Vincent and the Grenadines will miss my friend—a great American and personal representative of the President of the United States.

PRIVATE ENTERPRISE PROTECTION ACT OF 1999

HON. MARSHALL "MARK" SANFORD

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1999

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Speaker, should tax-exempt bonds, subsidized by our constitutents—be used by local authorities to enter into direct competition with private enterprise, outside the traditional functions of government? I don't believe so, and I would imagine most Americans would agree.

But that, Mr. Speaker, is the question addressed by the legislation I am introducing today, the Private Enterprise Protection Act of 1999. This legislation will help protect taxpayers from having the U.S. Treasury subsidize local government efforts to engage in unfair competition with private businesses.

As my colleagues are aware, tax-exempt bonds enable State and local governments to borrow at below market interest rates in order to finance public projects. This is generally a good program allowing State and local governments to reduce borrowing costs and enabling them to build public facilities for fewer tax dollars.

However, while the program has all good intentions, I would imagine that a vast majority of the American people would agree that tax-exempt bonds should be limited to use for projects which directly benefit the public good, but not to help the government engage in competition with private enterprise.

I was pleased to see my colleague from Texas, Mr. HALL, introduce H.R. 2756 this summer. His bill also aims to fix the problem I raise. In fact, the bill I introduce today is very similar to the Hall bill, but it incorporates several changes to reflect comments received on H.R. 2756.

It is important to keep in mind that while tax-exempt bonds are generally used for worthwhile purposes, the program does entail a sizable commitment on the part of the American taxpayer. According to the Wall Street Journal in 1997, tax-exempt interest income was reported on about 4.9 million individual returns, and total tax-exempt interest amounted to $48.5 billion.

Because there is a sizable commitment here, Congress and the Treasury have developed complex and carefully crafted rules to assure that these bonds are used for bona fide pubic purposes and not for private use of the Federal subsidy in tax-exempt bonds. These rules are intended to protect the taxpayers' interest and preserve a level playing field for concerned businesses.

A couple of instances have come to my attention in the last few months which suggest that there may be some misunderstanding of the very complex rules governing tax-exempt bonds and the intent behind these rules which have led local authorities to consider use these bonds to enter into direct competition with the private sector. The instances to which I refer include one in Las Vegas, where a local authority reportedly wishes to build a large addition to its convention center, and another in San Diego, where a local authority is reportedly looking at building a large hotel.

In cases like these, the taxpayer-subsidized facility can offer customers prices well below those that could be offered by a private facility financed at higher market rates. This strikes me as blatantly unfair, particularly in those cases where a taxpayer-subsidized facility is not a new enterprise, but instead siphons off business from already existing private business. Closing this loophole is the principal goal of my bill.

Obviously, my concern is with situations where the government is acting as a business and attracting customers. This legislation will have no effect on bonds used to build, maintain, or repair schools, hospitals, roads, or other facilities performing functions which private enterprise cannot or will not perform.

Mr. Speaker, it is bad enough that the government can impose unnecessary and costly regulatory burdens on the private sector. But, when that same government uses tax-exempt bonds to engage in competition with business, it raises a question of basic fairness.

It also blurs the lines of the role of government. Is it a wise use of taxpayer dollars to subsidize local government competition with business? I would again argue that my constituents would not support this notion or many other taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, these are serious, national policy issues which need to be addressed on a bipartisan basis so that we can protect both private enterprises from subsidized government competition and the taxpayer interests.

It should be made clear at this point that the idea that federal tax subsidies and tax exemptions should not be used to create such an unfair competitive advantage is already in the current tax code. To prevent unfair competition, for nearly 50 years, there have been laws that have taxed businesses conducted by charities if the activity of that business is the type normally conducted by private taxable enterprises.

Keeping in line with this precedence, the legislation I introduce today closely tracks H.R. 2756 by denying tax-exempt financing for certain facilities that compete directly with existing private sector facilities in the same community. Specifically, it accomplishes this by deeming as nonexempt any ''private activities bond'' within the meaning of Section 141 of the Internal Revenue Code, any bond issuance, a significant amount of which is used to finance the construction, expansion, or substantial reconstruction of a facility which would be rented to businesses which could otherwise be served by an existing competing private facility.

As a clarification, Mr. Speaker, let me say again that the bill does not affect bonds issued for traditional functions of government: roads, bridges, schools, etc. To make this perfectly clear, it specifically exempts from its provisions educational institutions, hospitals, or similar facilities which provide educational services or medical care to members of the general public.

With one minor exception, the bill will not apply to ''qualified bonds'' that Congress has previously exempted from restrictions on ''private activity'' bonds. This includes bonds used for so-called ''exempt facilities'' under Section 142 of the Code, which includes such projects as airports, water treatment plants, dockets and wharves, local power plants, etc. An exception is made for certain lodging facilities located in markets which could be served by private owned facilities, and these would generally be covered by my bill.

Furthermore, the bill include language to assure that projects, where physical construction has both already commenced in a material fashion (other than site testing, site preparation or similar activities) and is substantially underway, are not impacted. In fairness to those who may be planning transactions which fit within the parameters of this legislation, and to assure those local authorities, in an attempt to ''beat the clock,'' do not rush through bond offerings before this bill is enacted, the bill include a clear effective date for all provisions with the exception of those addressing lodging facilities, which carry a date of enactment effective date.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation will protect businesses from having the Federal Government grant local government facilities an unfair advantage over them in the marketplace. Further, it will protect all taxpayers from having their tax dollars used to subsidize local government efforts to enter into, or expand its presence in, non-traditional business functions already being performed by private enterprise.

RECOGNIZING PARTICIPANTS OF ''VOICES AGAINST VIOLENCE: A CONGRESSIONAL TEEN CONFERENCE''

HON. MICHAEL F. DOYLE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1999

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize three wonderful teenagers from my Congressional District. Miss Ashley Cole, a junior at Woodland Hills High School; Mr. Aniruddha Chatterjee, a senior at Fox Chapel High School and Mr. Jonathan Hobaugh, a senior at Elizabeth Forward High School will be representing Pennsylvania's 18th Congressional District in ''Voices Against Violence: A Congressional Teen Conference'' which began here in Washington this morning.

This conference, which has brought together some 350 students from across the country, will enable young people from all walks of life to discuss their experiences and ideas for the causes and prevention of youth violence. The young people involved in the conference will participate in workshops covering a variety of issues including: violence in the media, hate crime prevention strategies and peer mediation training.

Ashley, Aniruddha and Jonathan will participate in drafting a House Resolution, which will be presented for immediate consideration, stating the actions this Congress can take to help prevent youth violence.

Prevention of violence by and against our Nation's youth is a top priority. I am honored to have three such fine young people work with us helping to find the solutions to this problem.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. NEIL ABERCROMBIE

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1999

Mr. ABERCROMBIE. Mr. Speaker, I would like the RECORD to show that I would have liked to have been a cosponsor of H.R. 354, the Collections of Information Anti-Piracy Act, if the list of cosponsors was not closed. I strongly support the passage of H.R. 354.

TRIBUTE TO ORANGE COUNTY WORKS

HON. CHRISTOPHER COX

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1999

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend Orange County Works, an outstanding program in Orange County, CA that provides vital assistance to foster care children. For over 9 years, Orange County Works job readiness workshops have given foster children the opportunity to learn from successful, high-profile business leaders, ensuring youths leaving the foster care system at age 18 will design career paths for themselves to self-sufficiency and success. Orange County Works will provide job readiness training to 400 youths in 1999 alone.

Recently, Orange County Works was honored by being named as a partner in the BridgeGate 20 Initiative. This Initiative, sponsored by BridgeGate LLC, the executive recruitment firm, recognizes leaders in the Southern California information technology business community who have demonstrated a commitment to building employee knowledge in order to improve company performance. The BridgeGate 20 Initiative will assist Orange County Works to create employment opportunities for still more foster care children.

Orange County Works President and Founder, Don Mac Allister, once a foster child himself, was motivated to create a program that makes a real difference in helping foster children stay off the streets. He demands success from each foster child that is part of his program. Don Mac Allister's passion and determination to improve the foster care system

in Orange County inspires community leaders to get involved.

Orange County Works is a true star in the Orange County community service world. It has impacted a wide range of people and its continued growth will ensure that in the future it will make dramatic changes in the lives of children now leaving the county's foster care system. I'm proud of the accomplishments of Orange County Works, and look forward to its continued success as more people discover the wonderful results from this fine program.

HONORING THE NEW HAVEN HEBREW FREE BURIAL & BENEVOLENT ASSOCIATION ON ITS 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1999

Mr. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor for me to rise today to recognize the New Haven Free Burial & Benevolent Association which is celebrating its one hundredth anniversary this Sunday, October 17, 1999. For the past century, this organization has been a source of support and comfort for the Jewish community, especially in times of distress.

The New Haven Hebrew Free Burial & Benevolent Association was founded and continues its mission based on an old Jewish custom—tzedakah—that which is right. For centuries, Jews have held a commitment to protect and provide for their communities. The New Haven Hebrew Free Burial & Benevolent Association, once two separate entities, joined forces to provide interest-free loans and burial services for members of the Jewish community in financial need.

Generations of Jewish community members in New Haven have benefitted from the Association's economic and social support. The organization works to further the concept of Gemilut Chessed, aiding worthy persons in becoming self-supporting, self-respecting members of the community, through the provision of interest-free loans. Members are able to receive small loans, without question, which are repaid on a weekly payment schedule. This safety net enables recipients to get back on their feet, and alleviates some of the pressure caused by an unexpected financial crisis. It truly demonstrates the community's commitment to supporting its own in times of need.

Throughout time, the Jewish community has shown honor to the dead by preparing the body for burial and performing tahara, the ritual washing. This is one of the greatest mitzot—good deeds—in the Torah. According to Jewish Law and Custom, the complete washing and dressing of the body is necessary in order for the soul to rest. Because the natural decomposition of the body is of the utmost important in Jewish Law, the body must be placed in the ground in a strictly Judaic cemetery. The New Haven Hebrew Free Burial & Benevolent Association provides funerals and burial plots for those who could not otherwise afford the cost of a Judaic burial. In addition, the organization owns and operates a cemetery. The members and Board of Directors devote their efforts to its maintenance. It is their goal that no person should be denied a Jewish burial because of financial need.

For one hundred years this local organization has met weekly and worked diligently to raise money to provide their community these interest free loans and burial services. Today, it is indeed my honor to recognize the tremendous contributions of the New Haven Hebrew Free Burial & Benevolent Association to the Jewish community—preserving and protecting the dignity and character of Judaic custom. I would like to express my sincere thanks and heart-felt congratulations to all the members on this momentous occasion.

TRIBUTE TO CHINESE AMERICANS WHO SERVED IN WORLD WAR II

HON. DAVID WU

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1999

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to brave Chinese Americans who honorably served in the U.S. Armed Forces during World War II. As many of these men and women gather here in Washington, DC on October 26, 1999, I would like to express my sincere gratitude and admiration for their years of service to the United States.

Like all other Americans, Chinese Americans answered their nation's call during the Second World War and bravely served to preserve the American way of life and to advance democratic ideals around the world. Of the six million Americans who were drafted or enlisted to serve in the Second World War, over 20,000 Chinese Americans served in the Army, Navy, Air Force, the Marines, and the Coast Guard. These brave men and women served with honor in the European, Pacific, and the China-Burma-India Theatres of Operation.

While most of these men and women are descendants of earlier Chinese immigrants, some were also first generation immigrants. These servicemen and women brought valuable skills and served the United States in a number of different capacities, as fighter pilots, intelligence operatives, infantrymen, nurses, and others.

Once again, I commend all those brave Chinese Americans who served our Nation with pride, honor, and distinction. America will be forever grateful for their services to the Nation.

THE LEGACY OF PRESIDENT LYNDON B. JOHNSON AND THE GREAT SOCIETY

HON. GENE GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1999

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as we move even closer to the end of this century, I rise to pay tribute to President Lyndon B. Johnson. Earlier this year, I included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an article printed in the Houston Chronicle by Marianne Means which details why President Johnson will be considered as one of our nation's greatest Presidents.

Today, I would like to include an article from the October 1999 issue of the Washington Monthly by Joseph A. Califano, Jr. At the end of this important article, Mr. Califano states: "* * * it is time to recognize—as historians are beginning to do—the reality of the remarkable and enduring achievements of the Great Society programs. Without such programs as Head Start, higher education loans and scholarships, Medicare, Medicaid, clean air and water, civil rights, life would be nastier, more brutish, and shorter for millions of Americans."

Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude my remarks by including this important article in its entirety:

WHAT WAS REALLY GREAT ABOUT THE GREAT SOCIETY: THE TRUTH BEHIND THE CONSERVATIVE MYTHS

(By Joseph Califano)

If there is a prize for the political scam of the 20th century, it should go to the conservatives from propagating as conventional wisdom that the Great Society programs of the 1960's were a misguided and failed social experiment that wasted taxpayers' money.

Nothing could be further from the truth. In fact, from 1963 when Lyndon Johnson took office until 1970 as the impact of his Great Society programs were felt, the portion of Americans living below the poverty line dropped from 22.2 percent to 12.6 percent, the most dramatic decline over such a brief period in this century. Since then, the poverty rate has hovered at about the 13 percent level and sits at 13.3 percent today, still a disgraceful level in the context of the greatest economic boom in our history. But if the Great Society had not achieved that dramatic reduction in poverty, and the nation had not maintained it, 24 million more Americans would today be living below the poverty level.

This reduction in poverty did not just happen. It was the result of a focused, tenacious effort to revolutionize the role of the federal government with a series of interventions that enriched the lives of millions of Americans. In those tumultuous Great Society years, the President submitted, and Congress enacted, more than 100 major proposals in each of the 89th and 90th Congresses. In that era of do-it-now optimism, government was neither a bad man to be tarred and feathered nor a bag man to collect campaign contributions, but an instrument to help the most vulnerable in our society.

What has the verdict been? Did the programs we put into place in the 1960s vindicate our belief in the responsibility and capacity of the national government to achieve such ambitious goals—or do they stand as proof of the government's inability to effect dramatic change that helps our people?

A FAIR START

The Great Society saw government as providing a hand up, not a handout. The cornerstone was a thriving economy (which the 1964 tax cut sparked); in such circumstances, most Americans would be able to enjoy the material blessings of society. Others would need the kind of help most of us got from our parents—health care, education and training, and housing, as well as a nondiscriminatory shot at employment—to share in our nation's wealth.

Education and health were central to opening up the promise of American life to all. With the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Great Society for the first time committed the federal government to helping local school districts. Its higher education legislation, with scholarships, grants, and work-study programs, opened college to any American with the necessary brains and ambition, however thin daddy's wallet or empty mommy's purse. Bilingual education, which today serves one million individuals, was designed to teach Hispanic

youngsters subjects like math and history in their own language for a couple of years while they learned English, so they would not fall behind. Special education legislation has helped millions of children with learning disabilities.

Since 1965 the federal government has provided more than a quarter of a trillion dollars in 86 million college loans to 29 million students, and more than $14 billion in work-study awards to 6 million students. Today nearly 60 percent of full-time undergraduate students receive federal financial aid under Great Society programs and their progeny.

These programs assure a steady supply of educated individuals who provide the human resources for our economic prosperity. When these programs were enacted, only 41 percent of Americans had completed high school; only 8 percent held college degrees. This past year, more than 81 percent had finished high school and 24 percent had completed college. By establishing the federal government's responsibility to finance this educational surge—and the concept that access to higher education should be determined by ability and ambition, not dollars and cents—we have amassed the trained talent to be the world's leading industrial, technological communications and military power today.

Head Start, which has served more than 16 million preschoolers in just about every city and county in the nation and today serves 800,000 children a year, is as American as motherhood and apple pie. Like so many successes, this preschool program has a thousand parents. But how many people remember the battles over Head Start? Conservatives opposed such early childhood education as an attempt by government to interfere with parental control of their children. In the '60s those were code words to conjure up images of Soviet Russia wrenching children from their homes to convert them to atheistic communism. But Lyndon Johnson knew that the rich had kindergartens and nursery schools; and he asked, why not the same benefits for the poor?

The impact of the Great Society's health programs has been stunning. In 1963, most elderly Americans had no health insurance. Few retirement plans provided any such coverage. The poor had little access to medical treatment until they were in critical condition. Only wealthier Americans could get the finest care, and only by traveling to a few big cities like Boston or New York.

Is revolution too strong a word? Since 1965, 79 million Americans have signed up for Medicare. In 1966, 19 million were enrolled; in 1998, 39 million. Since 1966, Medicaid has served more than 200 million needy Americans. In 1967, it served 10 million poor citizens; in 1997, 39 million. The 1968 Heart, Cancer and Stroke legislation has provided funds to create centers of medical excellence in just abut every major city—from Seattle to Houston, Miami to Cleveland, New Orleans to St. Louis. To staff these centers, the 1965 Health Professions Educational Assistance Act provided resources to double the number of doctors graduating from medical schools, from 8,000 to 16,000. That Act also increased the pool of specialists and researchers, nurses, and paramedics. Community health centers, also part of the Great Society health care agenda, today serve almost eight million Americans annually. The Great Society's commitment to fund basic medical research lifted the National Institutes of Health to unprecedented financial heights, seeding a harvest of medical miracles.

Closely related to these health programs were efforts to reduce malnutrition and hunger. Today, the Great Society's food stamp program helps feed more than 20 million men, women, and children in more than 8 million households. Since it was launched in 1967, the school breakfast program has provided a daily breakfast to nearly 100 million schoolchildren.

Taken together, these programs have played a pivotal role in recasting America's demographic profile. In 1964, life expectancy was 66.6 years for men and 73.1 years for women (69.7 years overall). In a single generation, by 1997, life expectancy jumped 10 percent: for men, to 73.6 years; for women, to 79.2 years (76.5 years overall). The jump was highest among the less advantaged, suggesting that better nutrition and access to health care have played an even larger role than medical miracles. Infant mortality stood at 26 deaths for each 1,000 live births when LBJ took office; today it stands at only 7.3 deaths per 1,000 live births, a reduction of almost 75 percent.

These enormous investments in training medical and scientific experts and funding the National Institutes of Health have played a key part in establishing our nation as the world's leader in basic research, pharmaceutical invention, and the creation of surgical procedures and medical machinery to diagnose our diseases, breathe for us, clean our blood, and transplant our organs.

Those of us who worked with Lyndon Johnson would hardly characterize him as a patron of the arts. Yet think about what cultural life in America would be like without the National Endowments for the Arts and Humanities, which were designed to ''create conditions under which the arts can flourish,'' and make fine theater and music available throughout the nation, not just at Broadway playhouses and the Metropolitan Opera in New York. The Endowment for the Arts has spawned art councils in all 50 states and more than 420 playhouses, 120 opera companies, 400 dance companies and 230 professional orchestras. Johnson also oversaw the creation of the Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, whose programs entertain three million people each year and are televised to millions more, and the Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, which attracts more than 700,000 visitors annually.

Another creature of the Great Society is the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, which today supports 350 public television and 699 public radio stations. These stations have given the nation countless hours of fine arts, superb in-depth news coverage, and educational programs such as Sesame Street that teach as they entertain generations of children. Now many conservatives say there is no need for public radio and television, since there are so many cable channels and radio stations. But as often as we surf with our TV remotes and twist our radio dials, we are not likely to find the kind of quality broadcasting that marks public television and public radio stations.

The Great Society's main contribution to the environment was not just passage of laws, but the establishment of a principle that to this day guides the environmental movement. The old principle was simply to conserve resources that had not been touched. Lyndon Johnson was the first president to put forth a larger idea.

''The air we breathe, our water, our soil and wildlife, are being blighted by poisons and chemicals which are the by-products of technology and industry. The society that receives the rewards of technology, must, as a cooperating whole, take responsibility for [their] control. To deal with these new problems will require a new conservation. We must not only protect the countryside and save it from destruction, we must restore what has been destroyed and salvage the beauty and charm of our cities. Our conservation must be not just the classic conservation of protection and development, but a creative conservation of restoration and innovation.''

Those new environmental commandments inspired a legion of Great Society laws: the Clear Air, Water Quality and Clean Water Restoration Acts and Amendments, the 1965 Solid Waste Disposal Act, the 1965 Motor Vehicle Air Pollution Control Act, and the 1968 Aircraft Noise Abatement Act. They also provided the rationale for later laws creating the Environmental Protection Agency and the Superfund that exacts financial payments from past polluters.

Of the 35 national parks established during the Great Society years, 32 are within easy driving distance of large cities. The 1968 Wild and Scenic Rivers Act today protects 155 river segments in 37 states. The 1968 National Trail System Act has established more than 800 recreational scenic, and historic trails covering 40,000 miles.

EQUAL ACCESS

Above all else, Lyndon Johnson saw the Great Society as an instrument to create racial justice and eliminate poverty. Much of the legislation already cited was aimed at those objectives. But we directly targeted these areas with laser intensity. When LBJ took office, this country had segregated stores, theaters and public accommodations; separate toilets and water fountains for blacks; and restaurants, hotels, and housing restricted to whites only. Job discrimination was rampant. With the 1964 Civil Rights Act, the Great Society tore down all the ''whites only'' signs. The 1968 Fair Housing Act opened up housing to all Americans regardless of race.

But the measure of the Great Society, particularly in this field, cannot be taken alone in statutes enacted. In one of the most moving speeches of the century, Johnson's 1965 Howard University commencement address, ''To Fulfill These Rights,'' he said:

''But freedom is not enough. You do not take a person who, for years, has been hobbled by chains and liberate him, bring him to the starting line of a race and then say, 'You are free to compete with all the others,' and still justly believe that you have been completely fair. This is the next and the more profound stage of the battle for civil rights.'' Thus was born the concept of affirmative action, Johnson's conviction that it is essential as a matter of social justice to provide the tutoring, the extra help, even the preference if necessary, to those who had suffered generations of discrimination, in order to give them a fair chance to share in the American dream. Perhaps even more controversial today than when then set forth, affirmative action has provided opportunity to millions of blacks and has been a critical element in creating a substantial black middle class and an affluent black society in a single generation.

That speech provided another insight the nation ignored. In cataloguing the long suffering of blacks, Johnson included this passage: ''Perhaps most important—its influence radiating to every part of life—is the breakdown of the Negro family structure. It flows from centuries of oppression and persecution of the Negro man. And when the family collapses it is the children that are usually damaged. When it happens on a massive scale the community itself is crippled. So, unless we work to strengthen the family, to create conditions under which most parents will stay together, all the rest—schools, and playgrounds, and public assistance, and private concern—will never be enough to cut completely the circle of despair and deprivation.''

Conservatives charge the Great Society with responsibility for the disastrous aspects of the welfare program for mothers and children. But that program was enacted in the 1930s and conservatives (and liberals) in Congress rejected Great Society efforts to revamp it. LBJ called the welfare system in

America ''outmoded and in need of a major change'' and pressed Congress to stop conditioning welfare benefits on the man leaving the house and to create a work incentive program, incentives for earning, day care for children, child and maternal health, and family planning services. In the generation it has taken the nation to heed that warning, millions of children's lives have been savaged.

In the entire treasury of Great Society measures, the jewel Lyndon Johnson believed would have the greatest value was the Voting Rights Act of 1965. That law opened the way for black Americans to strengthen their voice at every level of government. In 1964 there were 79 black elected officials in the South and 300 in the entire nation. By 1998, there were some 9,000 elected black officials across the nation, including 6,000 in the South. In 1965 there were five black members of the House; today there are 39.

Great Society contributions to racial equality were not only civic and political. In 1960, black life expectancy was 63.6 years, not even long enough to benefit from the Social Security taxes that black citizens paid during their working lives. By 1997, black life expectancy was 71.2 years, thanks almost entirely to Medicaid, community health centers, job training, food stamps, and other Great Society programs. In 1960, the infant mortality rate for blacks was 44.3 for each 1,000 live births; in 1997, that rate had plummeted by two-thirds, to 14.7. In 1960, only 20 percent of blacks completed high school and only 3 percent finished college; in 1997, 75 percent completed high school and more than 13 percent earned college degrees.

In waging the war on poverty, congressional opposition was too strong to pass an income maintenance law. So LBJ took advantage of the biggest automatic cash machine around: Social Security. He proposed, and Congress enacted, whopping increases in the minimum benefits that lifted some two million Americans 65 and older above the poverty line. In 1996, thanks to those increased minimum benefits, Social Security lifted 12 million senior citizens above the poverty line.

The combination of that Social Security increase, Medicare and the coverage of nursing home care under Medicaid (which today funds care for 68 percent of nursing home residents) has had a defining impact on American families. Millions of middle-aged Americans, freed from the burden of providing and medical and nursing home care for their elderly parents, suddenly were able to buy homes and (often with assistance from Great Society higher education programs) send their children to college.

No Great Society undertaking has been subjected to more withering conservative attacks than the Office of Economic Opportunity. Yet the War on Poverty was founded on the most conservative principle: Put the power in the local community, not in Washington; give people at the grassroots the ability to stand tall on their own two feet.

Conservative claims that the OEO poverty programs were nothing but a waste of money are preposterous—as preposterous as Ronald Reagan's quip that ''LBJ declared war on poverty and poverty won''. Eleven of the 12 programs that OEO launched in the mid-60's are alive, well and funded at an annual rate exceeding $10 billion; apparently legislators believe they're still working. Head Start, Job Corps, Community Health Centers, Foster Grandparents, Upward Bound (now part of the Trio Program in the Department of Education), Green Thumb (now Senior Community Service Employment), Indian Opportunities (now in the Labor Department) and Migrant Opportunities (now Seasonal Worker Training and Migrant Education) were all designed to do what they have been doing: empowering individuals to stand on their own two feet.

Community Action, VISTA Volunteers, and Legal Services continue to put power in the hands of individuals down at the grassroots level. The grassroots that these programs fertilize just don't produce the manicured laws that conservatives prefer. Only the Neighborhood Youth Corps has been abandoned—in 1974, after enrolling more than five million individuals. Despite the political rhetoric, every president, Ronald Reagan included, has urged Congress to fund these OEO programs or has approved substantial appropriations for them.

A BETTER DEAL

The Great Society confronted two monumental shifts in America: The urbanization of the population and the nationalization of commercial power. For urban America, it created the Department of Housing and Urban Development. It drove through Congress the Urban Mass Transit Act, which has given San Franciscans BART, Washingtonians Metro, Atlantans MARTA, and cities across America thousands of buses and modernized transit systems. The 1968 Housing Act has provided homes for more than 7 million families. The Great Society also created Ginnie Mae, which has added more than $1 billion to the supply of affordable mortgage funds, and privatized Fannie Mae, which has helped more than 30 million families purchase homes.

The '60s also saw a nationalization of commercial power that had the potential to disadvantage the individual American consumer. Superstores and super-corporations were rapidly shoving aside the corner grocer, local banker, and independent drug store. Automobiles were complex and dangerous, manufactured by giant corporations with deep pockets to protect themselves. Banks had the most sophisticated accountants and lawyers to draft their loan agreements. Sellers of everyday products—soaps, produce, meats, appliances, clothing, cereals, and canned and frozen foods—packaged their products with the help of the shrewdest marketers and designers. The individual was outflanked at every position.

Sensing that mismatch, the Great Society produced a bevy of laws to level the playing field for consumers: auto and highway safety for the motorist; truth in packaging for the consumer; truth in lending for the homebuyer, small businessman and individual borrower; wholesome meat and wholesome poultry laws to enhance food safety. It created the Product Safety Commission to assure that toys and other products would be safe for users and the Flammable Fabrics Act to reduce the incendiary characteristics of clothing and blankets. To keep kids out of the medicine bottle we proposed the Child Safety Act.

The revolution in transportation led to the creation of the National Transportation Safety Board, renowned for its work in improving air safety, and the Department of Transportation.

In numbers of Americans helped, the Great Society exceeds in domestic impact even the New Deal of LBJ's idol, Franklin Roosevelt. but far more profound and enduring are the fundamental tenets of public responsibility it espoused, which influence and shape the nation's public policy and political dialogue to this day.

Until the New Deal, the federal government had been regarded as a regulatory power, protecting the public health and safety with the Food and Drug Administration and enforcing antitrust and commercial fraud laws to rein in concentrations of economic power. With the creation of the Securities and Exchange Commission and the other alphabet agencies, FDR took the government into deeper regulatory waters. He also put the feds into the business of cash payments: welfare benefits, railroad retirement, and Social Security.

Johnson converted the federal government into a far more energetic, proactive force for social justice—striking down discriminatory practices and offering a hand up with education, health care, and job training. These functions had formerly been the preserve of private charities and the states. Before the Johnson administration, for example, the federal government was not training a single worker. He vested the federal government with the responsibility to soften the sharp elbows of capitalism and give it a beating, human heart; to redistribute opportunity as well as wealth.

For the public safety, Johnson took on the National Rifle Association and drove through Congress the laws that closed the loophole of mail order guns, prohibited sales to minors, and ended the import of Saturday night specials. He tried unsuccessfully to convince Congress to pass a law requiring the licensing of every gun owner and the registration of every gun.

Spotting the ''for sale'' signs of political corruption going up in the nation's capital, Johnson proposed public financing of presidential campaigns, full disclosure of contributions and expenses by all federal candidates, limits on contributions, and eliminating lobbying loopholes. He convinced Congress to provide for public financing of Presidential campaigns through the income-tax checkoff. But they ignored his 1967 warning: ''More and more, men and women of limited means may refrain from running for public office. Private wealth increasingly becomes an artificial and unrealistic arbiter of qualifications, and the source of public leadership is thus severely narrowed. The necessity of acquiring substantial funds to finance campaigns diverts a candidate's attention form his public obligations and detracts from his energetic exposition of the issues.''

FEAR OF THE L-WORD

Lyndon Johnson didn't talk the talk of legacy. He walked the walk. He lived the life. He didn't have much of a profile, but he did have the courage of his convictions, and the achievements of his Great Society were monumental.

Why then do Democratic politicians who battle to preserve Great Society programs ignore those achievements? For the same reason Bill Clinton came to the LBJ library on Johnson's birthday during the 1992 campaign and never spoke the name of Lyndon Johnson or recognized Ladybird Johnson, who was sitting on the stage from which he spoke.

The answer lies in their fear of being called ''liberal'' and in their opposition to the Vietnam War. In contemporary America politicians are paralyzed by fear of the label that comes with the heritage of Lyndon Johnson's Great Society. Democrats rest their hops of a return to Congressional power on promises to preserve and expand Great Society programs like Medicare and aid to education, but they tremble at the thought of linking those programs to the liberal Lyndon. The irony is that they seek to distance themselves from the president who once said that the difference between liberals and cannibals is that cannibals eat only their enemies.

Democratic officeholders also assign Johnson the role of stealth president because of the Vietnam War. Most contemporary observers put the war down as a monumental blunder. Only a handful—most of them Republicans—defend Vietnam as part of a half-

century bipartisan commitment to contain communism with American blood and money. Seen in that context, Vietnam was a tragic losing battle in a long, winning war—a war that began with Truman's ordeal in Korea, the Marshall Plan, and the 1948 Berlin airlift, and ended with the collapse of communism at the end of the Reagan Administration.

Whatever anyone thinks about Vietnam and however much politicians shrink from the liberal label, it is time to recognize—as historians are beginning to do—the reality of the remarkable and enduring achievements of the Great Society programs. Without such programs as Head Start, higher-education loans and scholarships, Medicare, Medicaid, clear air and water, and civil rights, life would be nastier, more brutish, and shorter for millions of Americans.

TRIBUTE TO DR. BRADY JOSEPH JONES, SR.

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1999

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to note with great sadness the passing of Dr. Brady Joseph Jones Senior, one of the great community leaders of Dallas, Texas.

Dr. B.J. Jones was born in Longview, Texas on August 30, 1915. He graduated from Prairie View College in 1939, and he later earned his doctorate from Meharry Medical College in the area of Dentistry in 1953.

Out of dedication to delivering services to the low-income families, he chose to keep his practice in the heart of South Dallas. He cared for patients in this area with compassion and success. He was a pioneer dentist and a giant in our community.

During his career, he was a charter member of a group of Black Professional who introduced the idea of investment and saving throughout the Black Professional community. He advocated education, self-sufficiency, and responsibility.

Dr. Jones was a loving parent. He was the proud father of a dentist, a psychiatrist, and an educator, who is an art enthusiast with most of her studies being done at the J. Paul Getty Museum in Los Angeles, California.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. B.J. Jones inspired his children, his peers, the Black community and all who knew him.

With his passing, I have lost a dear friend, many members of our community have lost a mentor, and the citizens of Dallas have lost a great leader. He was truly an inspiration, and he will be missed. God bless him and his family. We commend him to you, dear Lord, in your eternal care.

HONORING DOUGLAS WAGNER MORAN

HON. GEORGE RADANOVICH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1999

Mr. RADANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the birth of Douglas Wagner Moran. Douglas, the first child of Mary and Michael Moran of San Francisco, California, arrived on Friday, October 15th, 1999, at 7:45 a.m., weighing in at a healthy 7 pounds three ounces and an impressive 21½ inches. Mr. Speaker I request my colleagues in joining me in offering our heartiest congratulations to the Moran family and share their happiness in being new parents.

RECOGNITION OF THE 80TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SECOND BAPTIST CHURCH

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1999

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize the 80th anniversary of the Second Baptist Church located in Romeo, Michigan. In late 1918 and early 1919, a group of devoted Christians began holding prayer meetings in their homes. In 1920, Katherine Board, Jennie (Green) Barton, George Green, Arthur Board, Katie Watkins, Virgil Watkins and Susan Armstrong met to discuss the idea of starting a church of their own. Many people at that time were attending the local Methodist Church and decided to approach the village officials to request a location to hold their own services.

The church was first housed in the Town Bank Practice Hall, a small room above the Romeo Fire Department and Jail on Rawles Street. After a year of increased attendance and the choir becoming well recognized throughout the region, the members decided that they wanted a building of their own. The cornerstone was laid in 1932 and dedicated Second Baptist Church under Reverend Cannon. The structure stood for over 35 years as the center of the church community until the new structure was started in 1968.

Through the hard work of the church's members, and the leadership of its many devoted Pastors, the members have built a beacon of light in the Romeo community. The Second Baptist Church brings together every aspect of the village. Blacks and whites from various economic backgrounds come together to worship in the community of faith centered around The Second Baptist Church.

For the last eighty years, the Second Baptist Church has remained steadfast in its loyalty to the community and to its faith in God. Please join me in asking for God's blessing for another eighty years of service, support, and community for the members of this wonderful church.

TRENDS AND ACHIEVEMENTS OF COMMUNITY-BASED DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATIONS FROM 1994 TO 1998

HON. MELVIN L. WATT

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1999

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I submit the document titled, "Trends and Achievements of Community-based Development Organizations from 1994 to 1998." For printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

COMMUNITY–BASED DEVELOPMENT—COMING OF AGE

THE 1999 NCCED CENSUS REPORT ON THE TRENDS AND ACHIEVEMENTS OF COMMUNITY-BASED DEVELOPMENT ORGANIZATIONS

Executive Summary

Over the past ten years, the National Congress for Community Economic Development has conducted a series of four national census surveys to record the trends and achievements of community-based development organizations. This report, Coming of Age—The Achievements of Community-based Development Organizations, contains NCCED's most recent census findings from 1994 to 1998.

Commonly known as CDCs (community development corporations), these non-profit organizations share several common characteristics: they focus on win-win outcomes benefiting business and community; they are multi-disciplined; they are based on economic practices; and they are indigenous. They derive their leadership and governance from residents and other stakeholders in the communities they serve and can therefore uniquely assess local needs and tap into local resources.

The census of CDCs commissioned by NCCED—the national trade association for the community-based development industry. The NCCED census report has become the definitive source of data on the characteristics and achievements of these organizations, which are found throughout urban and rural America.

Community-based development is not well-known—and is less understood. It is a movement borne of the poverty programs and policies of the sixties. Today, after three decades, it is an industry of considerable strength that is quietly transforming lives and communities across America. It is uniquely American force in the best traditions of the social and economic institutions observed by Alexis deTocqueville in early 19th century communities.

The achievements of CDCs are a story of remarkable success in the face of considerable uncertainty and challenge. The 1999 NCCED Census Report indicates that the industry of CDCs has grown by 64% to an estimated 3,600 organizations in the last four years alone. The productivity of the industry over its 30 years history is reflected in the following figures:

71 million square feet of commercial and industrial space developed;

$1.9 million in loans outstanding (at the end of 1997) to 59,000 small and micro-businesses;

247,000 private sector jobs created; and

550,000 units of affordable rental and ownership housing built or renovated, nearly 40% of which has been completed in the last four years.

These figures account for the most measurable outputs of the community development industry. They represents, however, only a part of the picture. The rest of the picture is found in the expanding role of CDCs in the delivery of services in such areas as pre- and post-employment training and support, entrepreneurship, and transportation services. Important to this story of productivity is the fact that most of it has occurred during the 1990s. Community-based development is an industry of considerable strength that is quietly transforming lives and communities across America.

The coming of age of the CDC as an economic force is in response to community needs, profound changes in public policy, and an awakening in the corporate sector to the economic opportunities that CDC communities represent. These communities—both urban and rural—are more and more recognized as a labor source to fill a growing job

market. They also represent an underserved market for the sale of goods and services. The forces that brought about the growth of community development represent challenges and opportunities for CDC communities. In many distressed communities, CDCs are at the center of initiatives that are the difference between being economically marginalized or being economically viable.

The convergence of public policy shifts and the forces of an economy in a period of unprecedented growth has created a set of conditions in which community-based development organizations are uniquely positioned to be agents of economic change and instruments of public policy. As the 1999 NCCED Census Report illustrates, CDCs are ideally positioned to bring together the economic interests and assets of communities, companies and city halls for the benefit of all.

The findings of the 1999 NCCED Census Report have significance for decision-makers in both the private and public sectors, and they demonstrate the credibility of NCCED as a value-added advisor to business. CDCs have established a track record as effective instruments in multiple areas:

Commercial and industrial real estate development. CDCs have produced an estimated 71,400,000 square feet of commercial and industrial facilities. In the latest four-year census period, CDCs provided nearly $600 million in financing for commercial and industrial development. This record establishes CDCs as capable development partners of shopping centers, manufacturing facilities, distribution centers, business incubators, office centers, and community facilities.

Small and Micro-business lending. CDCs have emerged as ''surrogate'' commercial lenders for banks in underserved markets. CDCs and community development financial institutions (CDFIs) are often the only source of credit for micro-entrepreneurs and start-up businesses. CDCs and CDFIs enhance their lending services with technical assistance and support to their business borrowers, which has been central to their success as loan services and portfolio managers. Nationally, at the end of 1997, the estimated amount of CDC loans outstanding was $1.9 billion of 59,000 businesses.

Business partners. CDCs are the key to facilitating business relationships, locating equity capital and real estate opportunities, and providing the technical assistance to forge partnerships between community and corporate interests.

Affordable housing production. CDC housing production is on the rise. Thirty percent of the assisted housing in the nation has been produced by CDCs. A total of 245,000 units of affordable housing were produced during the latest four-year census period.

Increasing home ownership. Of CDC housing production, 26 percent in urban areas and 53 percent in rural areas is for ownership by low and moderate income home buyers. Many CDCs have become home buyer counselors, and mortgage loan packagers and originators in partnership with banks and mortgage companies. This capacity is a valuable resource for achieving increased home ownership as a national and a local policy strategy for family asset building and neighborhood stabilization.

Workforce development. For the first time, the NCCED census indicates that CDCs are increasingly engaged in providing employment support and training to community residents. A growing number of CDCs are direct providers of job readiness training and job skill training, and such employment support services as child care and transportation to work. CDCs are natural partners in the welfare reform effort.

Neighborhood revitalization. CDCs have been working to revitalize distressed neighborhoods, often while municipal investment priorities have been focused on the downtowns of major cities. As municipal investment priorities shift attention to neighborhoods, CDCs are ready and able to act as brokers and partners with city halls and the business community.

Community building. The broad vision of CDCs is evident in the census results. Their community building activities are significantly on the rise and include child care, education programs, training, counseling, transportation, and health care services.

These findings reflect the extraordinary growth of the community-based development industry over the past decade. As the 1999 NCCED Census Report illustrates, CDCs have truly come of age in the 1990s. Tangible impact of their successes are visible in low-income urban and rural communities across the country. CDCs, with their comprehensive scope and indigenous origins, are uniquely positioned as the driving force in American renewal by bringing about win-win outcomes, benefiting both business and the community.

NCCED as the trade association for the community-based economic development industry is the voice for the policy interests of economically distressed rural and urban communities. Through its membership network, programs, and national public and private sector partnerships. NCCED is recognized as a leading information and technical assistance resource for community-based development organizations as they expand their capacity to undertake the diversity of strategies for the development of healthy communities.

REMEMBERING RABBI JOSEPH WEINBERG

HON. LOIS CAPPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1999

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, this weekend, the nation lost one of its foremost religious and spiritual leaders, Rabbi Joseph P. Weinberg. Rabbi Weinberg served for over thirty years at Washington Hebrew Congregation. Throughout his exceptional career, Rabbi Weinberg distinguished himself not only for his Jewish scholarship and the pastoral care he devoted to his congregation, but as a champion in the fights for civil rights, racial understanding, and religious tolerance.

Rabbi Weinberg was a gracious, warm and compassionate man. He possessed both a softspoken demeanor and a fiery determination to correct the injustices of our society. Above all else, he was devoted to his family. I wish to extend my most sincere condolences to his wife Marcia, his children Rachel, Johathan, Josh, their spouses, and his grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I submit for our colleagues an article about Rabbi Weinberg that was published in the Washington Post. This article reports on Rabbi Weinberg's final Rosh Hashanah sermon, delivered last month with the help of his children. Using Tolstoy's famous journal entry, ''Still Alive,'' Rabbi Weinberg said:

''Dear congregants, children and grandchildren,

It is Rosh Hashanah. . .and we are still here.

Still alive—to stand for causes that are just.

Still alive—to stand in solidarity with others.

Still alive—to bear witness to the majesty of the human soul.

Still alive! Still alive!''

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, Rabbi Joseph P. Weinberg is still alive. He may no longer be physically among us, but his spirit and legacy live on.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 17, 1999]

RABBI JOSEPH P. WEINBERG DIES AT 62

(By Caryle Murphy)

Joseph P. Weinberg, 62, senior rabbi at Washington Hebrew Congregation, who had been active in interracial and civil rights efforts since the 1960s, died at his Potomac home Friday night after battling brain cancer for more than a year.

Rabbi Weinberg, who was known for his concern for social issues, had served for 31 years at Washington Hebrew, the city's oldest Jewish congregation and the largest Reform congregation in the Washington area. For many of its thousands of members as well as many others in the community at large, he was the human symbol of the congregation.

His death came a little more than a month after the rabbi delivered an emotional farewell sermon on Rosh Hashanah, the Jewish New Year and one of the holiest days in the Jewish calendar.

With the help of his three children, who each read portions of the sermon, Weinberg told a packed sanctuary he had just learned that he must ''battle anew with my pesky invader'' but wanted ''to have Rosh Hashanah as usual.''

He said the holiday was a reminder of ''God's great gift to us . . . the precious gift of time,'' which is ''ours to fill wisely, joyfully, completely.'' The ailing rabbi told his congregants to rejoice that ''we are still here. Still alive, to stand for causes that are just . . . to bear witness to the majesty of the human soul. Still alive!''

The Sept. 11 sermon was the first time many in the congregation realized ''what was really happening as far as his health was concerned,'' recalled Kenneth Marks, president of the Northwest Washington congregation. ''The mood was quite emotional.

''Joe Weinberg and the congregation were one and the same, basically,'' Marks added. ''What can you say when you lose someone who meant so much? This is the most compassionate man you ever met in your life. He always wanted to do good, and he always had time for you.''

Weinberg's brain cancer was diagnosed in March 1998, and he underwent surgery twice, his wife, Marcia Weinberg, said yesterday. On Friday evening, the family had gathered for the traditional Shabbat prayers, and Weinberg, his wife recalled, ''left us while the candles were still burning.''

Since his arrival in Washington in 1968—a time when the city was wracked by racial riots and anti-war protests—Weinberg played a leading role in efforts to improve racial relations and fight poverty. He helped organize Ya'chad, a Jewish organization promoting affordable city housing, and Carrie Simon House, a transitional home for unmarried mothers in Northwest Washington, which is supported by Washington Hebrew.

Weinberg also was a moving force behind his congregation's annual service held jointly with local African American churches to honor the legacy of the Rev. Martin Luther King Jr. on the Jewish Sabbath right before King's national holiday.

Marcia Weinberg, 61, said her husband had been deeply affected by his experiences when he marched with King in the historic civil rights march in Selma, AL, in 1965. Then a young rabbi, Weinberg was arrested twice.

''It was an important moment for him as a human being and as a rabbi,'' she said. ''Joseph was very motivated by social action.''

Weinberg was born in Chicago in 1937. His mother, Helen Joy Weinberg, was an artist, and his father, Alfred, a businessman. In 1938, as the Nazi menace was threatening European Jewry, Alfred Weinberg returned to his native Germany to bring his parents and several other family members to the United States.

After graduating from Northwestern University in 1958, Joseph Weinberg immediately entered seminary at Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion in Cincinnati. After his ordination in 1963, he served as assistant rabbi at a San Francisco congregation before coming to Washington.

Weinberg, who also was a fervent supporter of Israel and campaigned for years to help Soviet Jews emigrate, became senior rabbi at Washington Hebrew in 1986. He was only the fifth rabbi to hold that position since the Reform congregation was founded in 1952.

The original congregants held services in their homes until they purchased a building site in the 800 block of Eighth Street NW. in Chinatown. There, they built their first synagogue, which they sold 58 years later. Today, the former temple, which still has the Star of David in its stained-glass windows, is home to Greater New Hope Baptist Church.

Washington Hebrew, with a membership of more than 3,000 families, is now located on Macomb Street NW. Funeral services for Weinberg will be held at the congregation tomorrow at 1 p.m.

In addition to his wife, Weinberg is survived by a sister, Judith Adler, 66 of Seattle; a daughter, Rachel Weinberg of Arlington; two sons, Jonathan Weinberg of Potomac and Josh Weinberg of Bethesda; and four grandchildren.

INTRODUCTION OF A BILL TO AMEND THE ALASKA NATIVE CLAIMS SETTLEMENT ACT

HON. DON YOUNG

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, October 18, 1999

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation that would address several matters of concern to Alaska Natives through amendments to the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (ANCSA) of 1971.

As my colleagues know, ANCSA was enacted in 1971, stimulated by the need to address Native land claims as well as the desire to clear the way for the construction of the Trans-Alaska Pipeline and thereby provide our country with access to the petroleum resources of Alaska's North Slope. As the years pass, issues arise which require amending that act. The Resources Committee as a matter of course routinely considers such amendments and brings them before the House.

The bill has three provisions. One of the provisions would restore 50,000 acres back to the village of Elim. The Norton Bay Reservation (later referred to as Norton Bay Native Reserve) was formally established in 1917 by an Executive Order and comprised approximately 350,000 acres of land for use of the U.S. Bureau of Education and the Natives of Indigenous Alaskan race. It is located approximately 110 miles southeast of Nome, Alaska along the shoreline of Norton Bay Reservation. Some of the burial grounds were mass graves of Natives who succumbed to epidemics of disease brought into the Eskimo culture by non-Natives. Today, Elim is home to about 300 Alaska Natives and a small number of non-Natives who live and work in the village.

In 1919, Congress enacted a law requiring that any future Indian Reservations be established only by an act of Congress. In 1927, Congress passed an act which prohibited boundary adjustments to Executive Order Reservations other than an act of Congress.

In 1929, President Herbert Hoover, by an Executive Order, reduced the size of the Elim reservation by 50,000 acres. The land was deleted from the Reservation for the benefits of others and was not offered to be restored to the original Reservation when lands comprising the Reservation were made available to the Native inhabitants of Elim under section 19(b) of the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act of 1971. The failure to replace these lands has been and continues to be a source of deep concern to the indigenous people of Elim and until this matter is dealt with equitably, it will continue to be a source of great frustration and sense of loss among the shareholders of Elim Native Corporation and their descendants.

This bill will give the Elim Native Corporation 2 years in which to select no more than 60,000 acres depicted on the map dated August 1, 1999, and entitled Land Withdrawal Elim Native Corporation Land Restoration. It also authorizes the Elim Native Corporation to select and receive title to 50,000 acres of lands within the boundary of the lands described on the map. The Secretary is further authorized and directed to receive and adjudicate a selection application by the Elim Native Corporation, and to convey the surface and subsurface estate in the selected lands to the Elim Native Corporation subject to rules, conditions and limitations outlined in this bill.

I am attaching copies of two letters (with my statement) from two individuals who support the restoration of 50,000 acres to the people of Elim. The first letter is from Mr. Donald C. Mitchell, Attorney at Law. Mr. Mitchell, over the course of 20 years, has worked on amendments to the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (ANCSA) and has written a book regarding the history of the ANCSA. The second letter is from Mr. Rick Steiner, Director of The Coastal Coalition, a highly respected conservation group in Alaska. Their letters simply state a brief outline of support for the restoration of 50,000 acres to the people of Elim.

Another provision of this bill would allow shareholder stock to be transferred to adopted Alaska Native children and to their descendants.

Another provision would amend the definition of a ''settlement trust'' under ANCSA.

This bill is the result of the work of the Alaska Federation of Natives, Elim Native Corporation and myself to restore 50,000 acres back to the Native peoples of Elim. The legislative language changes within the bill were revised with the technical assistance of the Department of the Interior.

DONALD C. MITCHELL,
ATTORNEY AT LAW,
Anchorage, AK, October 8, 1999.

Re: Section 7 of H.R. 3013 (Elim Native Corporation Amendment).

Hon. DON YOUNG,
Chairman, Committee on Resources, Longworth Building, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. GEORGE MILLER,
Ranking Member, Committee on Resources, Longworth Building, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES YOUNG and MILLER: On October 5, 1999 Mr. Young introduced, and the Committee on Resources was referred, H.R. 3013, the Alaska Native Claims Technical Amendments of 1999.

In 1971 when it settled Alaska Native land claims by enacting the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (ANCSA) the 92d Congress determined that social and economic justice required that Alaska Natives who resided in a village located within the boundaries of a reservation that had been established for their benefit should be afforded an opportunity to select, and to be conveyed legal title to, all public land located within the reservation's boundaries.

The Inupiat residents of the village of Elim took advantage of that opportunity, and the Secretary of the Interior conveyed the Elim Native Corporation legal title to the public land located within the boundaries of the former Norton Bay Reservation, as those boundaries existed in 1971.

ANCSA was a milestone in the history of Congress's relations with Native Americans. But because it was by no means perfect, since 1971 subsequent Congresses have amended ANCSA on numerous occasions to provide Alaska Natives additional land selection opportunities when necessary to ensure that the Act achieves its objectives.

The most important of those objectives is to afford Alaska Natives social and economic justice regarding their ownership of public land they historically used and occupied.

As you know, from 1977 to 1994 I served as counsel to the Alaska Federation of Natives (AFN), which Alaska Natives organized in 1967 to lead the fight for a fair and just land claims settlement. In that capacity I over the years participated in developing a number of amendments to ANCSA that Congress enacted to ensure that the objective of affording Alaska Natives social and economic justice is achieved.

One of the most grievous cases of social and economic injustice of which I became aware during my tenure as AFN's counsel was the caprice with which representatives of the federal executive in 1929 diminished the land rights of the Inupiat residents of the village of Elim by adjusting the boundary of the Norton Bay Reservation without their knowledge or consent.

The facts regarding that situation are well-known and uncontroverted. During my tenure at AFN I and others on several occasions attempted to bring the Elim situation to Congress's attention, but we were no successful. As a consequence, I am delighted to find that section 7 of H.R. 3013 attempts to remedy the injustice that was inflicted on the Inupiat residents of Elim in 1929 when the boundary of the Norton Reservation was unfairly, and in my view unlawfully, modified. For that reason, I would respectfully, but strongly, urge you and other members of the Committee on Resources to favorably report section 7 of H.R. 3013 to the U.S. House of Representatives, either as part of H.R. 3013, or as a stand-alone bill.

Sincerely,

DON MITCHELL.

THE COASTAL COALITION,
Anchorage, AK, October 8, 1999.

Re: Elim Native Corporation Land Restoration proposal

Hon. DON YOUNG, Chairman,
Hon. GEORGE MILLER,
House of Representatives, Committee on Resources, Washington, DC.

DEAR GENTLEMEN, I just wanted to offer a few words in support of the proposal before your committee to return to the Elim Corporation 50,000 acres of land that had been deleted in 1929 by Executive Order.

It is my understanding from the history of this issue that the deletion by Executive Order from the Norton Bay Reservation was the result of a concerted effort by non-Natives to gain access to the area for commercial purposes such as fur farming, prospecting and mining. The deletion from the Reservation seemed to be yet another profound injustice perpetrated on Alaska Natives. Apparently, Elim people weren't even consulted regarding this deletion.

In my many years living in and working in northwest Alaska, I visited Elim several times, and they were always some of the kindest, most accommodating people I had the opportunity to work with. They certainly seem to care a great deal about their land and cultural heritage.

Before your committee is a remarkable opportunity to right this wrong, and I urge you to act upon this opportunity. The return of 50,000 acres of land to the Elim shareholders seems justified not just on moral and ethical grounds, but also on the grounds of conservation and protection of valuable fish and wildlife habitat. Particularly important is the habitat along the Tubuktoolik River and its wastershed.

I would hope that a protective conservation easement or other protective covenant could be included with the transfer in order to secure sustainable protection of the area well into the future. This would not only protect the lands from potentially damaging commercial activities, but would also allow Elim to develop a truly sustainable economy in the region. As the lands are held at present, there are no such protections and the area could easily fall victim to short-term activities against the desires and sentiments of the Elim people.

Returning this land to the Elim people with protective covenants is a win-win scenario, as it provides ethical redress of some rather outrageous federal activity earlier this century, conservation of the region, and opportunity for the Elim people to rebuild a sustainable economy on their land.

Thanks for your attention to this very important issue.

Sincerely,

RICK STEINER,
Director, The Coastal Coalition.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, October 19, 1999 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

OCTOBER 20

9 a.m.
Judiciary
To hold hearings on the Justice Department's role and the FALN.
SD–226

9:30 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings to examine the use of performance enhancing drugs in Olympic competition.
SD–106

Indian Affairs
To hold oversight hearings on the implementation of the Transportation Equity Act in the 21st Century, focusing on Indian reservation roads; to be followed by a business meeting on pending calendar business.
SR–485

Rules and Administration
To hold oversight hearings on the operations of the Architect of the Capitol.
SR–301

Armed Services
Emerging Threats and Capabilities Subcommittee
To hold hearings on the efforts of the military services in implementing joint experimentation.
SR–222

Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.
SD–366

10 a.m.
Finance
Business meeting to mark up on the proposed Tax Extenders and the Balanced Budget Adjustments Act.
SD–215

11:30 a.m.
Conferees
Meeting of conferees continued on H.R. 1000, to amend title 49, United States Code, to reauthorize programs of the Federal Aviation Administration.
Room to be announced

2 p.m.
Foreign Relations
To hold hearings on extradition Treaty between the Government of the United States of America and the Government of the Republic of Korea (hereinafter referred to as ''the Treaty''), signed at Washington on June 9, 1998 (Treaty Doc. 106–02).
SD–419

2:30 p.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Water and Power Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1167, to amend the Pacific Northwest Electric Power Planning and Conservation Act to provide for expanding the scope of the Independent Scientific Review Panel; S. 1694, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study on the reclamation and reuse of water and wastewater in the State of Hawaii; S. 1612, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain irrigation project property to certain irrigation and reclamation districts in the State of Nebraska; S. 1474, providing conveyance of the Palmetto Bend project to the State of Texas; S. 1697, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to refund certain collections received pursuant to the Reclamation Reform Act of 1982; S. 1178, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain parcels of land acquired for the Blunt Reservoir and Pierre Canal features of the Oahe Irrigation Project, South Dakota, to the Commission of Schools and Public Lands of the State of South Dakota for the purpose of mitigating lost wildlife habitat, on the condition that the current preferential leaseholders shall have an option to purchase the parcels from the Commission; and S. 1723, to establish a program to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to plan, design, and construct facilities to mitigate impacts associated with irrigation system water diversions by local governmental entities in the Pacific Ocean drainage of the States of Oregon, Washington, Montana, and Idaho.
SD–366

OCTOBER 21

9:30 a.m.
Armed Services
To resume hearings on the lessons learned from the military operations conducted as part of Operation Allied Force, and associated relief operations, with respect to Kosovo; to be followed by a closed hearing (SR–222).
SD–106

10 a.m.
Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions
To hold hearings on the implementation of the Food and Drug Administration Modernization Act (P.L. 105–115).
SD–430

Governmental Affairs
To hold hearings on the nomination of John F. Walsh, of Connecticut, to be a Governor of the United States Postal Service; and the nomination of LeGree Sylvia Daniels, of Pennsylvania, to be a Governor of the United States Postal Service.
SD–628

Judiciary
Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.
SD–226

10:30 a.m.
Foreign Relations
To hold hearings on convention (No. 182) Concerning the Prohibition and Immediate Action for the Elimination of the Worst Forms of Child Labor, adopted by the International Labor Conference at its 87th Session in Geneva on June 17, 1999 (Treaty Doc. 106–05).
SD–419

2 p.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
National Parks, Historic Preservation, and Recreation Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 1365, to amend the National Preservation Act of 1966 to extend the authorization for the Historic Preservation Fund and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation; S. 1434, to amend the National Historic Preservation Act to reauthorize that Act; and H.R. 834, to extend the authorization for the National Historic Preservation Fund.
SD–366

Judiciary
Immigration Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine America's workforce needs in the 21st century.
SD–226

2:30 p.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine issues dealing with the national technical information services.
SR–253

OCTOBER 25

1 p.m.
Small Business
To hold hearings to examine the incidents of high-tech fraud on small businesses.
SD–562

OCTOBER 26

9:30 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings on the interpretation and implementation plans of subsistence management regulations for public lands in Alaska.
SD–366

2:30 p.m.
Armed Services
Readiness and Management Support Subcommittee
To hold hearings on the Real Property Management Program and the maintenance of the historic homes and senior offices' quarters.
SR–222

OCTOBER 27

9:30 a.m.
Indian Affairs
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for elementary and secondary education assistance, focusing on Indian educational programs; to be followed by a business meeting on pending calendar business.
SR–285

Armed Services
To hold hearings on the nomination of The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601: Gen. Joseph W. Ralston, 9172, To be General; the nomination of The following named officer for appointment as Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and appointment to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., sections 601 and 154: Gen. Richard B. Myers, 7092, To be General; the nomination of The following named officer for appointment in the United States Army to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section

601: Gen. Thomas A. Schwartz, 0711, To be General; and the nomination of The following named officer for appointment in the United States Air Force to the grade indicated while assigned to a position of importance and responsibility under title 10, U.S.C., section 601: Gen. Ralph E. Eberhart, 7375, To be General.

SH–216

3 p.m.

Foreign Relations

To hold hearings on numerous tax treaties and protocol.

SD–419

NOVEMBER 4

9:30 a.m.

Indian Affairs

To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Resources on S. 1586, to reduce the fractionated ownership of Indian Lands; and S. 1315, to permit the leasing of oil and gas rights on certain lands held in trust for the Navajo Nation or allotted to a member of the Navajo Nation, in any case in which there is consent from a specified percentage interest in the parcel of land under consideration for lease.

Room to be announced

CANCELLATIONS

OCTOBER 21

9:30 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

To hold oversight hearings on issues related to land withdrawals and potential National Monument designations using the Antiquities Act, or Federal Land Policy and Management Act.

SD–366

OCTOBER 26

9:30 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings on S. 882, to strengthen provisions in the Energy Policy Act of 1992 and the Federal Nonnuclear Energy Research and Development Act of 1974 with respect to potential Climate Change.

SD–366

POSTPONEMENTS

OCTOBER 21

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Aviation Subcommittee

To hold hearings on issues dealing with air traffic control delays.

SR–253

Daily Digest
Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S12731–S12798

Measures Introduced: Five bills were introduced, as follows: S. 1742–1746. **Pages S12783–84**

Measures Reported: Reports were made as follows:

S. 1119, to amend the Act of August 9, 1950, to continue funding of the Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection and Restoration Act. (S. Rept. No. 106–193)

S. 1744, to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to provide that certain species conservation reports shall continue to be submitted. (S. Rept. No. 106–194)

S. 1275, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to produce and sell products and to sell publications relating to the Hoover Dam, and to deposit revenues generated from the sales into the Colorado River Dam fund. (S. Rept. No. 106–195) **Page S12783**

Campaign Finance Reform: Senate continued consideration of S. 1593, to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide bipartisan campaign reform, taking action on the following amendments proposed thereto: **Pages S12734–76**

Pending:

Daschle Amendment No. 2298, in the nature of a substitute. **Page S12734**

Reid Amendment No. 2299 (to Amendment No. 2298), of a perfecting nature. (By 1 yea to 92 nays (Vote No. 329), Senate failed to table the amendment.) **Page S12734**

Wellstone Amendment No. 2306 (to the text of the language proposed to be stricken by Amendment No. 2298), to allow a State to enact voluntary public financing legislation regarding the election of Federal candidates in such State. **Pages S12756–61, S12776**

Messages From the President: Senate received the following message from the President of the United States:

A message from the President of the United States transmitting, the annual report of the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission for fiscal year 1998; referred to the Committee on Environment and Public Works. (PM–65). **Page S12782**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nominations:

Herschelle S. Challenor, of Georgia, to be a Member of the National Security Education Board for a term of four years.

1 Army nomination in the rank of general.

Routine list in the Navy. **Page S12798**

Messages From the President: **Page S12782**

Messages From the House: **Pages S12782–83**

Measures Placed on Calendar: **Page S12783**

Communications: **Page S12783**

Statements on Introduced Bills: **Pages S12784–89**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S12789–90**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S12790–93**

Notices of Hearings: **Page S12793**

Authority for Committees: **Page S12793**

Additional Statements: **Pages S12793–98**

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—329) **Page S12776**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 12 noon, and adjourned at 7:05 p.m., until 1:15 p.m., on Tuesday, October 19, 1999. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S12798.)

Committee Meetings

No committee meetings were held.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Bills Introduced: 10 public bills, H.R. 3089–3098, and 1 resolution, H.J. Res. 71, were introduced.

Page H10173

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

Filed on Oct. 15: H.R. 1714, to facilitate the use of electronic records and signatures in interstate or foreign commerce, amended (H. Rept. 106–341, Pt. 2);

Filed on Oct 15: H.R. 2300, to allow a State to combine certain funds to improve the academic achievement of all its students, amended (H. Rept. 106–386);

H.R. 1753, to promote the research, identification, assessment, exploration, and development of methane hydrate resources (H. Rept. 106–377, Pt. 2);

H.R. 2260, to amend the Controlled Substances Act to promote pain management and palliative care without permitting assisted suicide and euthanasia, amended (H. Rept. 106–378 Pt. 2);

H.R. 915, to authorize a cost of living adjustment in the pay of administrative law judges, amended (H. Rept. 106–387);

H.R. 2821, to amend the North American Wetlands Conservation Act to provide for appointment of 2 additional members of the North American Wetlands Conservation Council (H. Rept. 106–388);

H.R. 1528, to reauthorize and amend the National Geologic Mapping Act of 1992 (H. Rept. 106–389);

H.R. 2496, to reauthorize the Junior Duck Stamp Conservation and Design Program Act of 1994, amended (H. Rept. 106–390);

S. 382, to establish the Minuteman Missile National Historic Site in the State of South Dakota (H. Rept. 106–391);

H.R. 2389, to restore stability and predictability to the annual payments made to States and counties containing National Forest System lands and public domain lands managed by the Bureau of Land Management for use by the counties for the benefit of public schools, roads, amended (H. Rept. 106–392 Pt. 1);

H.R. 3070, to amend the Social Security Act to establish a Ticket to Work and Self-Sufficiency Program in the Social Security Administration to provide beneficiaries with disabilities meaningful opportunities to work, to extend health care coverage for such beneficiaries, and to make additional miscellaneous amendments relating to Social Security, amended (H. Rept. 106–393 Pt. 1);

H.R. 2, to send more dollars to the classroom, amended (H. Rept. 106–394 Pt. 1);

H. Res. 333, agreeing to the conference requested by the Senate on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 3064) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000 (H. Rept. 106–395); and

H. Res. 334, providing for consideration of H.J. Res. 71, making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2000 (H. Rept. 106–396).

Pages H10172–73

Speaker Pro Tempore: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he designated Representative Ballenger to act as Speaker pro tempore for today.

Page H10121

Recess: The House recessed at 12:43 p.m. and reconvened at 2:00 p.m. **Page H10123**

Journal Vote: Agreed to the Speaker's approval of the Journal of Thursday, October 14, by a yea and nay vote of 357 yeas to 49 nays with 1 voting "present", Roll No. 505. **Pages H10123, H10151**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Pennsylvania Battlefields Protection: Agreed to the Senate amendments to H.R. 659, to authorize appropriations for the protection of Paoli and Brandywine Battlefields in Pennsylvania and to authorize the Valley Forge Museum of the American Revolution at Valley Forge National Historical Park—clearing the measure for the President; **Pages H10123–27**

Chippewa Cree Tribe Water Rights: H.R. 795, amended, to provide for the settlement of the water rights claims of the Chippewa Cree Tribe of the Rocky Boy's Reservation; **Pages H10127–31**

Wetlands Conservation Council Membership: H.R. 2821, amended, to amend the North American Wetlands Conservation Act to provide for appointment of 2 additional members of the North American Wetlands Conservation Council; **Pages H10134–36**

Pension Plan Parity: H.R. 462, to clarify that governmental pension plans of the possessions of the United States shall be treated in the same manner as State pension plans for purposes of the limitation on the State income taxation of pension income;

Pages H10137–38

Chattahoochee River National Recreation Area Protection: H.R. 2140, to improve protection and management of the Chattahoochee River National

Recreation Area in the State of Georgia (passed by a yea and nay vote of 394 yeas to 9 nays, Roll No. 506); **Pages H10131–34, H10152**

Definition of Child re the Adoption of Siblings: H.R. 2886, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide that an adopted alien who is less than 18 years of age may be considered a child under such Act if adopted with or after a sibling who is a child under such Act (passed by a yea and nay vote of 404 yeas with none voting ''nay'', Roll No. 507); and **Pages H10136–37, H10152–53**

Presentation of the Congressional Gold Medal to President and Mrs. Gerald R. Ford: H. Con. Res. 196, permitting the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for the presentation of the Congressional Gold Medal to President and Mrs. Gerald R. Ford (agreed to by a yea and nay vote of 402 yeas with none voting ''nay'', Roll No. 508). **Pages H10138–39, H10153**

Recess: The House recessed at 3:08 p.m. and reconvened at 5:00 p.m. **Page H10139**

Motion to Instruct Conferees—Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary Appropriations: The House completed debate on the Coburn motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 2670, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000 to agree to provisions that—(1) reduce nonessential spending in programs within the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and other related agencies; (2) reduce spending on international organizations, in particular, in order to honor the commitment of the Congress to protect Social Security; and (3) do not increase overall spending to a level that exceeds the higher of the House bill or the Senate amendment was offered and debated. Further proceedings on the motion were postponed until Tuesday, Oct. 19, 1999. **Pages H10139–42**

Motion to Instruct Conferees—Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary Appropriations: Representative Upton notified the House of his intention to offer a motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 2670, making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000 to agree to the provisions contained in section 102 of the Senate amendment (relating to repeal of automated entry-exit control system). **Page H10154**

Presidential Messages: Read the following messages from the President:

Nuclear Regulatory Commission: Message wherein he transmitted his annual report on the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for fiscal year 1998—referred to the Committee on Commerce; and **Page H10142**

Veto Message—Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations: Message wherein he announced his veto of H.R. 2606, making appropriations for foreign operations, export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and explains his reasons therefor—referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered printed (H. Doc. 106–145). **Pages H10142–51**

Online Child Protection Commission: The Chair announced the Speaker's appointment of Mr. John Bastian of Illinois, Mr. William L. Schrader of Virginia, Mr. Stephen Balkam of Washington, D.C., Mr. J. Robert Flores of Virginia, and Mr. William Parker of Virginia to the Commission on Online Child Protection. **Page H10154**

Senate Messages: Messages received from the Senate on October 15 and today appear on pages H10121, H10123, and H10142.

Amendments Ordered Printed: Amendments ordered printed pursuant to the rule appear on pages H10174–80.

Referrals: S. 548, S. 762, and S. 938 were referred to the Committee on Resources. **Page H10168**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Four yea and nay votes developed during the proceedings of the House today and appear on pages H10151, H10152, H10152–53, and H10153. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 12:30 p.m. and adjourned at 9:47 p.m.

Committee Meetings

CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000

Committee on Rules: Granted, by voice vote, a rule providing for consideration of H.J. Res. 71, making continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2000, in the House. The rule provides that the joint resolution shall be considered as read. The rule provides for one hour of debate and one motion to recommit. Testimony was heard from Chairman Young of Florida.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS, FY 2000 MOTION TO GO TO CONFERENCE

Committee on Rules: Granted, by voice vote, a rule providing that the House disagrees to the Senate

amendment to H.R. 3064, District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 2000. The rule provides that the House agrees to the conference requested by the Senate thereon. Testimony was heard from Representative Istook.

Joint Meetings

FINANCIAL SERVICES MODERNIZATION

Conferees continued in evening session to resolve the differences between the Senate and House passed versions of S. 900/H.R. 10, bills to enhance competition in the financial services industry by providing a prudential framework for the affiliation of banks, securities firms, insurance companies, and other financial service providers.

FAA AUTHORIZATION

Conferees met to resolve the differences between the Senate and House passed versions of H.R. 1000, to amend title 49, United States Code, to reauthorize programs of the Federal Aviation Administration, but did not complete action thereon, and will meet again on Wednesday, October 20.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR TUESDAY, OCTOBER 19, 1999

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Armed Services: to hold hearings to examine future naval operations at the Atlantic Fleet Weapons Training Facility, 9:30 a.m., SD–106.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Forests and Public Land Management, to hold hearings on S. 1608, to provide annual payments to the States and counties from National Forest System lands managed by the Forest Service, and the revested Oregon and California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road grant lands managed predominately by the Bureau of Land Management, for use by the counties in which the lands are situated for the benefit of the public schools, roads, emergency and other public purposes; to encourage and provide new mechanism for cooperation between counties and the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management to make necessary investments in federal lands, and reaffirm the positive connection between Federal Lands counties and Federal Lands; and for other purposes, 10 a.m., SD–366.

Full Committee, with the Committee on Governmental Affairs, to hold joint oversight hearings on the implementation of provisions of the Department of Defense Authorization Act which create the National Nuclear Security Administration, 2 p.m., SH–216.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: business meeting to consider the nomination of Glenn L. McCullough, Jr., of Mississippi, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority; the nomination of Skila Harris, of Kentucky, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority; and the nomination of Gerald V. Poje, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board, Time to be announced, S–216, Capitol.

Subcommittee on Fisheries, Wildlife, and Drinking Water, to hold hearings to examine the benefits and policy concerns related to habitat conservation plans, 10 a.m., SD–406.

Committee on Finance: Subcommittee on Long-term Growth and Debt Reduction, to hold hearings on federal income tax issues relating to restructuring of the electric power industry, 9:30 a.m., SD–215.

Committee on Foreign Relations: to hold hearings on the nomination of Mary Carlin Yates, of Washington, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Burundi; the nomination of John E. Lange, of Wisconsin, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Botswana; and the nomination of Michael Edward Ranneberger, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Mali, 2:30 p.m., SD–419.

Committee on Governmental Affairs: to hold hearings on S. 1378 and H.R. 391, bills to amend chapter 35 of title 44, United States Code, for the purposes of facilitating compliance by small businesses with certain Federal paperwork requirements, to establish a task force to examine the feasibility of streamlining paperwork requirements applicable to small businesses, 10:30 a.m., SD–628.

Full Committee, with the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, to hold joint oversight hearings on the implementation of provisions of the Department of Defense Authorization Act which create the National Nuclear Security Administration, 2 p.m., SH–216.

House

Committee on Agriculture, Subcommittee on Risk Management, Research, and Specialty Crops, hearing on H.R. 2827, National Sustainable Fuels and Chemicals Act of 1999, 10 a.m., 1300 Longworth.

Committee on Armed Services, Subcommittee on Military Procurement, hearing on lessons learned from the Kosovo conflict—the effect of the operation on both deployed/non- deployed forces and on future modernization plans, 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on Commerce, Subcommittee on Health and Environment, hearing on the Implementation of the Food and Drug Administration Modernization Act of 1997, 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, to continue hearings on Blood Safety and Availability, 9:30 a.m., 2322 Rayburn.

Committee on Government Reform, hearing on Improving Care at the End of Life with Complementary Medicine, 1 p.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Committee on International Relations, to continue hearings on U.S. Policy Toward Russia, Part III: Administration Views, 10 a.m.; and to mark up the following: H.R. 1095, Debt Relief for Poverty Reduction Act of 1999; H. Con. Res. 102, celebrating the 50th anniversary of the Geneva Conventions of 1949 and recognizing the humanitarian safeguards these treaties provide in times of armed

conflict; H. Con. Res. 188, commending Greece and Turkey for their mutual and swift response to the recent earthquakes in both countries by providing to each other humanitarian assistance and rescue relief; H. Con. Res. 46, urging an end of the war between Eritrea and Ethiopia and calling on the United Nations Human Rights Commission and other human rights organizations to investigate human rights abuse in connection with the Eritrean and Ethiopian conflict; and H. Con. Res. 20, concerning economic, humanitarian, and other assistance to the northern part of Somalia, 2 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on the Judiciary, to mark up the following bills: H.R. 1869, Stalking Prevention and Victim Protection Act of 1999; and H.R. 2366, Small Business Liability Reform Act of 1999, 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Resources, Subcommittee on Forests and Forest Health, hearing on the following bills: H.R. 1680, to provide for the conveyance of Forest Service property in Kern County, California, in exchange for county lands suitable for inclusion in Sequoia National Forest; H.R. 1969, Arizona National Forest Improvement Act of 1999; and H.R. 3089, to provide for a comprehensive scientific review of the current conservation status of the northern spotted owl as a result of implementation of the President's Northwest Forest Plan, which is a national strategy for the recovery of the species on public forest lands, 2 p.m., 1334 Longworth.

Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands, hearing on the following bills: H.R. 2795, Shivwits Plateau National Conservation Area Establishment Act; and H.R. 3935, Utah National Parks and Public Lands Wilderness Act, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Rules, to consider the following: H.R. 2, Dollars to the Classroom Act of 1999; and H.R. 2300, Academic Achievement for all Act (Straight A's Act), 5 p.m., H–313 Capitol.

Committee on Science, Subcommittee on Basic Research, to continue hearings on Plant Genome Science: From the Lab to the Field to the Market, Part III, 2 p.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, Subcommittee on Regulatory Reform and Paperwork Reduction, hearing on the U.S. Postal Service's regulations regarding Commercial Mail Receiving Agencies (CMRAs), 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, executive, briefing on Colombia: Intelligence Issues, 2 p.m., H–405 Capitol.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

1:15 p.m., Tuesday, October 19

Senate Chamber

Program for Tuesday: Senate will recess for their respective party conferences; following which, at 2:15 p.m., Senate will vote on the cloture motions to close further debate on Amendment No. 2298 and Amendment No. 2299 (to Amendment No. 2298) to S. 1593, Bipartisan Campaign Reform Act. Also, Senate will consider any conference reports when available.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Tuesday, October 19

House Chamber

Program for Tuesday: Consideration of H.J. Res. 71, Continuing Resolution for FY 2000 (closed rule, one hour of general debate);

Consideration of 7 Suspensions:

(1) H.R. 3085, Discretionary Spending Offsets for Fiscal Year 2000;

(2) H.R. 1714, Electronic Signatures in Global and National Commerce;

(3) H.Res. 279, Congratulating Hank Aaron on the 25th Anniversary of Breaking the Career Home Run Record and Recognizing Him as One of the Greatest Baseball Players of All Time;

(4) H.R. 1887, Depiction of Animal Cruelty Punishment;

(5) H.R. 3046, Banking and Housing Agency Accountability Preservation;

(6) H.R. 1497, Women's Business Center Sustainability Act;

(7) H.R. 1180, Work Incentives Improvement Act; and

Consideration of a Rule agreeing to the conference requested by the Senate on H.R. 3064, District of Columbia Appropriations Act, 2000 (closed rule, one hour of general debate).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Abercrombie, Neil, Hawaii, E2118
Bonior, David E., Mich., E2122
Capps, Lois, Calif., E2123
Cox, Christopher, Calif., E2118
DeLauro, Rosa L., Conn., E2119
Doyle, Michael F., Pa., E2118
Filner, Bob, Calif., E2114
Green, Gene, Tex., E2119
Johnson, Eddie Bernice, Tex., E2122
Kaptur, Marcy, Ohio, E2112
Kucinich, Dennis J., Ohio, E2113, E2117
Lantos, Tom, Calif., E2115
Matsui, Robert T., Calif., E2112
Meek, Carrie P., Fla., E2114, E2117
Ney, Robert W., Ohio, E2112
Pelosi, Nancy, Calif., E2113, E2116
Portman, Rob, Ohio, E2113, E2117
Radanovich, George, Calif., E2122
Sanford, Marshall ''Mark'', S.C., E2117
Taylor, Charles H., N.C., E2111
Turner, Jim, Tex., E2115
Watt, Melvin L., N.C., E2122
Weller, Jerry, Ill., E2115
Wu, David, Ore., E2119
Young, Don, Alaska, E2124

Congressional Record The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed at one time. ¶Public access to the Congressional Record is available online through *GPO Access,* a service of the Government Printing Office, free of charge to the user. The online database is updated each day the Congressional Record is published. The database includes both text and graphics from the beginning of the 103d Congress, 2d session (January 1994) forward. It is available on the Wide Area Information Server (WAIS) through the Internet and via asynchronous dial-in. Internet users can access the database by using the World Wide Web; the Superintendent of Documents home page address is http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs, by using local WAIS client software or by telnet to swais.access.gpo.gov, then login as guest (no password required). Dial-in users should use communications software and modem to call (202) 512–1661; type swais, then login as guest (no password required). For general information about *GPO Access,* contact the *GPO Access* User Support Team by sending Internet e-mail to gpoaccess@gpo.gov, or a fax to (202) 512–1262; or by calling Toll Free 1–888–293–6498 or (202) 512–1530 between 7 a.m. and 5 p.m. Eastern time, Monday through Friday, except for Federal holidays. ¶The Congressional Record paper and 24x microfiche will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, $165.00 for six months, $325.00 per year, or purchased for $2.75 per issue, payable in advance; microfiche edition, $141.00 per year, or purchased for $1.50 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly Congressional Record Index may be purchased for the same per issue prices. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 371954, Pittsburgh, PA 15250–7954, or phone orders to (202) 512–1800, or fax to (202) 512–2250. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily Congressional Record is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the Congressional Record.