United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 146 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MARCH 14, 2000 No. 28

Senate

The Senate was not in session today. Its next meeting will be held on Monday, March 20, 2000, at 12 noon.

House of Representatives

TUESDAY, MARCH 14, 2000

The House met at 12:30 p.m.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER. 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 not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM) for 5 minutes.

ACCOLADES TO WOMEN'S AND MEN'S BASKETBALL TEAMS IN THE STATE OF IOWA

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, as everyone knows, we are starting March Madness, and there is something exceptional happening in the State of Iowa. I want to congratulate the Drake Women's Basketball team for making the tournament, but what is really happening in Iowa is the fact that both the Iowa State University Men's and Women's Basketball teams not only won the regular season championship in the Big 12, but each of them also won the Big 12 tournaments over the weekend.

This is unprecedented in the Big 12. The Iowa State Women have had a tremendous year. They are going to host the tournament at Ames; and we wish them the very, very best.

The Iowa State Men at the beginning of the season some people even rated them as being at the bottom of the Big 12 this year. In fact, they came through with an outstanding phenomenon performance and not only won, as I said before, the regular season but won the tournament; and I want to congratulate Marcus Fizer as the Most Valuable Player.

This is a great thing that is happening in Iowa. Minneapolis is going to look like Iowa State Cyclone country this weekend when the Iowa State Men go up there to play in the first round of the tournaments. Both coaches, Bill Fennelly and Larry Eustachy, have done a fabulous job this year. And I just want to send my congratulations to Iowa State, the great performance they have had.

I wish them the best of luck in the tournaments. No matter what happens, they will have given Iowa State fans across this country something really to cheer about.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, all I can say is go Cyclones.

REPUBLICAN ESTATE TAX POLICY

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Madam Speaker, rarely have the differences between the two political parties been more graphically demonstrated than when we debated the package of a minimum wage increase and tax reductions.

The resistance on the part of the Republican leadership to a fairly small minimum wage increase in the midst of the greatest prosperity we have ever known speaks a great deal to a social insensitivity, but equally distressing to me is their decision that we should begin to reduce one of the most progressive taxes in America. And, of course, their goal is ultimately to repeal it. I speak of the estate tax.

We have some unfair taxes in America, and many people feel that working people, people of average income, people who are making $30,000, $40,000, $50,000 a year pay an unfair share of the tax burden. And I believe that is true in part because of the payroll taxes.

We have one tax, the estate tax, which literally applies only to millionaires. And it does not even apply to millionaires. It applies to people who have shown a rare talent. They have shown an ability to be related to millionaires.

Madam Speaker, I think being related to a millionaire is certainly a great asset in life, and I would recommend it to people. If you have a chance to be related to someone very wealthy, take it. But I do not believe that being related to an extremely wealthy person who has just died is a mark of inherent value. It is neutral. It does not make you a bad person, but it does not make you a hero either.

And the notion that you have an absolute right to be greatly rewarded by your good fortune in having a very rich relative seems to me a mistake. Now,

Printed on recycled paper.

what is particularly interesting is the estate tax brings in a little over $20 billion a year, and it will soon be the case that your estate has to be a million dollars or more before you pay it. And the great bulk of it is paid by people who die and leave tens of millions of dollars.

Now, here is what we do if we abolish the estate tax, as the Republican party wants to do it, we say to old people who, because most of the people who pay the estate tax or over 90 percent were 65 or older when they die, we say to these older people who died rich that we will be very protective of them, or at least of their smart relatives who figured out how to be related to them.

On the other hand, if you are old and alive and not very rich, but you are on Medicare and cannot afford prescription drugs, the Republican position is, well, that is tough, you will just have to learn to deal with it. In other words, the Republican party tells us on the one hand we cannot afford this wealthy Nation to provide full prescription drug coverage to middle-income and lower-income elderly people, not the very poor, they are covered by Medicaid, but people who are making $25,000, $30,000, $35,000 a year in retirement, they ought to get no aid because we need the money that would have gone to pay for prescription drugs to alleviate the problem of Bill Gates' heirs and the heirs of other people who have made millions of dollars.

In other words, we are being asked to show more respect for older people who are dead and rich than for older people who are still alive and not wealthy.

Madam Speaker, now, there is one other aspect of this effort to reduce and, ultimately, repeal the estate tax that ought to be called into question, and that is the negative effect it will have on private charity.

My Republican colleagues talk about how much they want to help private charity. According to a recent study, I will put the New York Times article displaying this study from a couple of Boston College researchers, into the RECORD, for estates that are over $20 million, a very considerable number, 39 percent of the money at death goes to chart, while only 34 percent goes to taxes. And, indeed, these two professors conclude in their study, two eminent scholars from an institution mostly in my district, at Boston College. They conclude that, I am now quoting from the article, if the estate tax is repealed or significantly reduced, however, as Congress voted to do earlier this year in a bill that President Clinton vetoed, that was last year, bequests to charities might be smaller than the Boston College model predicted.

The Republican approach is to go to the aid of the wealthiest 1 or 2 percent of the people in the country and not just to them, but to the people who are smart enough to be related to them or to have otherwise ingratiated themselves to them, to deny prescription drug coverage to the great bulk of middle-income Americans and lower-income Americans, and while we are at it, reduce the amount that goes to private charity. That is the difference between the parties.

Madam Speaker, I include the following two articles for the RECORD which illustrate these points.

[From the New York Times, July 25, 1999]

STUDY CONTRADICTS FOES OF ESTATE TAX

(By David Cay Johnston)

Congressional opponents of the estate tax say it discourages savings, costs the economy more than it raises for the Government and makes it very difficult for a family-owned farm or business to be passed to the next generation.

But all of those arguments are contradicted by Government tax and economic data, according to a book-length study that will be published tomorrow in the policy magazine Tax Notes.

The article comes after the House passed on Thursday night the Republicans' bill to cut taxes by $792 billion, including the repeal of the estate tax. Similar legislation was being considered in the Senate but the outcome of the repeal is in doubt because President Clinton has promised to veto it.

Yet the article in Tax Notes seems likely to have a profound effect on the debate over estate taxes, experts say. Data from estate tax returns and other records do not support the claims of estate tax opponents, according to the article, by Charles Davenport and Jay A. Soled, professors at Rutgers University who teach estate tax law and business management.

The estate tax is projected in the Federal budget to raise about $28 billion this year. That is less than one-third of 1 percent of the gross domestic product, which is too slight to retard economic growth, the authors say.

While the tax rate on the largest estates can be 55 percent, Internal Revenue Service data cited in the study show that in 1996 the average tax on estates of $600,000 to $1 million was 6 percent.

It costs the I.R.S. 2 cents on the dollar to administer the tax, the authors calculate. They say the combined private and Government costs total about 7 cents on the estate tax dollar.

Professors Davenport and Soled said Congressional testimony by critics of the estate tax contending that the tax costs more than it raises was based on flawed data, including a study that estimated that every dollar raised in Federal income taxes cost the economy 65 cents more. That figure was dismissed as absurd by the authors.

They also disputed another contention of the critics, that rich people spend heavily in their later years in order to reduce estate taxes. Instead, the authors say, many rich people save more money to offset the tax

They say that the reasons family businesses are not passed to the next generation have little to do with estate taxes. A primary reason, the authors say, is the burden on heirs who want to keep the business and must raise cash to pay off those heirs who do not.

While the estate tax nominally begins when net worth at death exceeds $650,000 (1.3 million for a married couple), Congress lets a couple pass on $4.5 million untaxed if they own a business and $7.4 million if they own a farm. Only about 1 in 1,000 American families is worth $7.4 million.

The estate tax will be paid this year by the wealthiest 2 percent of Americans who die.

The Congressional Joint Committee on Taxation estimated last week that repeal of the estate tax would reduce Federal revenues by $75 billion over the next 10 years, even though the Federal budget projects the estate tax will raise more than that amount in the next three years alone.

The chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, Representative Bill Archer of Texas, who had not seen the article, said that he was skeptical of its claims and any data drawn from I.R.S. records.

''Every dollar taken by the death tax is a dollar taken out of savings when what this country needs is more private savings,'' said Mr. Archer, the author of the House Republicans' tax bill. He said the costs of the estate tax included discouraging wealthy foreigners from moving to the United States with their capital and skills.

As to whether existing exemptions are enough for farms to stay in families, he said, ''The input from the Ag Belt is totally contrary to that.''

The authors say that among the virtues they see in the estate tax are that it taxes some money that has slipped past the income tax system, it is paid only by those most able to pay, it encourages financial planning and charitable giving and it tends to ease the trend toward concentration of wealth. The richest 1 percent of Americans now one half of all stocks, bonds and other assets, a record level, according to Professor Edward N. Wolff of New York University.

Experts say the Tax Notes article may be as influential as the 1994 Yale Law Review article by Edward J. McCaffery of the University of Southern California Law School, who exhorted liberals to join conservatives in opposing the estate tax as inefficient and unfair. Since then, the Tax Notes article says, ''talk about the death-tax has been a monologue by the tax's opponents.'' The article is available at www.tax.org on the internet.

[From the New York Times, October 20, 1999]

A LARGER LEGACY MAY AWAIT GENERATIONS X, Y AND Z

(By David Cay Johnston)

Boston College researchers say that the widely cited estimate that $10.4 trillion of wealth will be transferred to younger generations over a half-century is far short of the likely amount. They estimate the wealth transfer will be $41 trillion to $136 trillion.

''It can now be safely said that the forthcoming wealth transfer will be many times larger than anyone has previously estimated,'' said Paul G. Schervish, director of the Boston College Social Welfare Research Institute, who has spent the last 15 years studying wealth and who created a computer model to study wealth transfers.

The new figures suggest that charities, in particular, stand to benefit from a platinum era of giving. Mr. Schervish and John J. Havens, his deputy at the institute, estimated that between now and 2055 charities would receive bequests of $16 trillion to $53 trillion, measured in 1998 dollars, assuming that the estate tax remains unchanged.

The widely cited estimate of $10.4 trillion—about $13 trillion today adjusted for inflation—in wealth transfer was made in 1993 by two Cornell University professors, Robert B. Avery and Michael S. Rendall, using data from the Census Bureau and other sources. Their estimate was restricted to households in which the chief wage earner was 50 or older and who had living children; it covered 1990 to 2044.

The Boston College analysis, using a computer simulation model created to estimate wealth transfers, covers all Americans who were at least age 18 in 1998. It estimates wealth transfers from 1998 to 2052, when the youngest of those in the study will turn 73.

The Boston College study is based on modest assumptions about growth in wealth

compared with historical experience. The study's low estimate that $41 billion will be transferred between generations by 2055 assumes that the value of all assets, adjusted for inflation, increases at 2 percent annually, while the high estimate assumes 4 percent annual real growth. Another profile assumes 3 percent annual real growth in the value of assets and projects $73 trillion in wealth transfers.

Actual growth in wealth, adjusted for inflation, averaged 5.3 percent annually from 1950 to this year, according to Prof. Edward N. Wolff, a New York University wealth expert.

Total wealth in 1998 was $32 trillion, the Boston College researchers estimated. Professor Wolff, who had not seen the new study, said, ''That figure is in the right neighborhood,'' noting that his own research indicated total wealth of $29.1 trillion today.

The amount of wealth transferred can be greater than current wealth for two reasons. One is economic growth. The other is that over 55 years some fortunes will pass through two—even three—generations. Mr. Avery, now an economist with the Federal Reserve, said that while he had some qualms about the techniques used by the Boston College researchers, as described to him in a telephone interview, their estimates sounded reasonable over all.

Mr. Avery warned, however, that while economists could make fairly accurate predictions about death rates far into the future, assumptions about how much wealth people would accumulate were risky, especially looking out a half-century.

''The important message is that there is a lot of wealth in this country,'' Mr. Avery said.

John J. Havens, a co-author of the Boston College study, said that while he was confident of the economic model he wanted to focus on the low end of the estimate, $41 trillion, because ''it helps protect against potential charges of irrational exuberance arising from'' the computer model's assuming steady economic growth without a depression or a sustained recession in the first half of the 21st century.

A quarter-century ago Professor Havens developed one of the first computer programs to model economic behavior. The model estimates that for estates of $20 million or more, 39 percent of the money will go to charity, 23 percent to heirs, 34 percent to taxes and 3 percent for fees and burial expenses. Data from the Internal Revenue Service show the same ratios in 1995 for large estates.

For estates of $1 million to just under $5 million, the study assumes that charity will get 8 percent; heirs, 66 percent; taxes, 22 percent, and fees and burial expenses, 4 percent.

For estates of less than $1 million, Professors Schervish and Havens estimated, nearly 90 cents of each dollar would be passed to heirs and little would go to charity or taxes.

One recent analysis found that among estates valued at $600,000 to $1 million in 1997, estate taxes averaged 6 percent, even though the estate tax rate began at 37 percent on amounts above the $600,000 exemption then in effect.

The Boston College study covers what are known as final estates, meaning the death of a single person or the second spouse in a married couple, since bequests to a spouse are tax free. The estimates of how much will be bequeathed to charity may be low, based on I.R.S. data in recent years, which show that growing numbers of people are engaging in estate planning so that more of their money will go to charity after their deaths and less to the Government. The I.R.S. data show that the share of money in estates going to charity is slowly rising, a trend that if continued through 2055 would mean far more for charities than the $16 trillion to $53 trillion cited in the study.

If the estate tax is repealed or significantly reduced, however, as Congress voted to do earlier this year in a bill that President Clinton vetoed, bequests to charities might be smaller than the Boston College model predicted.

HERE WE GO AGAIN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). 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. Madam Speaker, I might point out to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) that all the money that is in the estate has already been taxed and what Republicans are trying to say is why should the Government tax twice this money that is there.

Madam Speaker, I am here because of recent newspaper articles that have been published, especially in the New York Times. Last Thursday, a Federal jury convicted Maria Hsai, a friend and a political supporter of Vice President AL GORE, on five felony counts for arranging more than $100,000 in illegal donations during the 1996 presidential campaign.

Prosecutors allege that Hsai tapped a Buddhist temple and some of her business clients for money to reimburse Hsai donors who were listed as contributors in campaign records.

Hsai was charged with causing false statements to be filed with the Federal Election Commission. According to evidence presented in the case, $109,000 in reimbursed donations went to the Clinton-Gore 1996 campaign and to the Democratic Party.

Hsai's fund raising also included $65,000 in Hsai donations which she funneled through monks and nuns the day after Vice President GORE's 1996 visit to the Buddhist Temple in California.

Now, of course, Madam Speaker, the Vice President initially had no recollection that he was attending a fund raiser but believed, rather, that he was attending a community outreach program. That is, of course, until the video footage surfaced showing him at the temple and after documents turned up that referred to the event in advance as a fund raiser. Only then, Madam Speaker, did the Vice President modify his characterization, saying he thought it was a finance-related situation.

Ironically enough, in response to Hsai's conviction, the Attorney General, Janet Reno, said, ''The verdict sends a clear message that the Department of Justice will not tolerate violations of our Federal campaign finance laws.''

Evidently her comments need to be revised to mean the Department of Justice will tolerate campaign finance laws in some cases and not in others, for the Attorney General's action indicate there are certain violations of our Federal campaign finance laws she is willing to tolerate or unwilling to get to the bottom of.

The Los Angeles Times reported last Friday on Charles LaBella's report to Attorney General Janet Reno warning that numerous conflicts of interest made the Justice Department's insistence that its own lawyers handling the inquiry into the 1996 Clinton-Gore campaign a ''recipe for disaster.''

Madam Speaker, my colleagues will recall that Mr. LaBella was hand picked by the Attorney General to head the Campaign Financing Task Force and to take over the Department of Justice's public integrity section's investigation into political fund-raising abuses.

Mr. LaBella's report, which the Attorney General has still kept sealed for nearly 2 years, found ''a pattern of conduct'' on the part of White House officials, including the President, that warranted an independent counsel probe.

Additionally, Mr. LaBella found that senior Justice officials engaged in ''gamesmanship'' and legal ''contortions'' to avoid an independent inquiry into the Clinton-Gore fund-raising abuses.

According to the L.A. Times, Madam Speaker, Mr. LaBella found ''The campaign finance allegations present the earmarks of a loose enterprise employing different actors at different levels who share a common goal, bring in the money.''

Among those singled out for special treatment according to the LaBella report were the President, Vice President AL GORE, First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton, and former White House aide Harold Ickes.

The Times said the report was the first indication, the first indication, that Mrs. Clinton's involvement in the fund-raising scandal arising from the 1996 presidential election was under scrutiny.

Since the fund raising first made headlines in 1996, Attorney General Janet Reno has refused to allow outside prosecutors to narrowly focus their investigations of alleged White House wrongdoings. Examples include her refusal to appoint investigations into fund-raising telephone calls by the Vice President from the White House and the issue ads funded by the Democratic National Committee.

To further confound matters, she has long gone against her own FBI director.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair must remind Members that it is not in order in debate to level or repeat personal charges against the President or the Vice President.

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, this is being reported from the L.A. Times, the New York Times, and all the newspapers in Central Florida. So all I am

doing is reporting what is in the newspaper.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is addressing the standard of decorum in debate on the House floor.

Mr. STEARNS. Well, Madam Speaker, if you are quoting from a newspaper, like the New York Times, can you do that?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. No.

Mr. STEARNS. You cannot quote from the New York Times newspaper?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Member makes the words his own by quoting from the newspaper.

Mr. STEARNS. But I have used the word ''quotation.'' I have actually put the word ''quotation'' in there to signal that these are not my words but these are words from the newspaper.

I mean, it appears to me, Madam Speaker, that if you cannot quote the newspapers on the House floor and use ''quotation,'' that seems to be a denial of the right for a Member to use newspapers in an edifying way.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It is a settled precedent that the standard is the same whether the Member speaks on his own account or quotes another source.

Mr. STEARNS. Out of deference to you, Madam Speaker, yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. STEARNS. So, Madam Speaker, it is time for the Attorney General to disclose Mr. LaBella's report. That is all I am asking here today.

The American people have a right to know what is in that report. In fact, they should have an opportunity to know what the FBI director said when he also recommended that an independent counsel be appointed.

□ 1245

I think at this point, I think that the newspapers speak for themselves and so now, Madam Speaker, I think the Attorney General should come forward and tell us when she is going to make that report available.

MAKING ATLANTA, GEORGIA A MORE LIVABLE COMMUNITY

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, one indication of how the momentum for the efforts across the country to promote livability has been gaining speed is the comments from governors who are talking about smart growth and livability in their State of the State addresses. One State deserves special attention and that is Georgia, where we have been watching a renaissance in our cities and inner suburbs taking place.

Atlanta, which some have sort of dismissed as the poster child of sprawl, is making significant progress under the leadership of Governor Barnes and with the assistance of business leaders like John Williams, who was recently profiled in the New York Times.

Atlanta has been characterized by some as the area of the most rapid growth in the history of human settlement. A more than 25 percent increase in population since 1990, the city in that time frame has grown from north to south from 65 miles to 110 miles, and the results have been devastating, frankly. The average Atlanta commuter drives 36½ miles daily, the average, the longest work trip commute in the world.

This has had serious problems in terms of their air quality to the point that Federal transportation officials have withheld resources because it is not meeting air quality standards. Over 60 percent of the State's rivers and streams do not meet water quality standards, almost twice the national average.

It is losing business. In 1998, Atlanta lost a bid for the Harley Davidson plant. Hewlitt Packard decided not to expand its Atlanta facilities; and in fact, the city lost its 1997 top rank as the country's best real estate market and is now 15 among 18 cities that are monitored.

There are even concerns about the health implications. Last fall, the Centers for Disease Control reported amongst the alarming national increase in obesity rates that the greatest percentage increase occurred in Georgia, over 100 percent in the last 10 years. Some of these experts were speculating that it may be related to the bad air that discourages exercise and the poor urban design that makes it hard to find places to walk, bike, and otherwise exercise.

Asthma is the number one reason for childhood hospitalization in Atlanta, but there are very positive signs on the horizon. As I mentioned, the leadership of Governor Barnes, with the business community, was able to create the Georgia Regional Transportation Authority to coordinate and oversee for the first time metropolitan Atlanta's fight against pollution, traffic, and unplanned growth. There is an exciting 138-acre redevelopment in the old Atlantic Steel site that is combining residential, retail, office and entertainment space in a transit-oriented development on a brownfield site in midtown Atlanta.

Recently, we have seen another business, Bell South, decided to relocate from 75 different suburbans office areas to three centers for 13,000 employees inside the perimeter and all adjacent to transit. In no small way, this has been the result of business leadership exemplified by Mr. Williams, head of Post Properties. In fact, he has been here on Capitol Hill meeting with senators and representatives talking about how, in fact, his business, which was built on the development of suburban luxury office, has discovered a significant opportunity to move this new housing into the increased demand closer in central cities, growing at more than 10 percent a year as opposed to 2 percent in the suburbs. They have shifted their focus from development on existing farm lands and wood lots to more urban locations and expanding to make a profit in in-town housing, not just in projects in Atlanta but also the real estate markets in Texas, Florida, and Virginia.

One of the reasons why the livable communities initiatives are being successful is not just because of political leadership but because business leaders, like Mr. Williams, the president of the chamber of commerce for metropolitan Atlanta, understand what is at stake and they have practiced their civic leadership in the broader sense of the community and with their personal business practices. This is a very positive sign for those of us who want more livable communities so that our families can be safe, healthy, and economically secure.

SOCIAL SECURITY MUST BE SAVED FOR THE NEXT GENERATION

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Madam Speaker, I would like to discuss for the next 4 or 5 minutes why everybody is talking about Social Security, why they are concerned that Social Security is in trouble some time in the future, why young people today think the chances of their getting any Social Security are pretty remote. It is the young people today, probably under 35 years old, that are most at risk in not having Social Security in their retirement years if we continue to fail to do anything to keep Social Security solvent.

The chart that I brought in represents where we are now. If we look at the top left part of the chart, the little blue area in the top left is the current surpluses coming in to the Social Security trust fund, in other words, the amount of taxes that are in excess of benefits payments going out. That is going to stop around 2011 or 2012. At that point, there are going to be fewer Social Security taxes coming in than are needed to pay current benefits. Of course, Social Security, since it started in 1935, has been sort of a Ponzi game where current workers pay in their taxes that is immediately sent out to current retirees, and so it is a pay-as-you-go program.

The red portion represents where we are in terms of what is going to be the additional amount of dollars needed to pay current Social Security benefits in future years. We get down to 2019, and we are going to need something like $400 billion additional money from some place, either increased taxes or

increased borrowing, to pay promised Social Security benefits. It is a problem.

We are now looking at probably the best economic times in the history of the United States, where we are having a surplus of total revenues coming into the Federal Government. The question is now, do we use those revenues to spend on new expanded social programs and expand the size of Federal Government? Do we use those monies to start solving the Social Security problem? Here is what is needed: right now the average retiree that retires from now on is not going to get the money back that they and their employer put into Social Security, so essentially a zero-percent return on their finances unless they are lucky enough to live into their 80s and 90s or to be 100 years old.

So what do we do? I think one thing we have to do in the first place is to understand the seriousness of the problem. To demonstrate how serious it is, I projected what is going to be needed in payroll taxes if we do nothing in the next 30 or 40 years. If we are going to have a FICA tax, a payroll tax, that accommodates the needs of Social Security and Medicare and medicaid, Social Security taxes are projected to go up to be 40 percent of one's income within the next 35 to 40 years.

All we have to do to verify that kind of serious situation, increasing the cost of producing everything we produce in this country, is to look at what is happening in Europe, in Japan. Several countries now in Europe are up to that 40 percent mark. Japan is approaching it. A country like France, the effective payroll deduction to pay for the senior programs in France now is approximately 70 percent of payroll. It is no wonder that France is finding it very difficult to compete in the world market.

If we do nothing in this country, if we keep putting these proposed solutions off because it is easy to demagog, because really there is only two ways, Madam Speaker, to fix Social Security and to fix Medicare. We either bring more revenues into the program or we reduce the amount of money coming out. That means increasing taxes or reducing benefits. One way to increase revenues, though, is starting to get a better return on the investments coming in to Social Security, coming into Medicare. That means investing some of that money in real returns with real investments. That is why I have advocated for the last several years that we have personal retirement savings accounts that can draw real interest returns so that modest-income workers today can retire wealthy because of the magic of compound interest.

My grandson painted our fence this last summer, and I tried to convince him to put his money into a Roth IRA, and we figured what that money would be worth 50 years from now. He said, Grandpa, I want to really buy a car with that money and save up for a car. So we went step by step, year after year to see if that money would return revenues and we found out that $160 would turn into $70,000 by the time he was ready to retire.

We have to have some real retirement accounts. We have to start getting real returns on the money that is coming in from Social Security.

TUBERCULOSIS, A WORLDWIDE EPIDEMIC

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Madam Speaker, remember when we were children, in some cases 30, 40, 50 years ago, tuberculosis clinics were closing in virtually every community in America. I remember growing up in Mansfield, Ohio, in the 1950s and 1960s; and I remember that tuberculosis clinic was closed there because Americans realized that tuberculosis was not really much of a problem in the United States of the 1960s or 1970s or 1980s.

People are surprised in this country, Members of Congress are surprised, citizens are surprised, to learn that tuberculosis in 1999 killed 2 million people around the world. It killed more people in 1999 around the world than in any year in history. Tuberculosis is one of the greatest infectious disease killers of adults worldwide, killing someone every 15 seconds. It is the biggest killer of young women around the world. It is the biggest killer of people with HIV/AIDS. Of the deaths from AIDS in Africa, literally one-third of those deaths actually are from tuberculosis.

The World Health Organization estimates that one-third of the world's population of the 6 billion people in the world, some 2 billion are infected with the bacteria that causes tuberculosis, including an estimated 10 to 15 million people in the United States.

In India, 1,300 people a day in India, 1,300 people a day die from tuberculosis. An estimated 8 million people around the world develop active TB each year. It is spreading as a result of inadequate treatment, and it is a disease that knows no national borders; and it is becoming more and more of a problem in the United States. The threat that TB poses for Americans derives, one, from the global spread of tuberculosis and, second, from the emergence and spread of strains of tuberculosis that are multidrug resistant.

In the U.S., TB treatment is normally only about $2,000 per patient in the United States and in developing countries as little as $15 or $20 or no more than $100 per patient, regular, sort of standard tuberculosis. The costs can go up to as much as $250,000 a patient to treat multidrug resistant tuberculosis, and the treatment is much less likely to be successful.

Multidrug-resistant TB kills more than half those infected even in the United States and other industrialized nations.

Madam Speaker, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA), Republican from Maryland, and I are bipartisanly sponsoring legislation which will authorize an appropriation of $100 million to U.S. Agency for International Development, USAID, for the purpose of diagnosing and treating TB in high-incidents countries. The director general of the World Health Organization, Secretary General Gro Brundtland, said that tuberculosis is not a medical problem, it is a political problem. We know how to take care of people with tuberculosis. We know how to treat tuberculosis. The question is the political will to do it, the resources available to do it.

Tuberculosis experts estimate that it will cost an additional $1 billion each year worldwide to control this disease.

□ 1300

The great majority of funds are used for the direct implementation of DOTS Tuberculosis Control Program, DOTS stands for directly observed treatment, where a person infected with TB must take medication every day for up to 6 months, and, if they stop taking it, then even when they stop coughing up blood or stop showing symptoms of TB, their multi-drug-resistant TB can come back. That is why it is simple to treat, but difficult to make sure that people take their medicine every day.

The medicine is there. The will needs to be there, the outreach workers need to be available, whether it is in the United States or India or Nigeria or wherever across the world.

Resources under our legislation will be used primarily in those countries having the highest incidence of tuberculosis. It is a problem worldwide that we as a wealthy country have a moral obligation to deal with. It is a problem worldwide that we have a practical reason to deal with, because tuberculosis, with more tourism, travel, with more business development, with more trade, with more airplanes, tuberculosis has come into our country in greater and greater incidence, unless we in fact try to deal with tuberculosis internationally.

That is why we already have bipartisan support for the legislation that the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) and I are working on. That is why I ask other Members to join us in cosponsoring this legislation which I will be introducing next week. March 24 is International Tuberculosis Day. We will be introducing the bill next week, the week of March 24, and ask other Members to cosponsor it.

TRIBUTE TO COMMANDER PETER GUMATAOTAO, COMMANDING OFFICER, U.S.S. ''DECATUR''

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Madam Speaker, today I rise on behalf of the people of Guam to recognize the arrival yesterday Guam time of the naval warship U.S.S. *Decatur,* commanded by our own native son, Commander Peter Gumataotao.

Peter is the embodiment of all that is right with Guam. He is proud of his culture and ancestry, the Chamorro people. He understands Guam's history and the sacrifices of her people to help restore democracy around the world during World War II. And, most importantly, Peter is respectful and loyal to his family, his island, his command, and to his country.

He is a graduate of the U.S. Naval Academy and earned his Masters degree from the Naval War College. He has built an illustrious career as a U.S. Naval officer and has been decorated and recognized for his good work at every duty station.

His selection to command the U.S.S. *Decatur* is demonstrative of his continuing excellence and ability; and it is the first time, to our knowledge, that a native of Guam has commanded a warship that has sailed into Guam.

Guam is proud of her son, and we welcome him back to our shores. Peter will continue to command the *Decatur* through the high seas and into danger, when necessary, to defend democracy around the world.

On behalf of the people of Guam and his family, we will continue to keep you in our hearts, Peter, and wish you and your crew a safe voyage and congratulations. Welcome home. Thank you very much for your excellent service.

COMMANDER PETER A. GUMATAOTAO, UNITED STATES NAVY, COMMANDING OFFICER U.S.S. DECATUR (DDG 73)

Commander Peter. A. Gumataotao, a native of Agana, Guam, earned his commission in May 1981 from the U.S. Naval Academy in Annapolis, Maryland, where he received a Bachelor of Science Degree in Resources Management.

His first tour at sea was on board U.S.S. *Bagley* (FF 1069) as First Lieutanant and CIC Officer. He later served as Battery Control Officer in U.S.S. *Wordern* (CG 18). During this tour was the recipient of the Hawaii Navy League Award.

Ashore, he served as Assistant Surface Operations Officer and Surface Systems Analysis Officer for COMTHIRDFLT. He was COMTHIRDFLT's primary action officer for the planning and execution of Operational Test Launches of Tomahawk cruise missiles to include the only open ocean Tomahawk Anti-Ship Missile (TASM) live test shot conducted in the Pacific Fleet. During his tour as Combat Systems Officer aboard U.S.S. *Reuben James* (FFG 57), the ship received the Battle Efficiency Award, and his department was awarded the Spokane Trophy Award for Combat Systems excellence. Commander Gumataotao was the recipient of the COMNAVSURFPAC Shiphandler of the Year award while on board U.S.S. *Reuben James.* Additionally, U.S.S. *Reuben James* was one of two ships that accompanied CINCPACFLT on a historic port visit to Vladivostok, Russia in 1990. While serving as Combat Systems Officer for COMDESRON THIRTY ONE, Commander Gumataotao participated in numerous underseas warfare research and development projects both in open ocean and shallow water towed array operations.

Commander Guamataotao earned a Master of Arts Degree in National Security Strategic Studies at the Naval War College in Newport, Rhode Island and was the United States representative at the Naval Staff College.

His most recent sea assignment was as Executive Officer on board U.S.S. *Curtis Wilbur* (DDG 54). During this tour, Commander Guamataotao assumed the duties as Commanding Officer of U.S.S. *Curtis Wilbur* while the ship was deployed to the Arabian Gulf. Following his sea tour, he served as a Fellow for the CNO Operations Strategic Studies Group at the Center for Naval Analysis in Washington, DC and then served as Congressional Liaison for Surface Programs at the Navy Office of Legislative Affairs.

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 1 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

Let us pray using the words of Psalm 46:

God is our refuge and strength, a very present help in trouble. Therefore, we will not fear though the earth should change, though the mountains shake in the heart of the sea; though its waters roar and foam, though the mountains tremble with its tumult.

There is a river whose streams make glad the city of God, the holy habitation of the Most High, God is in the midst of her, she shall not be moved; God will help her right early. The nations rage, the kingdoms totter; he utters his voice, the earth melts. The Lord of hosts is with us; the God of Jacob is our refuge. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. KELLY 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.

THE TAIWAN FACILITIES ENHANCEMENT ACT

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member rises to alert his colleagues to the introduction of H.R. 3707, the Taiwan Facilities Enhancement Act. This bill authorizes construction of modern, secure facilities for the American Institute on Taiwan.

In the Taiwan Relations Act of 1979, the Congress established the American Institute on Taiwan to perform on behalf of the United States Government any and all programs and other relations with Taiwan. These facilities are grossly inadequate today from a security perspective, and major enhancements would be necessary to bring them into compliance with security requirements.

Mr. Speaker, Congress must specifically act to authorize because it is not a normal embassy or a consulate.

Mr. Speaker, over 20 years after the enactment of the Taiwan Relations Act, our unofficial relations with the people of Taiwan are stronger, more robust, and more important than ever. For very practical and security reasons, the Congress needs to act to upgrade our diplomatic facilities on Taiwan as well.

It will also demonstrate that we have and will have a presence in Taipei for the long-term, if necessary, to assure that any reunification is peaceful and uncoerced. This Member hopes that all Members of Congress will cosponsor and support this legislation.

BLISS MANUFACTURING BANKRUPTED

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, Bliss Manufacturing in my district makes bumpers for General Motors. Not any more. Bliss bankrupted yesterday, putting 500 of my workers on the street due to two reasons: number one, the continuing flood of illegal steel imports; and number 2, after a recent decision by the United States International Trade Commission that ruled in favor of Japan, Russia, Brazil, and Korea.

Beam me up. Even the Youngstown Vindicator, one of the most respected newspapers in Ohio, one of the staunchest supporters of free trade in open markets, said enough is enough. I agree with the Youngstown Vindicator.

I will be submitting legislation this week that my colleagues should support. I want to yield back the gutless wonders of the United States International Trade Commission and the

Clinton/Gore administration that appointed them.

COLOMBIA AID PACKAGE

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, soon the House is expected to consider the supplemental appropriations bill which contains the Colombia aid package. While this package is far from perfect, it is essential that we pass it now. Failure to do so would send a signal to the drug cartels in Colombia that this Congress is not serious about helping Colombia fight the war on drugs.

In fact, delaying the passage of this bill any further has and will lead to increased violence in Colombia. On March 8, just last week, for example, 100 guerillas from the drug cartel-backed FARC attacked a village 250 miles south of Bogota and released 92 of their compatriots who were imprisoned there. No doubt further delays will lead to more and even more bolder attacks.

This recent attack should present us with the more clear evidence that any further delay in passing a comprehensive aid package to Colombia will result in more violence, more attacks, and could threaten the very existence of the Colombian government.

Mr. Speaker, if we fail to act now, we will leave our friends in Colombia vulnerable to the narcoterrorists who will freely build their power and wealth upon the broken lives of our children. I urge support for the supplemental.

FAMILY FARMERS

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, the small family farm is quickly becoming an endangered species in this Nation. And with farmers being hit by the inheritance tax or what we should call the death tax, it is no surprise. Many family farmers work hard their whole lives struggling to make ends meet as they feed not only their own families, but families around the world. But instead of showing gratitude to farmers for their lifetime of work, our government instead punishes these farmers when they pass their farm on to the next generation.

When a farmer dies, the Federal Government assesses a tax of up to 55 percent on the value of his or her farm. This is ridiculous. It is tragic. For many people, the American dream is to build up a business or a farm and then pass it on to their children. Yet many times the children have to sell the farm just to pay the taxes.

Death should not be a taxable event. We are losing our farms. We should repeal the death tax.

I urge all of my colleagues to work towards this end. Farmers deserve a thank you, not an IOU.

TRADING WITH THE ENEMY

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, soon this august body will be debating the trade status of the United States with the People's Republic of China. We will begin discussing whether or not the U.S. should expand its trade relationships with a nation that has, one, stolen top secret nuclear technology from the United States and its laboratories; two, continues to be a known violator of human rights; and three, has threatened the United States with nuclear war.

Just a couple of weeks ago, China threatened to fire long-range nuclear missiles at the United States if we defend Taiwan. Mr. Speaker, how can we trust a nation that has stolen U.S. technology and secrets, oppressed its own people, and now threatens the United States with nuclear war?

The actions of China appear no different from those of the Soviet Union during the Cold War. We did not consider an open trade policy with the USSR then, and we should not consider granting normal trade relationships with China today.

I yield back the dangerous Clinton trade policies which force Americans to give to a nation that is all ready and willing to launch a nuclear attack on us.

CONGRESS SHOULD REPEAL THE GAS TAX TODAY

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

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, the lead story on most all newscasts today is about the high price of gasoline and fuel.

In just the past 2 weeks, the price has risen 12 cents per gallon, with a national average today at $1.53 per gallon as compared to less than $1 one year ago. For the past two weeks the people at home have asked, what is Congress going to do about the high price of gasoline?

Mr. Speaker, the only controlling factor the Congress has pertaining to the price of gas or fuel is the tax imposed by Congress. In 1993, the Congress increased the gas tax by 4.3 cents per gallon for deficit reduction. Today there is no deficit. Today Congress can repeal the 4.3 cents gas tax and help with the cost of gas and fuel.

Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the needs and the challenges of infrastructure, but the Congress must adjust its needs, the same as a family adjusts its budget to meet its needs.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Any record 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.

ESTABLISHING A JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE ON INAUGURAL CEREMONIES

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate Concurrent Resolution (S. Con. Res. 89) to establish a Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies for the inauguration of the President-elect and the Vice President-elect of the United States on January 20, 2001.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. CON. RES. 89

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),

SECTION 1. ESTABLISHMENT OF JOINT COMMITTEE.

There is established a Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies (in this resolution referred to as the ''joint committee'') consisting of 3 Senators and 3 Representatives, to be appointed by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, respectively. The joint committee is authorized to make the necessary arrangements for the inauguration of the President-elect and Vice President-elect of the United States on January 20, 2001.

SEC. 2. SUPPORT OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE.

The joint committee—

(1) is authorized to utilize appropriate equipment and the services of appropriate personnel of departments and agencies of the Federal Government, under arrangements between the joint committee and the heads of those departments and agencies, in connection with the inaugural proceedings and ceremonies; and

(2) may accept gifts and donations of goods and services to carry out its responsibilities.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, everyone, I think, is becoming aware that this is a presidential election year, but it is not just a political event. It is, in fact, an important governmental institutional event. It is, in the long history of governments, the longest peaceful transition between those who hold the executive position in this government.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 89 is the traditional start of this institutional process. The chairman of the Senate Committee on Rules and the ranking member have cleared through the Senate and presented to the House this concurrent resolution, which will

establish the Joint Congressional Committee on the inaugural ceremonies surrounding the selection of the President of the United States on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November of the year 2000 for that ceremony on January 20, 2001.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution. This routine concurrent resolution will create, as the chairman has said, the customary joint committee of this Congress to prepare for the inauguration of the 43rd President and the 46th Vice President of the United States on January 20, 2001.

The joint committee will consist of three Senators and three Representatives who will plan the ceremony transferring the highest office in the land to the person chosen as our next chief executive.

That simple but elegant, dignified ceremony is the grandest in our national life, and symbolizes our commitment to peaceful, democratic self-governance. The chairman correctly pointed out that ours is the longest-standing democracy in history. That transfer of power is a magnificent testimony to the people of the United States and our commitment to democracy.

I urge all Members to support the resolution.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate Concurrent Resolution, Senate Concurrent Resolution 89.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of S. Con. Res. 89, the Senate concurrent resolution just concurred in.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING USE OF CAPITOL ROTUNDA BY JOINT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE ON INAUGURAL CEREMONIES

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 90) to authorize the use of the rotunda of the Capitol by the Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies in connection with the proceedings and ceremonies conducted for the inauguration of the President-elect and the Vice President-elect of the United States.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. CON. RES. 90

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring),

SECTION 1. USE OF THE ROTUNDA OF THE CAPITOL.

The rotunda of the United States Capitol is authorized to be used on January 20, 2001, by the Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies in connection with the proceedings and ceremonies conducted for the inauguration of the President-elect and the Vice President-elect of the United States.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, this is obviously an adjoining resolution which, having created the structure of the committee to assist in this inaugural ceremony, the facilities of the Capitol Rotunda are made available.

Oftentimes, the Rotunda is used for, in essence, social and ceremonial activities. However, those Members who were here might remember that January day of 1985 at the inaugural ceremony of the second term of then President Ronald Reagan.

His 1980 election was a balmy spring-like day with the West Front being the focal point for the inauguration. In January of 1985, it was an extremely cold and bitter snowy January, and in fact, the swearing-in ceremony had to take place in that Rotunda, packed as tightly as I have ever seen it packed with people anticipating, once again, the inauguration of a president of the United States.

□ 1415

This Senate concurrent resolution offered by the chairman of the Senate Committee on Rules and the ranking member, as it states quite clearly, would be in connection with the ceremonies. Let us hope that it is, in fact, a social and ceremonial use of the rotunda rather than cover because of the kind of weather that no one wants to accompany an inauguration of the President of the United States.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, all of us were very pleased that the judgment was made to move into the rotunda, and, that in fact, the rotunda was available on January 20, 1985. I think the temperature outside with the windchill was many degrees below zero. It was a very cold period. Very frankly, the health of all of those in attendance, including the President himself, would have been at stake had we remained outside.

More than that, however, the rotunda, of course, is one of our most historical sites, in the middle of the United States Capitol, which is perceived around the world as the center of democracy.

I rise in support of this resolution.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, no matter how cold that day was, the event certainly warmed the hearts of all Americans. We look forward to the ceremonies surrounding the next President of the United States, and it certainly will warm all of our hearts once again.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 90.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on Senate Concurrent Resolution 90.

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

There was no objection.

SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT CORRECTIONS ACT OF 2000

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3845) to make corrections to the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3845

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 ''Small Business Investment Corrections Act of 2000''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

(a) SMALL BUSINESS CONCERN.—Section 103(5)(A)(i) of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 662(5)(A)(i)) is amended by inserting ''regardless of the allocation of control during the investment period under any investment agreement between the business concern and the entity making the investment'' before the semicolon at the end.

(b) LONG TERM.—Section 103 of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 662) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (15), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (16), by striking the period at the end and inserting ''; and''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(17) the term 'long term', when used in connection with equity capital or loan funds invested in any small business concern or smaller enterprise, means any period of time not less than 1 year.''.

SEC. 3. SUBSIDY FEES.

(a) DEBENTURES.—Section 303(b) of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 683(b)) is amended by striking ''plus an additional charge of 1 percent per annum which shall be paid to and retained by the Administration'' and inserting ''plus, for debentures issued after September 30, 2000, an additional charge, in an amount established annually by the Administration, of not more than 1 percent per year as necessary to reduce to zero the cost (as defined in section 502 of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 (2 U.S.C. 661a)) to the Administration of purchasing and guaranteeing debentures under this Act, which shall be paid to and retained by the Administration''.

(b) PARTICIPATING SECURITIES.—Section 303(g)(2) of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 683(g)(2)) is amended by striking ''plus an additional charge of 1 percent per annum which shall be paid to and retained by the Administration'' and inserting ''plus, for participating securities issued after September 30, 2000, an additional charge, in an amount established annually by the Administration, of not more than 1 percent per year as necessary to reduce to zero the cost (as defined in section 502 of the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 (2 U.S.C. 661a)) to the Administration of purchasing and guaranteeing participating securities under this Act, which shall be paid to and retained by the Administration''.

SEC. 4. DISTRIBUTIONS.

Section 303(g)(8) of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 683(g)(8)) is amended—

(1) by striking ''subchapter s corporation'' and inserting ''subchapter S corporation'';

(2) by striking ''the end of any calendar quarter based on a quarterly'' and inserting ''any time during any calendar quarter based on an''; and

(3) by striking ''quarterly distributions for a calendar year,'' and inserting ''interim distributions for a calendar year,''.

SEC. 5. CONFORMING AMENDMENT.

Section 310(c)(4) of the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (15 U.S.C. 687b(c)(4)) is amended by striking ''five years'' and inserting ''1 year''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY) and the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELAZQUEZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY).

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

Mr. Speaker, first, I would like to thank the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELAZQUEZ), the ranking member of the Committee on Small Business, for her efforts in moving this noncontroversial, yet crucial legislation through the committee process on the floor today.

H.R. 3845, the SBIC Corrections Act, is a specific, clear-cut bill offered in an efficient and timely fashion. The purpose of H.R. 3845 is to amend the Small Business Investment Act to make changes in the Small Business Investment Company program at the Small Business Administration, commonly known as SBIC program.

Created by Congress in 1958, SBICs are licensed by the Small Business Administration. They are privately organized and privately managed firms. SBICs serve as profit-motivated businesses that have a chance to invest in small businesses and a chance to share in the success of the small businesses they expand and thrive.

SBICs serve as partners with the government and the private sector by using both their own capital and funds borrowed through the Federal Government to provide venture capital to small, independent businesses, both start-ups and established businesses.

H.R. 3845 contains four technical changes to improve the program and correct problems brought to the committee's attention through the oversight process. We heard testimony regarding these changes at a hearing held on March 9. SBA has examined this legislation and is in agreement with the changes the Committee on Small Business has made.

The bill makes four minor changes in the SBIC program. First, H.R. 3845 modifies the definition of control for SBIC investment in small businesses, eliminating a cumbersome five-prong test and setting a clear statutory standard.

Second, the legislation modifies the definition of long-term investment to harmonize that definition with accepted business practice and the tax and banking laws, changing it from 5 years to 1 year.

Third, the bill allows the administration to adjust the subsidy fee for the SBIC program to maintain the subsidy rate of the program at zero. It is an unfortunate side effect of the success of the program that the current fixed 1 percent fee is actually taking in more money than the cost of the program, resulting in an unnecessary cost to borrowers.

I would also point out that this section has been amended to be effective after the end of the year; therefore, the bill has no impact on direct spending in the current fiscal year.

Finally, the bill changes the language in the investment act concerning distributions by SBICs. H.R. 3845 will allow SBICs more flexibility in making distributions to their investors and will simplify the accounting and tax procedures for SBICs by permitting distributions according to the quarterly needs of SBICs.

Mr. Speaker, while these changes are minor, they are essential to the continued success of this valuable program. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3845 and the thousands of small businesses who could not flourish without the capital provided by the SBIC program.

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

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, as an original cosponsor of H.R. 3845, I rise in strong support of this legislation that continues to build on a program that has been critical to the success of this Nation's small businesses.

Mr. Speaker, as many Members of this body are aware, the Small Business Investment Company program created in the 1950s has been one of the most successful tools in helping this Nation's entrepreneurs succeed. This private-public partnership has provided access to capital, resulting in more than $15 billion worth of investment in 90,000 small businesses. Of that, $600 million has gone to businesses located in low- and moderate-income communities. SBICs have helped such household names as Apple Computers, Federal Express, and Callaway Golf get off the ground.

With today's passage of H.R. 3845, we will build on work already undertaken by this body last year that passed, and the President signed, legislation that streamlined the SBIC program. These changes increased flexibility, allowing more businesses to receive the vital financing that they need.

But given last year's passage of sweeping financial modernization legislation that allowed banks, insurance companies, and investment firms to compete in all sectors of financial services, it is critical that we update the SBIC program.

The Gramm-Leach-Bliley legislation, while providing an important new service to small business, has had a rippling effect throughout the entire financial community, including the SBIC program. Banks are no longer required to use the SBIC program for venture capital investments, and the new realities of venture capital are that we must, too, make some adjustment that will ensure this program continues a strong record of service.

Let me give my colleagues an example of the types of changes we must make. Since the program was created in the 1950s, it was established that, in order to be deemed a long-term investment, the investment must be held for 5 years. However, when we passed financial modernization, the definition of long-term investment was set at 1 year. If the SBIC program is to continue as an attractive investment option, rules like what is considered a long-term investment must be consistent with the rest of this Nation's financial laws.

The legislation also addresses the critical issues of control. When the SBIC program was originally created, it was clear that SBICs would not serve as holding companies. Over the life of the program in recognition of the changes in venture capital investment, several exceptions have been put in place that will allow for limited control. Unfortunately, rather than updating the program, this has created a complicated and burdensome system for both the SBIC and SBA that, in the end, limits assistance to small businesses.

This legislation recognizes that today's SBICs act as incubators of business ideas. It is still the intent that SBICs do not become holding companies; but in many cases, SBICs may need to create, capitalize, and operate small business concerns in the early years.

The other changes under consideration ensure that the fees are not overburdensome and that the SBICs will be given the maximum flexibility with tax distribution to help with the cash flow.

I want to also commend the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. TALENT), the chairman, and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY) for their hard work on this legislation.

These changes will continue to make the SBIC program the current flagship program that it is. I believe it is important to act quickly to ensure that the SBIC program continues its mission of creating future companies that, in turn, become common household names.

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

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

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I would like to state that this technical corrections act is entirely that, technical in nature. However, it will save time and expense for both SBA and SBICs by eliminating duplicative filings and inefficient use of the SBA resources.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. KELLY) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3845, 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

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 3845.

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

There was no objection.

JOEL T. BROYHILL POSTAL BUILDING

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3699) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 8409 Lee Highway in Merrifield, Virginia, as the ''Joel T. Broyhill Postal Building''.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3699

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

SECTION 1. JOEL T. BROYHILL POSTAL BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 8409 Lee Highway in Merrifield, Virginia, shall be known and designated as the ''Joel T. Broyhill Postal Building''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Joel T. Broyhill Postal Building''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 3699.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) introduced this bill, H.R. 3699, on February 29 of this year, with each Member of the House delegation from the State of Virginia supporting the legislation, which is the standing policy on the Committee on Government Reform.

As noted, Mr. Speaker, this bill designates the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 8409 Lee Highway in Merrifield, Virginia, as the ''Joel T. Broyhill Postal Building.''

The Congressional Budget Office has reviewed the legislation and has determined the enactment of H.R. 3699 would have no significant impact upon the Federal budget. Spending by the Postal Service is classified as off-budget and, thus, is not subject to pay-as-you-go procedures. As well, the bill contains no intergovernmental or private sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act. It would impose no cost on State, local, or tribal governments.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud of the record of this subcommittee in working with particularly the distinguished gentleman from Philadelphia, Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH), the ranking minority member, in having the opportunity to bring a host of postal naming bills to this floor.

Today we have two bills that certainly are no exception, two bills that seek to name facilities after individuals who, as their predecessors have done, have so admirably served their country, have served, in these instances, their Congress and their government here in Washington, and most importantly have served their communities.

□ 1430

I am going to be pleased in a moment to yield to our good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), for a full description of the background of our first designee. But I would just say that this is an individual who was elected to the 83rd Congress in 1955 and for 22 years served in this House proudly.

Of interest, he was the first Member of Congress to represent what was then the newly created 10th Congressional District of Virginia, where he served as a member on the Republican side of the aisle. It is also important to note, Mr. Speaker, that Congressman Broyhill was also a member of what was then the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, that committee at the time that oversaw the activities of the postal service and, as such, I think is particularly worthy of this particular designation.

His time in Congress, I think, would merit such a designation, but Congressman Broyhill accumulated a record of service that extends far beyond the halls of this hallowed institution. He was a decorated veteran. He served in World War II as a captain and, at age 25, he fought in the Battle of the Bulge, where he was taken prisoner and held in a German POW camp until he heroically escaped and rejoined the advancing allied forces.

In short, Mr. Speaker, this is an individual that dedicated most of his life to service of his country, both in a public fashion and, as we have just heard, in his military capacity as well.

Congressman Broyhill today is the father of three daughters and one stepdaughter and resides not far from this body, in Arlington, Virginia. It is with great pride, Mr. Speaker, that I bring this bill to the floor and ask for its enthusiastic adoption.

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

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

As a member of the Committee on Government Reform, I am pleased to join with the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH) in the consideration of two postal-naming bills. Both bills honor fine individuals who have contributed much to the improvement of their country and their State.

First, we will consider H.R. 3699, which honors Joel Broyhill. When the time is appropriate, Mr. Speaker, after we hear from the prime sponsor, I will yield to my colleague, the gentleman from the fine State of Virginia (Mr. MORAN), to make some further comments on this bill.

Mr. Speaker: H.R. 3699 and H.R. 3701, both sponsored by Congressman FRANK WOLF, have met the committee cosponsorship requirement and are supported by the entire Virginia congressional delegation. It must be voted that the persons honored by H.R. 3699 and H.R. 3701—former members of Congress—Joel Broyhill and Joseph Fisher, both represented the congressional district currently held by Congressman FRANK WOLF.

As the Ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on the Postal Service, I would like to thank Chairman BURTON and Chairman

MCHUGH for their support and assistance in the accommodation and timely consideration of these postal naming bills.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3699, to designate the United States Postal Service located at 8409 Lee Highway in Merrifield, Virginia, as the ''Joel T. Broyhill Postal Building,'' was introduced by Congressman WOLF on Tuesday, February 29, 2000, with the support and cosponsorship of the entire Virginia delegation.

Congressman Joel T. Broyhill was born in 1919 in Hopewell, Virginia. A World War II Army veteran, he fought in the famous ''Battle of the Bulge,'' was captured and held as a POW in a German camp until his escape. Mr. Broyhill returned to Virginia and was elected to Congress in 1952, representing the 1oth District for 22 years. He served as a Republican member of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the Committee on the District of Columbia, and the Committee on Ways and Means.

I urge swift adoption of this measure.

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

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), who is the primary author of this bill, a gentleman who has worked very hard to bring these two very meritorious measures to the floor before us today.

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

Mr. Speaker, it is a privilege, as the representative of the 10th Congressional District of Virginia, to speak today in very strong support of legislation I introduced which would designate the postal facility located at 8409 Lee Highway in Merrifield, Virginia, as the Joel T. Broyhill Postal Building. I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH) of the Subcommittee on Postal Service and the entire Committee on Government Reform for moving this legislation very, very fast.

The Honorable Joel T. Broyhill was elected to Congress in 1952 and began his career in the service in the House as a Republican Member in 1953 in the 83rd Congress. I can still remember looking down and seeing Congressman Broyhill as he served here on the floor for so many years.

Born in Hopewell, Virginia, on November 4, 1919, Joel Broyhill served 22 years as a representative of the 10th Congressional District. He was the first Member of Congress to represent the newly created 10th. He began his congressional career and service as a member, as the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH) said, of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and the District of Columbia, and later became a member of the powerful House Committee on Ways and Means.

Constituent services, assisting people he represented, was the cornerstone of Joel Broyhill's service in Congress. According to the Almanac of American Politics in 1972, and I quote, they said, ''There were few offices that took care of constituents' needs and complaints with more efficiency.'' Congressman Broyhill estimated that he aided more than 100,000 10th Congressional District residents in his 20-plus year service in office. The almanac also describes Congressman Broyhill as a Member of Congress and says that he ''should be credited with voting his conscience.''

Congressman Broyhill is a decorated veteran and for 4 years served bravely, along with thousands of other young American soldiers, in World War II as a captain in the 106th Infantry Division. At the age of 25, Captain Broyhill fought in one of the most decisive and costly conflicts in World War II, the famous, the infamous, the Battle of the Bulge. He was taken prisoner and held in a German POW camp until he heroically escaped and was able to rejoin advancing allied forces.

Congressman Broyhill has dedicated most of his life to serving his country in both war and peace, in public and in a military capacity. His commitment and his devotion to public service is deserving of recognition, and it is appropriate that the postal building at 3409 Lee Highway in Merrifield, Virginia, be renamed in his honor. He also loved this body and loved this House, and I appreciate the fact that the House has honored him with this.

Congressman Broyhill is the father of three daughters, one step-daughter and resides today in Arlington, Virginia.

Mr. Speaker, the entire Virginia congressional delegation has sponsored this legislation today, and we join in asking our colleagues to vote in support of H.R. 3699 to honor former Congressman Joel T. Broyhill through the naming of the Joel T. Broyhill Postal Building in Merrifield, Virginia.

I would also like to announce that Senator WARNER has introduced identical legislation in the Senate where we hope it goes for a quick passage.

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH).

Mr. Speaker, it is entirely appropriate that we name the central post office facility in Merrifield, Virginia, after Joel Broyhill. Mr. Broyhill served Arlington County and Fairfax County and Northern Virginia extraordinarily well during his long public career. It was a transitional period during those days and Mr. Broyhill earned a reputation for excellent service to his constituency, particularly Federal workers.

A native of Hopewell, Virginia, this distinguished gentleman attended public schools, graduated from Fork Union Military Academy, and then, upon completion of his studies at George Washington University, enlisted in the Army.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) have described his courage and valor. He escaped the German forces after the Battle of the Bulge and then rejoined advancing American forces. After his distinguished career in the military ended, he did not end his public service. After concluding his military career, he resumed real estate pursuits but then ran for Congress.

His base was his long service with the Arlington County Chamber of Congress, the County Planning Commission in Arlington, and then served for 22 years in the United States Congress. He was a vigilant advocate for Federal workers. He served his country well. As the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) has said, he was credited with always voting his conscience.

It is entirely appropriate, Mr. Speaker, that we recognize his commitment and devotion to public service by naming this central post office in his honor.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise today to honor Mr. Joel T. Broyhill. I am proud to be a co-sponsor along with my colleagues from Northern Virginia, Congressmen FRANK WOLF and JOM MORAN, of H.R. 3699, designating that the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3409 Lee Highway in Merrifield, Virginia, to be known as ''Joel T. Broyhill Postal Building.'' Mr. Broyhill has served a distinguished career in the United States Army and as a Representative from Virginia's 10th Congressional District.

Born in Hopewell, Virginia, November 1919, the Honorable Joel Broyhill was first elected to the Eighty-third Congress in 1952 as a Republican and served for 22 years as representative of the 10th Congressional District. He was the first elected representative of the newly created district. He served as a member of the House Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and a committee nearest to my heart, the Committee on the District of Columbia and the Committee on Ways and Means.

Congressman Broyhill, a decorated veteran, served four years in World War II as a Captain in the 106th Infantry Division. At age 25, he fought in the ''Battle of the Bulge'' and was held captive in a German POW camp until he heroically escaped and made his way back to the advancing Allied armies.

The Honorable Joel Broyhill has dedicated his life to serving his country in both the military and as a public official. The Almanac of American Politics stated that Congressman Broyhill ''should be credited by voting his conscience.'' His commitment and dedication to public service is deserving of recognition, and it is appropriate that the postal building at 3409 Lee Highway in Merrifield, Virginia.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I am proud to honor such a man as Joel Broyhill. He was ably served his country and community. I know my colleagues join me in honoring and thanking Joel for his many years of dedicated service to the people of Virginia's 10th Congressional District.

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

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I would simply urge all our Members to support this very worthy piece of legislation honoring an equally worthy individual.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3699.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

JOSEPH L. FISHER POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3701) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3118 Washington Boulevard in Arlington, Virginia, as the ''Joseph L. Fisher Post Office Building''.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3701

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

SECTION 1. JOSEPH L. FISHER POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3118 Washington Boulevard in Arlington, Virginia, shall be known and designated as the ''Joseph L. Fisher Post Office Building''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Joseph L. Fisher Post Office Building''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 3701, the bill now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) once again has taken the mantle of leadership in introducing this bill, H.R. 3701. Also on February 29 of this year and, as in the previous enactment, he has brought the entire House delegation of the State of Virginia in support of his proposal in concert with the standing policy of the Committee on Government Reform.

As we have heard, H.R. 3701 designates the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3118 Washington Boulevard in Arlington, Virginia, as the Joseph L. Fisher Post Office Building.

The Congressional Budget Office has also reviewed this legislation and determined that its enactment would have no significant impact on the Federal budget. Spending by the postal service is classified as off budget and not subject to pay-as-you-go procedures. This act would have no impact or cost on State, local, or tribal governments.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, we have an individual and an opportunity to honor an individual who served in this body. Joseph L. Fisher was elected as a representative from the 10th District of Virginia in 1974, the 94th Congress, as a Democrat, and served for three terms, interestingly enough, immediately following our previous honoree, Representative Broyhill.

As in our previous designee, then Congressman Fisher went on to a very storied, very meritorious career in public service. After his leaving Congress, he served as Secretary of Human Resources for the Commonwealth of Virginia during Governor ROBB's administration. He was a professor of political economy at George Mason University. He served as the Chairman of the National Academy of Public Administration. He served as the head of the Unitarian Universalist Association, and on and on and on.

As I have said previously, we are indeed privileged today to have the opportunity to honor two individuals who have served in a broad range of capacities that have really exemplified what the commitment to public service should be and, in fact, is all about.

Congressman Fisher passed from our midst in Arlington, Virginia, in 1992; but he is survived today by his wife, Margaret, seven children, 16 grandchildren, and two great-grandsons. And certainly to them we want to extend our most heartfelt feelings of appreciation and deep respect for the actions of Joseph L. Fisher in support of this House, in support of his government, and in support of his community.

I will be pleased in a moment to yield to the author, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), for some more extensive remarks.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to also add my voice in support of H.R. 3701. This is another bill authored by our good friend and colleague, the gentleman from the State of Virginia (Mr. WOLF), who has been concerned with, among many other issues, the question of making sure that this Congress recognizes the importance of family.

□ 1445

I think that is evident by these two bills, he understands that family extends even to Members who have left this body. And we honor ourselves by recognizing the contributions of those who come before us.

So I want to thank him for offering this bill, and I add my support to it.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3701, to designate the United States Postal Service located at 3118 Washington Boulevard in Arlington, Virginia, as the ''Joseph L. Fisher Post Office Building,'' was introduced with the support and cosponsorship of the entire Virginia delegation.

The late Congressman Joseph L. Fisher was born in Rhode Island. In 1963 he was elected to the Arlington, Virginia County Board and served as chairman of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority. After unseating a former member of Congress, Congressman Joel Broyhill in 1974, Congressman Fisher was elected to represent the 10th District where he served for three terms. Congressman Fisher, a Democrat, was a dedicated member of the Committee on Ways and Means and Committee on the Budget. During his time in the Congress, he made a reputation for his work on taxes, energy and budget policy.

At the time of his death in 1992, Congressman Fisher was a Distinguished Visiting Professor of Political Economy at George Mason University.

I urge swift adoption of this measure and thank my colleague, Congressman WOLF for seeking to honor such distinguished men and former members of Congress.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned, we are very fortunate today to have two individuals designated in these two bills who are so worthy of this designation that I am confident we are about to bestow.

Again, to that opportunity, we owe much to the sponsors of both bills, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF).

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF).

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

Mr. Speaker, it is an honor and a privilege to speak in support of the legislation I introduced to designate the post office located at 3118 Washington Boulevard in Arlington, Virginia, as the ''Joseph L. Fisher Post Office.''

I want to again thank the gentleman from New York (Chairman MCHUGH) of the Postal Service subcommittee and all the members of the Committee on Government Reform for their efforts to move this legislation to the House floor today.

Born in Rhode Island on January 11, 1914, the same year as my dad was born, the late Congressman Joseph L. Fisher was first elected as representative of the 10th District in 1974 as a Democrat and began his service in the 94th Congress. He served for three terms and was the second Member of Congress to represent Virginia's 10th Congressional District.

As the current representative of the 10th District, I am honored to offer this legislation to highlight the public service career of Joe Fisher, which spanned over 50 years.

Economist, educator, author, and congressman, Joe Fisher earned his undergraduate degree at Bowdoin College

and went on to graduate studies at the London School of Economics, Harvard University, and The George Washington University. In 1942, he married the former Margaret, now Peggy, Saunders Winslow.

He served as Senior Economic Advisor on the Council of Economic Advisors during the Truman Administration. During his 6 years in Congress, he was a member of the powerful House Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on the Budget and earned a reputation for his diligent work on taxation, energy, and budget policy. He also served as the chairman of seven task forces all charged with important national policy issues.

He held the position of economist at the U.S. Department of State before serving his country in World War II in the Pacific theater from 1943 to 1946. He was also deeply involved in community activities.

He was elected to the Arlington County Board in 1963 and served as its chairman. Working closely with his community, he became an advocate for regional air and water pollution and transit improvement projects. He also served as chairman of Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority and president and chairman of the Washington Metropolitan Council of Governments.

After his service in Congress, he continued his public service career during Virginia Governor CHARLES ROBB's administration as secretary of human resources for the Commonwealth of Virginia. He was also a professor of political economy at George Mason University and chairman of the National Academy of Public Administration. He also served as head of the Unitarian Universalist Association, the church's international administrative body.

As an author, he wrote several books, including World Prospects for Natural Resources in 1964 and Resources in America's Future in 1963. The Joseph L. Fisher papers are featured in a collection at George Mason University.

Former Virginia Governor L. Douglas Wilder once stated, ''Joe proved how well one can serve the people. He did it every day, pushing for the kinds of things that would truly improve the quality of life for all of his constituents.''

Congressman Fisher dedicated his life to public service and was a committed advocate of the causes in which he believed. It is fitting to recognize his commitment to public service by renaming the post office located at 3118 Washington Boulevard, Arlington, Virginia, in tribute to him.

Congressman Fisher passed away in Arlington, Virginia, on February 19, 1992, and is survived by his wife Peggy, 7 children, 16 grandchildren, and 2 great grandsons.

Mr. Speaker, I urge our colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation to honor the late Congressman Joseph L. Fisher for his dedicated public service. I would say that Senator WARNER has introduced identical legislation in the Senate, and we are hopeful for a quick passage.

I want to again really thank the chairman for moving these so very, very fast.

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

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank again my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH), for yielding me the time and for his leadership in the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong support of this legislation to rename the central post office in Arlington County after the late Joe Fisher, who so ably represented Virginia's old 10th District between 1974 and 1980.

I want to commend my good friend and distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), who now represents the new 10th District of Virginia, for his leadership on this bill, as well as the prior bill with regard to Mr. Broyhill.

Joe Fisher was one of the finest men I ever knew. I am proud to stand on his inspirational shoulders today. He was extraordinarily intelligent, holding a doctorate from Harvard in economics. He was a man of unquestioned integrity and genuine humility. He worked hard and purposefully, and he understood our responsibility to the future, particularly in the area of environmental preservation.

Many young people who are active in Government service and public service today got their start working for and observing Congressman Joe Fisher.

During his service here in the House, Joe was a leader on economic issues, tax reform, and economic policy. It is amazing to think that he was appointed to the Committee on Ways and Means in his very first term.

The leadership of my party appointed Joe to head no less than seven task forces that helped to draft the Energy Policy Act of 1978. He was a founding member of the Environmental Study Conference that provided a bicameral forum in which to examine our Nation's environmental policies. And he was a strong voice for Federal workers in Northern Virginia, as well as for people in need throughout the country.

After leaving this body in 1980, Joe continued his public service as Secretary of Human Resources in the administration of then Governor CHUCK ROBB. He, in fact, had the unenviable task during that period of time when we had a recession in the State of administering Virginia's AFDC and Medicaid programs. But he had a heart that was as expansive as his mind. And throughout his tenure, he earned a reputation for being fair minded, even handed, and extraordinarily effective.

When he left Richmond, he continued serving the public as a professor at George Mason University, which is a post he held until he passed away at the age of 78. He has left a legacy in Northern Virginia particularly, but in this country generally.

With regard to Northern Virginia, I think it is fair to say that he was instrumental in transforming Northern Virginia from what had at one time been a segregated, insular suburb to a progressive and inclusively caring community. That probably would have happened without Joe Fisher, but it happened sooner and more profoundly because of Joe Fisher.

Beyond his service to Virginia and this Nation, those of us who knew Joe Fisher came to appreciate the renaissance character of his personality and intellect. He was an avid sportsman and hiker. He was a national leader of the Unitarian Church. But first and foremost, he was a devoted husband and father to his wife Peggy and their seven children.

Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to support this bill to honor the lifetime of public service that Joe Fisher provided our country. Again, I commend my good friend the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) for his leadership on it.

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

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume for a final word of appreciation for the leadership of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF) on this and a plea to our colleagues to adopt, as well, this piece of legislation honoring a very worthy individual.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise today to honor Mr. Joseph L. Fisher. I am proud to be an original co-sponsor of H.R. 3701, introduced by Representative FRANK WOLF and Representative JIM MORAN, which designates the United States Post Office facility located at 3118 Washington Boulevard in Arlington, Virginia, to be known as the ''Joseph L. Fisher Post Office Building.'' Mr. Fisher served a distinguished career in both the U.S. Armed Forces and as the first Representative from Virginia's 10th Congressional District.

Born in Pawtucket, Rhode Island, January 11, 1914, the late Congressman Joseph Fisher was first elected as the representative of the 10th Congressional District of Virginia in 1974 as a Democrat and began his service in the Ninety-fourth Congress. He held the seat of Congressman FRANK WOLF. He served three terms and was the second Member of Congress to represent the 10th Congressional District. He served the 10th district through a period of tremendous growth and change for Northern Virginia. During his six years in Congress he served as a member of the House Ways and Means and Budget committees and earned a reputation for his diligent work on taxation, energy and budget policy. He also served as chair of seven task forces all on national policy issues.

When he first came to Northern Virginia he accepted a position as an economist at the U.S. Department of State before serving his country in World War II in the Pacific theater from 1943 to 1946. After he returned to the area, he was elected to the Arlington County Board in 1963 and became an advocate for

regional air, water pollution and transit improvement projects. He also served as a Chairman of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority.

After his service in Congress, he continued his public service at the state level during Virginia Governor CHARLES S. ROBB's administration as Secretary of Human Resources for the Commonwealth of Virginia. Former Virginia Governor L. Douglas Wilder once stated, ''Joe proved how well one can serve the people. He did it every day.''

Congressman Fisher dedicated his life to public service and was a committed advocate of the causes in which he believed. It is fitting to recognize his service and commitment by renaming the post office located at 3118 Washington Boulevard, Arlington County, Virginia.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I am proud to honor such a man as Joseph Fisher. He has ably served his country and community. I know my colleagues join me in honoring Joseph for his many years of service to his nation and the people of Virginia's 10th Congressional District.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3701.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE TO REPUBLIC OF MOZAMBIQUE

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 431) expressing support for humanitarian assistance to the Republic of Mozambique, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 431

Whereas in February 2000, the southern Africa nations of Botswana, Madagascar, Mozambique, South Africa, Zambia, and Zimbabwe began to experience severe flooding caused by days of heavy rain;

Whereas the Republic of Mozambique bore the brunt of the torrential rains and experienced the worst flooding in 100 years;

Whereas roads, homes, bridges, the energy infrastructure, and crops were destroyed;

Whereas many towns are without potable water and the corresponding public health threat from water-borne diseases is severe;

Whereas on February 22, 2000, tropical cyclone Eline blew full force into Mozambique, exacerbating an already terrible humanitarian crisis;

Whereas continued rainfall from swollen rivers in neighboring southern African countries threatens to bring more flood waters into Mozambique;

Whereas thousands of Mozambicans have lost everything and are in desperate need of water, food, and shelter;

Whereas in 1992 Mozambique ended a bloody 16 year civil war and has made substantial progress on democratic freedoms and multi-party elections;

Whereas Mozambique is one of the world's poorest countries where 27 percent of all babies born die before the age of 5;

Whereas the flooding has virtually wiped out the significant economic recovery the Mozambican people have worked hard to achieve over the last 8 years;

Whereas large segments of Mozambican crops were spared from the cyclone and flooding and could be utilized to feed needy citizens later this year;

Whereas the Government of Mozambique will require massive international assistance over the next 90 days and the growing international relief effort must remain on high alert for the next several weeks;

Whereas prior to the flood disaster, Mozambique was one of the first countries to qualify for benefits under the World Bank/IMF Heavily Indebted Poor Countries initiative; and

Whereas the total amount of Mozambique's external debt is $5.3 billion: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) commends the Government of the Republic of South Africa for its quick response and assistance to the Mozambican people;

(2) commends the Government of the United Kingdom for announcing debt cancellation for Mozambique so that precious financial resources may be dedicated to the national relief and recovery effort;

(3) commends the Administration for its growing involvement and leadership in coordinating America's disaster assistance package to the Republic of Mozambique;

(4) supports the efforts of the United States Government to assist in coordinating international efforts to help the Republic of Mozambique salvage what remains of this year's food crops and to provide seeds for rural agricultural growers;

(5) encourages the international community to continue to provide emergency relief, airlift capacity, and other disaster assistance to the Republic of Mozambique for the next 90 days;

(6) urges the international community to take all necessary steps to locate and demarcate areas that may now harbor semi-boyant plastic land mines transported to new locations by the flooding in Mozambique;

(7) requests that the international community develop a coordinated response to the Government of Mozambique's request for recovery and reconstruction assistance for buildings and transportation infrastructure;

(8) encourages the international community to assist the nations of southern Africa to increase their capacity to respond to national emergencies and natural disasters; and

(9) urges the International Monetary Fund and other international creditors to fully accelerate debt reduction efforts with respect to Mozambique's external debt in the aftermath of the severe flooding.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. 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 House Resolution 431.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, the waters of southern Africa's worst flooding in a century are slowly beginning to recede, but the flood waters have left behind an altered landscape. Where there were homes, there are now ruins. Where there were schools, there is now only rubble. Throughout Mozambique, where there were signs of steady economic progress, once again there is a spectre of hunger and disease.

We still do not know how many people have perished in Mozambique. We believe that 40,000 cattle have drowned. A third of their onion crop has been destroyed. We know that Mozambique and other nations in the region need serious help. When a disaster this scope afflicts a wealthy nation like our own Nation, it is an enormous challenge. But when it happens to a country where the average annual per capita income is less than what we might pay for a dinner for two in one of our favorite restaurants, it is tragic.

Our Nation and other nations are already helping, but their work has only just begun. I fully support this resolution introduced by our good friend and colleague the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) because it reiterates this Congressional commitment to help our brothers in southern Africa in a time of need.

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

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, let me first thank the chairman, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), for his support on this piece of legislation, this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, for the past 3 weeks, the world has watched with great anguish as the people of the Republic of Mozambique clung to whatever they could to escape raging flood waters. The storms that ravaged Mozambique are the worst the southern African region has seen in more than 100 years. The nations of Botswana, Zambia, Zimbabwe, and South Africa have also experienced national emergencies from the rainy flooding season.

However, Mozambique bore the brunt of the storms and is still threatened by flood waters from neighboring countries who are forced to open their dams to ease the pressure of these structures.

In the southern third of Mozambique, virtually all the primary roads, bridges, electric grid facilities, and clean water wells have been destroyed.

Many buildings and homes that were built along the fertile flood planes of the Save and Limpopo Rivers will need to be relocated or rebuilt.

Mr. Speaker, it is ironic that a nation that has experienced much success over the past 8 years to reform its Government and economy has suffered the economic disaster caused by the floods.

Mozambique recently held its second multi-party elections in 1999 and has privatized over 800 former government-owned enterprises.

□ 1500

For the first time in as long as anyone can remember, Mozambique did not request international food aid. Additionally, because the Mozambique government's track record and economic performance was so strong, the nation qualified for the World Bank and IMF Highly Indebted Poor Countries program.

With the flood waters comes the threat of waterborne diseases and other public health problems. Another problem comes from land mines. Mozambique has thousands of semi-buoyant plastic land mines that may have been uncovered by the rising waters. These new areas must be located and demarcated to avoid the unnecessary damage they can do to the population.

In the midst of destruction and great human tragedy, we witnessed the miracle of life above the flood water as a mother gave birth to a child while clinging to a tree.

Additionally, a vast quantity of the country's crops was spared from the flood waters. If the international community can get seeds and tools to the right areas, Mozambique's 2000 harvest yield should be available to help the emergency food shortages.

The Clinton administration has announced its intention to draw down $37.6 million of DOD funds to assist the Mozambicans. The administration's package also includes the relocation of military assets, small boats and helicopters, to the region to assist.

The Clinton administration has also announced today that it will cancel Mozambique's bilateral debt. We must be prepared to do all we can to assist Mozambique and to help it get back on track so that her hard-fought economic and political reforms are not washed away with the flood waters.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), the distinguished chairman of our Subcommittee on Africa.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to state my support for this resolution put forward by the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS), a member of the Subcommittee on Africa. This resolution is a strong statement of support for humanitarian aid efforts in Mozambique; and as we have seen in news reports, Mozambique has borne the brunt of the destructive torrential rains and tropical cyclones. Unbelievably, Mozambique has been hit with over 500 percent of its average annual rainfall over the course of a couple of weeks.

Flooding has also hit South Africa and Zambia and Zimbabwe, Mozambique's neighbors and partners in the Southern Africa Development Community.

This resolution commends South Africa, for one, for helping Mozambique. Special recognition should be given to the tireless efforts of the South African helicopter teams who saved an estimated 14,000 stranded Mozambicans from their homes, from the roof tops of their now-destroyed homes.

These were heroic efforts which saved innumerable lives, and some quarter of a million Mozambicans are now living in relief camps. Food, tents, medicine, and blankets are desperately needed. I applaud the U.S. military units now involved in rescue and relief efforts in Mozambique. American military forces are the best in the world. They bring unparalleled skills to this multi-international operation, skills that have been demonstrated in humanitarian operations in the Balkans and Bangladesh and in Latin America.

I would like to say a few words about Mozambique's recent history. The example of Mozambique is a strong counter to those who see nothing in Africa but war, famine, and disease. Mozambique has put an era of authoritarian one-party rule behind it and successfully resolved the bloody, bitter civil conflict that once tore apart the country's social fabric. It is moving toward a market-based economy, one that has registered several years of impressive growth, growth in the 8 percent range.

This natural disaster is a setback on this progress. Today, we can only do our best to see that Mozambique's move toward a more prosperous future is not derailed. As we speak, humanitarian relief efforts are being made by the U.S. and by Germany and by Britain, Canada and many other countries.

It is my hope that out of this disaster some good may come. Some African governments, faced with limited resources, are being asked some tough questions by their citizens. A newspaper in Namibia has noted, no single Namibian would question the need to send assistance to Mozambique, whereas they can quite legitimately question the need for military assistance to Congo, which is torn by war.

A Zimbabwean paper focusing on the flooding in Zimbabwe wrote, ''The government was unable to respond properly to the plight of the victims in the flooding in the south of the country because the majority of our helicopters were in the Congo.''

I hope that African citizens will increasingly question their government's presence in the war in the Congo; and if pressure is put on to end this destructive war, if Africans decide that they want to help others in need, not fight unwinnable wars, then something positive will come out of this disaster.

Today, the people of Mozambique need help. Mozambique has shown that it knows the road to a better life. It deserves America's help in overcoming this natural disaster, and this resolution expresses support for U.S. relief efforts in Mozambique, and I ask my colleagues to support it. I thank the chairman of the full committee, and I also want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) for introducing this legislation.

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from the State of Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK), and a member of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs.

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

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) and the rest of the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs, we appreciate them bringing this amendment forward to our committee.

The resolution is most desperately needed. I want to report that last week in appropriations, we have a commitment from our chairman, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), as well as the chairman from the Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN), to see that Mozambique gets the assistance that they need. We offered an amendment that would replenish the accounts, the $37 million that has been taken from the military and DOD, as well as replenishing the child survival accounts, as well as international assistance.

Mozambique, after 16 years of war, is now one of the fastest growing countries on the continent. It is our responsibility, as a partner in the world, that we address this most desperate need that they have today.

Nineteen million people; 1 million homeless; 2 million land mines have been identified. The cyclone has now moved those mines, and we must go in there and assist them, as they grow and help themselves.

So I would say to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) and the rest of my colleagues, this is one of the most important resolutions we will see in this Congress.

I commend the Committee on International Relations, as well as our Members on the Committee on Appropriations, for adopting an amendment to see that Mozambique gets the financial assistance they deserve.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA).

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the chairman of the Committee on International Relations, for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to commend my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS), for introducing this very worthy resolution honoring the United States civilian and military personnel serving bravely to rescue victims of the flooding in Mozambique, and expressing our support for humanitarian assistance to the Republic of Mozambique.

The survivors of this massive natural disaster face the challenges of fighting disease, reclaiming their lives, and rebuilding their homes. As neighbors in this rapidly shrinking world, we must do what we can to assist with these efforts.

I want to raise a point, however, in my statement, a point that I think needs to be raised because flooding is a predictable disaster and much of this tragedy could have been averted by the pre-deployment of trained resources.

Mr. Speaker, the recent flooding that has left millions homeless in Mozambique underscores the point that sadly there is a broad ignorance of effective flood disaster management. Flooding is the leading cause of weather-related death worldwide, and the situation in Mozambique is not unique.

Much criticism has been leveled at the delayed response of United States resources to the area. Without rehashing the stories found in the newspapers, I want to point out that when civilian rescue teams were sent from the Miami-Dade Urban Search and Rescue Team, nobody on that team had been trained for swift-water rescue. Though the most dangerous part of this flood disaster has passed and the waters are receding, the weather patterns over Mozambique continue to change and just a little rain is sufficient to make the standing and receding water dangerous, not only dangerous but rapidly moving water.

Very specific training is required for rescue personnel to work in this environment without putting themselves in danger, and very few rescue teams have even one person adequately trained for this type of situation.

The bottom line, Mr. Speaker, is that much more needs to be done about how we plan for, respond to, and educate people about floods. Recently, work has begun to raise awareness of this issue on the national level. Last month, as the flood waters were rising in Mozambique, I testified along with the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY), before the Subcommittee on Oversight, Investigations and Emergency Management, of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, about the need to develop a coherent national flood response plan.

A constituent of mine, Chief Steve Miller of the Cabin John Fire Department, worked with Lieutenant Marshall Parks of the San Diego Lifeguard Service to propose such a plan to coordinate local, regional, and Federal flood response efforts.

Without much effort or expense, many urban search and rescue teams nationwide can incorporate flood and swift-water rescue components as has already been done in California. Perhaps next time such a team is dispatched regionally, nationally, or internationally, they will be better trained and better equipped to move more effectively and serve the victims of disaster.

I wish to reiterate the pride I feel for the humanitarian service being provided by American personnel in Mozambique, and indeed the need is there. Stemming waterborne diseases such as cholera and malaria, while providing clean water and seeding reclaimed farmland, are important first steps to recovery of that nation. Let us hope that we will learn from this experience and better prepare ourselves for flood disaster at home.

With such resources coordinated nationally, we can better assist flood victims around the world.

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON), the ranking member of the Committee on International Relations.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in urging the administration's continued effort during this incredible humanitarian disaster. Some 650,000 people have been left homeless. Hundreds, I think some 300 schools and clinics, have been destroyed, washed away; children left orphaned; a country that was just coming to pull itself together after many difficult years finds itself under a natural assault that has really dislocated and devastated people's lives.

I join my colleagues, and I know the American citizens, who have responded with such strong support for our help in this particular instance.

□ 1515

It is clear that all of us in Congress and society have such a great opportunity because of our own success as a Nation to be helpful and to join with other nations in providing some assistance in this very terrible situation.

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE), a Member who has long been working in the valiant effort with reference to Africa.

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 431, a resolution to support humanitarian aid for Mozambique. I would like to thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the Chairman of the Committee on International Relations, for allowing this to come to the full committee, and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON) for also supporting this resolution.

I would like to commend the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa, for his outstanding work on the Subcommittee on Africa, where he has taken many initiatives. I would like to give special congratulations to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS), a new member on the committee, who has taken his responsibilities extremely seriously and has been a tremendous asset to the Subcommittee on Africa with his energy and his knowledge and his compassion for the work of the subcommittee. So it is a pleasure for me to work alongside the gentleman and other members of the Subcommittee on Africa, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE).

Mr. Speaker, let me say that this is a very timely resolution. As you know, the Republic of Mozambique has been experiencing severe floods which began early last month, the worst in over 40 years. Massive flooding not only devastated the lands of Mozambique, but it also hit South Africa, Zimbabwe, Zambia, and Madagascar. What began as a heavy rain soon turned into Cyclone Eline and brought disastrous floods to the south and central parts of the country.

Secondly, there was a second cyclone that came unexpectedly, and then a third. So the initial slow response was exacerbated by the fact that the second and third cyclone came to bring devastating rains to that region.

Grim images flashed over CNN and showed Mozambicans stranded on tops of trees and utility poles. Sophia Pedro, a young mother, gave birth to a baby, a little girl, in a treetop, where she sought refuge for 4 days earlier. The torrential rains took a heavy toll on the population, with several hundred dead and over 1 million refugees.

This natural disaster, the worst in Southern Africa's recorded history, has interrupted the economic, political, and social miracle of Mozambique which it has created for itself during the past decade. Few people know that before this disaster, Mozambique had the fastest and most sustained economic growth of any country in the world.

This resolution recognizes these things that I have mentioned, and further calls for the U.S. to take the lead in the international community to coordinate relief efforts; it commends South Africa for its swift response; it commends the British government for cancelling its bilateral debt; and, finally, it encourages the multilateral institutions to constructively deal with debt reduction.

Mozambique has complied with the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries Initiative, HIPC. Last year, Mozambique completed the requirements to receive $3.7 billion in debt reduction from external creditors, the largest reduction under the HIPC initiative.

In conclusion, let me say Mozambique is an impoverished country of 19

million, and debt relief means flood relief. Land mines have been exposed and must be dealt with. Mozambique, as we all know, was one of the last colonies in Africa. It wasn't until 1974 when Mozambique and Guinea-Bissau and Cape Verde and Angola became independent, the final release of countries other than South Africa under a colonial-type regime.

But after independence, after the colonial powers were thrown off them, the Cold War took its toll by rearing its ugly head and wreaked havoc on that country, with Renamo forces being supported by the West and Frelimo forces being supported by the opposition parties. Therefore, it created the civil war that continued on because of the U.S. and the Soviet Union. It had nothing to do with the people of Mozambique, but pawns again of the major powers in the world. So we feel that they are still recovering from this 16-year civil war between Renamo and Frelimo which ended in 1992.

I had the opportunity to talk to President Chissano just one month ago where the miracle of Mozambique was discussed. He was just reelected in January of this year.

So we are asking for more assistance for this catastrophic situation. Although relief was slow initially, I am pleased, however, that USAID finally supplied some $12.8 million for airlifts, and the Department of Defense allotted $37.6 million for an emergency assistance package to include a 30-day deployment of resources.

Conversely, the response to natural disasters in Turkey was met with an overnight swift and quick and decisive action. This disaster alone costs the country hundreds of millions of dollars to rebuild. It will cost them many, many person hours. Ambassador Marcos of Mozambique has estimated that for flood supplies alone and medicine, the costs will exceed $65 million that they need immediately.

So we are simply here to once again say that we all support the aid going to Mozambique, and we hope that the world will continue to support them.

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

(Mr. DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the Committee on International Relations under the leadership of the gentleman from New York (Chairman GILMAN) and the ranking member, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON), and also the Subcommittee on Africa, under the leadership of the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE).

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS), for his very timely presentation of this resolution, which commends the United States Government for its ultimate response to a very real and ongoing crisis.

I also want to join in commending South Africa for its swift action and the serious effort that it put forth, and the United Kingdom for initiating debt relief. Ultimately debt relief, for not only Mozambique, but for many of the nations of Africa, is going to provide serious help to the ultimate development of those countries, and I am pleased to see that it has taken shape.

I also want to take this opportunity to commend the people in my city, the City of Chicago, where we have initiated our own private response. I want to commend the Chicago Public School System under the leadership of Paul Vallas and Gary Chico, whose children have pledged to raise between $75,000 and $100,000 through their Kids Helping Kids program that will go to Mozambique. Also I want to commend Alderman Ed Smith, chairman of the Health Committee. We are seeking to find medical resources that are not going to be used by our city that will conversely be used to give to the people of Mozambique.

So I join all of those who are in support of this resolution, congratulate again the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) and all of those who have made it happen.

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH).

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

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to reiterate our thanks to the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) and his colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) who chairs the Committee on International Relations, for having this resolution before this Congress today.

It is critically important that our country, a superpower, have a super heart when it comes to humanitarian disaster, such as what we see in Mozambique. I wanted to commend the administration and our country, and in particular all American citizens, for what we have done, and challenge us to do even more.

We need to provide all of the relief possible in terms of this crisis, and we also need to recognize and commend South Africa for its initial response. Hopefully, as we look down this road, perhaps there are joint arrangements that we could make, perhaps with South Africa, to help develop their capacity there to respond to humanitarian disasters on the continent, because they are obviously much more capable and able to develop the political will to act in a swift way, as exhibited by their actions here in Mozambique.

But I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) for the introduction of this resolution, and thank him for his efforts, along with that of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS) and in particular the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) for the attention they have brought to this issue, to make sure that our Nation does all it should do, given our role in this world.

Mr. MEEKS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS), a strong advocate for the continent of Africa and the country of Mozambique.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS). The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 3 minutes.

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

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS), for his leadership in sponsoring this resolution. I would like to also thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and other members of the Committee on International Relations for their quick response.

I rise in favor of H. Res. 431. This resolution supports the efforts of the United States to provide disaster assistance to Mozambique in the aftermath of two consecutive cyclones resulting in torrential rains and severe flooding. The resolution also encourages the international community to continue to provide emergency relief, and urges the International Monetary Fund and other international creditors to fully accelerate debt reduction efforts for Mozambique. I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this resolution.

Upon learning of the severe flooding, I immediately contacted Assistant Secretary Susan Rice for Africa, and I immediately sent a letter to President Clinton encouraging swift and substantial relief for Mozambique and the other surrounding countries. I wanted to make sure we did not make the mistake of waiting too long. I did not want the kind of delay we had experienced with Rwanda, a different kind of disaster, but indeed a disaster that could have been mitigated had we moved faster.

Mozambique is experiencing its worse flooding in 50 years. Flooding along the Limpopo River is particularly severe. Several other countries in Southern Africa are also affected by these floods. The extent of the death and destruction is still unknown. However, the floods clearly have a devastating impact on the people of the region. There are now 250,000 homeless people living in camps in Mozambique alone. Those displaced people are in desperate need of food, clean water, medicine, blankets and tents.

Relief efforts are continuing, but they have been hampered somewhat by the destruction of the country's infrastructure. Many roads and bridges have been completely washed out, and others are still under water. All relief delivered to date has had to be airlifted, which is slow and expensive.

Disaster assistance is essential, but it is not enough to adequately address

the critical needs of the people of Mozambique or other countries of Southern Africa affected by the floods. We must also enable the governments of the affected countries to begin to repair and reconstruct their damaged infrastructure. These countries need funding and technical assistance for the repair and reconstruction of roads, bridges, schools and hospitals, energy facilities, telecommunications, and other essential infrastructure.

For these reasons, I will introduce the Limpopo River Debt Relief and Reconstruction Act to provide assistance to Mozambique and other Southern African countries affected by flooding to enable them to provide for the needs of their people, repair their damaged infrastructure, and rebuild their economies.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 431.

□ 1530

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank all of our proponents of the measure and urge our colleagues to fully support this severely needed measure to help the country of Mozambique.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Res. 431, a resolution expressing support for humanitarian assistance to the Republic of Mozambique. I am proud to join my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) and other Members in expressing concern for the people of Mozambique and commending those who are providing assistance to Mozambique during this difficult time. I also want to thank my African and Caribbean Task Force in the 9th Congressional District of Illinois for underscoring for me the importance of this aid and the United States' support for other international development and debt relief initiatives.

On February 9 of this year, several Southern African nations including Mozambique, Botswana, South Africa, Zambia and Zimbabwe began to experience serious flooding as a result of heavy rainfall. Mozambique experienced the most severe consequences. On February 22, Tropical Cyclone Eline blew into Mozambique. The cyclone worsened an already critical situation.

Mozambique is now facing a severe humanitarian and economic crisis. Water supplies are in jeopardy, thousands of Mozambicans are homeless, crops and livestock have been destroyed and the threat of disease has been increased.

It is important that the United States and the international community take an active and committed role in Mozambique's recovery efforts and those of other Southern African nations. Mozambique is one of the world's most heavily indebted poor countries according to the World Bank and therefore does not possess adequate means by which to address this crisis.

I join my colleagues in commending South Africa and the United Kingdom for acting quickly to assist Mozambique. The Administration should also be commended for its increasing efforts to provide disaster assistance to Mozambique. I hope the message of this resolution will encourage the continuing efforts of the Administration and increasing involvement of the international community in providing emergency relief to Mozambique.

This tragic disaster serves as a reminder of the importance of debt relief and development assistance efforts that focus on sub-Saharian Africa. We need to help those nations to bolster their capacity to respond to natural disasters and the needs of their people in general. My thoughts and prayers are with the people of Southern Africa. I am determined to help maintain a long-term commitment to the welfare of those nations. I urge all Members to vote in support of H. Res. 431.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Res. 431.

As Americans, we are a major partner in the global community. It is our right and responsibility to assist members of the community suffering great misfortune. The United States' response to the crisis in Mozambique must reflect those values.

It is in this spirit that I strongly support the resolution, which urges increased U.S. and international humanitarian, disaster, and economic relief for the Republic of Mozambique.

The rains, cyclone and subsequent flooding in Mozambique have devastated communities and infrastructure that had just begun to rebuild after a 16-year civil war.

In supporting this resolution, I commend U.S. humanitarian and disaster relief organizations, on the front lines, who've been working tirelessly to save lives. Two organizations based in my district of Baltimore, MD—Lutheran World Relief and Catholic Relief Services—are providing emergency food, shelter, and technical assistance to those in need. We must continue to support those efforts.

Again, I support H. Res. 431 and urge President Clinton to continue our involvement and leadership in this effort.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, House Resolution 431, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

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

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 8, 2000.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Enclosed are copies of resolutions adopted on February 16, 2000 by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

With kind regards, I am
Sincerely,

BUD SHUSTER,
Chairman.

Enclosures.

RESOLUTION—DOCKET 2616—UPPER TURKEY CREEK BASIN, KANSAS

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the United States House of Representatives, That the Secretary of Army is requested to review the report of the Chief of Engineers on the Turkey Creek Basin, Kansas and Missouri, dated June 21, 1999, and other pertinent reports, to determine whether any modifications of the recommendations contained therein are advisable at the present time in the interest of flood damage reduction for areas of Turkey Creek Basin in Johnson and Wyandotte Counties, Kansas, upstream of the project for flood damage reduction authorized in section 101(a)(24) of Public Law 106–53, the Water Resources Development Act of 1999.

Adopted: February 16, 2000.
Attest: Bud Shuster, Chairman.

RESOLUTION—DOCKET 2617—SURF CITY, NORTH CAROLINA

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the United States House of Representatives, That the Secretary of Army is requested to review the report of the Chief of Engineers on West Onslow Beach and New River Inlet, North Carolina, published as House Document Number 393, 102nd Congress, 2nd Session, dated September 23, 1992, and other pertinent reports to determine whether any modifications of the recommendations contained therein are advisable at the present time in the interest of shore protection and related purposes for Surf City, North Carolina.

Adopted: February 16, 2000.
Attest: Bud Shuster, Chairman.

RESOLUTION—DOCKET 2618—OCRACOKE ISLAND, NORTH CAROLINA

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the United States House of Representatives, That the Secretary of the Army is requested to review the report of the Chief of Engineers on Ocracoke Island, North Carolina, published as House Document Number 109, 89th Congress, 1st Session, dated March 10, 1965, and other pertinent reports, to determine whether any modifications of the recommendations contained therein are advisable at the present time in the interest of shore protection and related purposes for Ocracoke Island, North Carolina.

Adopted: February 16, 2000.
Attest: Bud Shuster, Chairman.

RESOLUTION—DOCKET 2619—DAYTONA BEACH SHORES, FLORIDA

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the United States House of Representatives, that in accordance with Section 110 of the River and Harbor Act of 1962, the Secretary of the Army is requested to review the feasibility of providing shoreline erosion control, storm damage reduction, environmental restoration and protection, and related improvements to the shoreline at Daytona Beach Shores, Florida and adjacent areas.

Adopted: February 16, 2000.
Attest: Bud Shuster, Chairman.

RESOLUTION—DOCKET 2620—SABINE PASS TO GALVESTON BAY, TEXAS

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the United States House of Representatives, That in accordance with section 110 of the Rivers and

Harbors Act of 1962, the Secretary of the Army is requested to review the feasibility of providing shore protection and related improvements between Sabine Pass and the entrance to Galveston Bay, Texas, in the interest of protecting and restoring environmental resources on and behind the beach, to include the 77,000 acres of freshwater wetlands and the maritime resources of east Galveston Bay and Rollover Bay, and including the feasibility of providing shoreline erosion protection and related improvements to the Galveston Island Beach, Texas, with consideration of the need to develop a comprehensive body of knowledge, information, and data on coastal area changes and processes to include impacts from federally constructed projects in the vicinity of Galveston Island.

Adopted: February 16, 2000.

Attest: Bud Shuster, Chairman.

RESOLUTION—DOCKET 2621—GULLEY BROOK, OHIO

Resolved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the United States House of Representatives, That the Secretary of the Army is requested to review the report of the Corps of Engineers for Chagrin River, Ohio, dated December 2, 1946, and other related reports to determine whether any modifications of the recommendations contained therein are advisable at the present time in the interest of environmental restoration and protection and flood damage reduction for Gulley Brook, a tributary of the Chagrin River, in the vicinity of Willoughby, Ohio.

Adopted: February 16, 2000.

Attest: Bud Shuster, Chairman.

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6 p.m.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6 p.m.

□ 1802

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. MORELLA) at 6 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON H.R. 3908, EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, FISCAL YEAR 2000

Mr. YOUNG of Florida, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106–521) on the bill (H.R. 3908) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Union Calendar and ordered to be printed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All points of order are reserved.

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:

H.R. 3699, by the yeas and the nays, and

H.R. 3701, by the yeas and nays.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first such vote in this series.

JOEL T. BROYHILL POSTAL BUILDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 3699.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3699, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 405, nays 0, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 46]

YEAS—405

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Baca
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
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth-Hage
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooksey
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
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)
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—29

Boswell
Cook
Cox
Deutsch
Franks (NJ)
Gonzalez
Hansen
Hinojosa
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Johnson, Sam
Klink
Maloney (CT)
McCollum
McIntosh
Meeks (NY)
Mollohan
Myrick
Ortiz
Packard
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ros-Lehtinen
Rush
Snyder
Stark
Taylor (NC)
Waxman
Weygand
Wicker

□ 1826

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.

SUPPORT AND GOOD WISHES TEMPER A SERIOUS HEALTH CHALLENGE

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

Mr. VENTO. Madam Speaker, I know a few of my colleagues have noticed I have not been around the last month or so. And believe me, spending a month in Minnesota in February is not necessarily a voluntary decision that one might make. I would much rather have been with my colleagues.

As my colleagues know, I have returned from experiencing a serious illness. But I wanted to point out some of the experience I had just briefly, and I will try to be brief.

But I think the true mark of who we are as persons is who we can call our friends. If we are fortunate, we have those friends to fall back on and lean on during the unexpected events of our lives, the disappointments and the challenges.

I rise to say that I feel that I am very fortunate and blessed to call so many of my colleagues and many others my friends, especially during this period in my life as I do face this serious health challenge.

Simply put, the outpouring of affection that I have received has been overwhelming from my colleagues on both sides of the aisle and from my constituents, my friends, and from my family. Cards and letters, calls and visits, not to mention their prayers, both spoken and unspoken, are very much appreciated. They have lifted the spirits of my staff, my family, and certainly myself.

In early February, I was diagnosed with a rare form of cancer, mesothelioma, which required aggressive treatment. A month ago, I underwent pretty aggressive surgery. In the near future, I will receive chemo and then radiation treatment on top of that.

I am surely in the middle of a 10-round major event of my life. But my spirits are good, as my colleagues can tell, and I am optimistic. And I am greatly reinforced by the outpouring of support that has been so generously offered.

□ 1830

The past 2 months have given me good cause to reflect upon and to genuinely appreciate the value of our collective experience; victories savored, setbacks endured and shared values and, to be sure, challenges ahead.

For the past 24 years in this body, I have had the privilege to serve as a Member. It is an honor and I have been reminded most vividly of the strong bond that has been established with my constituents in Minnesota and the role of service in the United States Congress, and the important work with other public servants similarly charged. Good people, good Americans.

Too often in my experience, it has served some political cynical purposes to denigrate public service. I regret that. It is my belief each of us should aspire to inspire others, young people in particular; to give of ourselves and themselves, as we have done; to define the differences between skepticism and cynicism. Indeed, in serving the people's interest we should be proud and respectful. When direction is lost, when purpose is needed, no further than the words of Minnesota's happy warrior and my mentor serve us well, the very embodiment of public service, Hubert H. Humphrey, to guide us, and I quote, ''If there is dissatisfaction with the status quo, good. If there is ferment, so much the better. If there is restlessness, I am pleased. Then let there be ideas and hard thought and hard work,'' end quote.

Together, as Members of Congress, we would do well to strive to serve as Minnesota's Humphrey instructed us to make people's lives better, to provide opportunity and to give new hope. To me, the key of all we have done and continue to do is that we have done this together.

So as I make my plans to meet the new health challenge, I am grateful that I am not making this journey alone but with so many cheering me on, my friends supporting and encouraging me. In the words of Tennyson, I intend to continue to strive, to seek, to find, and as most of my colleagues who know me well, not to yield.

Madam Speaker, I thank my constituents, my colleagues, my friends all, for the outpouring of concern and the care as I have faced this challenge. I am very grateful.

JOSEPH L. FISHER POST OFFICE BUILDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MORELLA). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 3701.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3701, 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 400, nays 0, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 47]

YEAS—400

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth-Hage
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooksey
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E.B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays

Sherman	Sweeney	Visclosky
Sherwood	Talent	Vitter
Shimkus	Tancredo	Walden
Shows	Tanner	Walsh
Shuster	Tauscher	Wamp
Simpson	Tauzin	Waters
Sisisky	Taylor (MS)	Watkins
Skeen	Terry	Watt (NC)
Skelton	Thompson (CA)	Watts (OK)
Slaughter	Thompson (MS)	Weiner
Smith (MI)	Thornberry	Weldon (FL)
Smith (NJ)	Thune	Weldon (PA)
Smith (TX)	Thurman	Weller
Snyder	Tiahrt	Wexler
Souder	Tierney	Whitfield
Spence	Toomey	Wilson
Spratt	Towns	Wise
Stabenow	Traficant	Wolf
Stearns	Turner	Woolsey
Stenholm	Udall (CO)	Wu
Strickland	Udall (NM)	Wynn
Stump	Upton	Young (AK)
Stupak	Velazquez	Young (FL)
Sununu	Vento	

NOT VOTING—34

Becerra	Jackson-Lee (TX)	Rodriguez
Blumenauer	Johnson, Sam	Ros-Lehtinen
Boswell	Kasich	Roukema
Cook	Klink	Royce
Cox	McCollum	Rush
Deutsch	Meeks (NY)	Smith (WA)
Duncan	Mollohan	Stark
Franks (NJ)	Myrick	Taylor (NC)
Gonzalez	Ortiz	Thomas
Hansen	Pickett	Waxman
Hinojosa	Reyes	Weygand
		Wicker

□ 1851

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.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Madam Speaker, due to the primary election in my state of Texas today, I was unavoidably detained and missed the following votes. Had I been present, I would have voted:

''Yea'' on H.R. 3699 designating the Joel T. Broyhill Post Office; ''Yea'' on H.R. 3701 designating the Joseph L. Fisher Post Office

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Madam Speaker, on rollcall numbers 46 and 47, I was unavoidably detained in my district. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DEUTSCH. Madam Speaker, I was unavoidably detained today during rollcall vote No. 46 on H.R. 3699 and rollcall vote No. 47 on H.R. 3701. Had I been present I would have voted ''yea'' on both.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 396

Mr. OWENS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of House Resolution 396, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that a biennial budget process should be enacted in the second session of the 106th Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. MORELLA). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 1501, JUVENILE JUSTICE REFORM ACT OF 1999

Ms. LOFGREN. Madam Speaker, pursuant to clause 7(c) of rule XXII, I hereby announce my intention to offer a motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 1501 tomorrow. The form of the motion is as follows:

Ms. LOFGREN 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. 1501, be instructed to insist that the committee of conference should have its first substantive meeting to offer amendments and motions within the next 2 weeks.

Madam Speaker, while I understand the House rules do not allow Members to coauthor motions to instruct, I would like to say that the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) supports this motion and intends to speak on its behalf tomorrow.

SUPPORT HUMANITARIAN RELIEF ASSISTANCE TO THE REPUBLIC OF MOZAMBIQUE

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

Ms. CARSON. Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 431, a bill to support humanitarian relief assistance to the Republic of Mozambique. The people of Mozambique have suffered tremendous hardship due to rains that started over a month ago. The flood's side effects of disease, homelessness, and hunger are even more damaging when coupled with 2 million displaced land mines left over from the civil war.

Just as the people of Mozambique seem to be turning the corner to independence, democratic government, and economic advancement, this tragic event has occurred that only, some say, only a God in heaven can control.

As humans, we cannot rationalize or understand nature's catastrophes. As a country, we must follow our belief that not only is the aid to Mozambique necessary because of our national interests and stability, but also because of our moral interest. If there is any short-term gain in this tragedy, it is an opportunity to pass the test of compassion, charity, and humanity that God administers.

I reiterate and encourage the Members of this august body to support H.R. 431, which will provide humanitarian relief assistance to the Republic of Mozambique.

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.

TRIBUTE TO VETERAN CONGRESSIONAL AIDE CARY BRICK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York (Mr. MCHUGH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCHUGH. Madam Speaker, I rise today with a sense of mixed emotions, because it is an occasion of good-byes, but it is also an opportunity to recognize the work and career of someone who is very special to this House, and certainly to me personally, my chief of staff, Cary R. Brick. His 30-year Congressional staff career spans the service of three consecutive New York State Congressmen. He really has an uncommon record of service, and I am pleased that I have this opportunity tonight to say a few words.

Cary is the most senior chief of staff in the New York Congressional Delegation, and, in fact, one of the most senior staffers to serve this institution. He began his Capitol Hill career in January of 1969 as press secretary to the late Robert C. McEwen, and later served as his executive assistant. When Bob McEwen retired in 1980, Cary was appointed by his successor, former Representative David O'Brien Martin, to serve as his administrative assistant.

When I was elected following Dave Martin's retirement in 1992, I asked Cary to stay on as my chief of staff as well, and it remains to this day one of the easiest and certainly one of the best decisions I have made in my 7-plus years in this House.

Cary Brick has served our current office, that of my predecessors, and our Congressional constituents with the highest level of dedication and enthusiasm. There are few, if any, communities, institutions, organizations or individuals in our district who have not benefited in some way from his work.

Additionally, as the administrator of my Congressional allowances, Cary has made it possible for us to return nearly $1.5 million to the Congressional coffers, without ever sacrificing the needs of the office and our constituents. He has handled his many responsibilities with the highest level of integrity and has gained a well-earned reputation on Capitol Hill as a dedicated professional.

At a time, Madam Speaker, when the Congressional staff turnover rate is estimated to be 40 percent a year, it is unlikely that anyone will ever equal his achievement. His retirement is a loss to the institution of Congress, the people of New York's 24th Congressional District, his fellow staffers, and me personally.

There are many remarkable things about Cary Brick's career as a Congressional aide, but, rather than citing his impressive biography, I would share but a single glimpse into Cary's psyche that I believe reveals much about what makes him particular.

□ 1900

Simply put, Cary loves New York's North Country. Just as Dorothy loved

Kansas in the Wizard of Oz, Cary truly believes that there is ''no place like home.''

Although he and his wife, Erin, have raised two beautiful daughters in their Northern Virginia house, Sarah and Rebecca have always known their home is in New York. His strong ties to the North Country and his strong sense of community have helped him keep that perspective. He never lost sight of what matters most. Although his job brought him to Washington, D.C., Cary embraced, even relished, the fact that he worked for every citizen of New York's 24th District.

Through his service as my chief of staff for the last 7½ years, our interaction has been far more than a work relationship. We have celebrated the many achievements our combined efforts have produced; and there have, of course, been a few disappointments over which we have agonized together as well. He has been my advisor, my confidant, and most of all, my friend. In a town where personal ambition often obscures public interest, I can say without hesitation that Cary's brand of loyalty and friendship has been a priceless gift.

When Cary publicly announced his retirement, one quote stood out as a great ''sound bite'' that stood out time and time again and on Capitol Hill. He said, and I quote, ''To have been an inside observer of congressional participation and debate in every national and world event during the final third of the 20th century is an awesome opportunity that few others have had.'' Awesome, indeed.

However, Mr. Speaker, nothing about Cary's quote should lead anyone to believe that he has in any way been on the sidelines or a mere observer. Rather, he has been a soldier on both the front lines and in the war room. His battlefield has been Capitol Hill. From Watergate to the Gulf War to the closure of Plattsburgh Air Force Base, he has earned his stripes through many battles. His weapons have been quick thinking, his unmatched instincts and his constant integrity; and his ammunition has been the power of his words and his proven ability to mobilize forces.

For your uncommon commitment, loyalty and sense of duty, Cary, we all salute you.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield at this time to the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH), my friend and colleague and neighbor to the south and a good friend and associate of Cary Brick's as well, for a few comments.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend for yielding time. I have a prepared statement that I would like to enter into the record regarding Cary Brick, and it was penned by a good friend of his, my chief of staff, Art Jutton who has served almost as long as Cary has. Cary was always referred to as the dean of the delegation because of his seniority. I suspect Art may be in line for that, although Mr. Brick may not want to give up that title.

Cary has been a true exemplary public servant, someone who has served the country well, served his Members of Congress well, served the people of the North Country well. He is a role model for anyone who would be willing to enter public service and suffer the slings and arrows that we take in this business; but he never lost his sense of humor, never lost his wisdom and his ability to stand back from the fray and make a cognitive decision that is always of benefit, not only to the Member of Congress in whose office he served, but to other Members who were smart enough to ask.

So I would like to join my colleague. I identify with everything that he said. I wish the gentleman well in his selection of a replacement, although it is a tough pair of shoes to fill. Mr. Speaker, my best to Cary and his family as he retires.

KICKING OFF THE REBIRTH OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RURAL CAUCUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DEAL of Georgia). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the two preceding speakers for recognizing Mr. Brick. All too often I think those that serve us so well do not get the particular commendation that they are so richly deserving of; and I am very pleased that this individual, in the capstone of his distinguished career, received the kind of recognition just provided.

Mr. Speaker, this is kick-off day, kick-off of the Rural Caucus. I particularly want to commend the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON); the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON); and the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN), my cochairs in the Rural Caucus, in announcing the rebirth of this important endeavor. As a representative of one of the most rural districts in the House, the entire State of North Dakota, I am very pleased with this initiative and proud to be a part of it.

In the last 7 years, our Nation's economy has been growing by leaps and bounds. Unemployment rates are at all-time lows, consumer confidence is at an all-time high, the rising stock market is creating unprecedented levels of wealth. But for this sky-rocketing economy for so many Americans, the situation in rural America, our smallest towns and villages across the country, has been quite different. The boom of Wall Street is not meeting necessarily the needs of rural Main Streets. I think rural America is at a serious crossroads tonight. As I travel throughout my home State, I literally see many fine, long-standing communities shrinking and disappearing.

In an ever-more urban House, we have to understand the distinct and enormous challenges facing rural America. In the House today, there are only 57 Members out of the 435 who represent predominantly rural areas compared to 130 years ago. We know that after the next decennial census now being conducted, the rural representation in this Chamber will shrink even further. According to census information, however, 1 out of 4 Americans, 62 million, live in rural areas. Due to the lack of representation, I believe, of rural America in the House, many rural Americans suffer from funding formulas or programs that do not represent their unique needs.

Mr. Speaker, we have had 110 Members, Republican and Democrat both, join in the rebirth and relaunch of the Congressional Rural Caucus. I think that this initial success is due in large part to the stress that the rural areas in each of our districts is experiencing. In North Dakota the agriculture sector is facing a flat-out depression. Farmers are receiving $2.50 a bushel for wheat, nearly 30 percent below the cost of production. In North Dakota the farm auctions replace the church picnic as a social gathering in many communities. I am hopeful that the Congressional Rural Caucus with Members from all over the United States will be able to advocate Federal policies that address our most pressing needs in rural America.

In addition to production agriculture, however, there are many interrelated facets of our rural communities that need attention and will be emphasized by the Rural Caucus, issues like education, health care, technology and economic development. They are all essential parts of our small towns in rural America. Without the access to quality education, rural residents fall behind the learning curve. Without access to quality health care, they stand exposed to unexpected health concerns. Without access to technology, rural residents will be left out of the technological revolution. Without investments in rural development, our communities and our residents will not find places of employment, new economic opportunities for them, to continue living in these parts of the world.

Education, for one, is a vital component to the prosperity of rural America. We take great pride in the quality of our schools and the student achievement; but in keeping the quality of rural schools, we know that there is going to be an ongoing commitment of resources and partnership between local, State, and increasingly Federal participation. This critical investment in our children is one of the most cost-effective ways to ensure opportunity and prosperity. Unfortunately, most Federal funds are channeled to larger urban school districts. Small and rural school districts, we feel, have not gotten their fair due, and this will be a target area of the caucus.

Another pressing issue is rural health care. We hear about millions who lack health care coverage, and yet we see in

rural areas the actual care delivery system being strained, people having to drive further and further distances to receive access to even emergency primary health care services.

On technology, we see people use the Internet to access a variety of information; and yet we see that the prospect of the digital divide, separating the kind of Internet access that provides so many new opportunities for us across the country, may provide a distinct have and have-not, with rural America being left behind as the latest technology comes on board.

For all of these reasons, I am very proud to join with my colleagues in the Rural Caucus. I commend the bipartisan effort, and I know that we will stand together as we face these challenges.

THE CONGRESSIONAL RURAL CAUCUS: SPEAKING OUT FOR RURAL AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, tonight I join the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY) and my other cochairs, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) and the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON), as we celebrate today the coming together of about 212 Members of Congress, both Republicans and Democrats, to revitalize the Congressional Rural Caucus. Last year the four of us came together with this common goal: to speak out for rural America and to find ways that we could do that here in the United States Congress. Today, we have celebrated the hard work and our ability to bring us all together for a united voice for rural America.

Our jobs as Members of the Congressional Rural Caucus, and we would enjoin any of our colleagues to continue to join us in this pursuit, is to promote economic and social policies that support and help the continued viability of our rural communities. In many instances throughout my home State of Kansas, our rural communities continue to struggle. We continue to lose population from once-thriving communities and elsewhere across the Great Plains region. Demographic trends show that young people are leaving the lands of their ancestors and that the population left behind is rapidly aging.

Kansas has 105 counties. Fifty-eight of those counties are smaller today than they were in 1890. Eighty Kansas counties have lost population in the last 2 decades. Seventy counties will lose population in the next decade.

So as a result, Kansas communities are confronted with serious challenges of prosperity and even of survival. Concerned parents wonder if their children will receive a public school education sufficient to meet the demands of tomorrow's global marketplace. I myself want to raise my children, I have a 9-year-old daughter and a 12-year-old daughter, I would like for them to have the opportunity to be raised in rural America and to raise their children, if they so choose, in rural Kansas; and we are concerned about the availability not only of education but of health care, especially in our smallest communities. Even though our unemployment rates are low, we see significant under-employment in many areas of rural Kansas. That is the state of the job market in too many of our small communities.

The world of information technology, the Internet, is equally important to our towns and to our homes. Connecting that last mile will be a formidable challenge. Telecommunications is vital to rural America's economic development. It is vital to our schools and our hospitals, and it is vital to our businesses. Business must have access to deal with their customers and suppliers; students and individuals need access to the Internet to communicate, to acquire knowledge and develop skills to maintain our competitiveness.

I serve as the chairman of the Telecommunications Task Force of the Congressional Rural Caucus; and I am committed to working with other Members of Congress, with the industry and with the administration, to ensure the availability of advanced telecommunications services in our rural communities. Many of the challenges confronting rural America can be met and overcome with the commitment that adequate resources are directed toward the development of rural communities, and access to telecommunications is one of those critical issues we face.

By bringing quality health care, education, information, and commerce to rural families and to business, an advanced telecommunication infrastructure can overcome any disadvantages of distance and low density.

By providing one voice for rural America, the congressional caucus will ensure communities remain viable and competitive. Our job in Congress is to raise the awareness of rural issues to preserve this way of life. As Congress debates important issues like access to telecommunications, we must address the opportunities and challenges that we face in rural America. Rural America across this country needs to demonstrate to ourselves and to the rest of the world our commitment for a better life. I urge my colleagues to join us in this effort to fight and to speak out for rural America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. CLAYTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. EMERSON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE TO THE REPUBLIC OF MOZAMBIQUE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, we just passed out of this House tonight H.R. 431, a very important piece of legislation, expressing support for humanitarian assistance to the Republic of Mozambique. I want to commend our government, nongovernmental organizations, and other nations for their response to the flood crisis in Mozambique. Cyclone Eline devastated that poor country, driving residents from their homes, children from their schools, shopkeepers from their businesses, and doctors and patients from their clinics. The only refuge was roofs, treetops and scraps of land protruding here and there from swirling waters. One young woman, Sophie Pedro, gave birth to a baby girl in a tree top where she had sought refuge for 4 days.

The heavy toll on the population and massive destruction of the infrastructure, however, have dwarfed these early emergency relief-and-rescue efforts.

□ 1915

The flood waters have destroyed a decade-long economic recovery undertaken by Mozambique. Before these disastrous floods, Mr. Speaker, the government had embarked upon sustained efforts to manage public resources better, improve the climate for investors, and promote private sector development. Mozambique had complied with the Structural Adjustment Program requirements, the Enhanced Structural Adjustment Facility, and more recently the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries Initiative.

Last year, Mozambique completed the requirement to receive $3.7 billion in debt reduction from external creditors, the largest reduction under the HIPC Initiative. Prudent fiscal and monetary policies and structural reforms increased international confidence in Mozambique's economy, reflected in higher long-term capital inflows and a stable exchange rate.

However, the disaster now will cost the country nearly all their hard-won

economic gains. It will take hundreds of millions of dollars to rebuild the transportation and communication infrastructure, schools, clinics, homes, and businesses.

While Mozambique has been one of Africa's economic success stories, the floods threaten to return the country to conditions reminiscent of the command economy of the 1970s and the ravaging civil war of the 1980s.

To sustain its economic gains, Mozambique will need more than emergency aid and logistical relief. It will need long-term reconstruction and rehabilitation assistance. Already the multilateral institutions are considering new construction loans. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, these new loans will only compound Mozambique's existing debt burden, even with the substantial reductions under the HIPC program.

I applaud the President's decision to forgive Mozambique's remaining bilateral debt and encourage this Congress, the World Bank, and the International Monetary Fund to follow suit. Mozambique has played by the rules. They have restructured their economy, adhered to all conditionalities imposed by the multilateral financial institutions, and stayed the course with their fiscal and monetary policies.

The Mozambican people have made great short-term sacrifice for the long-term future prosperity of their country. If we do not address this current crisis with speedy and substantial current multilateral debt forgiveness, we will betray our social contract with the men, women, and children of Mozambique.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, we should look at a permanent relief force so we will not have to come before this body every time a disaster occurs.

CONGRESSIONAL RURAL CAUCUS/ RURAL TRANSPORTATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DEAL of Georgia). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. NEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, tonight I rise, along with my colleagues before me, to promote the kick-off of the Congressional Rural Caucus. I am proud to be a member of this caucus, which will work to better represent the interests of rural America by raising awareness of the needs of communities in these areas.

Mr. Speaker, my district, the 18th Congressional District of Ohio, is mostly rural, made up of people who proudly support the coal and steel industries, agriculture, and various other manufacturing industries. A native of the Ohio Valley, I have represented this district for a number of years, both as a State Representative and a State Senator, and now in Congress. I am well aware of the needs of the people who live there.

Tonight previously Members heard from colleagues who talked about education in rural America. We also heard about telecommunications. Tonight I want to focus on transit, but there are a lot of other needs today. There is housing.

We were visited by Bruce Veldt from the Ohio Department of Development who was talking to us about rural housing initiatives. We have had many people who are concentrating on the things that are important, and they are coming from the State of Ohio. They are communicating more. But I think this kick-off of our Congressional Rural Caucus is something that is going to be able to work across all 50 States to help rural America.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, too often rural communities have been an afterthought in Federal policy discussions and program development. The establishment of the bipartisan Congressional Rural Caucus, which currently has 112 members, will help to ensure that the interests of rural America are properly represented in Federal policy and legislation.

One area that undoubtedly exhibits the need for better representation of rural America is the transportation arena. Rural areas are often left out of negotiations when State transportation planning is being planned, with most of the decision-making power being left to the State and metropolitan officials, who have a place at the table.

In June of 1998, when Congress passed the landmark Transportation Equity Act for the 21st century, better known as TEA–21, it marked the beginning of a new era in rural transportation. In addition to providing more Federal funds to help improve the infrastructure and services in rural America, the new law reinforces the intermodal philosophy and takes an important first step in strengthening the role local officials wield in the decision-making process and planning process.

As a member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, I was privileged to have served on the TEA–21 conference committee. I am proud to have fought for the language which increased the presence of local rural officials in the transportation and planning process. This is good for rural America and it is good for transportation.

However, challenges abound in rural areas. The needs still greatly outpace Federal, State, and local resources. I would like to just give a few examples.

One in every 14 households in rural America is without a vehicle, despite being the most prevalent mode of transportation. Nearly 38 percent of county roads are inadequate for current travel, and nearly half of major rural bridges are structurally deficient.

This is significant, as 81 percent or 3.1 million miles of the Nation's public highway system exist in rural America.

While still an important mode of transportation, inner city bus service has almost completely disappeared off the face of rural America. In 1965, 23,000 communities were linked together with daily bus service. As we start the new century, that number has dwindled to a mere 4,500, from 23,000 down to 4,500. Those are communities with rural routes. Too often the rural routes are the ones that are eliminated.

This decline has implications, not only for passenger service, but also for essential freight services, as intercity buses often provide the only daily package express service in remote rural communities.

Public transit is becoming a vital source of transportation in rural areas, especially as disabled and elderly populations rise. Yet, 38 percent of rural residents live in an area without any form of public transportation. This can be directly linked to the fact that less than 10 percent of Federal spending for public transportation goes to rural communities.

Air service is often seen as an essential factor in attracting and retaining businesses in rural communities, but the high cost of subsidizing service limits its availability. On this, the eve of the day when Congress is scheduled to take up the Aviation Investment and Reform Act, or known as AIR–21, the conference report, a bill which will reauthorize and increase funding for Federal aviation programs, as well as provide improved passenger service to rural areas, on this eve, I wish to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and the rest of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure who, on a bipartisan basis, have recognized the needs of rural America when it comes to aviation.

TEA–21 does help ensure rural elected officials and communities are represented in the planning process, which is best described as the gateway for accessing Federal transportation funds. This will help States develop comprehensive plans that use our limited resources most wisely, as well as contribute to the economic and social growth of rural areas.

Even with the new TEA–21 provisions, however, rural elected officials are still on an uneven playing field with urban and state officials. That is why members of groups like the National Association of Counties, National League of Cities, National Association of Development Organizations and the American Public Works Association continue to advocate federal legislation that closes the equity gap in planning and programming.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, transportation is an essential component of addressing the needs of rural America. It not only connects people to jobs, health care and family in a way that enhances one's quality of life, but it also serves as the lifeline of the rural and national economies. I look forward to serving with the other members of the Congressional Rural Caucus and to bettering the lives of those we serve.

I just want to pay tribute to the rural caucus, who is going to absolutely make life better across rural America by their bipartisan effort.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Mrs. CHRISTENSEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. CHRISTENSEN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

REPORT ON RESOLUTION WAIVING POINTS OF ORDER AGAINST CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1000, WENDELL H. FORD AVIATION INVESTMENT AND REFORM ACT FOR THE 21ST CENTURY

Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106–523) on the resolution (H. Res. 438) waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 1000) to amend title 49, United States Code, to reauthorize programs of the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3843, SMALL BUSINESS REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2000

Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106–524) on the resolution (H. Res. 439) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3843) to reauthorize programs to assist small business concerns, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ISSUES CONCERNING RURAL AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, I, too, wish to commend those who provided the leadership in the House of establishing the Congressional Rural Caucus. As a member of that caucus, I am enthusiastic about the work before us and the goals that we propose to undertake.

The kick-off of that caucus is an exciting time and I think an important realization that rural issues need some help here in the United States Congress. There seem to be fewer and fewer of us who represent rural communities, and our goal and our charge over the rest of this Congress and on into the future years involves elevating the priority of rural issues in the Congress. I am excited to be part of that.

Sixty-two million Americans live in rural America. That is one out of every four people. We should not be leaving 25 percent of our citizens out of the economic prosperity we are enjoying generally as a Nation today.

In the Fourth Congressional District of Colorado, it is a largely rural area and depends heavily on agriculture. The fragile support system of small towns scattered throughout the region depends on the bounty of our natural resources. The tax base in small cities and counties in Colorado and all over rural America is usually small and less flexible than in larger cities in suburban areas. With such small populations, tax bases rarely grow, and increased taxes have a much greater impact on the individual property owner.

Residents of these areas cannot afford tax increases to support the needs of their small communities, so local governments have to make do with what they have. They cannot afford to compensate for an ever-changing Federal role with respect to an overregulatory propensity here in Washington. The Federal government and Congress must allow these people to raise the resources they need, and we should spend less of our time regulating every last penny out of them.

All too often Federal agencies propose regulations without keeping in mind these rural communities. These communities, I submit, cannot afford to comply with too many more new rules and regulations.

One of the biggest offenders in the overregulating of rural America is the Fish and Wildlife Service, through the Endangered Species Act. Regulations involving sensitive animals and plants can clean out just about any small town's economy if the species in question happens to be in a community.

Rural communities, like those in my district, are often supported by agriculture. Agriculture is not benefiting from the economic prosperity that the rest of the country is currently experiencing. They are suffering even more thanks to the Endangered Species Act.

My district contains the short grass prairie ecosystem that attracts many small critters, such as the Preble's Meadow Jumping Mouse, the black-tailed prairie dogs, the mountain plover, as well as their predators, and a handful of other species that the government has determined to be threatened or endangered.

If one ran into a rare mineral on his land, his property value might increase overnight, but find an endangered species on your property, if that species decides to take up residence on your land, your property value will sink, because the Fish and Wildlife Service now determines what you do with your land, and any value received from production is subsequently lost.

While many homeowners in our country do not have to worry about a Preble's Meadow Jumping Mouse or a mountain plover, a rural American, or more specifically a farmer, can see these little animals ruin their livelihood and take away much of their rights as landowners.

Often their losses are not even helpful in recovering the species. Out of thousands of Endangered Species Act listings, approximately 22 species have been delisted since 1973. Seven of those were due to extinction, eight of them due to data error, and only seven have actually been helped by the Endangered Species Act. That is less than 1 percent.

Private landowners, I believe, are the best stewards of their land. They are often willing to set aside a portion of their land to help preserve these valuable species. In fact, private landowners are the most responsible and most helpful for endangered and threatened species recovery, more so, I say, than the government is.

Unfortunately, farmers are often punished for voluntarily creating habitat suitable for these declining species by unknowingly giving the Fish and Wildlife Service a right of passage onto their land to monitor species recovery. Farmers and ranchers are often told what they can and cannot do with all of their land. That sometimes means they cannot produce the products that constitute the basis for their income.

□ 1930

The Endangered Species Act is not only invasive, but it impacts disproportionately rural America. This law and the regulations that come with it often eliminate the only income that rural communities have.

In Colorado, here is an interesting example, Mr. Speaker, four fish which are found mostly in the rural part of my State, include two types of Chub, the squawfish and the sucker, are being protected with a budget of $60 million. However, the economic impact of this recovery is $650 million. Meanwhile, over in the State of Washington, anglers are paid a $3 bounty for every squawfish caught measuring over 11 inches in their rivers.

The Endangered Species Act needs to be reformed, Mr. Speaker. It is just one more example of the kinds of issues that the rural caucus intends to focus on in our efforts to reach out to rural America and elevate the prominence of rural issues on the floor of the House.

ESA affects all aspects of Rural America:

Road building—Rural communities typically have inferior transportation systems to begin with. The ESA doesn't help a community build a much needed road that may bring more commerce to the area. They must check first to see if they are invading on any endangered or threatened species' territory or they could face litigation or government fines. These delays can be both costly and devastating to a community that needs the business to survive.

Water use—Rural Communities tend to rely on less sophisticated systems to provide water for their communities. Unfortunately, these systems often rely on what is seen as potential habitat for endangered or threatened species. Towns often have to spend millions of dollars to divert water or create new systems to avoid impact to a species.

Construction in general—when a rural community wants to build a new hospital, school or maybe even a new store to bring some revenue to the area, they frequently face road blocks because the only land they have might be the preferred habitat of a species that may not even be living in the area.

Tax base—small towns may have to spend their small tax base to defend themselves from Environmental groups, or on costly modifications to their infrastructure, because of a species that may or not be in their community and, in some cases, may not actually be endangered or even exist.

When the Fish and Wildlife Service considers a listing in Rural America, the economic consequences are brought to their attention, but they often place the lowest priority on the communities they devastate.

While the Mountain Plover was being evaluated for listing, the government suggested if the plover was listed, farmers would have to cease normal farming practices from late April to mid-May because this coincides with the plover's nesting season. For a farmer in the Eastern Plains, this would be devastating because this is the only time of the year for planting most crops. USDA Natural Resource Conservation Service wrote that the plover's listing ''may adversely impact a number of common agriculture practices in the shortgrass prairie region in the United States.'' In already difficult times for farmers in America, the elimination of their planting season would cause extinction of the Rural Farmer in the eastern plains.

Farmers are often fined for continuing farming activities on their property, even if the species is not known to exist on their land, but just because their land might be potential habitat for an animal the government is concerned about.

The bottom line:

Federal agencies should not create mandates that will financially devastate entire communities.

Rural America is already burdened because they face various economic disadvantages.

Rural Americans cannot bear the burden of species recovery.

The government should take into consideration the economic consequences to already strained Rural Americans, and work with the communities, not against them.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DEAL of Georgia). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. LIPINSKI addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. JONES of North Carolina addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

ESTABLISHING A NATIONAL OCEAN DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a resolution in support of establishing a National Ocean Day.

A National Ocean Day would help to focus the public's attention on the vital role the ocean plays in the lives of our nation's people and the significant impact our people have on the health of this vital resource.

The ocean covers 71 percent of the Earth's surface and is key to the life support systems of all creatures on this planet. It contains a wondrous abundance and diversity of life—from the smallest microorganism to the blue whale. The potential of the ocean's tremendous resources are not yet fully explored and likely includes life-saving medicines and treatments.

Two-thirds of the world's people live within 50 miles of a coast and one out of six American jobs is in fishing, shipping, or tourism. Some 90 percent of the world's trade is transported on the oceans.

The health of our ocean ecosystems are threatened by global warming, pollution, overfishing, and the destruction of coral reefs. We must take steps today to protect this irreplaceable resource.

The State of Hawaii has designated the first Wednesday of June as Ocean Day in recognition of the significant role the ocean plays in the lives of Hawaii's people, culture, history, and traditions. I hope my colleagues will join me in calling for a National Ocean Day to help focus nationwide attention on the need for responsible stewardship of this precious resource.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. HUNTER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. METCALF) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. METCALF addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

POWS AND MIAS IN VIETNAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, back in 1993 I met a gentleman named Binh Ly. And Mr. Ly told me and other Congressmen that he had a business partner, Mr. Nguyen Van Hao, who met with former Secretary of Commerce Ron Brown to seek his help in normalizing relations with Vietnam.

Mr. Ly said that Mr. Hao who met with Ron Brown three or four times told him that Ron Brown wanted $700,000 in up-front money to start the normalization process with Vietnam. Mr. Brown said initially that he never met with Mr. Hoa, but later, it was found out that he did indeed meet with him three times.

The FBI, on October 2 of 1992, was reported in the New York Times to have discovered evidence that the Vietnamese government was preparing to establish a special bank account in Singapore, and the evidence was in the form of a large transfer of an undisclosed sum of money or a transfer of undisclosed sum of money between the East Asian banks.

The interesting thing about this is that Mr. Ly told us before we found out about that that there was going to be $700,000 transferred to the Banque Indosuez in Singapore for Mr. Brown from the Vietnamese government.

Now, the reason I bring this up is we had hearing on this, and Mr. Brown was investigated. Unfortunately, Mr. Brown died in a plane crash over in the former Yugoslav a few years ago, but the fact of the matter is, Mr. Ly made this statement, and the normalization process then did go forward.

The administration said that the reason the normalization process was going forward was we wanted to heal old wounds and that the Vietnamese government had agreed that they would give us a full accounting of the 2,300 POW-MIAs that were still missing and unaccounted for in Vietnam while we normalize relations with Vietnam. And we have received a few reports on the POW-MIAs that were unreported up until the normalization took place, but the process went forward. And we normalized relations.

Mr. Speaker, now, here we are 7 years later in the year 2000, and we still have 2,023 POW-MIAs unaccounted for. Every President up until this administration had said that we would never start the normalization process until we had a full accounting of our POW-MIAs.

There is a lot of families in this country that still wonder what happened to their husbands, their fathers, their sons that do not know and may never know what happened to them because the Vietnamese government has not lived up to the commitment that they made.

Many people believe to this day that the reason the normalization process took place was because of the potential money being given to Ron Brown and others in the government as a payoff to start the process.

Others believed that the administration really did want to get a complete accounting of the POW-MIAs and they believed the Vietnamese government when they said they would give us a complete accounting.

Here we are 7 years later, and we have had an accounting of maybe 200 out of the 2,300 that were missing and are still missing and unaccounted for.

The reason I come to the floor tonight is because I am very concerned about something that is taking place as we speak. The Secretary of Defense of the United States, Mr. Cohen, has gone to Vietnam. And he is meeting with Vietnamese leaders to talk about the POW-MIA issue and to show good faith on the part of the United States Government in the peaceful agreements that have been made by this administration with the Vietnamese government.

The thing that concerns me is that our Secretary of Defense has gone over

there at almost exactly 25 years to the day that we have seen our troops pull out of Saigon, now Ho Chi Minh City. That really bothers me.

They are celebrating in Vietnam. They are taking our Secretary of Defense around to war memorials showing where their valiant airmen shot down our young Americans who were killed, and they are celebrating their victory over the United States 25 years after the fall of Saigon.

Our Secretary of Defense is over there during this celebration. To me, as an American, it seems unseemly. And I think a lot of Americans, especially those who served in Vietnam or who had loved ones that died and are still unaccounted for in Vietnam, would feel the same way.

Mr. Speaker, I just say to this administration and to the Secretary of Defense, if he wanted to go to Vietnam to talk to them about the POW-MIA issue, if he wanted to go to Vietnam to tell them how important their relationship with us is, then why in the world did he do it during their celebrations of the defeat of the United States and Vietnam? It makes no sense to me. It rubs me the wrong way.

I hope that the Secretary of Defense and others in the administration hear what we had to say. He should have done it at a different time.

ISSUES FACING RURAL AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is certainly a good day for rural America. I want to congratulate the gentlewoman from Missouri (Mrs. EMERSON) and the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) for reviving the Rural Caucus. I do not know what happened that it died. It should never have. For someone who represents a very rural district, it is certainly a delight that we have it back.

Why do we need a Rural Caucus? Well, first, I come from a very rural district, the most rural district east of the Mississippi, from northern tier Pennsylvania. A lot of people do not think of Pennsylvania as being rural. They think of Philadelphia and Lancaster and Pittsburgh. But much of Pennsylvania is rural. It is the most rural population in the country. One-third of Pennsylvanians live in towns of less than 2,500. That is rural.

Now, the problem we have is that urban America, who really runs this country, dominates governments at State and national level, does not understand the needs of rural America. I call rural America the heartland of this country where we have some of our finest, hardest working people with the best work ethic.

There is nothing more than we can point to today than the farm crisis. As I look out on the beautiful farmlands that are in Pennsylvania and other neighboring States, and as we see the farmers leave and the barns fall down and the underbrush grows up on what was beautiful farm fields, we are gradually losing much of our heritage in this country.

The farm crisis, if not addressed, will again put more and more rural people out of work and send them to the cities to push more urban sprawl. It is vital that this Congress meets the needs to preserve farms in this country because of the vital role that we play.

My message to the White House is stop the food embargoes. Allow American farmers to sell their products at a fair price around the world. By lifting the embargoes, it would be $12 billion to $15 billion added to the farm budgets, and our farmers would get a much better price for their products because their markets would be expanded.

Another issue that is facing rural America is rural health care. I chaired health issues in Pennsylvania for a decade. I understand them. Rural health care is paid an unfair payment in comparison to urban suburban America. Why should a procedure in rural America be paid maybe half as much as a procedure in suburban urban America. There is no real reason for that except that is the rules that have been promulgated by HCFA that administers Medicare and Medicaid.

If rural America's health payments are not equalized or made fair, we will lose rural health care, and there will be no winners because those people will have to travel long distance to suburban areas. HCFA will pay the high price for the same health care that could have been administered in the hometown communities.

Rural transportation, rural airports, rural rail lines, we cannot afford to lose another mile of rail line in rural America. We cannot afford to have another community lose its ability to have rail service because it will make sure that certain jobs and certain opportunities are not available to them. Local air service is vital to the future of rural America, and it is under threat in this country because of government policies.

Another issue that has just been recently brought into the national news is the explosion of substance abuse in this country and in particular in rural America. Rural America was always thought to be free of drug use. It was an urban problem. Mr. Speaker, the recent studies show that there is more abuse among young people in rural America than any other part.

One of the reasons is we do not have adequate enforcement in rural America. The strike force, the drug strike force, the special groups that have been put together to work in urban America and suburban America, they do not like to work out in rural America. Because we do not have adequate enforcement, drug usage is on the rise, and we are losing young people by the thousands because drugs, not only harm young people, they often kill them. Drugs are dangerous. Drugs are not healthy. Drugs are not safe. We must somehow stop the drug culture in all of America and specifically rural America.

A question I ask: Is rural America prepared for e-commerce? Do we have adequate ability to the Web, to the Internet? Are our telephone systems up to date? Do we have digital switching? Do we have an adequate amount of fiber optics? Because if we do not, it will be no different than if we do not have highways and we do not have rail and we do not have air service. E-commerce is where the future is.

One of the issues is equity in education. Rural school districts have historically been underfunded in comparison to urban and suburban districts. Suburban America has a strong tax base and can afford a good educational system. Urban America has some of the similar problems of rural. We have always subsidized them. But we have not subsidized rural education in the same manner that we have subsidized urban education. So rural education has had to take a back seat. Not all of the opportunities that are needed for our young people are there.

One of the issues facing this country and rural America is, do we have adequate access to technical education. My answer is no. The jobs that are out there today, many of them are high-tech jobs, many of them are mid-tech jobs. But we need an education that is a blend of academic and technology.

America is not prepared in my view, and rural America very much so, not prepared for the jobs of tomorrow, not prepared for the jobs of today. We are not adequately training the workforce. What is going to happen if we do not prepare this technical workforce, we are going to export another level of manufacturing that we should not lose and we do not need to lose if we do not prepare the workforce for the manufacturing companies.

The manufacturing companies that are still processing and manufacturing in America today are very high-tech. There is a computer and a robot hooked together all the way down the line. It is a very high-tech manufacturing, and it takes a worker far more than was needed in the past when one just needed a willing worker. One needs a person today that is trained.

ELIMINATION ON BAN ON IMPORTING TO UNITED STATES IRANIAN CAVIAR, CARPETS, AND PISTACHIOS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the House for this opportunity, because I was not on the list to address the House today and did not expect to do so. My remarks may be intemperate because I come here in anger. I speak here not with any prepared text, but

from a few roughly thrown together notes. I know those who prepare the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD like a prepared text to follow afterwards, but they will, unfortunately, have to rely upon our outstanding court reporter.

Mr. Speaker, 20 minutes ago, I became aware of a horrifying news report, a report that filled me with anger at a proposed administration policy, a policy that may be taken by an administration that I have supported time and time again with my vote and with my voice.

Today, news reports indicate that this Friday the State Department plans to announce an elimination on the ban on importing to the United States of Iranian caviar, carpets, and pistachios. We will be told that these three exports are insignificant to a Nation with so much oil. But Iran is able to export its oil on the world market and obtain the world price. Nothing America does influences that price or the total demand for Iranian oil.

□ 1945

In contrast, Iran stands to benefit substantially if its three major non-energy exports are allowed into the United States. Nothing we do could have a greater impact in the area of importing goods from Iran than to allow carpets, pistachios, and caviar into our markets.

Mr. Speaker, do we really need Iranian caviar? The Russian caviar somehow does not satisfy the palates of the most discriminating? I do not think so. I think the greater thirst, the greater craving than for Iranian caviar is the thirst, the craving in the State Department to make concessions of a tangible nature to Iran before we get more than the first wisp of improved Iranian behavior.

Mr. Speaker, about a year ago, 13 Jews were arrested in Shiraz, Iran; and they were charged with espionage for the United States. Ten of those 13 remain in prison. All 13 go to trial next month. All of them face the death penalty. Why would America liberalize our export rules while these 13 face the death penalty for allegedly spying for us?

Mr. Speaker, since the Iranian revolution, 17 members of the Jewish community have been executed at roughly the rate of one per year in a constant and bloody effort at community repression, and yet our State Department wants to let in the caviar, the carpets. Mr. Speaker, that caviar will not taste good. There is blood in the caviar; the carpets wrap human bodies. And we have got to stand firm for once.

Mr. Speaker, the Vice President of the United States has said that Iran's treatment of the 13 Jews held in Shiraz would be a test for the Iranian government. But what test proctor is so wimpish as to award an A to the student before that student even turns in a paper? The test is still outstanding. Can Iran stop its repression of the oldest Jewish community outside of Israel? Can they let go of the desire of some of the hard-liners in Iran to oppress this small remaining community of 30,000 people?

Mr. Speaker, we have to understand how stupid and outrageous these espionage charges are. Here in the United States we are a multiethnic society. Anyone can grow up to be a spy. We can have Jewish-American spies, Chinese-American spies, or English-American spies, because everyone participates in our society. In Iran, no Jew is allowed anywhere near anything of strategic significance, and America would not be the world's only superpower if we made a practice of hiring as our spies those in a small community prohibited from getting anywhere close to any of the information we might find significant.

Mr. Speaker, these 13 are not held out of a genuine belief that they might be guilty of espionage, but rather as an effort to torture a community and perhaps execute 13 of its members.

Mr. Speaker, there is blood in the caviar, bodies have been wrapped in the carpets, and it is time for America to say no until the 13 Jews of Shiraz are liberated and until the Iranian government takes other important actions as well.

TIMELY TOPICS FOR A NIGHT-SIDE CHAT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, it is time for another night-side chat. I look forward to visiting with my colleagues in the next few minutes. There are a number of topics I would like to cover this evening, but first and foremost I have just listened to the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) and his points on caviar from Iran. The gentleman's comments were excellent, and they were right on point.

It is amazing how the administration, in my opinion, is dealing with the oil situation that we have got, the high gasoline prices that all of our constituents pay out there, yet this week they are going to lift the restraints and allow Iran, which is a member of OPEC, to go ahead and trade these products in our country. When we consider even further what the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) has said in regards to the terrorist acts and the problems that we have had with the country of Iran, it makes it even more astonishing that the administration would lift those trade restraints and allow Iran to come in here and trade as if they are our neighbors in our neighborhood. It does not make sense.

I had to put my two bits in on that because I think it is important and because I want to talk a little this evening about gasoline prices. It has hit all of us across this country.

I also want to talk about my case of the week. As many of my colleagues know, I used to be a police officer; and I like to highlight some of the more absurd cases I read about in our national press. This week's case comes out of the State of Colorado, my home State.

I want to talk a little about law enforcement and our drug enforcement in the State of Colorado. We have a lot of good hard-working law enforcement officers in Colorado.

And then, finally, colleagues, I wanted to talk about probably the most important topic of this evening: guns. Guns. A little controversy later on in the discussion, so I hope my colleagues will stay around because I want to talk about guns and what kind of situation we have got with guns. I want to talk about gun squads. I want to talk about guns, and I think at the conclusion of those remarks, my colleagues will walk out of this Chamber supporting what we are doing in the State of Colorado in regards to guns.

Let us start at the top. Let us start talking about gasoline prices. We all know what is happening at the pump. And, by the way, I have heard a few news commentators say, gosh, we have nothing to complain about, look at the gas prices in Europe. Well, let me just say that we should not compare the gas prices in Europe with the gas price in the United States because the gas price in Europe is not comprised of extra cost of production; it is taxes. It is extra taxes in Europe.

I do not think we in this country ought to sit idly buy and say we ought to raise our price of gasoline, just like the Europeans do, which means we are going to put a substantial tax increase on our gas prices. I think our country has every reason to object to the high prices of gasoline as we now see it. Our entire economy is dependent upon fuel and oil.

Now, sure, we would like to lessen that dependence in the future. In fact, during the oil crisis in the 1970s we had a very aggressive drive to reduce our dependence on oil; but in fact we increased our dependence on oil, to the extent that we are much more dependent today on foreign oil than we were after the crisis in the 1970s, when we said we were going to be less dependent. A number of different factors played into that.

Now, it is very easy to condemn oil. I deal with a number of people that are anti-oil. They think it is all big corporations, or they think this country has deserves what it gets in regards to oil. Well, if we really take a look at how fundamental it is, in fact there is not in this great room of ours, nothing, whether it is the furniture, whether it is the vehicles we use to get here, the electricity that lights the facility or powers this microphone or works TV cameras, all of this is very dependent upon this fuel. If we did not have this fuel, if the price gets out of hand, we will have an economic crisis. And when we have an economic crisis, that means

we cannot do a lot of things that we think are good in our society, things like helping other countries, things like helping our own people, things like providing a strong military defense, things like providing health care, Medicare, Social Security. All of that is very dependent on a healthy economy.

And when we look at our economy, the foundation of our economy, we have several pillars. One is good people. We have good people in this country. We have efficiency. We have economies of scale in this country. We have expertise. We have education. But amongst those pillars is oil, and we have to have decently priced oil. It is essential for us.

Now, I want to point out that I have a disagreement with the Vice President's policy, as I take it, on oil. The Vice President's policy has been stated in a book that he wrote in 1992. Raise the taxes. My disagreement with the Vice President's policy and the administration's policy is that they should not be raising taxes on fuel. We are trying to get the gasoline price down, not take the gasoline price up. We cannot just continue to layer tax after tax after tax on the American people.

I should point out again my disagreement with the Vice President. That was the tie-breaking vote in 1994, when the gasoline taxes were raised 4.3 cents per gallon. That may not sound like a lot, until we think about one of these poor working people that has to go to work every day who are pulling into a gas pump. They did not see a raise at work, and they are not seeing any more efficiencies. All they are seeing is they have to reach down deeper and deeper into their pocket and pull out more and more money at the gas pump. Then there are people in Washington, D.C. that think it is a good idea to have policies that say we ought to raise taxes more on gasoline. Those policies and the policies of that administration are wrong. We should not be doing that. We have to worry about this economy.

Now, what can we do? We can all complain about gasoline prices and OPEC, and I can tell my colleagues that I have had experience with gasoline prices in Colorado. My district is the 3rd District of the State of Colorado. It is all the Rocky Mountains; almost all of the mountains in Colorado, and we have experienced high gasoline prices out there. Nothing like we are seeing today, but we have experienced those kind of prices.

But today's price is being driven by a cartel. We do not allow cartels in this country. It is a monopoly. We do not allow that. We have antitrust legislation in this country, so we do not have cartels that stick it to the people.

Now, some people say, well, it is the market. Let the market work. Well, let the market, if the market works in a true market form. I am a firm believer in Adam Smith. I am a strong believer in the philosophy of Adam Smith and capitalism and the market. But it is an unfair advantage in the market if we let a cartel go in. The cartel is not a concept of the market, and that is what is happening to your gasoline prices.

People say why is the price going up? Well, part of it is the policy of the administration, in my opinion, that I have stated my disagreement with. But the strongest push upward, the more immediate push upward that we have seen in the last few weeks is as a direct result of this cartel called OPEC.

Okay, well let us talk about the battle we are involved in. We have OPEC over here. It is a cartel. And as my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN), said, Iran is a member of OPEC. We have a number of different countries, Algeria, Nigeria, Indonesia, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait. These countries all belong to this good old boy club. Now, surely some of us have heard, especially being in politics in an election year, we have to get rid of the good old boy club. There is not a better more definite example of the good old boy club than the cartel and OPEC. They are putting a noose around us and keep tightening the noose.

Well, does this country deserve to have a noose put around us? Let us take a look at some of the OPEC members. Kuwait, for example. Maybe we should dial up Kuwait on the telephone: Hey, Kuwait, how long is your memory? Was it not America that gave you your country back about 9 years ago? Was it not America that lost 50 or so soldiers giving you back your country? Was it not America that rebuilt your country? And this is how you express gratitude; you go into this cartel and say stick it to the Americans?

By the way, Saudi Arabia and Nigeria, and all these other countries of OPEC, whose expertise do you think you are using for the mechanical aspects of taking that oil out of the ground, of transporting that oil, of marketing that oil?

We have had a good friendship over the years with many of those OPEC countries. It would be a shame if that friendship is allowed to be diluted by greed, which is the only bottom line when dealing with a cartel. Greed is the only bottom line that a cartel results in. It is the only result one gets with a cartel. It brings greed. And there are a lot of victims sacrificed as a result of greed.

What is my proposal? I think the President, and I have heard the comments of the administration, and I refer to the administration's policy, I am not referring to the President or Vice President personally, as my colleagues know, but the President and the Vice President's policies of saying we should not tamper with it, it is the market, let the market deal with this, is wrong. A cartel is not part of the market. And if the administration is going to consider it part of the market, then let us play by market rules, which means let us get in there and tussle a little. Let us get in that market and say, all right, if OPEC wants to charge us 20 some bucks or 25 bucks a barrel for oil, we are going to start taxing American products that go over to make it possible for them to produce that oil.

□ 2000

Now, starting tomorrow, if they want drill bits out of the United States to drill down, maybe we ought to charge them an extra premium to help us offset the fuel costs we are being dealt with.

They want to transport? If they are using any kind of American expertise or American personnel, maybe we ought to have a special little assessment, we will not call it a tax, an assessment to make it a little softer approach, lets call it an assessment. We are going to put an assessment on OPEC.

Two people can play this game. If OPEC wants to come in with a cartel to the free world and you want to put a stranglehold on us, it goes two ways. They are not totally independent of the United States. In fact, I say to OPEC and any number of those countries, not only was Kuwait dependent on the United States to free their country and give it back to them, all of those countries over there, without exception, all of them are dependent upon American expertise for their own economies.

Maybe we ought to play a little tit for tat, as they say. That is what they do in the market; they get competition out there. Let us compete. Let us not just say, well, the competition has put together this cartel so we will just let things kind of wander as they might, as we hear from the Vice President's administration.

Let us get out there and let us get in the ring with them. Let us take a look at foreign aid. Last year four countries, Algeria, Nigeria, Indonesia, and Venezuela, $165 million in aid, $165 million in aid to those four OPEC countries, foreign aid from the United States.

When our budget comes up this year, maybe we ought to take a look at the OPEC countries that we have in our budget that we are giving money to to help with their problems under our foreign aid program; and maybe we ought to remember what they are doing to us, to the American citizens, to the hard working people that have to get to work every day, turn on their lights, feed a family, maybe we ought to remember what they are doing to us when we do our foreign aid bill this year. I think it is important.

I think these gasoline prices will have a negative impact on our economy. It is nothing to laugh at. It is not something, as the administration says, well, we will just kind of let it go, you know, let the market take place.

If we had a true market form the way that Adam Smith talked about a true market, we would not have a cartel out there, competition would be allowed to

thrive, and we would not have this kind of situation occurring.

The administration has got to recognize they do not have an Adam Smith type of playing field out there, they have got a cartel. And that is what is jacking up the price to the American people. The American people deserve an aggressive behavior out of its Nation's capital before our economy begins to crumble as a result of these oil prices.

And we have got the leverage to do it. It is not like we are totally disarmed in this battle. We have got lots of leverage. That foreign aid is just one small part of it. American expertise is a big part of it. What we do for those countries is a big part of the leverage we have. We ought to put it all on the table. They laid out their cards. They got together and decided which cards were best to play poker with. And so, instead of playing poker with each one of them, they all got together and put their cards and are coming up with the best hand.

Well, they do not have all the leverage. We have got some leverage. I urge my colleagues, let us get aggressive. Let us not sit back and take it. Let us get aggressive on this. We have got leverage, and let us use it.

CASE OF THE WEEK

I am going to change horses here for a minute. I want to talk about my crazy case of the week. First a little of my background.

As I said before, I used to be a police officer. And you cannot ever get that out of your blood. By the way, I want to say to my colleagues, of course, I am from Colorado. I was a police officer in Colorado. I have got a number of good colleagues out there who still are on the force. And just a message to all law enforcement across the country, my constituents' colleagues, they have got our full support. We love good cops. We do not like bad cops, but we love good cops. And they deserve the kind of credibility that they have.

In most communities, I guess I should take that back, in every community, overall there is strong respect and admiration for our police officers.

Let me tell my colleagues about a case that I read about in the Denver Post. I will cite the article. Denver Post, March 11. That was last Saturday. This case involves a defendant who is accused of murder.

This defendant went out and allegedly, and everything I say this evening is allegedly, although the evidence, in my opinion, proves it up, but the decision has not yet been made, so it is all allegedly, let us take that into consideration, this defendant allegedly goes out with one of his buddies and decides that they want to go ahead and rape a woman. And, of course, if you rape them, you better murder her, too.

So they go out and hit a jogger with their car. They hit a jogger with the car. The jogger falls, gets cut up and things. And this defendant jumps out and says how apologetic he is that he hit her with his car and he offers to take her to the hospital. Good Samaritan, I am sorry I hit with you with my car. Let me take you to the hospital.

The smartest thing that woman ever did was say, no, I will get my own help. I do not need your help. I am not going to let you take me to the hospital.

So that victim did not work out. So then they go on down and they find another victim, a 23-year-old young woman. They take her. They rape her. They beat her. They abuse her. They torture her. Then they murder her.

Well, let me tell my colleagues what the defense is saying. Now, I have got to tell my colleagues, in fair disclosure, I did used to be a cop. I am biased toward the prosecution side. I used to be an attorney. I practiced law. I could not practice defense law. I mean, I know that they are entitled to a defense, but, as an attorney, I chose not to do defense law because I just could not find myself defending somebody whom the facts made very clear were guilty.

But that is an aside. An attorney has an obligation to defend its client. I just could not do that kind of work. But I do disclose to all of my colleagues, I have a bent towards the prosecution. But these are facts out of the newspaper. This is not the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) coming up with an idea. These are facts out of the newspaper.

So they go and rape this person. The defense puts on their case. And guess what the defense says? Oh, the defendant, this guy that did this, he thought he was the victim. He thought in his mind, and this is true, this is what the psychiatrist testifies to, that in his mind he thought he was being raped. In his mind, he thought she, the true victim, the murder victim, he thought she was causing infidelity in his marriage and he just did not really know what he was doing when he killed her because he thought he was the victim and he was trying to push her away from raping him and from causing an extramarital affair in his marriage. It is incredible.

Dr. Riyana Rogers, a forensic psychiatrist who currently works as a professor at the University of California in San Francisco, let me tell my colleagues something, I hope I get the opportunity some day to meet her or that my colleagues get an opportunity to ask her about this defense.

Come on, folks. Can you really think that a mental illness will allow a defendant, who earlier in the day, by the way, earlier in the day very methodically tried to get a woman in his car. He hit her with his car. By the way, I should also add this fact: A year earlier they had a witness testify that he dreamed or had a fantasy of going out and grabbing a woman and raping her. He said he wanted to rape a girl and kill her and make her boyfriend watch, according to videotaped testimony.

And yet, this psychiatrist comes to the common people of America and says, look, I am sorry that the victim got raped. I am sorry that the woman got raped. I am sorry that the woman was abused. I am sorry that the woman was tortured. I am sorry that the woman was killed. But, you know, in this case the real victim was this guy. I know he is the one that killed her. Yeah, he killed her. But he is the victim. He thought he was getting raped. He thought she was disrobing him. He thought he was being tortured. He thought it was his marriage that would suffer as a result of this situation. So he called upon himself to justify it.

Well, I am telling my colleagues, it makes me sick. Now, the jury is still out on this. I hope the jury does not buy it. If the jury buys it, I can tell my colleagues this will be one of the saddest chapters in American defense law in the history of this country. I said ''defense,'' not prosecution, ''defense.'' Because it does a disfavor to your industry to their profession, and I used to be an attorney, it does a disfavor to their profession if somebody is going to get off the hook by claiming that, in fact, they were the victim of the rape, they were the victim and blame it on the sweet child of 23 who never saw another day.

That is the case of the week.

LAW ENFORCEMENT

Next, I want to visit for a minute about law enforcement. I want to thank especially the Intensity Drug Trafficking Area.

Senator CAMPBELL and I worked very intensely, as maybe my colleagues know, on the appropriations bill. We put appropriations in starting about 3 years ago. We have got it in every year since. Senator CAMPBELL, on the Senate side, has done a tremendous job for this, I on the House side. And it is the Intensity Drug Trafficking Area. We have Garfield, Eagle, Rio Blanco Counties are participating on a tri-county team, along with the communities in there.

For example, my good friend Terry Wilson, the chief of police of the Glenwood Springs Police Department, I used to be on that department, I worked with the gentleman, he is doing a great job. And I want my colleagues to know here, this is a good program.

What we have done is we have focused in on high drug trafficking corridors. We have given local money. We have not come in and said, we know better. The Federal Government has not sent in a bunch of agents and said, we know how to tell local law enforcement to do their job.

What we have done is made available expertise and put money into those communities so that those communities can go out onto their highways, into their counties, into their cities on these corridors and intercede that drug trafficking. And it has been a great success. I want to acknowledge that success this evening.

AMERICA WANTS SOLUTION TO GUN PROBLEM

Now I want to talk about guns. We have seen a lot of tragedy in this country. We have seen a lot of debate. Unfortunately, a lot of it is being motivated by politics. But we have seen a lot of debates on guns in this country. And there has been opportunities for exaggerations on both sides of this debate on guns.

There is a problem out there. Now, a lot of people will go with the satisfaction of just having the debate itself so they think they can score political points. But the core of America, the core of America, wants a solution to this problem. They want us to work out something that makes sense that will work.

□ 2015

I think there are a number of people across this country that have come up with an answer that does work. I think it is being completely ignored, most specifically by the national media. I must say that in Colorado, the local media has done strong justification to the program that I am going to talk about.

Let me give a little brief history of the program that I want to visit about, but first of all let us talk a little more, very briefly, about this gun issue. My position has always been, as a Congressman and as a State representative for years before that, that it is the misuse of the weapon that we must focus on. Putting all your attention on possession of the weapon it is a distraction. It is not the possession of the weapon that creates the problem. It is the misuse of that weapon that creates the bigger problem, in my opinion.

How do you deal with misuse?

Now, this sounds simple. It is so simple, you are going to say, right, get on to the next point; but the fact is when you have misuse you have to go after it. You cannot have misuse of a weapon, misuse of a gun, and ignore it, because the misuse will only grow unproportionately. You have to go after the misuse. That is a simple rule, rule number one, go after the misuse.

Number two, what do you do about the misuse? How do you go after it? Well, I am going to go through a project that I think is very effective in going after it, but there are other things. This project incorporates all of them. One, be quick, swift. If you see misuse, if you see misbehavior, move quickly to stop it. You must intercede quickly. Delay of time works against you. You must intercede quickly. You must intercede with significant force. I don't mean you call in the Army. I am just saying that you have to be able to reach out there and grab that misuse and stop it.

So, one, you have to go after it; two, you have to do it quickly; and, three, you have to have significant ability to stop it, to enforce it. It is very much like touching a hot burner.

That is an experience that all of us have had at some point in our early years. The elements of touching a hot burner are contained within this project that I am going to go through with you, but I think it is the answer. Instead of talking about, well, we should have this and we should have more laws on the books here and more laws on the books there, let me say politically it sounds great, but it is a distraction. It is going after possession.

Let us go after misuse and let us compare it to a burner, a hot burner. A hot burner is very, very dangerous. A gun misused is very, very dangerous. A car driven at a high speed or misused is very, very dangerous. You must have consequences if you are going to stop that misuse.

Well, take a look at a hot burner. First of all, there is a warning. Now, the first time you touch it, you probably did not know the difference when you were very, very small, between a red hot burner and a burner that was just black, it was not red in its color. So you walk up to a burner and it is red. Well, after the first time that signal alone will send little signals to your brain, trouble ahead, trouble ahead, there is a hot burner; do not touch that burner.

The first time that signal did not go up because it was not implanted. The impression was not made on your mind what a red burner meant. We are going to place impressions on minds with this project. We are going to take care of that. We want people to see the red burner.

The second thing you did when you did not recognize that the red burner was a signal that there is danger is you approached it; and as you approached it, you began to feel heat. The heat was of little consequence because you did not really know what it meant. You knew it meant heat as a small child. So you kept going to the burner and you touched it.

What happened when you touched that burner? There were immediate impressions made on your mind. Ouch, ouch, it hurt. The response was immediate, the consequence was immediate, and the impression on your mind lasted you for the rest of your life: do not ever touch a red hot burner.

Today I want to talk a little about Project Exile. That is the red hot burner. We want people out there to know, Mr. Speaker, that it is red hot; and if you touch it, it is going to burn and the consequences are going to be severe because we want to create an impression in your mind that the misuse or the illegal use of weapons or guns in this country will not be tolerated; zero tolerance.

It does not require new laws, by the way, no new laws, no new gun laws, none of this stuff. Put all the political argument aside. By the way, this project is supported non-partisanly. I will talk later about my friend Ken Salazar in the State of Colorado, the attorney general; a little later about Tom Strickland and all of the attorneys general who work for him who have done a tremendous job, the same thing with the Colorado State attorney generals there, attorneys there who have done a good job. We have a lot of Republicans in there. Wayne LaPierre, head of the NRA, is involved in this, our governor, of course, in the State of Colorado, Bill Owens, a tremendous leader for the State of Colorado. He is involved in it. It is bipartisan.

Let me begin by starting with a little brief history on where it started. It actually started in the East, in Virginia. Now, you are talking to SCOTT MCINNIS. It takes me a lot to credit something beginning in the East. I am strong on the West, but this one started in the East. It started in Richmond, Virginia.

What happened in 1997 is Richmond suffered from the second highest per-capita murder rate in the country, second highest rate in the country. So they decided to put together a project they called Project Exile; and in 1998, as a result of this project, the city's homicides were cut by 33 percent, the lowest they had had since 1987, all as a result of Project Exile.

Project Exile, what is it? What does it mean? It is a Federal, State, and local effort. It is not just a Federal effort. The Feds are not coming into your State, into your community, into your county telling you what to do. They are working a partnership. This is a partnership. The Feds, they are a partnership with the State; and they are a partnership with the local government.

The effort in Colorado, as it was in Virginia, was led by the United States Attorney General's office. Those are the ones who prosecute, from a Federal level, gun crimes. Where do we come up with the name ''exile''? What we wanted, and I say ''we,'' I wanted a part of it, I just think it is a wonderful program and that is why I am promoting it; but the reason the word ''exile'' came is if you violate a gun law, if you misuse that weapon, and violate that gun law, you are going to be exiled to prison, exiled to prison. Thus, the name Project Exile; Colorado Project Exile.

In this particular case in the history, it started in Virginia, but this is what many of our billboards in Colorado are going to look like, just exactly like this, pack an illegal gun, i.e., misuse, misuse, abuse of the law, touch the burner, pack your bags for prison; and then report illegal guns, we give a 1–800 number. It have been so successful this Project Exile in Virginia that it has been implemented in Boston, it has been implemented in New Orleans, in Rochester, in Birmingham, in Baltimore and many other cities across the country, and now we in Colorado have adopted this and I urge my colleagues on the House floor, take a look at it for their own State.

Look, there is a lot of rhetoric going on out there about these guns, and there have been some tragedies. There have always been tragedies with guns,

misuse of guns; but put all the rhetoric aside. I have seen some rhetoric over the weekend, and most of it seems to focus on possession. We have the laws in place. We have a lot of gun laws in this country, and a lot of those laws are good laws. They make sense. For example, you cannot have an automatic machine gun. It makes sense.

We have a lot of laws that make sense. You cannot misuse a gun, you cannot use a gun in a robbery, in this and that. It makes sense. Let us use them. Let us let people know that we mean business when we talk about gun laws.

Well, Colorado Project Exile had a press conference last week. The NRA was there. I know some of you every time you mention the NRA your hair bristles. Other people stand up and clap. That was one side that was there.

The U.S. Attorney's Office was there. The Colorado attorney general, who is a Democrat, Ken Salazar; and I applaud my colleague who does a darn good job in Colorado, he was there. MARK, my colleague here on the House floor, MARK was there; Tom Strickland, U.S. attorney, State of Colorado, he was there and his staff was there. By the way, a lot of Ken's staff was there. Of course, the governor led off on this thing. Bill Owens has done a tremendous job for us.

The sheriff's department was there. Police departments were there. The Colorado state patrol was there. Lee White, an individual in Colorado who has put a lot of effort in helping us raise money, they have gone out and raised money to take this campaign to the people; go out to the people and tell them, the burner is hot. It is red hot. If you touch it, you will be exiled into pain. In this particular case you are going to be exiled into prison.

Well, the project has multiple aspects to it; but the goal of the project is this, this is our goal in Project Exile: raise the stakes. You break a gun law in Colorado, we are raising the stakes. The citizens of Colorado are going to raise the stakes at the poker table. No longer are we just going to talk about issues like possession. We are going to raise the stakes, and we are going to look at the laws we have. We are going to make it very painful for you to violate gun laws in the State of Colorado. We want to make that burner hot. We want to make it red hot. We want it very clear that if you violate Federal or State gun laws you will go to prison.

One of the ways that we are going to do it is we are getting a message out there. We really have three components to it. Remember at the beginning of my comments, Mr. Speaker, I talked about the gun squads. Gun squads, you said? What is he doing on the House floor talking about gun squads? Sounds like some kind of gun fanatic out there. No. We have a new gun squad, just like the vice squad. Vice squad goes after things, the drug squad goes after things, the traffic squad goes after things. Well, now the gun squad.

Remember everything I am telling you about was supported by everybody from the NRA clear over to the State patrol, the city police, Democrats, Republicans. We are going to have a gun squad, and they are going to be looking for people violating those gun laws. If you are packing an illegal gun, if you are breaking a law like that, you are going to pay the consequences, so be ready. It is fair game; you are fair game. We have to let those constituents out there who think they are going to get away with violating those laws, who think we are going to ignore the fact that we have lots of laws on the books, we are going to let them know we mean business. That burner will be hot.

So our gun squad will consist of a cooperative effort from our partnership with the Federal, the State and the local, to go out and coordinate our gun laws. For example, I will give you an example, every police officer in the State of Colorado will be given this placard. Now, this placard has the gun laws.

You are saying, Scott, why do you give this placard on gun laws to the State Patrol, for example, or to the Grand Junction Police Department or people like that? Why do you give them this placard?

This is not State gun law. This is a quick summary of Federal gun laws. Every police officer will have this; and they will be able to, when they make a stop or when they come into a situation, they will be able to very quickly figure out if there is a gun law, Federal gun law, violation that has taken place.

Remember, they already know their city ordinances, city laws. They know the State laws, but really they do not have right at their hand, right in their palm, the Federal gun laws. Now they will have it, and they will be able to immediately know if we have a situation that the gun squad ought to look at. Our effort is to coordinate the gun laws at the local level, the gun laws at the State level, and the gun laws at the Federal level so that we can come up with the maximum temperature on that burner so that the person who continues to misbehave in our society and causes us a lot of grief, I mean talk about the challenge to the second amendment; I am a strong supporter of the second amendment. You talk about a challenge to the second amendment, it is these people out there that are breaking the laws that make other people in our society think that it is the second amendment that is the cause.

□ 2030

The cause is that our coordination has not taken place. We are not making that burner hot enough. We are not making it hot enough for those people that violate the laws.

Well, secondly, of course, the second thing goes along on the enforcement. I have told you this, those officers will have this. We are doing lots of educational seminars in Colorado. We have citizens in Colorado, not just cops, not just lawmakers, and I have many, many good colleagues in the State house and State Senate in Colorado that support this. We are getting common people out there to go out and raise money to help us make the public, and, in this particular case, the law enforcement agencies, aware that, number one, we are behind you. You men and women out there have got a tough job on the street. You need to know that we are going to stand behind you, and we are going to stand behind you on this one. We are there. We are there with you.

Two, we are going to make information accessible to you.

Three, once you go through this effort, we are going to follow through with the prosecution side of it. We are going to go after this.

The third element we need to talk about is public awareness. This is not just a fancy poster to bring on to the House floor. This is a duplicate copy of what our billboards and what our advertising program is going to be like in the State of Colorado.

Now, I say ''ours.'' It is ours. It is the people of the State of Colorado. In fact, it is the people of the United States of America focusing in Colorado, or in Baltimore, or in West Virginia. It is your taxpayer dollars in the U.S. Attorney's Office.

But in Colorado our project is going to read Colorado, Project Exile. Remember what exile means. You violate the law, you do the crime, you do the time, except this time we are going to do something. We are really doing it. Pack an illegal gun, pack your bags for prison, and a 1–800 number. I will talk about that later.

Mr. Speaker, when I was in the state legislature in the 1980s we decided we were going to get tough on guns. We decided we were going to get tough on crime. We decided we were going to get tough on judges who we did not think were doing an adequate enough job of being tough on these people.

We toughened up in Colorado. We built prisons and we sent people to prisons and our crime rate dropped like a rock in water. Why? Because they knew there were consequences. They knew the punishment would be there and they knew it would be fairly immediate and it worked in Colorado.

Now, look, I have heard the age-old argument, well, look, Scott McInnis in Colorado has the wrong idea. Build more schools and less prisons.

Mr. Speaker, that is comparing apples to oranges. Who does not want to build more schools? Who does not support stronger education? But the finest education system in the world in a society that has it, and I happen to think the United States, when you look at the overall picture of education, I think we have one of the finest systems in the world, still has got people that are going to misbehave.

The Catholic priesthood is one of the finest callings man could go to, in my

opinion. I am a Catholic. But if you are Jewish, maybe a Rabbi, or whatever. It is one of the finest callings you can go to, but you have bad people. No matter how well you educate a Catholic priest, no matter how well you educate a Rabbi, or no matter how well you educate your general population, you are going to have some bad apples out there, and some of these apples are animals, just like the fellow I mentioned before, who declares he is the victim because he raped a woman, murdered her and tortured her. She was not the victim; he was the victim. That guy ought to be in prison. I do not care what kind of school you build in Colorado, you are not going to do much with this guy.

Face the fact that a certain percentage of your population you are going to have to deal, you are going to have to consequences.

So that is what we are doing. We are saying you are going to go to prison. We are not going to go out and rehabilitate you, we are not going to go out and doodle around and slap you on the hand and tell you we are going to look the other way, although in the past I can tell you very few gun laws in the State of Colorado in my opinion were enforced. We looked the other way. Too much hassle. ''It's okay. Old Joe here has got to use this weapon in a robbery or something, let's get him on a robbery.''

Well, things have changed. Now, tragedy, of course, has created this change. Not just tragedy at Columbine, we all know about that, but tragedy in the other cases too, and it is time for the whole Nation, every one of my colleagues sitting on this floor, to change, not change, because I know you are supportive, I do not know anybody that is not, let us use the laws we have got. Let us go after them.

Let us talk about the 1–800 number. ''Report illegal guns, 1–800–283–guns.'' Where did that come from? Remember the program, maybe you have seen it in your neighborhood, I have got it in my neighborhood, neighborhood watch, the neighborhood watch program? Or crime watchers, where you call in. You do not have to give your name, and we put rewards out there?

We went out in law enforcement, I used to be a cop, we went out there and recognized, you know, we do not know it all. We cannot do it all. We have got to form a partnership. We need to form a partnership with our citizens. We need to reach out to our citizens and ask them to help us. That is where crime watchers came, that is where neighborhood watch came about, and that is exactly what is going to happen with Colorado Project Exile. We are asking for your help.

We are going to give you a 1–800 number. If you know somebody that is carrying an illegal weapon, you know somebody that used a weapon in a crime, you know somebody that has a fully automatic weapon that is illegal, call us, 1–800. No expense. No cost. You are helping yourself, you are helping your society. Call us. We mean business. You call us. Let us prove to you we are not going to tolerate this kind of behavior in society. We have got some good solid laws on the books.

I want to remind everybody, the National Rifle Association supports this. This is not something that has got a polarization going on out there. There is a lot of polarization today. I just saw it over the weekend. The President's policies are this, somebody else's policies are this, the Vice President is demanding apologies.

Forget all of that rhetoric. Let us talk about right here. This is it. This is a policy that works. It is nonpartisan. It reaches out and brings lots of partners into our partnership, and our partnership is a strong partnership, as witnessed by the number of people that were at that press conference last week in Colorado announcing the kickoff.

Now, has it made a difference? You bet it has.

Remember, the press conference was last week, the statewide effort. Tom Strickland, the U.S. Attorney in the State of Colorado, actually initiated this in October of last year.

Let me tell you, first of all, has it been accepted by the public in Colorado? I have talked to you about how all the leaders have come together in a non-polarized partnership and formed a team. But have the people who we work for, have they accepted it?

The answer in Colorado is yes. The media has accepted it. Denver Post, Denver Rocky Mountain News, Colorado Springs Gazette, Grand Junction Daily Sentinel, Boulder Daily Camera, I could go on and on. This has strong support in Colorado.

In 1998, let me give you a few examples, these are some statistics. Primary charge, weapons used to facilitate drug trafficking. In 1998, eight people were charged. In 1999, 36 were charged. Project Exile was only in effect for 3 months.

Another startling statistic. A felon in possession of a gun, in 1998, 17 people, in Colorado, we have 3 million people, we got a lot of felons. Colorado is a great State, do not get me every wrong, but every State has felons out there, too many felons, and we know those felons, we know more than 17 felons had guns in their possession.

Well, now we are going to know a lot more, because we are getting participation from the community and from the law enforcement agencies and from the prosecutors and from the Federal Government with its assistance. Now we know we are going to find out a lot more about these felons. That number jumped by 30 percent, by 30 percent, and we were only in effect for 3 months.

We have a number of others. But let me just give you an idea. Here are some crimes in Colorado that recently charges have been filed under Operation Project Exile. In my opinion and in the expert opinion of the U.S. Attorney's Office and other people who really are in the field hands-on, these charges would not have been filed in Colorado, would not have been filed in Colorado, had it not been for our team effort on Colorado Project Exile.

What are they? I will give you an example. Delivery of a firearm to a common carrier without notice. Illegal exportation of guns via commercial airliners to Honduras. They were exporting illegal weapons to Honduras. Had this project not been in effect starting in October of last year, our guess is charges would never have been filed under this law.

Possession of two sawed-off shotguns. We know sawed-off shotguns are illegal. It has been a long time since there were charges filed. Project Exile, we are filing charges. We filed them.

Possession of a firearm by a prohibited person, possessed an Uzi and a sawed-off shotgun and had domestic violence convictions and attempted third degree assault charges. All of those were wrapped up under Colorado Project Exile. Our belief is that most of those charges would not have been filed, had we not decided to take an aggressive, very aggressive, stance on the existing gun laws.

Drug user, addict in possession of a firearm, marijuana and methamphetamines, while possessing explosive devices and possession of unregistered firearms, destructive devices. In the past we think that it was too complicated or the coordination was not right or the team was not in place. We think in this particular case those charges would have been overlooked. Not under Colorado Project Exile.

Possession of a firearm by a prohibited person. Possessed a 9 millimeter semiautomatic assault weapon and had a misdemeanor domestic violence conviction. Another case, look the other way. Not intentionally look the other way, but the sophistication, the teamwork was not there, the commitment to aggressively go after the laws that already exist was not there. It is all there now.

I stress to you, one of our biggest partners are our constituents. This is not isolated to the police department or to the U.S. Attorney's Office or to Ken Salazar at the State Attorney General Office or our Governor. This is statewide.

Possession of a firearm by an illegal alien. Federal firearm license, selling to a non-resident of Colorado, failure on the background check and selling to a convicted felon.

So you can see, I have got page after page after page of violations we think will now be aggressively pursued against the people who decide that their misbehavior is something that society is going to have to tolerate. Their theory is, ''Hey, I do what I want to do. If I want to carry around a sawed-off shotgun or misuse a weapon, society is going to have to adapt to my behavior.'' Well, we have got news for you.

You are going to adapt to society's behavior.

Let me say in conclusion, this Project Exile is not an attack on the Second Amendment. I am a strong believer in that. In fact, I think it helps us support the Second Amendment. This Project Exile is not ignorance of the problems we have out there of the tragedy. In fact, I think it is going to do a lot more to avert tragedies and to get our hands on these tragedies that are taking place than any of the rhetoric going on right now in the Nation by the highest levels of our administration.

This is going to get things done. This is not talk. Talk is cheap. This is going to get things done. It has got support of the major law enforcement agencies in Colorado, from your local police department to the Attorney General, to the U.S. Attorney General's office. It has got the Governor. It has got Democrats and Republicans in the State house and the State senate supporting it.

In fact, maybe the best way to summarize, I have not found anybody who objects to it. I have not found anybody who says to ignore the laws, the laws in existence on the books now. In fact, my friends who support the Second Amendment, one of their basic points is let us see what happens when we enforce the laws we currently have on the books. Let us see what happens when we make the consequences of touching a burner immediate and painful. Their bet, my bet, everyone involved in this, the bet is you will not touch that burner again, and society will be better for it.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge all colleagues, in their respective districts, in their respective States, go out there, talk to their Attorney General. If you are Republicans, talk to the Democrats. If you are Democrat, talk to the Republican leaders in your State. Form a team like we did in Colorado and put in your own Project Exile. My bet, and I think it is a safe bet, and I am a betting man and I like safe bets, my bet is that after 1 year you will find out that your Project Exile has accomplished more than all of the rhetoric combined for all of the States.

□ 2045

But the rhetoric aside, put the action in place. You pack an illegal gun; you pack your bags for prison.

CHARACTER EDUCATION IN OUR SCHOOLS: AN INNOVATION THAT WORKS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, this evening I want to talk with my colleagues about the future. As I talk about the future, I want to talk about the children of this country, because they truly are our future.

Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to talk about education, particularly an effort in education called character education. We talk about a lot of things that work and things that do not work; but as my colleagues know, before I came to the people's House to serve in this body, I was the State superintendent of schools in the State of North Carolina. As I have told many of my colleagues from time to time, there are a lot of things in education that a lot of us who work in it, if we are honest with ourselves, do not know a great deal about when we do do some of the things that work and a lot of the things that do not work. I happen to know firsthand that character education can make a difference to teach our children values and make sure that our students are well rounded and prepared to become good citizens.

In 1989 when I took over as State superintendent, we did a survey of about 25,000 students across our State, and I was quite alarmed at some of the results we got back. About 37 percent of the students said that they did not respect their fellow students nor their teachers, and it was quite obvious from that data that something needed to be done.

We pulled together teachers, administrators, members of the clergy. We pulled together members from the bench and we did an extensive study for about a year and a half, almost 2 years, and came up with what we called ethics education. We put together some principles, and ultimately that evolved into character education. It was later adopted by the State board of education and then the North Carolina general assembly in 1995; and we received a grant in 1995 from the U.S. Department of Education to begin a process in three of our school districts, three of the larger ones, incidentally, Wake County, Cumberland County, and Mecklenberg County to pilot character education.

Now, across my congressional district, school leaders have developed character education initiatives that really are making a difference for stronger schools and better communities. Wake County, as I just mentioned, was one of the early leaders. Not only were they a leader by receiving the funds and initiating the project and having community meetings, because this truly is based at the school level and the community level; but they have become a leader through their innovative effort that they call Uniting for Character.

In that process, there are a number of principles that they focus on and that they come together on, which are respect, citizenship, justice and fairness, honesty, caring, respect and trustworthiness are the core; and each community must develop those issues that they believe in. What we recommend is that the educators, the parents, the business community, all in the community come together and work together collaboratively to come up with those core issues that they want to use.

In Johnston County, another county in the district, they have come together and done theirs. The principal of Selma Elementary School, a school which I visited just a few weeks ago, attributes 59 fewer suspensions during the 1995–1996 school year to their character education program. They also attribute the fact that they have had academic growth, tremendous academic growth over the years and again this year, and I visited that school again to see what kind of progress they were making. They again are showing progress as a result of character education. It is not a program that teachers have to struggle with as another addition to their already crowded school day. It is integrated in the curriculum in the standard course of study that we use in North Carolina, and it is taught along with everything else they do, and I will talk about that more in just a few moments.

Mr. Speaker, some of my colleagues and certainly others across the country may have seen the CBS News profile that was done several months ago on one of the successful character education programs in the Nash Rocky Mount school system, Baskerville Elementary School, a school that really was having a difficult time. They were having problems with truancy, they were having problems with discipline, their academics were suffering, and under the leadership of a dynamic principal named Anne Edge, she took this on, she got her staff involved, she got the community involved, and she literally indoctrinated the children in that school, and it is working well.

I visited there several weeks ago, and I can tell my colleagues as a result of that program being implemented properly and being supported by the community, supported by the central office staff and the local school board, that is one public school that has turned around and is making a difference and it has become infectious. It is working all across Nash Rocky Mount school system in North Carolina.

This morning, Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity to visit Tramway Elementary School in Lee County, another school in my district where character education really fills the entire community with hope. I went into that school this morning, and I was so pleased to see the number of parents who were there. They were there participating, active in the school. They had other members of the school faculty there, but the impressive part of it was what was happening with the students. The young people in that classroom gave reports, probably half the class got up and read reports and shared with me and with the others present what character education had done, what a difference it had made, and the different character traits that

they had picked up as a result of reading such books over the last several months as Charlotte's Web and any other number of books that they had been assigned to read as special reading projects. That is what making good citizens is all about.

When we have good citizens in the classroom, we have good citizens in the school; and it flows over into the community, and it goes home with the children. They are reinforcing in Tramway Elementary and Baskerville Elementary and schools all across the second district, and certainly across North Carolina, what parents are teaching at home; and in some cases, children are taking it home and reinforcing it with parents and really helping parents understand.

I was in Combs Elementary School in Wake County, one of the first schools I visited talking about this issue of character education and the bill that I introduced on February 16 entitled character education, or Character Counts in the 21st Century. We have in that school children speaking languages from probably about 12 to 14 different countries. It was amazing how they were sharing and helping one another, talking about these issues of character that brings them together, that helps those children be better students academically and better students in terms of sharing within that school environment being good citizens.

Mr. Speaker, character education works because it teaches our children to see the world through a moral lens. Children learn that actions do have consequences, and if we deal with it at an early age with early intervention, we will see a difference not only in our classrooms, but in our communities and across this country, and many of the challenges that we are facing together we will not have to face in the future. Yes, we will continue to face the challenges in the adult community for years to come, but we need to get back to those principles that we talked about many years ago, and character education certainly works. It works when teachers work with parents and with children and with the entire community to instill a spirit of a shared responsibility.

That is why character education is so important, if we can get it on issues like this that are important to the community. Education is a shared responsibility. I try to remind my colleagues here and in every speech I give back home, education starts in the home; and if there is no education in the home, the challenge of teachers is almost insurmountable. How in the world, if we cannot teach one child or two children at home, do we expect a teacher to take the responsibility of 30? It is a shared responsibility.

When we talk about character education and we emphasize those values, as I talked about earlier, of courage, and certainly courage is important in everything we do; good judgment, as we talk to children; integrity in our teaching every day in the various courses, whether it be math, whether it be history; kindness, in the things that children do for one another, and we reward those things. It is one thing to be punished; it is another thing to be rewarded when one does something good.

Children learn very quickly in life, if they get rewarded for doing good things, they will do good things again. And if they are not rewarded, and all they see is punishment and the dark side of life, I can tell my colleagues it will be difficult. Early intervention works. Kindness. Perseverance. We can teach it without having it laid on to something else. We can do it in the course of what we are teaching every day. How we respect one another. We respect other's property; we respect the school property, and it carries over into the community where young people work with their brothers and sisters, where they do it on the job. Self-discipline. Self-discipline is an important value. These are principles we can agree on. They are things that the community decides they want to do. It brings the PTAs together with the teachers, with the community interest. It is important.

As a father of two public school teachers, my heart aches for the victims of recent school violence. I can assure my colleagues that not only do the parents hurt, but so do all of those folks who work with children, whether it was in their school or not, because it affects them. The scars are there.

So rather than engaging in those divisive debates and partisan posturing, I call on my colleagues in this Congress on both sides of the aisle to pass progressive innovations that work, things like character education. It is not one-upsmanship, even though I introduced it on February 16. It is going to take both sides of the aisle, Democrats and Republicans, liberals and conservatives, working together to make a difference.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield to my colleague from New York who has really been a leader not only on this issue of character education but in school construction and in the areas of education.

□ 2100

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good friend, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE), for all his good works and especially in introducing this piece of legislation. I think this is, I say to the gentleman, in all honesty, long overdue. We have to go back to teaching civics. We have to go back to teaching responsibility. We have go back to teaching on self-worth.

How can a child have respect for others when the child does not even respect himself or herself? That is what this legislation, I believe, is attempting to do and will do teaching respect, citizenship, I will just list them, justice and fairness, honesty, caring, responsibility, trustworthiness. That almost sounds like the Boy Scout oath that I recollect as a child, but things that I think have been lost unfortunately, and not only reflective in schools, but just in general.

We see it on television. We see it in the movies, and that is what the children are exposed to today. They are not getting enough, I do not believe, of that attention on these issues in the classroom.

I do not understand what we are afraid of. I do not know what it is we are afraid of by instilling these into children, that is what is going to make them better individuals when they get older.

Going back again, as I said before, we cannot expect these children to have respect for others when they do not respect themselves. We see what is happening in our schools today. We see the violence that is coming out of our schools today and what is happening in schools, a 6-year-old child being shot to death by another 6-year-old child. It is incredible, incredible, but it is existing. It is happening.

Mr. Speaker, we have to do something about it. I am a strong proponent of gun control. I think we need to do something about that, but I think we have to do more than simply gun control. Instilling values, again, into children is really where we have to go.

And I say to the gentleman, you know how much I have been working with you on the issue of school modernization. This is a part of school modernization, school modernization and construction. We have to do more than build new schools and modernize those schools.

We have to build the character of the children that we are educating in those schools. We do have a responsibility. We do have to provide a seat for those children.

In my district, as the gentleman knows, School Districts 24 and 30 in New York City are in the top three most overcrowded school districts in the City in New York, the most overcrowded school district in the country.

We have over a million students in that school district. The average age of a school building in New York City is 55 years of age, and one out of every five is over 75 years of age.

We are teaching children in classrooms and schools that were built at the beginning of the last century. And as the gentleman was pointing out on the poster there, the issue of caring, what message are we sending back to our children when we do not give them the proper tools that they need to learn, to take it a step further, to prepare them for their life, to have a proper job, a pensionable job, to have the ability to invest.

Unless we instill in them the virtues that the gentleman is suggesting we do today, we are in deep, deep trouble. We have to go back to the way we used to do things I think, to new, modernized classrooms and to new schools, but to go back to the basics. I think that is where we have been lost.

I want to thank the gentleman for all of his hard work and leadership on this issue.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Reclaiming my time just one moment please. The gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) was talking about these things of school modernization; that is so critically important. I was in a school this morning that I was talking about and that is in Lee County in my district. It is a relatively new school within the last 2 years.

You can tell all the difference in the world when you go into the new school. It was a new building. They had moved from an old building into a new building. There was a corridor in the middle of the building that was open, one of the parents as a memorial to his mother, I believe it was, had planted flowers and kept them on a regular basis in planters, just a gorgeous area where children could go during the day, a little respite to get away for a child that goes to that school who may come from a home where there are no flowers, from a home where there is no caring for flowers.

Schools need to be safe havens for all children. It is important to teach all of these character traits, but for us as adults, as the gentleman has pointed out, it is very important that we live up to those. Children are a lot smarter than we give them credit.

I was listening to those children this morning when they went through talking about the character traits they had learned from each book they had read. They were seated on the floor in a carpeted classroom that was new and fresh. And it was nice.

Mr. Speaker, I could not help but think as I walked away what a difference it would make in this country if every child, every child in every community had a nice, spacious classroom, well lighted, well supplied with the resources that the teachers needed. And there was just an outstanding teacher there. It is a lot easier to recruit quality people in a quality facility and that goes to the point the gentleman was making. I would yield.

Mr. CROWLEY. It is a great point. I think maybe all too often we forget about those who are entrusted with an incredibly difficult job, but a so important job, and that is teaching our young.

We forget sometimes about the lack of resources that they have. We forget that they are also in those overcrowded classrooms; that they are called upon to perform duties without the proper resources, and in those same Archaean schools, they have their hands full.

Some may say what are we doing now, we are asking them to not only teach them math and science and history and reading, we have to transform them into mothers and fathers as well.

We are not really asking them to, mothers and fathers have a responsibility, but it is enhanced and reinforced by teachers. It is an incredible responsibility they have, but one we ought to cherish more as a society. I do not quite frankly think we do enough.

I have, as the gentleman knows, a 6-month-old son at home. Every day I just take pride and joy in looking at him develop. He is 6 months now. In 6 more months he will be a year. It is not too far from now that he is going to be going to kindergarten and first grade. I am concerned about what environment he is going to be in and other children like him are going to be in.

It has changed my life incredibly, but it has also opened my eyes up in many respects to what we have to do, this Congress, individual States and local governments, but especially this Congress, to make sure that my son and other children like him have all that they can have to make the best of their lives.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman. When we think about it, I went into two schools today and last week I was in two others talking with children, school administrators, looking, listening, seeing what was going on.

Sometimes I am not real sure I am hearing what I hear, but I hear people say, it is not the Federal government's role, it is somebody else's role. We do not need to be doing this or doing that.

The gentleman was talking about his child who is 6 months now. I remember when we had one in elementary PTA and one in middle school PTA and one in high school PTA. It has changed our lives.

The point I want to make in talking about this whole role of education and who has responsibility, all of us do. There is a Federal, State, and local role. There is a parent's role and there is a community role.

I have never, in all the years I have been going into schools, 8 as a State superintendent and years before that as a county commissioner, a State legislator, and now a Congressman, I have never had a child nor an administrator nor a teacher ask me whether the money came from the Federal, State, or local. They just knew they did not have enough.

Even in some of the nicer schools we go into, and it is true in my State and I assume it is across the country, as the gentleman talked about earlier, these people are there because they care. They work hard. They take our most precious possessions, our children, and they work hard at educating them. But they have never asked me who provided the money. They do not really care. They just do not have enough.

I do not know of any PTA that is not selling something today or maybe having a fund-raising project to buy some resources for the school, because they in many cases are short something, copying paper or whatever it may be. The reason they do it is because they care. They care. And I care, as the gentleman cares. I hope more of our colleagues will care on both sides of the aisle, and make sure that we do not get into partisan rhetoric of whether or not character education is in or whether or not we put money into school buildings or whether we put counselor money in or special education funds. We will never have enough resources to meet all the needs. We recognize that.

But as the gentleman pointed out, the commitment of caring and putting the resources we can will send a powerful signal that we will support those people who every day go in, and a lot of folks say at 8 and get off at 3, but it is not so any more. That is not so. Many of them show up at 6 and 7 for bus duty and a lot of other duty. At the end of the day when the children leave, they are still there tutoring or having a lot activities in the evenings, or PTAs.

They are long hours for not the kind of pay that we ought to be giving them for the most precious thing we have in this country, and that is our children.

Mr. CROWLEY. I think the gentleman is absolutely right. I would also add that teaching these subjects in any which way that the curriculum will be developed, and I understand through the gentleman's legislation it would vary from school district to school district, and it could be done with the cooperation of businesses and local entities that would be able to come in and work on it as well, but I think in many respects, in many ways, by addressing these issues in a classroom, we can start to see through to some of the troubled students, and realize a little earlier some of the children who may not be coming around, who may still be outside the pale here, and get them the professional help they may need to bring them back in, as well.

Quite often really for children their first exposure to the general public and to other children outside the family is really in school; social development, where they really begin to do that is in school, and their first exposure. I think teachers more often than parents are in a position to see that these children interact with those who they may not be familiar with.

They are not experts, they are not psychiatrists or psychologists, and maybe sometimes we expect them to be everything. I do not mean to be saying that. But they are really in the front line, and they can see these children and they watch them develop, whether it be the principal or the guidance counselor or their home room teacher.

There are many ways in which they can teach these things. It can be taught in history classes. Certain aspects can be taught in science classes, language arts classes, on and on. There are different ways these can be taught and graded, as well. There has to be that grading. There has to be that responsibility. There has to be reporting back so someone is accountable. I think this is really what is sorely missing in our schools today.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. I thank the gentleman. The gentleman touched on the accountability piece, because that is part of the accountability piece, responsibility.

The point the gentleman made about children in schools and how much they can be impressed by their teachers, that is true. I am sure the gentleman can think of a teacher that made a difference in his life. I certainly can, my fifth grade teacher, who is still living. I visit with her from time to time and call on her, Ms. Barbara. She is a delightful lady.

I think of my own children. The gentleman will do this as he goes through with his child, as he goes to school. The first thing is, the child has a good-looking teacher, the teacher becomes their first girlfriend, in some cases.

Mr. CROWLEY. I had a couple of those myself. I hope my wife is not listening.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. My older son liked one of the teachers. We had her home for dinner because he just idolized her. All of a sudden, that is why this is so important to be taught and integrated in the curriculum, because teachers do have a significant impact. They can change lives, there is no question. They are changing lives every single day in classrooms across this country, because those young minds are like little sponges, they really are. They can be changed and molded for good.

I certainly know teachers made a difference in my life, and in telling me that I could be whatever I wanted to be. I never had the idea of being in the United States Congress, but they at least told me I could go to college. For a lot of children, that is what they need.

I think the gentleman is absolutely correct in what he said. Teachers have a great opportunity. I think we have a great challenge of honoring what they do every day.

Mr. CROWLEY. I think in many respects teachers are doing these things already, too, in an informal way, inspiring young people, but they are not getting everyone. It is almost impossible to get everyone.

I daresay if this bill became law, we are still never going to get everyone, but I think we would get a lot more than we are getting right now. There would be more accountability on these issues.

□ 2115

I certainly remember teachers that influenced my life in so many, many different ways. But one of the things I see that is missing today in my district is a lack of a sense of involvement by young people in the community. I do not see the volunteerism. I do not see the dedication towards voting, being inspired to want to get out. That is not universal, but I do not see enough of it where we see young people wanting to get out and vote, wanting to learn who their elected officials are, what the process is about.

I am almost amazed sometimes when I go to a school and teach, like many of us do, a little government class. They have some ideas and some concept. They are obviously learning. But they have not put the whole thing together yet. That is because they do not think they are living it. They are learning about it, but they are not living it. They are not really going out to the community and putting what they are learning in schools together.

I think going back to the gentleman's bill again, learning about respect, citizenship, justice and fairness, caring, those are words that say to me, one cannot just do it in school, one has to do it elsewhere, in the home, and, as the gentleman says, in the broader community. I think what we are making is better citizens.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, what the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) is really talking about is civic responsibility. It has to start at a young age, and we reinforce it every step along the way with teachers in the classroom, with parents, in the community, where students come in contact with one another. I have seen that over the last several weeks in visiting schools.

I would even encourage my colleagues here to go in and talk with students as much as they can. I think they appreciate it. I think the schools appreciate it. The teachers do. Because it makes all the difference in the world.

I remember growing up, I never remember seeing an elected official in my school that I remember. I really do not. A Member of the United States Congress I know I did not see. But I think it makes a difference.

I agree with the gentleman from New York, teachers are doing it in a number of ways. But I think if we can formalize it in a way, and with this, it would allow the Secretary of Education to provide grants to those communities on a one-time basis to pool these groups together, because one does need some resources to facilitate the community coming together, to at least define these issues or other issues that they think are as important to that community.

Ultimately, we start to see the point the gentleman from New York made earlier, the involvement of the community in that public school, because it is about the public, bringing them to that school, getting their involvement. Because children can feel when their parents are concerned about the school. They will ask the questions. Then we start seeing it turns into academics.

I know in our State, North Carolina, we have seen, over the last 7 or 8 years, academic scores go up in every category, one of two States in the Nation where it is happening, and our discipline problems have gone down.

Now, I think it is part of that is, number one, we have good people in the classroom. That is the beginning point. But, secondly, we do have a lot of character education in a lot of our schools. Thirdly, we have started to put more resources, we need to do more of that.

A lot of things that we need to do, I do not know that there is any one thing, but there is one thing about it, if we start with the good core principles of developing strong character, we can build a lot of things around that foundation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY).

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, the one thing I think I would like to say is that it is heartening to know, I guess to a degree, that a Yankee from New York and a southern gentleman from North Carolina share similar concerns and have similar problems as well in terms of overcrowding and old school buildings, but also on these issues that the gentleman from North Carolina is talking about.

This is universal. This is not a New York issue. This is not a California issue. It is not a North Carolina issue. It is not a Democratic from the party sense, it is not a Democrat or Republican issue, it is really an American issue. It is an issue we all have to grapple with and we should all be working on, not trying to, as the gentleman said before, to create one-up-one-upmanship. This is something we should all be working on together.

If one asks the average Member here, I think everyone would be in agreement, I think they agree 100 percent, these are the things that we believe are lacking right now. I do not see politics coming into play here. It is common sense to me. This is all pure common sense.

It is my hope doing these special orders and talking about the legislation of the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) and other bills as well, like the Rangel-Etheridge School Construction and Modernization bill, again, to me, it is not about politics.

Children do not know Democrat or Republican, they are just learning about it. In the first grade, they have an idea who George Washington and Abraham Lincoln were, but they do not know what party they belong to. Really, this is about children. Black, white, it makes no difference, they are all the same. They all deserve to have equal treatment. A part of that equal treatment is being exposed to these very issues the gentleman is talking about.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I could not help but thinking as the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) was going through it, we talk about children. If one goes in certainly the early classrooms, early years, kindergarten, prekindergarten, first, second grade, their eyes are so bright, they have such visions and opportunity, and they are so trusting. If we can capture that, we can help them there, we can make a difference.

One of the leading newspapers in our States said a number of years ago, and they are absolutely correct, and I have used it a number of times since then, they said that children do not know what they need, they only know what they get. It is our responsibility as adults, as policy makers at every level to make sure they get what they need to be good citizens, to be well educated,

and make sure the 21st Century is productive for them so that those of us who are now adults are a lot better off.

It is like one of my friends said when we had a study commission, and I appointed one to get some things done, he was a corporate head of a large corporation. He came to North Carolina from New York, an outstanding citizen, never finished high school. Never went to college. He made a substantial sum of money. He said, I am a lucky fellow. He said, I may never see anyone else like me. He said, but I am going to make sure every child that comes through these public schools has the best opportunity they can have, because I do not care what they look like or where they come from, I want them to get a good education and make a lot of money because I want to draw my Social Security when I retire. So I have always remembered that.

But getting back to this issue of character and really formalizing that in our public schools, I agree with the gentleman from New York. I do think that it is important that every child be exposed to these types of principles, hopefully in every classroom, that is agreed to by the school community and the broader community. I know it will have an impact. It has in North Carolina on discipline, on academics. When children feel good about themselves, they have their own self-respect, their own inner strength, they do so much better. They do so much better.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I could not agree more. I hate to keep harkening back to my own problems back in New York. It is sometimes difficult for me to imagine, though, how children who are being taught in hallways, are being taught in closets, or school rooms that were once bathrooms, those are really some of the problems that our teachers are faced with and our administrators in New York City.

I guess if I lived in other parts of the country, I would have a hard time believing as well that that is how we can treat our children. I think I said it to the gentleman from North Carolina once I heard that Reverend Jackson had taken a number of children from inner-city schools in Chicago and brought them out to the suburbs and showed them what it was like in those suburban schools. What I thought was more important, he took those children from the suburbs and brought them back to the city to show those children what the city schools are like and what they were not afforded in those schools.

I think the same can be done in my district. We are lacking so much in terms of proper environments to, as the gentleman said before, caring, instilling that in children.

Getting back into buildings, we really have to address that issue. I do not want to wait to address that issue before we start addressing this issue as well. But sometimes it can be difficult to imagine how can we do this, how can we teach all these issues, respect and caring and honesty and justice and fairness and citizenship, when children are being taught in makeshift classrooms and hallways. There is no gym anymore because it has been put into cubicles so children can have a seat in a classroom.

What we are facing in my district is that, by the year 2007, if we do not do more, we are going to be between 20,000 and 60,000 seats shy in Queens County alone. Queens County is going to be between 20,000 and 60,000 seats shy. It is a major, major crisis. So it is sometimes hard for me to imagine how we can do it.

We have great teachers in New York City. We really do, fantastic and dedicated people. But it is hard to imagine how can they do it. They have to.

We need to do this, and we cannot wait for the other to get done first. We have got to address both. But it is an awesome task and awesome responsibility. But I do hope, despite our problems in New York, that this bill does become more.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I think it comes back to the issue that the gentleman from New York raised earlier. We have to do it whether it is done at the Federal, State, local, however, jointly get the job done.

In my district, well in North Carolina as a State, over the next 10 years, we are projected to be the fifth fastest growing State in the Nation in school population. We cannot build schools fast enough. Yet, I went by a school, visited a school earlier this morning where my children used to go. It is a fairly new school by school standards. They had trailers all over the place. All the inside interior of the building, like the gentleman from New York was saying, the lounge was now a classroom. It was never built for a classroom. It was a small area where one was tutoring students. That is not acceptable. That is not acceptable. They are doing it, but it is not acceptable.

One can talk about these principles, and one can teach them, and teachers can reinforce them. But children also understand that somewhere along the line somebody is not being quite honest with them when they say they do not have the resources when they see other nice new buildings going up or they think they are not really caring whether other things are happening when they could provide those resources. Children do not know what they need. They only know what they get.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, just going back to the list of the gentleman from North Carolina again, it is a lack of responsibility, a lack of caring, a lack of being honest, a lack of justice and fairness, a lack of respect.

A word that is not up there but I think is encompassed in all of that I think is dignity. There is no dignity here if we are not teaching these points we are talking about here. But more importantly, if we are not demonstrating it on a daily basis in school construction and modernization, giving them the tools and making sure the teachers are prepared are really all a part of that. But right now, if we do not provide these, we are guilty of not showing the true dignity of the student and the individual and the human being.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) for sharing with me his time this afternoon and sharing with my colleagues and the people the critical needs of, not only character education, but this whole issue of education that he cares so much about and has worked so hard on here, and I thank him for it.

As we work together with our colleagues to make sure that, not only is character education integrated and a part of our curriculum in the future, but all of these issues of education continue to be at the top of our agenda. Because if we are going to have the kind of future we want to have in the 21st century, and America continues to be strong and a Nation that leads the world, we will do it through one thing. We will do it through education and providing those opportunities to our children and all the children of this country, no matter where they may live, no matter what their economic background might happen to be.

□ 2130

HMO LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ISAKSON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to clarify points about HMO legislation before Congress for my colleagues, particularly members of the conference committee, and to specifically address two memoranda that have been recently released by the Heritage Foundation and one by the Blue Cross/Blue Shield Association.

Mr. Speaker, I refer to the Heritage Foundation Backgrounder N1350, The Patients' Bill of Rights, Prescription for Massive Federal Health Regulation, by John Hoff; to Heritage Foundation Executive Memorandum 658, Why the Texas HMO Liability Law is Not a Proven Model for Congress; and to a letter by Mary Nell Leonard, Senior Vice President of Blue Cross/Blue Shield, with accompanying memo, A Regulatory Quagmire, Questions and Answers about the Bipartisan Consensus Managed Care Improvement Act of 1999.

Mr. Speaker, these memos are primarily a rehash of previous arguments that have been made frequently on the floor. We had several days of full debate on the Bipartisan Consensus Managed Care Improvement Act, and we debated all of these issues. However, these repackaged arguments deserve comment, I think, precisely because they are so specious.

Let me start with the Backgrounder. It makes three main charges: that the House bill would encourage costly litigation, expose employers to risk of litigation over benefits, and would impose powerful new Federal regulations on private health plans.

The organization of this paper is clever in that there is a mixture of accuracy and distortions in discussing the House bill. But it primarily tries to scare conservative legislatures with the bogeyman of massive Federal regulation. The summary of this paper bemoans the establishment of an intrusive new Federal bureaucracy with new rules on utilization review, internal and external review, grievance processes, drug formularies, clinical trials, patient information, and doctors' incentive arrangements, among others.

This paper makes it seem as if these rules are proposed just for the fun of it, as if these new regulations would be there just for their own sake. Well, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD), the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. GRAHAM), the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARR), myself, and many other conservatives do not propose regulations just for the hell of it. The paper leaves unmentioned the reasons for these rules for HMOs, reasons why 80 percent of the American public wants Congress to fix this problem and fix it now.

Let me give my colleagues some real-life examples of why new rules are necessary for HMOs. This little boy lost his hands and his feet because an HMO decided he could travel 60 miles to an emergency room instead of going to the nearest emergency room. This woman lost her life because an HMO gagged her doctors. This woman's HMO would not pay her hospital bills because, when she fell off a cliff and went to the emergency room, she had not phoned for prior authorization.

Mr. Speaker, if regulation is bad simply because it is regulation, then we can just pack up the Federal and State governments, and we can all go home. Of course, we would soon have monopolies controlling everything; water we could not drink and buildings that fall down in earthquakes.

Mr. Speaker, a year ago we talked an awful lot on this floor about the rule of law. Well, without patient protection legislation, we will sure continue to have lawless HMOs. If there are no Federal standards in health care, then who does ensure quality and solvency? Who fights against fraud in the insurance industry?

Well, the State should do it, some say. Okay. Then let us repeal ERISA, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act, which preempts State oversight of employer health plans. Let us turn it back to the States. Oh no, would say the group health plans. We do not want State oversight. But then again, we do not want Federal oversight either. To be quite frank, the HMOs say, we do not want any oversight. So just leave ERISA alone, we will police ourselves, thank you.

Well, Mr. Speaker, maybe we ought to ask that little boy who lost his hands and feet, or the family that lost its mother how well self-imposed standards in the HMO industry work.

I could give a reasoned rebuttal to every page of this Backgrounder, but we do not have time tonight to go over this sentence by sentence. So let me just give my colleagues a few examples.

On page 4 this paper says the House's bill's external appeals board is ''biased'' because, and this is from the Backgrounder, ''neither the entity nor its members can have what is considered to be a conflict of interest or have familial, financial, or professional relationships with the insurer, the health plan, the plan sponsor, the doctor who provided the treatment involved, the institution at which the care is provided, or with the manufacturer or medical supplier involved in the coverage decision.'' That is in the Backgrounder.

This Backgrounder says the board is ''biased'' because it does not have a specific statutory language prohibition against one of those peer reviewers having a familial relationship with the patient but does prohibit a relationship with the HMO. Well, Mr. Speaker, that is just plain wrong. The bill that passed on this floor with 275 votes specifically says, ''A clinical peer or other entity meets the independence requirement of this paragraph if the peer or entity does not have a familial, financial, or professional relationship with any related party.'' Mr. Speaker, what could be clearer than that?

Or how about the discussion on the ''medical necessity quandary'' on page 5 of this Backgrounder? Now, I have spoken many times on this floor about the Employee Retirement Income Security Act and medical necessity. Indeed, the Heritage Backgrounder tries to use some of my own arguments.

Under current Federal law, HMOs can define as medically necessary or unnecessary anything they want. One HMO, for example, has defined medically necessary as ''the cheapest, least expensive care.'' That HMO could deny surgical correction of this boy's cleft palate because it would be cheaper to just provide a plastic upper denture. Of course, his speech would not be very good, but it sure does meet that plan's definition of medical necessity. After all, that would be cheap.

The bipartisan House bill corrects that travesty by giving the external appeals board the final say in determining medical necessity, as long as the treatment is not explicitly excluded from coverage in the contract. The review panel can consider many things in its decision, even the plan's own guidelines, but is not ''bound'' by those planned guidelines.

So the author in this Backgrounder rightly states that outcomes data can provide valuable guidance but cannot match the characteristics of individual patients, thus echoing arguments that I have made on this floor many times. Amazingly, he then, the author of this paper, then criticizes the House bill's external appeals provision exactly because it recognizes that reality and states that the appeals board can consider outcome studies but is not bound by them.

But in the very next paragraph in this paper, we get to what the HMOs really do not like about that provision in the Bipartisan Consensus Managed Care Improvement Act that passed this House, and that is that doctors, not HMO bureaucrats, would be making those medical decisions. As this paper states it, ''The legislation would punt these crucial questions to the subjective consideration of external reviewers.'' Mr. Speaker, note the pejorative words punt and subjective. Where in this paper is the criticism of the ''subjective consideration'' of HMOs looking at their bottom line?

The author goes on to say, ''The bill will turn the determination of what is covered over to government-controlled external reviewers who are directed to make their decision regardless of what the private health plan and its enrollees agree upon.'' Once again negative adjectives, like government-controlled, show the writer's prejudice. For heaven's sake, we have already established that the House bill reviewers are independent, not government-controlled. What the HMOs really do not like is that the peer reviewers in the bill that passed this House are not HMO controlled.

Furthermore, as I already stated, the external panel cannot overrule specifically excluded benefits. But that is rarely where the dispute is. It usually involves denial of care for treatment that fit well within standards of care.

To show my colleagues how abusive the HMO industry can be on this issue of medical necessity, listen to testimony that a former HMO medical reviewer gave before my congressional committee in which she admitted that she had made medical decisions for HMOs that had killed people. She said, ''I wish to begin by making a public confession.'' Mr. Speaker, this is a former HMO medical reviewer. She said, ''In the spring of 1987, as a medical reviewer, I caused the death of a man. Since that day, I have lived with this act and many others eating into my heart and soul. The primary ethical norm is to do no harm. I did worse; I did death. Instead of using a clumsy bloody weapon, I used the simplest of tools, my words. This man died because I denied him a necessary operation to save his heart. I felt little pain or remorse at the time. The man's faceless distance soothed my conscience. Like a skilled soldier, I was trained for this moment. When moral qualms arose, I was to remember 'I am not denying care, I am only denying payment.'''

This former HMO medical reviewer then listed the many ways that managed health care plans deny care to patients, but she emphasized one particular point: the right of HMOs to decide what care is medically necessary. She said, ''There is one last activity that I think deserves a special place on this list, and this is what I call the smart bomb of cost containment, and that is medical necessity denials.

□ 2145

''Even when medical criteria is used, it is rarely developed in any kind of standard traditional clinical process, it is rarely standardized across the field, the criteria is rarely available for prior review by the physicians or members of the plan.''

Well, Mr. Speaker, I have a complete discussion of this critical issue in this Dear Colleague. I will be sending this Dear Colleague to every Member of the House and the Senate. I especially hope that the conferees, at least, will take the time to read this because this is one of the two or three most important issues before the conference.

The next several pages of this Heritage paper describes some of the House bill's provisions, again, without providing a context of the problems with HMOs that make these provisions important. The author even criticizes the prohibition on gag rules that some HMOs have tried to impose on doctors.

For heaven's sake, Mr. Speaker, over 300 Members of the House signed on to a bill that would ban HMOs from trying to keep doctors from telling patients the whole story about their treatment options.

Apparently, the Heritage Foundation also does not like the fact that Congress has already prohibited Medicare HMOs from paying doctors to limit care. This is on page 9 of this Backgrounder.

The Norwood-Dingell-Ganske HMO reform bill uses the same language that the vast majority of Members of this House and the Senate voted on for Medicare to prohibit HMOs from paying doctors to limit care.

I am a physician, and I want to tell my colleagues that there should not be a conflict of interest in doctors providing needed care to their patients. Yet some HMOs pay a doctor more if he or she withholds referrals or treatment.

Congress has already overwhelmingly said that this practice is ethically wrong. So, as an aside, and I hope somebody from the Supreme Court, some clerk, is listening to this special order, I think the Supreme Court should consider that Congress has already legislated on this behavior of HMOs as it considers the Hurdrick case that is currently on its docket.

Well, this paper even calls the bipartisan bill an attack on fee-for-service coverage. Wrong again. In fact, the House bill recognizes the difference between HMOs and fee-for-service plans and exempts those fee-for-service plans from requirements that are pertinent to HMOs.

The House bill would, however, require PPOs and point-of-service plans to follow fair utilization reviews, a fair internal and external appeals process, and require that enrollees be given adequate information about the plan. ERISA plans do not currently have to do that. And 275 bipartisan supporters of the House bill do think that every plan covering everyone in this country, regardless of the type, should follow those minimum requirements.

Now, the Blue Cross paper, ''a regulatory quagmire,'' tries to make some similar points on regulation. So my comment will apply to both. I would note that Blue Cross owns HMOs, so caveat emptor.

Well, how would the House bill work? As in the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act, the provisions of the House bill form a Federal policy floor. States are encouraged to bring their laws into compliance. If a State fails to enforce the law, then the Federal Government would. Same way under the Health Insurance Portability Act. And under the Health Insurance Portability Act, all States except four have already complied.

Now, on the patient protection issue, most States have already enacted some of the provisions of the House HMO reform bill into State law. For example, 50 States have enacted internal review, 50 States have enacted access to information, 46 States gag prohibition, 41 States emergency care provisions, 32 States external review, 34 States direct access to OB-GYNs, 24 States continutity-of-care provisions.

Mr. Speaker, it will not be hard for those States to comply. But the important point to note is that no matter how good a State's patient protections law are, these State laws generally do not apply to ERISA plans. And that is exactly why we need Federal legislation to protect the people who receive their insurance from their employer.

Now, the HMO industry complains that the Norwood-Dingell-Ganske bill would result in dual regulation and be confusing to consumers. But we have dual regulation today. We already have complex dual regulation that differs from jurisdiction to jurisdiction.

The Bipartisan Consensus Managed Care Improvement Act will actually simplify things for consumers. What is clear today is that the consumer in an ERISA health plan, an employer health plan, has basically nowhere to go to turn for help. But if our bipartisan House bill would become law, the vast majority of consumers would be able to go to their State insurance commissioners for questions about their rights because all States would have a minimum standard.

Furthermore, I would point out that it can be hardly valid to criticize the House bill for Federal-State conflicts. We have had a Federal-State system of regulation of commerce for 200-plus years.

Yes, if the Norwood-Dingell-Ganske bill becomes law, there will be questions of Federal-State jurisdiction to work out, as there is in any bill. And I would say, what is new?

Now, as an example of delay of implementation, the Blue Cross memo, the one that says ''quagmire of regulation,'' points out that the Health Insurance Portability Act still has not been fully implemented on the privacy regulations. Well, I should point out that Congress had something to do with that, since Congress did not meet its own deadline on legislation for privacy. But I sure do not see any groundswell calling for repeal of the Health Insurance Portability Act. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I have had many constituents thank me for their health insurance portability.

In any congressional bill, there has to be the right balance between prescription and flexibility. The House bill provides a reasonable balance. But on page 6, again of this Heritage Backgrounder, the legislative language of our bill, the House bill, is criticized for being too loose. But then, Mr. Speaker, on page 11, the same bill is criticized for being too rigid. There is just no pleasing those opponents of HMO reform.

Let us discuss the liability issue a bit. The HMO community is clearly getting nervous that Governor Bush says he supports the Texas Health Care Liability Act of 1997. So Heritage came out with a memo entitled ''Why the Texas HMO Liability Law is not a Proven Model for Congress.''

However, if you actually read the memo, you will be struck with how similar the House bill is to the Texas law, which Governor Bush says is working just fine, thank you. No avalanche of lawsuits. No extraordinary increase in premiums. No Diaspora of HMOs from Texas.

Now, the Heritage memo notes that, on September 1, 1997, the Texas legislature passed the Texas Health Care Liability Act, according to Heritage, by a ''sizable majority.'' Sizable majority indeed. The bill passed the Texas Senate unanimously. It passed the Texas House 120–21. It was veto proof.

Well, what did the Texas bill do? According to this Heritage paper, it ''created a new cause of action against three entities in the event of a failure to exercise ordinary care. These entities are: a health insurance carrier, a health maintenance organization, or other managed care entity.''

Mr. Speaker, in plain language, the Texas liability bill allowed patients to sue HMOs for negligence, just plain language.

So what has happened in Texas since the bill was passed? Well, in September 1998, Federal judge Vanessa Gilmore refused to void the Texas right to sue. On October 18, 1999, the first case was filed ''Plocica v. NYLCare.''

The HMO wanted the case moved to Federal court, but the Federal court remanded it back to State court. But it

is interesting to know a little bit about this case because it makes the case for having a strong enforcement provision in a bill that Congress would pass.

Mr. Plocica was suicidal in a hospital in Texas. His treating doctor thought he should stay in the hospital, needed more psychiatric care. His HMO, NYLCare, said, no, we are sending you home. Under State law, NYLCare should have taken their treatment denial to what Governor Bush calls the ''IRO Panel,'' the Independent Review Organization Panel. But NYLCare ignored State law, so Mr. Plocica went home. That night he drank half a gallon of antifreeze, and he died a horrible death. His family has sued NYLCare for breaking Texas law.

It should be noted that, under current Federal ERISA law, NYLCare would be liable for only the cost of care denied, in this case I guess the cost of a day or two in the hospital. That is hardly justice to a family that has just lost its father and hardly a disincentive to an HMO from not following the law.

There have been only a few cases filed under Texas law. Heritage says it is too early for this to be accurate. I would point out that Texas has a 2-year statute of limitations on these cases.

What you see is what you have got. If the cases are not filed by now, they never will be. The Texas law exempts employers from liabilities stating ''this chapter does not create any liability on the part of an employer or employer group, purchasing organization, or a pharmacy licensed by the State Board of Pharmacy that purchases coverage or assumes risk on behalf of its employees.''

Mr. Speaker, the Norwood-Dingell-Ganske bill is written differently, for the following reason: Unlike State-regulated plans, ERISA, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act, provides liability preemption for self-insured plans, some of which are self-administered or actually are HMOs owned by the company.

Now, I am referring here to section 302(a) of the Bipartisan Consensus Managed Care Reform Improvement Act of 1999. This section creates a limited exception to ERISA's general ''preemption'' of State laws that relate to employee benefit plans. This exception only applies to State law causes of action against any person based on personal injury or wrongful death resulting from providing or arranging for insurance, administrative services or medical services by such person to or for a group health plan.

So that is kind of complicated language. Let me see if I can explain this a little simpler. This language does not, let me repeat, ''does not'' disturb ERISA preemption of State law actions against a plan sponsor except, ''except'' for the exercise of discretion by an employer on an employee's treatment that has resulted in a personal injury to that patient.

□ 2200

Other decisions by plan sponsors, including setting up a uniform benefit plan, is not, let me repeat, is not affected by section 302(a) of the Norwood-Dingell-Ganske bill. Opponents to our legislation claim that the bipartisan bill would subject employers to a flood of lawsuits in State courts over all benefit decisions and suggest that employers would be forced to abandon health insurance benefits.

Mr. Speaker, according to a memorandum done by one of the leading ERISA labor law firms in Washington, Gardner, Carton and Douglas, this memorandum, which I will be happy to share with any of my colleagues, this is simply not correct. I will be happy to provide this brief to anyone who desires a copy.

The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD) and I and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) have always wanted to protect innocent employers from liability. The vast majority of businesses, certainly small businesses, simply contract with an HMO to provide health coverage for their employees. They do not get involved with the HMO's decisions.

So we wrote protections for businesses into our bill, the bill that passed this House. Those provisions are discussed in this brief, which makes four main points in a well-documented and scholarly review.

First, lawsuits would not be against employers. Under current ERISA law, suits seeking State law remedies for injury or death of group health plan participants are already allowed in some jurisdictions. Those cases show us that suits are normally brought against the HMO, not against the employers. Why? Because employers are generally not involved in treatment decisions, the type of decisions that lead to an employee's injury or death. Ordinary benefits decisions, such as setting up a benefit plan, are not affected by our bill.

Second, employer exposure would be limited. If an employer exercises discretion in making a benefit claim decision under its group health plan and that decision results in injury or death, then the section in our bill makes an exception to the ERISA preemption and would allow an employee to sue in State court, but to recover a patient must first prove that the sponsor exercised discretion which resulted in the injury or death and then must prove all elements of a State law cause of action based on the employer's conduct in making the decision on that particular claim. The injured patient must have a viable State law cause of action because section 302(a) in our bill only creates an exception to the preemption and does not create a new cause of action.

Three, the statute's plain meaning limits employer liability. According to a thorough review of the law in this brief, the brief by Gardner, Carton and Douglas from September 27, 1999, the liability provisions in this House bill that protect employers would be interpreted under the Supreme Court's well established, quote, plain meaning, unquote, analysis. Such an analysis supports the bill's clear intention to continue to prevent any liability suits against employers that do not exercise discretion that results in injury or death. Specific language in our bill states that other types of discretionary employer language would not be affected and would not be subject to State tort law claims.

The Heritage interpretations in this backgrounder simply ignore the quote, plain meaning, unquote, language of the Supreme Court.

Number 4, employer health plans would not be destroyed. The limited legal exposure of employers in the House bill will not cause them to abandon health insurance for their employees. The experience of nonERISA group health plans supports this. A recent study by Kaiser Family Foundation compared ERISA health plans to nonERISA employer health plans, such as CalPERS or the State of Colorado. That study showed that the incidents of lawsuits and costs against nonERISA health plans, where an employee can sue the health plan, is very low, in the range of 0.3 to 1.4 cases per 100,000 enrollees per year at a cost of 3 to 13 cents per month per employee.

Mr. Speaker, am I going to be told that an employer is going to drop his health care coverage for an employee for the difference in cost of 3 to 13 cents per month per employee? I think that a lot of employers would soon have no employees if that were the case.

Furthermore, employees would not need to abandon control, control, over a group health plan to remain protected under our bill, the bill that passed the House. Having HMOs or other third parties make claims decisions as in the case for the vast majority of small businesses, but then monitoring the third party would preserve your employer control. If they are not doing a good job, you do not sign them up next year.

An alternative for some self-insured third party administrators would be to insure their exposure. If third party administrators truly are not making medical decisions like they all claim, then their risk will be small and their premiums will be very low.

Mr. Speaker, in addition, the House bipartisan bill delineates in section 514(e)(2)(B) several employer activities which specifically will not constitute an exercise of discretionary authority, such as decisions to include or exclude any specific benefit from the plan; decisions to provide extra contractual benefits outside the plan; decisions not to consider the provision of a benefit while an internal or external review of a claim is being conducted.

Contrary to our opponents' claims, these carve-outs further insulate employers from State law actions, but I

think a bit of legislative history is interesting here.

Mr. Speaker, first business groups complained that without these provisions they would not be able to advocate for an employee not being treated fairly by their HMO. So the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD) and I put those exceptions into the bill. Then those same business groups complained that the exceptions were in the bill. You just cannot please some people.

Now let us talk about the punitive damages protections in the House bill. This is another case in point of how you just cannot please some people. This provision was suggested to me, as a matter of fairness, by members of the industry. They said if we are going to be bound by the external review board's decision and if we follow the board's decision, then we should not be liable for punitive damages, quote/unquote.

Know what? I agreed, and this provision in my original bill was incorporated into the Norwood-Dingell-Ganske bill. Maybe Heritage does not think that this provision is significant, but that is not what I have heard from the industry. Remember, this punitive damages relief would apply to all health plans under our bill, not just to group health plans.

While the Heritage paper closes by saying that the bipartisan House bill would result in, quote, a staggering amount of red tape for American doctors and patients, unquote, well, Mr. Speaker over 300 patient and professional organizations have endorsed the bipartisan House bill. Spare them your crocodile tears, please.

The Heritage paper also quotes Professor Alain Enthoven, a health policy analyst, from his paper, ''Managed Care: What Went Wrong? Can It Be Fixed?''

Mr. Speaker, the Bipartisan Consensus Managed Care Improvement Act will go a long way to fixing the problem that Dr. Paul Ellwood, the father of managed care, expounded on at a Harvard conference last year. In speaking of the takeover of health care by managed care, Dr. Ellwood said, quote, ''Market forces will never work to improve health care quality, nor will voluntary efforts by doctors and health plans. It does not make any difference how powerful you are or how much you know, patients can get atrocious care and can do very little about it.''

Remember, this is the originator of the concept of managed care. He goes on to say, ''I have increasingly felt that we have to shift the power to the patients. I am mad,'' he said, ''in part because I have learned that terrible care can happen to anyone.''

Mr. Speaker, the Norwood-Dingell-Ganske bipartisan House bill which passed this House with 275 bipartisan votes would shift that power to the patient. I sincerely hope that the conference committee gets the message.

CYBER TERRORISM, A REAL THREAT TO SOCIETY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS) is recognized for half the remaining time until midnight, approximately 50 minutes, as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I want to begin by expressing my appreciation to the Chair at this very late hour and to the members of the staff who are so diligently working here with us and for us at this very late hour as well.

We are gathered tonight at a time of unprecedented peace and power for our country. Because of the enormous dedication and sacrifice of Americans who have served in our armed forces throughout history, around the world in the past and at present, our country is stronger and more secure than it has ever been, and that is a blessing for which we are truly thankful.

Certainly that thanks is directed at those who wear the uniform of our country tonight around the world and those who have so nobly worn it in the past. It is truly a gift and a legacy that we enjoy tonight.

Our relative strength in the world does not mean that we live in a purely safe world, a world without risk. We must endeavor not to repeat the mistakes of history, where very often at times when we felt most safe we were most vulnerable.

There are clearly three areas of major threats to our country's security as we gather tonight. The first is the threat of an emerging competing global superpower in the People's Republic of China. The second is the continued virulent presence of regional negative hostile dictatorial forces such as Saddam Hussein in the Persian Gulf, President Milosevic in the former Yugoslavia. Those two threats, the threat of China and the threat of those regional dictators, are very severe threats indeed. I trust that in the coming weeks and months we will consider as a Congress, along with the executive branch and the military, ways to confront those threats.

This evening I want to spend, Mr. Speaker, some time talking about a threat that is not so easily detected, is not so obvious, but a threat that I believe is truly lethal and deadly, a threat that is unlike any threat that we have faced in the history of our republic, and that is the silent but deadly threat of cyber terrorism, the quiet but lethal assault on our country's systems and people, which I believe will be one of the major issues in the new century, the new millennium, in the defense of our country.

Unlike the growth of a large superpower army, unlike the proliferation of arms from a hostile nation state, we cannot readily or easily see the development of the cyber threat. I pray that we may never feel it and tonight I would like to talk about how we can prepare for it.

I would like to begin by talking about what has already happened to make it clear that our subject tonight is not an imaginary one. It is all too real. Listen to George Tenet, the director of the Central Intelligence Agency, speaking a few months ago. He said, and I am quoting, ''An adversary capable of implanting the right virus or accessing the right terminal can cause massive damage to the United States of America,'' the right virus or the right terminal.

□ 2215

In 1998, two youngsters in California, directed by a hacker in the Middle East who was later described as the Analyzer, launched attacks which disrupted our troop movements in the Persian Gulf. These two young hackers, based in California and directed by the Analyzer in the Middle East, disrupted troop deployments to the Persian Gulf in February of 1998 from California, launched attacks against the Pentagon systems, the National Security Agency and a nuclear weapons research lab.

The deployment disruptions, that is, the disruptions in the deployment of our troops around the world and the Persian Gulf, from a computer terminal in California, were described by Deputy Secretary of Defense John Hamre, a real leader in this field, as ''the most organized and systematic attack'' on U.S. defense systems ever detected. In fact, they were so expertly conducted that President Clinton was warned in the early phases that Iraq was most probably the electronic attacker.

Two teenagers steered and directed by a master hacker halfway around the world, launching what our number one defender has called the most organized and systematic attack on sophisticated defense computer systems, so sophisticated that in the early hours of the attack the President of the United States was told by his most wise and knowledgeable advisers that Iraq was the electronic attacker. It was not Iraq, it was two U.S. citizens directed by a hacker in the Middle East.

On March 10, 1997, another teenager, this one based in Massachusetts, invaded a computer system run by the Bell Atlantic company in Massachusetts, knocked out telephone communications, among them telecommunications, telephone service, for the Worcester, Massachusetts air traffic control system at that airport in western Massachusetts. The tower was knocked out for 6 hours.

Let me read from a report from the Boston Globe of March 19, 1998. ''The computer breach knocked out phone and radio transmission to the control tower at the Worcester airport for 6 hours, forcing controllers to rely on one cellular phone and battery powered radios to direct planes.''

One teenager hacking into a computer system of a major regional telephone company, knocking out for 6

hours the telecommunications capacity of an entire area, and including an airport. And as people flew through the skies above Worcester, Massachusetts, the air traffic controllers relied on one cell phone and battery powered radios to direct the planes.

Joseph Hogan, who manages the control tower at Worcester and 26 other airports for the Federal Aviation Administration, said this: ''We relied on our back-up systems, and, thank goodness, they worked. Had we been busier, the potential for a serious incident with dire consequences was there.'' Six hours.

In 1997, our intelligence community conducted what was called Operation Eligible Receiver, a war game played in cyberspace, an intelligent and far-reaching attempt by the U.S. military and intelligence community to game out what would happen if a hostile foreign power tried to attack our systems around the country.

A so-called red team put together by the intelligence community pretended to be North Korea. Thirty-five men and women specialists, 35 people using hacking tools freely available on 1,900 web sites, Mr. Speaker, any of our listeners tonight could access on their home computer right now. These 35 men and women accessing those 1,900 web sites in the public domain managed to shut down large segments of America's power grid and silence the command and control system of the Pacific Command in Honolulu.

The Defense Information Systems Agency, DISA, launched some 38,000 attacks against its own systems to test their vulnerabilities. Only 4 percent of the people in charge of those targeted systems realized they were under attack, and, of those, only 1 in 150 reported the intrusion to the superior authority.

We had a war game, and the good guys lost. The smartest and most capable people that we have were rather easily outwitted by this war game.

A Pentagon report goes on to say that probing attacks against the Pentagon, there are tens of thousands of them a year, are routed and looped through half a dozen other countries to camouflage where the attack originated. Information warfare specialists at the Pentagon estimate that a properly prepared and well-coordinated attack by fewer than 30, 30 computer virtuosos, strategically located around the world, with a budget of less than $10 million, could bring the United States to its knees. Such a strategic attack mounted by a cyber-terrorist group, either sub-state or non-state actors, that is to say either terrorist groups that are not part of any state or terrorist groups that are sponsored by a rogue state, would shut down everything from electric power grids to air traffic control centers. A combination of cyber-weapons, poison gas and even nuclear devices could produce a global Waterloo for the United States.

In 1999, the Pentagon tracked 22,144 intrusions on its own sensitive computer systems. 22,144 times in the last calendar year people figured out how to hack their way in to our most vulnerable systems. That is according to Major General John H. Campbell of the United States Air Force.

Deputy Secretary Hamre reports that his sources show that there are at least 20 countries who presently have information warfare strategies and operations active against the United States. This is an overwhelming and compelling body of evidence that says that this is not a question of whether we will be prepared for something that will happen to us in the future; this is a question of how well we are prepared for something that is happening to us right now, tonight, around the world.

Now, there is good news to report. As a member of the Committee on Armed Services, I have had the opportunity to meet and listen to and be briefed by some incredibly committed and talented men and women, both in the civilian service of this country and the Department of Defense and in the uniform of this country in the branches of our armed Services, and also serving in the various intelligence agencies of this government.

Mr. Speaker, we are blessed tonight with a robust, dynamic and bright corps of young men and women who are committed to defending their country. With the tools that we have given them, they are doing a magnificent job. Deputy Secretary of Defense Hamre is the leader of this effort and deserves special praise. His Assistant Secretary, Art Money, deserves special praise, and so do many others who work at their direction who have foreseen this problem, have been so diligent in pursuing it, and are truly inspiring in their level of preparation.

I have no doubt, no doubt whatsoever, that if we do our job, Mr. Speaker, and give these civilians and uniformed personnel and intelligence personnel the tools to do their job, they will excel in doing their job and protect our country.

This issue is not new to this floor. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), my friend and colleague from nearby Pennsylvania, has been working on this issue years before it found its way into the headlines. He is serving as the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Research and Development of our Committee on Armed Services and has been a long time advocate of this cause.

The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE), the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services, a Republican, and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), the Democratic ranking member of the committee, have very wisely appointed a special task force of our committee to focus on cyber-terrorism in this year's defense budget. That special committee is ably chaired by my neighbor and friend, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON). The members of the committee are truly dedicated to this purpose, and I believe that the efforts of Chairman SPENCE and Mr. SKELTON and Chairman WELDON and Chairman SAXTON and those of us working with them on this effort are going to elevate this issue in this Congress, in this defense budget and defense bill, and take some important steps that really need to be taken.

Now, these steps would follow on the heels of the President's directive number 63 which was issued on May 22, 1998. That directive, which is well under way, is a good first step toward addressing the very real problems that I talked about tonight. But I think we have to build on those steps and understand the very unique nature of the problem before us.

Our country is organized, and well organized, for the world of physical space. Our military strategy has always been about protecting and defending key points of territory, the seas, land, so we could protect the sovereignty and rights of our people. We have always recognized a distinction in our civil law between civilian and military, between police action and law enforcement on the one hand and military action on the other.

These are time-honored and wise distinctions that we should never forfeit, but they are distinctions based on the physical world. And when we deal with the world of cyber-terrorism, we need to rethink them. By no means should we abandon cherished principles that recognize that civilian authority rules our country and the military serves civilian authority. By no means should we abandon the principle that recognizes the rights of Americans to enjoy privacy in their homes, the reasonable expectation of privacy in their affairs.

By no means should we forfeit those principles, but by no means should we permit those who would do us harm and terror to hide behind those principles to abuse the purposes of those principles and subject the country to horrible acts of destruction.

This month I will be introducing legislation that creates a strategy to address what I believe are the three great questions posed for our country by the here and instant onslaught of cyber-terrorism.

The first question is how can we make sure that our military is fully prepared? The President has given us great guidance in this in his budget proposals for the new fiscal year. He has set aside $91 million, not for software or fancy computers or bricks and mortar, but he set aside $91 million so we can be sure that the smartest and most motivated Americans serve their country in this field. Scholarships for bright young students, continuing education for those who already serve, institutes and centers and programs for people to come together from the worlds of business and academia and government and the military and think about ways that we can address and solve these problems.

I believe, based upon the classified briefings I have been privileged to receive and the record in the public domain, that the U.S. military, the U.S. intelligence community and the civilian employees of the Department of Defense are ahead of the curve in this area. We are by no means invulnerable in our defense infrastructure, but this is a problem that has been thoroughly analyzed, and I believe we are well on the way to thoroughly protecting the key defense infrastructure of our country in military bases around our country and around the world.

But that leads us to the second question, which I am not so confident has been resolved, and that is what can we do to protect ourselves against the place at which we are most vulnerable, and that is in the civilian infrastructure and civilian systems of our country?

□ 2230

When the California hackers hacked into the Pentagon computers and disrupted our troop deployments in the Persian Gulf, it was shocking. But the Defense Department has acted swiftly and, I believe, powerfully, to prevent future repeats of this problem, future manifestations of this problem.

The same really cannot be said of our civilian sector, of the air traffic control system, of water and power utilities, of our banking and financial system, of our transportation and law enforcement systems. Not because these people are not doing their jobs; they are doing a very good job, Mr. Speaker. But I think the same level of confidence cannot be stated about civilian institutions because they are civilian institutions. Thank God for the fact that the United States of America is not organized as a military society.

In our country, the military does not run the airports, the military does not run our court system or our 911 system or our water and sewer and power systems; and may they never, because we are not that kind of society and the military is not designed for that purpose in America. These systems are run by some combination of public and private institutions that do a wonderful job of fueling and supporting the strongest economy in the world, but they are not organized for the purpose of preventing cyber-terrorism.

The phone companies are organized for the purpose of making our calls go through and our data. The water and sewer and power utilities are organized for the purpose of making the lights go on when we turn the switch and the water go on when we turn the faucet and the heat go on when we turn the thermostat up. The air traffic control system is designed to get us safely from one point to another. The 911 system is designed to dispatch the brave and courageous men and women who ride in our police cars and who drive our ambulances and serve on our fire trucks and other emergency vehicles. Those systems work.

Late in 1999, we saw as a country that we had a major and comprehensive effort to make sure that accidental breakdowns in that system would not paralyze and cripple our country. The phrase ''Y2K'' became forever embedded in our national lexicon, and it was an American success story. At my house, we filled our bathtub up with water on New Year's Eve and made sure we had all the flashlights ready and made sure we had some means of communicating with our loved ones, because we were not sure, were not exactly sure that the water would work or the lights would stay on and the phones would work the next day, or at 12:01. To the everlasting credit of America's institutions, in most cases, in most ways, everything worked, because we were prepared.

But the Y2K story was really just the tip of the iceberg, Mr. Speaker, because the real question is what if somebody intended to do us harm. What if it was not an accident that the computer systems turned over from 99 to 00, but what if someone who could not defeat us by dropping bombs on our power plants or could not defeat us by having an army invade our shores decided to defeat us and create chaos in America by hacking into our systems on purpose and create that kind of havoc? Are we prepared? I think the answer is not nearly well enough, as the incident in Massachusetts in 1997 shows.

So what do we do about it? Well, there are three approaches we could take and two of them are absolutely wrong. One approach would be to say that let us militarize everything, let us be sure we can defend our airports and our power plants and our phone systems and our 911 system; let us put the military in charge of it. There is no one, I trust, in this House and no one, I am certain, in America's military establishment who would want that result, nor would I.

The second approach would be to say, let us just see what happens. Let us let the normal market forces which work so well in organizing our economy handle this problem. I know of very few captains of industry who would be so naive as to agree with that statement. Our phone companies, our power companies, our transportation companies are not organized to defend against terrorists, nor should they be. They are organized to deliver goods and services at a profit or in the proper way to the public.

So there needs to be a third approach that is a partnership between and among the military community, the intelligence community, the private sector, the academic sector, and law enforcement. I think that American ingenuity in the utility companies and the telecommunications companies, in law enforcement could absolutely do this job and make us thoroughly well prepared for the cyber-attacks which are happening to us as we speak, but they need help. My legislation will propose that very high standards be set, the same way they were for Y2K. They will propose an active, cooperative system between and among our military and our law enforcement and our civilian entities, and it will propose reasonable and well-targeted financial assistance for those aspects of industry and the private and civilian sector that reach the goal most expeditiously and most efficiently.

There are precedents for this, Mr. Speaker. Our MIRAD program, our shipbuilding program is a good precedent and it works this way, and my legislation will reflect this principle. We say to certain shipbuilders that if you are building a cargo ship, the Government of the United States will subsidize in part the construction of that ship through loan guarantees and direct contributions. We will help you build your ship. What you need to do for us in exchange is to make that ship available at a time of national emergency, to carry military cargo so we can deploy our troops around the world if and when necessary. It is burden-sharing between the vibrant commercial sector and the military and law enforcement carrying out its mission to defend and protect the country.

That is the approach that I think we should take in our bill, is to share the burden with the dynamic private sector, but encourage and indeed require that sector to bring its level of protection up so that when someone wants to hack into an air traffic control system, when someone wants to mask the computers at the water utility so that when the person reading the water utility computer screen thinks there is no arsenic in the water because that is what the printout says, but there is arsenic in the water because someone has bugged the computer, there is a backup system. Or when someone, and this has happened, hacks into the telephone system and reroutes 911 calls to a pornographic call-in line, as has happened, or a pizza delivery service, as has happened, chaos will not occur; but there will be a backup system in place.

The third thing that my legislation will do is to answer the question of prevention, and prevention is what we most want. We want our military to be able to protect us so that we can prevent cyber-attacks. We want our civilian sector to ramp up its efforts so that we can be protected from cyber-attacks. However, sometimes they are still going to happen, as they did in 1998 when the California hackers, aided by the Middle East hacker, disrupted our troop deployment; as it did in 1997 when the airport air traffic control system in Massachusetts shut down for 6 hours. It is still going to happen.

How do we very quickly find the perpetrators and understand whether this is a law enforcement problem that requires prosecution in our criminal law enforcement system or whether it is an international terror problem that requires a military or diplomatic response.

There are two changes that I believe are foremost of importance that will be

in the legislation that I propose. The first change is a change that says to the Department of Defense, we are going to take the handcuffs off of your hands and when a Defense Department information system or computer is attacked, we are going to let you find out who did it.

I think most Americans would be amazed, Mr. Speaker, to find out that we have a law that works this way: if tonight a hacker hacked into an important Defense Department software system or computer that affected the launch codes for our nuclear weapons, or that affected our defenses against poison or nerve gas, we have a law that says, until the law enforcement people conclude and prove that the hackers are foreign agents, the Department of Defense cannot do anything about it. They have to wait until the law enforcement people conclude that it is not a domestic threat, it is foreign. In other words, we treat these hackers the same way we would someone who is running an illegal NCAA basketball betting pool on-line.

Now, I do not for one minute disregard or impugn the abilities of our law enforcement people. They do a great job. But their job is to deal with organized crime or with those who would do harm within America. It is certainly not to deal with the Libyan special services forces or with people in North Korea who would do us harm.

We need a law which says, when the Department of Defense's computer systems are under attack, they do not have to wait to find out who did it, that they can immediately and expeditiously figure it out and take whatever steps are necessary, consistent with our Constitution and consistent with our law to do something about that.

The second change that I think is imperative is that we change the law so that our government can find out more easily about criminal records of people in very sensitive jobs that affect government infrastructure. Believe it or not, right now, if the following occurred, the Department of Defense and others would have a hard time getting information. Let me sketch this scenario.

If what happened in Massachusetts in 1997 had happened because a vendor who was working for the phone company as a troubleshooter deliberately sabotaged the air traffic control system, and that vendor had someone working there who was a spy for the vendor; and that spy, in fact, had some kind of criminal record at the State or local level that would attach that spy's conduct or relationships with foreign agents, and we had in our CIA database evidence that if we knew that this spy, if we knew about his record that we could figure out who was hooked in internationally, our military people cannot get access to the State and local criminal records of that spy. It is illegal. It is unbelievable.

The fourth amendment does not give someone who wants to do harm to the people of this country license to do so with impunity. There is no Member of this body who is more committed to the principles of the fourth amendment than me. I think it needs to be respected and revered in every way. But this is not a fourth amendment issue; this is a national security issue. We need to change the law in such a way that our military protectors and defenders, if they have intelligence that says that someone is trying to hack into the air traffic control system because they are working for the Libyan government or the North Korean government or the Iraqi government, and there is evidence in State and local criminal records that would help them find that person and stop them, we need to empower them to do that. The legislation that I will be proposing will do just that.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Research and Development, and I have both served in local government; and we understand that one of the things that happens in local government is that for a long time people will say, there really needs to be a traffic light at such-and-such an intersection; it is really dangerous. And they come out to meetings and they tell their mayor and they tell their council and they talk for years about the need for a traffic light. Then, in places where government is not very responsive, which is not true in Delaware County, Pennsylvania, and it is not true in my area either, in places where government is not responsive, they do not put up the traffic light. They wait until there is a fatality, a fatal accident at that intersection, and then they rush and put the traffic light up.

I never want to come to this floor and have 435 Members clamoring to pass legislation that would unlock the potential of our military people, consistent with our Constitution; I never want to have them coming to this floor clamoring to do that because the morning news is full of reports of planes crashing over the sky over a major airport, or thousands of people being poisoned because their drinking water was poisoned and the computer systems that would have told the utility that were hacked into.

□ 2245

I never want to have a national uproar because all the 911 calls for a major city went to a pizzeria or an airline reservation counter instead of to the police and the fire department. I never want to have a situation where there is financial chaos and there is a run on our banks because the checking account records or credit card records of millions of Americans are deliberately sabotauged.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the stuff of a Tom Clancy novel. It is the stuff that Members of this House are hearing about, both in classified and unclassified briefings. We have been warned, and to the Paul Reveres of this effort, like the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON), the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE), and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) who have paid attention to this, Secretary Hamre, people that work with him, we need to give them the tools that they need to continue to do this job.

I notice that my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) is here. I am happy to yield to him, and commend him on his leadership on this for many years.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague and friend for yielding. I came over for this special order, having watched his beginning and agreeing totally with the statement, and I appreciate the gentleman's leadership in making this a personal issue for him, for taking the time to understand a very complicated issue that many Members do not have the time to get into, but which is so vitally important to our country.

As the gentleman knows from hearings that we have held in our Subcommittee on Military Research and Development, we are going through a major revolution in America that the people really do not understand. In fact, we only have had one other revolution of this kind in our country's history. It was when we changed from an agrarian country where we made most of our living on the farms and on the land to an industrial economy, where people went to work in our factories building products and materials. It was a difficult change for America, but we did it because we wanted to lead the world economy in the 1900s, and we did it very successfully.

Now we are going through a similar revolution, changing from an industrial economy to an information economy, where more and more every day in our lives we are affected by the use of computers and information technology.

As a result, some very interesting and difficult challenges face us, because the single biggest technology, probably, to improving our quality of life has been the use of information technology.

I would argue, and I think my colleague would agree with me, that the single biggest vulnerability to continuing our quality of life is the use of information technology. If an adversary wants to take out America, they know in most cases they cannot match us gun for gun, tank for tank, plane for plane. That is an impossible task. But they know full well that our society is largely dependent upon information systems: our military systems, our smart weapons; but even beyond that, our information systems. Our banking, our communications, our air traffic control, electric grid, are all based on information technology.

So if you are an adversary of the U.S. in the 21st century, you are going to try to find a way to neutralize that

technology advantage, to level the playing field. That is exactly what nations are doing today. As my colleague knows, in classified hearings we have held, there are in fact countries today that are working very diligently in finding ways to be able to shut down the communications and information systems of America during times of conflict.

It is a major concern for us also because we are having a difficult time keeping talented young people in the service when they can make three to four times the amount of money they are making as a software engineer for the Pentagon going out to work for a private company. So we have a very difficult challenge keeping up with that technology leap.

In fact, in the past, in the history of the country, military technology has often been ahead of the civilian community: the first airplane, the first jet engine. That is changing now. With the growth of the information revolution, the private sector and information technology companies and some of our would-be adversaries have the technology capability equal to or better than we have in the military. Therefore, we have a tough time keeping up.

So the kinds of ideas that the gentleman is pursuing, the kinds of strategies to focus the attention of the American people, not just our military, on information vulnerability are critically important.

I will give the gentleman a couple of horror stories. I cannot give the details. But to highlight the point he has made, we had a classified hearing several years ago where it was documented to us that one of our military hospitals had all of its health care records, all the blood types of all the patients, changed by a hacker who broke into the IT system without the administration of the hospital knowing all the blood types had been changed.

If the American citizen sitting at home wants to understand the impact on their life, imagine a loved one being in the hospital and all of a sudden, every blood type of every patient has been changed by someone who had access to that information system.

The banking system in America likes to pride itself on being the best at information security, but we all know there was a New York bank just a few years ago that had $10 million illegally transferred out of its accounts by a St. Petersburg, Russia firm that they were not able to stop, and the banking community has had examples like that where hackers have broken in and taken money away.

As the gentleman has pointed out, we need to think differently in the 21st century. If a terrorist group comes into America and wants to discharge a chemical or biological weapon, we need to have broad-based data systems so we can detect whether or not there is a pattern of occurrence of health care problems that might indicate to us that someone has released some type of toxic material. Because a warning may not be accompanied by a bomb, it may simply be a low-key release of an agent that we will not be able to determine unless we have processes in place to be able to do massive data mining.

I want to also applaud my colleague because he has been assisting very aggressively in establishing the first smart region in America. The idea behind this initiative, the HUBs project, is to link up as many of our institutions in the four States of New Jersey, Delaware, Pennsylvania, and Maryland to demonstrate that we can build smart regions in America, we can link technology, but we must build security in the process. We must have encryption capability, we must have security controls and access controls, not just in the government agency systems but also in our hospitals, in our schools, in our colleges, in our private business establishments.

I just want to add my comments and my praise. The gentleman is a leader in this effort. I look forward to the legislation that the gentleman is working on. As I have told the gentleman, I would be happy to cosponsor it. We need forward thinking, because this is really a new challenge. It is the single biggest threat to our security in the 21st century, the threat of being able to disarm America's economy and America's quality of life by disarming our information systems.

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend, and again, long before this was an issue on the evening news or the front page of the newspaper, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) was working on this issue on his committee, on the floor.

It is not a partisan issue, it is an issue that he has played a major role in educating people about. We thank the gentleman for that, and I look forward to following the gentleman's lead and to bringing legislation to this floor this spring that will help address these issues.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. I look forward to supporting it. The gentleman mentioned bipartisan. He is so right. The gentleman mentioned John Hamre's name. There is no one I respect more in this administration than John Hamre. It is unfortunate that he is leaving to go head the Center for Strategic and International Security, but he is a great leader.

It was John Hamre who 2 years ago, in leading this administration on this issue, made this quote: ''It is not a matter of if America has an electronic Pearl Harbor, but when.''

This past year when he came in before our committee, he said that we were at war, in a cyber war, at the very moment he came in, because we were in the middle of a massive attack on our defense information systems by an organized network that we think was focused in a selected few countries, but it has been a totally bipartisan effort.

The gentleman's leadership has been critically important. There is a need for more work like the gentleman is doing, and again I look forward to supporting the gentleman's legislation.

Mr. ANDREWS. I thank my friend for being here tonight as well, Mr. Speaker. We are going to summarize.

I want again say that each one of us involved in this effort is devoted to the idea of our constitutional principles, devoted to the idea of the separation of civilian and military; of the fact that in this country, the military responds to decisions by the civilian sector.

Each one of us is firmly committed to the sanctity of the constitutional rights of privacy, the protection against search and seizure, the rights of legitimate people in our country to be protected from the abuse of State power. We need not choose between forfeiting our Fourth Amendment rights and defending our country. These are consistent goals.

But in order to pursue these goals, we need to rethink the way we pursue them. I think that is so very, very important.

Mr. Speaker, I am here late tonight, and normally I would have the greatest privilege of my life, which is tucking my 7-year-old and 5-year-old into bed, my daughters Jaqueline and Josie, and their mother did that a while ago, I hope, tonight.

We are really fortunate that we put our children to bed tonight in a country that is safe and strong. It is not safe and strong everywhere, there are children who are going to sleep tonight in horribly violent neighborhoods and areas and horribly violent homes, ruined by alcohol and drug abuse and by all kinds of pernicious behavior.

But this is a country that, at least in terms of pernicious behavior in the world, is safer than it has ever been, and is the safest place in the world because of those who sacrificed in the service of their country, and who do so tonight.

But despite that sacrifice, there is a war going on tonight. As we put our children to sleep tonight, we have to put them to sleep with the sure understanding that there are evil and pernicious people in the world who are trying to do to us what Hitler and the Japanese could not do to us with their bombs and their armaments in World War II, could not do to us what the former Soviet Union threatened to do with us with their intercontinental ballistic missiles in the Cold War, could not do to us what foreign powers have tried to do to us throughout our history. That is to undermine and destroy the sovereignty and sanctity of our country. The way they are trying to do it is pernicious, it is lethal, but it is very quiet.

I pray that the night will never come when we wake up and hear that millions of our fellow citizens have been poisoned by their drinking water because the software that is supposed to detect poison was hacked into.

I pray that we never wake up and hear that thousands of people crashed

to their death above airports because of an intentional violation of our air traffic control system.

I pray that we never wake up and find financial chaos, and people withdrawing their money from our banking system because the money they thought was safe and the records they thought were accurate proved to be neither.

I pray that we never wake up to a country where, when we try to call our police and fire and emergency management personnel by dialing 911, we cannot get through because someone has deliberately interfered with that system.

This is a reality. Now, thankfully, it is a reality that our military and our intelligence community are preparing vigilantly to protect us against. It is our job to give them the tools. But there is immense preparation that still must be done on this floor in legislation with our resources to both require and incentivize our civilian sector to meet the same standards of protection as our military has met, and then to give our military and law enforcement the tools to apprehend those who do us harm.

Mr. Speaker, it is my prayer that this issue will become irrelevant because we will be so well prepared, but I do not assume that that is the case.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYES). The Chair would remind all Members to address their remarks to the Chair and not the television audience.

ILLEGAL NARCOTICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) is recognized for half the remaining time until midnight, approximately 30 minutes.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor of the House again at this late hour to talk about an issue that I always try to address the House on Tuesday nights on, and that is the question or problem relating to illegal narcotics.

It has been several weeks. We have had some intervening business and time away from the House of Representatives, but some things have happened, and I wanted to report on my activities as chair of the Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources.

□ 2300

I also wanted to highlight some of the reports that have filtered through the media on this subject and bring my colleagues up to date on where we are and where we are going.

Since I last addressed the House, there have been some serious incidents in our Nation. One that has sort of riveted and focused the attention of the Congress and the American people was a situation with a 6 year old killing a 6 year old. The method was by a gun, and all the attention has focused on the gun. But like many of the other stories about tragedy in our society today, they fail to focus on the real problem, the situation that led to that tragedy.

In this instance, we had a 6 year old who, unfortunately, came from a crack house setting. The belief is that the father was in jail, a family without any normal nuclear bounds, and a situation where you had, I believe, a stolen weapon. No one focused that the root of the problem was, indeed, illegal narcotics, drug trafficking, drug addiction, crimes related to illegal narcotics.

I had an opportunity to conduct, at the request of Members, a hearing this past week when the Congress was in recess, traveled to Sacramento, the capital of California, and also down to San Diego to visit our joint agency task force operations in Alameda, California to see how our war on drugs and our problems with illegal narcotics in that area of the country are progressing.

The story I heard in hearings in California was as horrible as the death of this 6 year old, but magnified many, many times in stories of deaths of young people that I had never heard of and I am sure the American people had not heard of.

We had testimony by a lady by the name of Susan Webber Brown on one of the occasions of hearing, and I believe this was the one in Sacramento. Susan Webber Brown, who is involved with a program out there to help drug-addicted families, gave us some incredible and powerful testimony.

She talked about a 15 month old who overdosed on methamphetamine in Rancho Cordova. That is a 15 month old. A 5 month old tested positive for methamphetamine and succumbs to death with 12 rib fractures, a burned leg, and scarred feet by a methamphetamine addict in Los Angeles, California. Not killed with a gun, but murdered by illegal narcotics.

She testified to a 13 month old who died of heart trauma, broken spine, and broken neck by a methamphetamine addict. She was also raped and sodomized. This was in the California high desert.

Susan Webber Brown testified about a 25-month-old Oregon toddler who overdosed on methamphetamine. She testified to us about a 2 month old who dies on methamphetamine, who had methamphetamine in her system in San Jose, California.

Another death that we did not read about or was not publicized was the 2 year old who ate methamphetamine from a baby food jar in Twentynine Palms, California; a 14 month old who drinks lye and water from a parent's methamphetamine laboratory, hospitalized permanently with severe organ damage in Fairfield, California; a new baby who died from mother's breast milk laced with methamphetamine in Orange County.

An 8-week-old, 11-pound boy dies from methamphetamine poisoning found inside a baby bottle in Orange County. An 8 year old watches and hears mom die in a methamphetamine laboratory in Oroville, California. A 6 month old overdoses, semicomatose, seizing, and hospitalized who drank methamphetamine from a bottle. A 4 year old who tested positive for methamphetamine, beaten and hair pulled out by the mom's boyfriend in Chico, California.

One of the worst stories that was told and video pictures presented at our hearing was of a young child, a young girl who was beaten and tortured by her parents who were both on methamphetamine. When they finished beating and torturing this child, Susan Webber Brown told a stunned audience that they basically scalded their daughter to death, high on methamphetamine.

Now, we have heard about a 6 year old killing a 6 year old with a gun, but we have not heard these stories of babies even younger being victimized. Hidden behind the other stories are the facts that this 6 year old, again, came from a home setting, if one could call it a home, of illegal narcotics.

I was absolutely shocked by the methamphetamine epidemic in California and the Midwest. I have held hearings in Washington, and we have talked about it. We have heard testimony here about it. But until one hears individuals, visits the locale, and sees firsthand the damage that has been done by methamphetamines, one cannot imagine the damage that has been done.

It is amazing that the President of the United States, it is amazing that the leadership of this country, it is amazing that the media of this country can focus on a tragedy like a 6 year old shooting a 6 year old, not focus on the root causes of that death and the deaths I have cited here.

In fact, we are now up to 15,973 drug-related deaths in this country. That is the 1998 count, and the count continues to skyrocket. Many of these are silent deaths, not making the front page, not being discussed in the talk shows or the subject of the root causes of the death and the tragedy, not coming forward or part of the discussion. But I intend to make it part of the discussion.

Methamphetamine production, trafficking, and use has increased in our rural communities and midsize cities, according to a published paper that came out January 26 this year. The report stated that lab seizures, the drug labs that were seized by the Drug Enforcement Administration, have increased sixfold in the past 5 years, from 263 seizures in 1994 to 1,627 labs in 1998.

We heard testimony, not only in Sacramento, but also down in San Diego about methamphetamine. We had law enforcement officials who brought methamphetamine to Sacramento and

showed us that methamphetamine. They know where most of it is coming from or at least part of the main ingredients of methamphetamine, and that is Mexico. We know that the largest amount of methamphetamine reaching our country is coming through Mexico.

Unfortunately, we have not had a national strategy in place to deal with the problem of methamphetamine or other narcotics now coming through Mexico. In fact, in the last several weeks, this administration has, again, certified Mexico. Mexico is now the source of nearly 70 percent of the illegal narcotics entering the United States.

□ 2310

Now, it is a fact that 70 to 75 percent of the heroin and cocaine is produced now in Colombia, but some 70 percent-plus of the hard narcotics coming into the United States, the vast majority of illegal marijuana, is coming through Mexico.

The United States Government and the administration is required under our Federal law to certify whether or not a country is participating and cooperating with doing two things: stopping the production and also stopping the traffic of illegal narcotics. This administration says that Mexico is cooperating on both accounts. I tend to believe that that is not the case. I believe the administration acted in both conflict with the facts and also contrary to the intent of the law that was passed that requires an assessment of cooperation and then gives the countries who do cooperate trade, finance, and other aid benefits from the United States.

So I think, in fact, this administration has misused the certification process, particularly with a country like Mexico that is failing to even meet minimal requests of the United States for cooperation in combating the production and trafficking of illegal narcotics.

In last week's Washington Times there is an article: ''Mexican Ruling Party Soft on Drugs, Foe Said.'' There are two major candidates for the Presidency of Mexico and one is a gentleman by the name of Vincente Fox. He is a Conservative National Action Party member. He said that, in fact, the current administration in Mexico is in league with the drug bosses, to use his quote. They have been part of the problem. They have negotiated with the narcos. And many PRI members have been jailed for being narcos.

He went on to say that, in fact, Mexico and this ruling party have made a joke out of the certification law. He said that this entire process has been made a charade by Mexican officials. Let me quote him. He said, ''The government's attitude was making a mockery of the annual assessment by Washington of efforts by Mexico and other countries to combat drug trafficking, a ritual known as certification, which is widely resented in Mexico. This is just making a fool of the United States, and this certification business is no use at all.''

He went on to say, ''Each time certification comes around, the Mexican government arrests two or three drug bosses, puts them in jail, and acts as if it is getting very serious with drug trafficking,'' he said. ''Then certification is awarded and the Mexican government forgets about the whole business and does not think about it again until the following year.''

This is the comment of a gentleman who may very well become the next president of Mexico and one of the leading officials there, attesting publicly as to how Mexico and the current government makes it a joke and makes a fool of the United States in this process.

I was so pleased, in fact I sent a personal note to our United States ambassador, Jeffrey Davidow, who just previous to Mr. Fox's pronouncement, the candidate for the Mexican presidency, had the courage to finally be one of the first few Clinton administration officials to tell it like it is. He said, ''The fact is that the headquarters of drug trafficking is in Mexico, just like the headquarters of the mafia is in Sicily.'' Ambassador Davidow was speaking in Spanish before a group of alumni of Southern California in Mexico City. He was very frank. This made all the papers down in Mexico.

But even the Mexicans are shocked by recent events, which we also looked at in our hearing in San Diego, where just across the border, in Tijuana, just a few days before we arrived there, the chief of police, and this was actually the second chief of police, was slaughtered in an assassination. A brutal assassination. And again, the second police chief so assassinated by drug lords and drug gangs in that city.

In fact, Tijuana, which is located in the Baja Peninsula, has been the scene of not only corruption but now extreme violence, with hundreds and hundreds of drug-related murders. And Tijuana has one of the highest murder rates of any city in the Western Hemisphere. And almost all of these slaughters are done by drug traffickers. Yet this administration has certified Mexico as fully cooperating.

I have been a critic and, based on the hearings that we have conducted, have said that in Mexico, I believe from the office of the president, the current president, there is no doubt about the past president, in fact the past president's family, Salinas, was involved in narcotics trafficking and profits from narcotics up to their eyeballs and packed away hundreds of millions of dollars in accounts around the world; but even within the current president's office we have had evidence, both public accusations and also behind closed doors, and information about the level of corruption all the way to that office.

I had said also to the attorney general's office, and I am not saying that the attorney general or the President of Mexico personally are now involved, but within those offices, the highest offices of Mexico have in fact been corrupted. I had repeated that not knowing that in fact the headlines would be just a few days ago that in a box rented to a senior official at the Federal attorney general's office a public servant with a modest salary had sitting $700,000 in cash. That official committed suicide some few days ago. Yet another example of tremendous amounts of money involved in corruption at the highest level of Mexican officials' offices.

I just read in the last 2 days that a legal adviser to the Mexico City attorney general's office had been found strangled in his home, along with his two elderly sisters. They said that Salvador Cordero, 64, had apparently been tortured before he was killed in his home some 30 miles west of the Mexican capital. Again, the rampant violence in Mexico, that corruption is now leading to incredible acts of violence, this has raised the concern of both of the Mexican candidates for president. And we heard the comments of one Mexican high official, again a leading candidate, and the joke they have made out of the process of certification that the United States relies on to try to enlist cooperation from Mexico.

□ 2320

Now, we have not asked a lot from Mexico. We have asked that our DEA agents be armed and adequately protect themselves, the limited number that Mexico allows. That still has not been granted. We have asked for a sign and an executed maritime agreement. That still has not been granted. We have asked for the extradition of one major drug lord from Mexico. To date there has not been one Mexican national drug kingpin extradited to the United States.

So the corruption, the killing goes on. The amounts of money in this corrupt process are absolutely astounding. Again, we held a hearing that documented from a former United States Customs official that one Mexican general had attempted in a sting operation to place $1.1 billion in drug profits in American financial institutions.

So the corruption is in the military, it is in the President's office, the Attorney General and cabinet members' office, in the police, in the States.

We saw in the Yucatan Peninsula, Quintana Roo, which is the Yucatan Province, we saw the governor there who we knew was involved heavily in drug trafficking and immune from prosecution because of his status that he holds in Mexico. They do not go after sitting officials. And a few days before he was to leave office, he fled the country and has not been located. But we know that the entire Yucatan Peninsula and the government there is run and directed by narco-traffickers; and again this all has implications in the United States, the methamphetamine coming in in unbelievable quantity.

We had testimony from officials in Wisconsin and Iowa, in addition to the hearing that I held in California, talking about Mexican drug cartels operating in the Midwest bringing this death and deadly destruction.

The effects of methamphetamine I had no idea could destroy people in such a fashion or cause such incredibly savage behavior as we have heard in these hearings.

Now, this is not a rocket scientist. We know where illegal narcotics are coming from. As I said, we have Colombia, which is the source now of over 70 percent of the heroin and 70 percent of the cocaine. It is interesting to note that Colombia did not produce at the beginning of the Clinton administration almost any heroin. There was none produced in Colombia. There was almost no coca produced in Colombia at the beginning of the Clinton administration.

But I will be darned if this administration, through one bungling act after another, could not make Colombia into the largest source of illegal narcotics. Now, we are talking about producing. We know that a hundred percent of all the cocaine in the world comes from Peru, Bolivia and Colombia.

Through a program instituted by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), Mr. Zeliff, some of the others here who worked on it in reinstituting source country programs, we have been able to cut production of cocaine and coca in both Peru and Bolivia by some 60 percent.

In Colombia, this administration has done everything possible to bungle and thwart and stop assistance for international programs to aid Colombia in dealing with illegal narcotics production and trafficking. They have done everything imaginable. And I will detail those in just a minute. But those illegal narcotics are coming up in trafficking and now they form cartels with Mexican traffickers and they are coming up through the United States.

We know how this traffic pattern has emerged. We also know what works and what does not work. I cannot believe the media and the garbage that they continue to publish and the misstatement that the war on drugs has been a failure. And it is repeated over and over.

The war on drugs existed in the Reagan and the Bush administration. The war on drugs was closed down by the Clinton administration in some very specific acts.

This chart, let us take just a minute and look at the war on drugs. This was the trend with Ronald Reagan and George Bush, and we saw the long-term trend in lifetime prevalence of drugs.

This is percentage of 12th graders, a pretty good indication of where we are going on the narcotics issue and use of illegal narcotics, going down, down, down. This is the beginning of the Andean strategy. This is the beginning of the war on drugs bringing the military in, the Vice President's task force. And look at what happened to the use of illegal narcotics.

Then we have the election of Mr. Clinton. Let me, if I can, quote some facts on what took place with the election of Mr. Clinton.

First of all, we have a question of international programs to stop illegal drugs at their source. That would be source country programs. Look at this here. Source country programs, international programs under Mr. Bush and previously Mr. Reagan. We had increases in 1993, 1994, 1995. And it does take a little while to get a budget in place for a new administration and a new Congress. We are a little bit ahead of the curve. But Federal drug spending on international programs was cut 50 percent during the Democrat controlled Congress from 1992 to 1994. Fifty percent of that means to stop drugs at their source. What we had been successful in stopping drugs at their source, they cut 50 percent.

On interdiction, which is the next most cost-effective way to stop illegal narcotics is to get the drugs not only where they are produced at their source, because that farmer is getting a few dollars or a few pesos, and the most effective thing is to stop the illegal narcotics at the next level and that is to interdict them.

You can interdict them through intelligence and provide that intelligence to another country, which was part of the strategy that we had with the Bush and Reagan administration, very cost effective. And then that country goes after the plane or the trafficker, whatever, and stops it.

Federal drug spending on interdiction was cut 33 percent during the Democrat controlled Congress from 1992 to 1994. Again, part of the strategy to close down the war on drugs. And when you close down the war on drugs, and you see the chart here, let us look at this chart here for a moment, because you see us getting back up to in 1999, basically, if you look at dollars and use 1991 or 1992 dollars to 1999, we are back where we were at the end of the Bush and Reagan administration and their anti-narcotics programs.

□ 2330

So basically some of the comments and one of them that really irritated me is a column by Marjorie Williams. I do not know who she is but she put it in the Washington Post Friday, March 10, and she said, despite two decades of proof that interdiction and tough law enforcement will do nothing to stop the sale or use of drugs, this is the type of trash that the media puts out and convinces people that the war on drugs is a failure. In fact, the war on drugs was specifically closed down.

Let us go back up to this chart here. Go back to this chart here. The Clinton administration, go back to 1992, 1993, they slashed, first of all, the drug czar's staff from 112 to 27. They cut the source country programs, which I just cited. If you put another one of these dots where they appointed Jocelyn Elders as Surgeon General you can see another little surge in use.

In 1994 and 1995, they stopped U.S. intelligence information-sharing with Colombia and Peru and slashed the U.S. military and Coast Guard anti-narcotics program.

Is this showing that that is a war on drugs? In fact, they dismantled the war on drugs. In 1996 and 1997, they blocked the antidrug assistance to Colombia. They also distorted the program that we have to certify countries as cooperating, decertified Colombia without a national interest waiver and blocked and stopped the equipment getting to Colombia.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HAYES). There being no other Member claiming time, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) is recognized for the remainder of the hour.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I will try not to take that but as one can tell, I am just getting warmed up tonight. I do get excited about this issue, Mr. Speaker, because it has some incredible impact, not only six year olds killing six year olds but thousands and thousands of lives lost across this country and families destroyed by illegal narcotics.

We know what works in this effort. We know what does not work. We know that, again, the Clinton administration blocked aid to Colombia and that is why we are here in the next few weeks and about to pass $1.7 billion, $1.5 billion, whatever we end up with, in aid to Colombia, because the situation this administration created by these specific actions has created such a disaster. This is not something that just jumped up on us. This is something that was predicted in hearings, and I participated in some of those hearings.

I took out a quote not from me but a quote from the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) and he says, ''As you recall, as of May 1, 1994, the Department of Defense decided unilaterally to stop sharing realtime intelligence regarding aerial traffic in drugs with Colombia and Peru. Now, as I understand it, that decision, which has not been completely resolved, has thrown diplomatic relations with the host countries into chaos.'' The gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) said this August 2, 1994, the beginning of the end of the situation in Colombia, the beginning of presenting this Congress and the American people with a bill for $1.7 billion, a direct action of this administration to close down sharing that information. Not only did they do this in 1994, they turned around and did it again, according to a GAO report that I asked be conducted of the current operations the last couple of years in that region. I received a report in December, just a few months ago, that the administration, despite the requests of their appointed ambassador in Peru to increase, again, the surveillance, who said that if you do not do this you will get more cocaine produced, even

though the Congress and the Republican Congress put into effect a very effective eradication and crop substitution program, in spite of what we had done their own ambassador said, hey, do not do this again, or do not do this in fact; you will have problems.

In fact, we have seen an increase in production because, again, they made the same mistake just in the last 24 months that they made in 1994. We saw this coming. We asked them not to do it.

Let me also bring up another headline, 1994. How do we get ourselves into these incredible situations? This is Thursday, August 4, Washington Post, U.S. Refusal to Share Intelligence in Drug War Is Called Absurd.

We did it in 1994, we cut off aid and assistance. Was this a partisan attack, something the Republicans did? I cited my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN), a fellow Republican. These are the comments of ROBERT TORRICELLI who at that time was chairman of the Subcommittee on Foreign Affairs on the Western Hemisphere and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), chairman of the Subcommittee on International Security, denounced as absurd the administration's argument that current law might expose U.S. officials to prosecution. They distorted the law with some liberal interpretations to close down information-sharing to stop going after drug traffickers, basically sharing information allowing the other countries to, if necessary, shoot down these planes.

There is nothing more effective than shooting down drug traffickers to stop illegal narcotics. These are direct actions that got us into this situation today. These are the actions that require a 1.6, 1.7, who knows how many billion dollars, to get us out of this predicament. Colombia produces and that area around Colombia produces 20 percent of our oil supply, and if you have paid for gasoline lately you can see why the source of oil production is a strategic value to the United States.

What is interesting is that, back to Mexico for a minute, I received these reports from DEA on heroin production and they can tell us where heroin is coming from on what is called a signature program. It is almost sort of like reading DNA from a blood test, and they can tell me almost the country and the field that heroin is grown from. You have to remember again that the policy of this administration allowed in 6 or 7 years a country which produced no heroin, they did not produce any heroin, any poppies at the beginning of the Clinton administration in Colombia, and this shows now South American production, by 1997 they got it up to 75 percent of the heroin seized in the United States came from Colombia. That is where it is coming from. Fourteen percent came from Mexico.

This administration just certified in the last few weeks Mexico fully cooperating. That means they are helping reduce production and reduce trafficking. Two criteria, reduce production, reduce trafficking. I got the report from 1998. You have not read about this. No one will talk about this. Mexico is up to 17 percent. Now, simple mathematics will say that is a 20 percent increase in production. It shows a slight decrease in America but we are getting more from the country that the administration just certified, Mexico; in fact, a 20 percent increase in heroin production in one year.

This, again, does not require a rocket scientist to know where the heroin is coming from. We know that it is coming from Colombia. We know it is coming from Mexico. We heard it in the hearings this past week in California, which is also seeing a recurrence and proliferation of extremely deadly and high purity heroin in addition to incredible volumes of methamphetamine. This is from the country the administration just certified, where corruption is so rampant, where the leading candidate says, ha, ha, we made a fool out of the United States in its own process that grants trade, finance, benefits to Mexico.

These are the headlines that we see now with a country that the administration just certified: Drugs Flood in From Mexico. This is not necessarily a conservative publication the last time I checked, the Washington Post. ''Increase in traffic on land and sea alarms U.S. officials,'' and it should alarm U.S. officials because the U.S. officials are the ones that allowed it to get into that situation.

Let me show this chart.

□ 2340

This is part of a chart from a report that I also requested from GAO. This report, given to me just a few weeks ago, shows me that assets DOD contributes to reducing illegal drug supply have declined.

If you look at the red here, these are provided by DOD, and these are requested by SOUTHCOM. SOUTHCOM is our Southern Command, which is asking for surveillance assistance, or to conduct surveillance, and equipment and resources to conduct surveillance. Requested by SOUTHCOM, requested by SOUTHCOM, 1997, 1998, 1999, requested by SOUTHCOM. This is what they got.

This is a war on drugs by destroying any effort to have combat, and to have combat the first basic thing you need to do is stop the activity at its source. Then the next thing you would do is get surveillance and information. This report told me that the surveillance flights declined 68 percent from 1992 to 1999, 68 percent in surveillance, and this shows even less attention by this administration to stop drugs at their source or do anything about it, and a 62 percent reduction in maritime activity, anti-narcotic activity by the administration.

So what you have had is a closing down of any semblance of a war on drugs, and this is in spite of the fact that this Republican Congress, which took over in 1995, has done some very positive things in trying to restart the war on drugs. In fact, we have been successful in that effort, which Mr. Zeliff and now the gentleman from Illinois (Speaker HASTERT) went down personally and began the efforts to start the eradication of cocaine in Peru and Bolivia, and that program has shown some 60 to 65 percent reduction in just several years. Speaker HASTERT and the Republican Congress led an effort for a supplemental appropriation that put $800 million into the anti-narcotics effort. That is where you saw that bump up. But even with the money there, the funds are diverted, the reported by DOD tells us, from the war on drugs. Even our vice president has taken some of the assets I have found for surveillance, our AWACS, and diverted them to check oil spills in Alaska.

So the resources that the Congress appropriates and tries to get to Colombia, including $300 million of assistance which we appropriated a year before last October, those assets still have not gotten there.

Most of the money was for Blackhawk helicopters which can be used for eradication or going after drug traffickers in the high altitudes. We know where the stuff is grown; we know who is trafficking. If you have the capability, and the Colombians have the capability, just like President Fujimora had the capability and went after drug traffickers, wiped them out, stopped the destabilization, the terror in that country, which was also financed and run by drug traffickers, the same thing can be done in Colombia, but we cannot get even the basic equipment we funded over a year ago there.

Most of that, as I said, was in several of these helicopters we have tried to get to the national police force there, and this administration, in fact, is the gang that can't shoot straight. They cannot even get the helicopters there. In fact, the helicopters that were sent there sat on the tarmac and did not have the armoring that could be used. In one of the greatest fiascoes of this entire effort by this administration, they delivered the ammunition that should have gone 2 or 3 years ago to Colombia to the back door of the State Department loading dock during the holidays. This in fact is an effort that has been a disaster by this administration.

Every time I think the administration cannot bungle anything else, I am shocked. I was shocked to have people come in from my locale today and show me their pre-census mailing that was sent out. This administration that runs our census, that is a scary thought right there, sent out 120 million mailings, and sent out the wrong Zip Code on all 120 million of them. One of my cities they sent out the wrong name to the entire city in Florida. When I think that they cannot possibly bungle it any further, I am always amazed.

This is, again, a very sad story for the United States, because we have a good friend and a good neighbor in Mexico, wonderful people. They are tremendously gifted. They are hard-working, dedicated people, and their country has been taken over by drug traffickers, and those drug traffickers are so emboldened that now they are offering rewards and bounties on United States agents, $200,000 reward as reported by drug traffickers. This is how emboldened they have gotten. This is from the country that has been certified as cooperating in this war on drugs.

Again we find this administration, the gang that can't shoot straight or get a war on drugs together, in The Washington Post, March 13, just a few days ago, U.S. officials cite trend in Colombia. Lack of air support hindering drug war.

Well, my friends, there has been no drug war, as you can see, since 1993, with the exception of what the Republican majority has been able to get in dribbles and drabs and in spite of the bureaucrats who have fought us every inch of the way, in spite of the administration who has blocked aid, assistance, ammunition, anything that you could possibly use in a war on drugs from getting to the source.

Finally, now the situation has deteriorated so that even this administration is coming forth with a very expensive plan, and it is an expensive plan because they made very costly mistakes. This is also a repetitive mistake, because of lack of air support and the surveillance that is so incredible for any type of mission, military or anti-narcotics mission. And our military does not fire or fight in this war on drugs or arrest people. They merely provide surveillance and information. In this case we are not asking for United States troops or anyone to go in there. We are only asking to get that information to countries that are beseeched by drug traffickers like Colombia, like Peru, and like Bolivia.

It is a very difficult situation we have been put in. I know there are some Members who are concerned about expending those dollars in this effort. Some are concerned on the Republican side of the aisle because we have attempted to spend money on a real war on drugs, and every dollar we have spent has either been diverted or not gotten to the source, or handled in such an incompetent manner that nothing is accomplished. That does bring some criticism from the Republican side of the aisle.

The other side of the aisle, we hear the human rights concerns. I share human rights concerns. Anyone who commits human rights abuses should be held accountable, and whether it is from paramilitary right-wing extremists, or from left-wing terrorists on the communist-socialist side, the murder they commit is not justified and should not be tolerated. But both of these activities I am told are financed in Colombia by narco-terrorists, people who are living and also promoting their criminal, murderous behavior with the proceeds and supported by the profits from illegal narcotics.

□ 2350

That has destabilized Colombia. There have been 35,000 people killed in that war; there have been over 800,000 in just 2 years, displaced as many as Kosovo; and Kosovo I do not know has imported any drugs or produced any drugs that is killing 15,700 Americans in 1998 and destroying thousands and thousands of lives, so certainly this is in our national interest to proceed.

So I appeal to my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. I am sorry that it is so difficult for this administration to learn lessons of what it takes. I am so sorry that they have also convinced the media that the war on drugs is a failure. We, in fact, have doubled the amount of money for treatment. We need even more treatment. But those liberal, the liberal programs, in fact, do not work. We know that tough enforcement programs, the Rudy Guiliani programs. Rudy Guiliani, just stop and think about this, took office and over 2,200 people died in murders in the years in which he assumed office. That figure was down in the 600 range. Tough enforcement works.

Take another example, the liberal Mayor Schmoke who turned his back, instituted a needle exchange program, had liberal narcotics policies in Baltimore. Baltimore had 312 deaths, murders in Baltimore in 1997; they had 312 in 1998; and they had 60,000 heroin and drug addicts in Baltimore; 60,000, one in eight a city council member told the press, one in eight. Imagine, taking that model and imposing it on the rest of the United States. Think of one in eight Americans under a liberal policy for narcotics. We could do that and we would have one incredible society. We think it is expensive to support 2 million people in our prisons; imagine supporting somewhere in the neighborhood of 40 million Americans as drug addicts. It is not a pleasant thought.

So we know it works. We know we can stop drugs at their source. Richard Nixon did it; the Chinese have done it. We have done it in Peru and Bolivia; we can do it in Colombia. We can also cooperate with others, even the United Nations; and Pino Arlacchi who heads the United Nations Office of Drug Control Policy, the former Italian prosecutor who helped rub out organized crime, and who we have worked so effectively with the last couple of years since he took office in stopping the rest of the drugs at their source in Afghanistan and Burma, in Colombia and other countries where we do not have the best relations. But a simple plan; not a great deal of money needs to be expended. Because we could put 100,000 a year; we could put 500,000 more police on the streets, and we will not get it all, but we know we can stop it cost effectively at its source.

If we do not have tough enforcement, it does not work. If we do not have tough prosecution, it does not work. It is unfortunate that we do have so many Americans hooked on illegal narcotics and so many have succumbed to the philosophy that if it feels good, do it; and they have become addicted and victims in this whole disaster that has rained terror on the United States and so many of our families.

Mr. Speaker, the hour is late. I hope to come back and finish and also update the House on additional information we have received, our subcommittee has received. We look forward to working with Members on both sides of the aisle, both in passage of this Colombian effort, plan Colombia in our efforts to rid our Nation of illegal narcotics and also assist other countries in stopping the production and trafficking of hard drugs.

We also look forward to enhancing our treatment programs and rewarding programs that do a good job and encouraging our young people not to take the path of illegal narcotics and the path of death and destruction of their lives.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BOSWELL (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of a death in the family.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business in the district.

Mr. ORTIZ (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business in the district.

Mr. REYES (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business in the district.

Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business.

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. POMEROY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POMEROY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CLAYTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LIPINSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES of North Carolina) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SCHAFFER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WELDON of Florida, for 5 minutes, March 16.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, today and March 15.

Mr. HUNTER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, March 15.

Mrs. BIGGERT, for 5 minutes, March 15.

Mr. METCALF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RAMSTAD, for 5 minutes, March 15.

(The following Members (at their own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SHERMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, March 15, 2000, at 10 a.m.

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 first, second, third, and fourth quarters of 1998 and 1999, by Committees of the U.S. House of Representatives, and for miscellaneous groups in connection with official foreign travel during the calendar year 2000 are as follows:

AMENDED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 1998

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]
Caleb McCarry	1/21	1/30	Cuba		729.00						729.00
							969.00				969.00
Grover Joseph Rees	1/18	1/25	Peru		1,414.00						1,414.00
Commercial airfare							2,846.00				2,846.00
Hon. Alcee Hastings	2/18	2/21	Austria		528.00						528.00
Commercial airfare							3,911.69				3,911.69
Hon. Doug Bereuter	2/17	2/21	Israel		1,154.00						1,154.00
Commercial airfare							2,110.11				2,110.11
Hon. Howard Berman	2/15	2/21	Israel		1,684.00						1,684.00
Commercial airfare							6,265.00				6,265.00
Richard Kessler	2/15	2/21	Israel		1,684.00						1,684.00
Commercial airfare							4,993.00				4,993.00
Hon. Bob Clement	1/4	1/6	Italy		796.00						796.00
	1/6	1/8	Macedonia		372.00						372.00
	1/8	1/9	Azerbaijan		346.00						346.00
	1/9	1/12	Belgium		170.00						170.00
Richard Garon	1/12	1/15	Syria		751.00						751.00
Commercial airfare							3,329.22				3,329.22
Michael Van Dusen	1/12	1/15	Syria		801.00						801.00
	1/15	1/16	Cyprus		146.00						146.00
Commercial airfare							4,789.17				4,789.17
Hon. Doug Bereuter	1/7	1/11	South Korea		912.00						912.00
	1/12	1/18	Australia		1,655.00						1,655.00
Commercial airfare							2,434.00				2,434.00
	1/23	1/25	England		300.00						300.00
Commercial airfare							583.44				583.44
Mark Gage	1/3	1/7	Kazakhstan		944.00						944.00
			Uzbekistan		702.00						702.00
			Turkmenistan		944.00						944.00
Commercial airfare							6,319.00				6,319.00
Hon. Amo Houghton	1/2	1/10	South Korea								
Hon. Eni F.H. Faleomavaega	1/6	1/10	South Korea		912.00						912.00
Commercial airfare							3,269.00				3,269.00
Carol Reynolds	1/5	1/11	South Korea		1,153.00						1,153.00
Commercial airfare							3,825.00				3,825.00
Cliff Kupchan	1/4	1/7	Kazakhstan		1,014.00						1,014.00
	1/7	1/10	Uzbekistan		772.00						772.00
	1/10	1/13	Turkmenistan		1,014.00						1,014.00
Commercial airfare							6,319.00				6,319.00
Grover Joseph Rees	2/17	2/20	Marshall Islands		740.00						740.00
Commercial airfare							4,787.98				4,787.98
Paul Berkowitz	2/17	2/20	Marshall Islands		614.88						614.88
Commercial airfare							4,229.00				4,229.00
Deborah Bodlander	1/3	1/10	Israel		2,149.00						2,149.00
Commercial airfare							4,721.00				4,721.00
Hon. Eni F.H. Faleomavaega	1/12	1/13	Malaysia		162.00						162.00
Commercial airfare							3,957.56				3,957.56
John Mackey	1/12	1/15	Colombia		352.00						352.00
Commercial airfare							1,752.00				1,752.00
Peter Brookes	1/5	1/7	Thailand		380.00						380.00
	1/7	1/12	Vietnam		1,140.00						1,140.00
	1/12	1/15	Cambodia		620.00						620.00
	1/15	1/17	Malaysia		224.00						224.00
	1/17	1/20	Indonesia		591.00						591.00
Commercial airfare							4,888.50				4,888.50
Kristen Gilley	1/5	1/7	Thailand		380.00						380.00
	1/7	1/12	Vietnam		1,140.00						1,140.00
	1/12	1/15	Cambodia		560.00						560.00
	1/15	1/17	Malaysia		224.00						224.00
	1/17	1/20	Indonesia		591.00						591.00
Commercial airfare							4,888.50				4,888.50
Elana Broitman	1/5	1/7	Thailand		380.00						380.00
	1/7	1/9	Vietnam		382.18						382.18
Commercial airfare							3,586.00				3,586.00
John Mackey	2/15	2/19	South Africa		635.00						635.00
	2/29	2/21	Nigeria		515.00						515.00
Commercial airfare							6,289.20				6,289.20
Cliff Kupchan	2/15	2/19	South Africa		635.00						635.00
	2/19	2/21	Nigeria		515.00						515.00
Commercial airfare							6,289.20				6,289.20
Lester Munson	2/15	2/19	South Africa		635.00						635.00
	2/19	2/21	Nigeria		515.00						515.00
Commercial airfare							6,289.20				6,289.20
Vincent Morelli	1/19	1/21	Nicaragua		297.50						297.50
Commercial airfare							1,547.00				1,547.00
Paul Bonicelli	1/19	1/21	Nicaragua		297.50						297.50
	1/21	1/23	El Salvador		150.00						150.00
Commercial airfare							1,538.00				1,538.00
David Adams	1/19	1/21	Nicaragua		297.50						297.50
	1/21	1/23	El Salvador		150.00						150.00
Commercial airfare							1,538.00				1,538.00

AMENDED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1 AND MAR. 31, 1998—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]
Michael Ennis	1/4	1/7	Sri Lanka		584.00						584.00
	1/7	1/12	India		923.00						923.00
	1/12	1/15	Pakistan		555.00						555.00
Commercial airfare							6,939.00				6,939.90
Richard Kessler	1/4	1/7	Sri Lanka		584.00						584.00
	1/7	1/12	India		1,179.00						1,179.00
	1/12	1/15	Pakistan		555.00						555.00
Commercial airfare							6,939.90				6,939.90
Robert Hathaway	1/4	1/7	Sri Lanka		584.00						584.00
	1/7	1/12	India		944.00						944.00
	1/12	1/15	Pakistan		555.00						555.00
Commercial airfare							6,939.90				6,939.90
John Walker Roberts	1/7	1/12	India		1,202.00						1,202.00
	1/12	1/15	Pakistan		555.00						555.00
Commercial airfare							6,447.90				6,447.90
Hon. Benjamin Gilman	1/15	1/18	Belgium		852.00						852.00
	1/18	1/20	France		598.00						598.00
Hon. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen	1/15	1/18	Belgium		852.00						852.00
	1/18	1/20	France		598.00						598.00
Commercial airfare							377.20				377.20
Hon. Kevin Brady	1/16	1/18	Belgium		568.00						568.00
Commercial airfare							5,069.21				5,069.21
Hon. Robert Wexler	1/15	1/18	Belgium		852.00						852.00
	1/18	1/20	France		598.00						598.00
	1/20	1/22	Poland		556.00						556.00
Richard Garon	1/15	1/18	Belgium		792.00						792.00
	1/18	1/20	France		548.00						548.00
	1/20	1/22	Poland		506.00						506.00
Francis Record	1/18	1/20	France		498.00						498.00
	1/20	1/22	Poland		406.00						406.00
Commercial airfare							1,871.00				1,871.00
Hillel Weinberg	1/15	1/18	Belgium		572.00						572.00
	1/18	1/20	France		532.00						532.00
	1/20	1/22	Poland		344.00						344.00
Robert King	1/15	1/18	Belgium		852.00						852.00
	1/18	1/20	France		598.00						598.00
	1/20	1/22	Poland		556.00						556.00
Linda Solomon	1/15	1/18	Belgium		852.00						852.00
	1/18	1/20	France		598.00						598.00
	1/20	1/22	Poland		556.00						556.00
Parker Brent	1/15	1/18	Belgium		852.00						852.00
	1/18	1/20	France		598.00						598.00
	1/20	1/22	Poland		556.00						556.00
Committee total					60,635.56		142,848.78				203,484.34

[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.

BEN GILMAN, Chairman, Mar. 1, 2000.

AMENDED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 1998

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. Gary Ackerman	4/2	4/3	Colombia		271.00						271.00
	4/3	4/5	Chile		548.00						548.00
	4/5	4/7	Argentina		546.00						546.00
	4/7	4/9	Peru		612.00						612.00
Commercial airfare							1,360.76				1,360.76
	5/23	5/26	Israel		1,260.00						1,260.00
David Adams	4/2	4/3	Colombia		271.00						271.00
	4/3	4/5	Chile		548.00						548.00
	4/5	4/7	Argentina		546.00						546.00
	4/7	4/9	Peru		612.00						612.00
	5/24	5/27	Japan		678.00		5,449.00				6,127.00
	5/27	5/31	South Korea		848.00						848.00
Curtis Banks	5/7	5/9	Costa Rica		468.00						468.00
Hon. Cass Ballenger	4/2	4/3	Colombia		242.00						242.00
	4/3	4/5	Chile		328.00						328.00
	4/5	4/7	Argentina		311.00						311.00
	4/7	4/9	Peru		380.00						380.00
Brent Parker	4/2	4/3	Colombia		271.00						271.00
	4/3	4/5	Chile		548.00						548.00
	4/5	4/7	Argentina		546.00						546.00
	4/7	4/9	Peru		612.00						612.00
	5/23	5/26	Israel		1,260.00						1,260.00
Deborah Bodlander	5/23	5/26	Israel		1,260.00						1,260.00
Elana Broitman	4/1	4/9	China		1,344.00		4,113.00				5,457.00
Peter Brookes	5/24	5/27	Japan		678.00		5,449.00				6,127.00
	5/27	5/31	South Korea		823.00						823.00
Hon. Pat Danner	4/2	4/3	Colombia		271.00						271.00
	4/3	4/5	Chile		548.00						548.00
	4/5	4/7	Argentina		546.00						546.00
	4/7	4/9	Peru		612.00						612.00
Hon. Eni Faleomavaega	4/2	4/3	Colombia		271.00						271.00
	4/3	4/5	Chile		548.00						548.00
	4/5	4/7	Argentina		546.00						546.00
	4/7	4/9	Peru		612.00						612.00
Rich Garon	4/2	4/3	Colombia		271.00						271.00
	4/3	4/5	Chile		498.00						498.00
	4/5	4/7	Argentina		496.00						496.00
	4/7	4/9	Peru		552.00						552.00
	5/7	5/9	Costa Rica		398.00						398.00
	5/23	5/26	Israel		1,080.00						1,080.00

AMENDED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1 AND JUNE 30, 1998—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]
Kristen Gilley	4/2	4/9	China		1,294.00						1,244.00
	4/9	4/11	Hong Kong		684.05		4,557.00				5,241.05
Hon. Benjamin Gilman	4/2	4/3	Colombia		271.00						271.00
	4/3	4/5	Chile		548.00						548.00
	4/5	4/7	Argentina		546.00						546.00
	4/7	4/9	Peru		612.00						612.00
	5/7	5/9	Costa Rica		468.00						468.00
	5/23	5/26	Israel		1,260.00						1,260.00
Hon. Alcee Hastings	4/23	4/25	Spain		645.00		3,718.43				4,363.43
Robert Hathaway	5/24	5/26	China		514.00						514.00
	5/26	5/30	North Korea		651.00		4,527.00				5,178.00
	5/30	6/1	Japan		552.00						552.00
	6/1	6/2	South Korea		262.00						262.00
John Herzberg	4/2	4/7	Bosnia		1,505.00		4,161.00				5,666.00
	4/7	4/8	Croatia		262.00						262.00
	4/8	4/9	Bosnia		301.00						301.00
	4/9	4/10	Croatia		254.00						254.00
	5/25	5/28	Austria		513.00		5,351.84				5,864.84
	5/28	5/30	Belgium		440.00						440.00
Celes Hughes	5/25	5/28	Austria		513.00		5,351.84				5,864.84
	5/28	5/30	Belgium		440.00						440.00
Kenneth Katzman	5/23	5/26	Israel		1,182.71						1,182.71
Allison Kiernan	5/23	5/26	Israel		1,260.00						1,260.00
Hon. Robert King	5/23	5/26	Israel		1,260.00						1,260.00
Mark Kirk	4/1	4/9	Bosnia		2,750.00		5,602.00				8,352.00
	4/10	4/14	Yugoslavia								
	4/15	4/15	Israel								
	4/16	4/19	Jordan		1,200.00						1,200.00
Clifford Kupchan	4/2	4/7	Bosnia		1,505.00		4,161.00				5,666.00
	4/7	4/8	Croatia		301.00						301.00
	4/8	4/9	Bosnia		301.00						301.00
	4/10	4/14	Serbia/Montenegro		293.00						293.00
John Mackey	4/2	4/3	Colombia		271.00						271.00
	4/3	4/5	Chile		548.00						548.00
	4/5	4/7	Argentina		546.00						546.00
	4/7	4/9	Peru		612.00						612.00
	4/16	4/16	Colombia		243.00						243.00
	4/17	4/20	Chile		999.00						999.00
	5/28	5/30	Italy		516.00						516.00
	5/30	6/1	Ireland		393.30		2,295.00				2,688.30
Caleb McCarry	4/2	4/3	Colombia		271.00						271.00
	4/3	4/5	Chile		548.00						548.00
	4/5	4/7	Argentina		546.00						546.00
	4/7	4/9	Peru		273.00						273.00
	5/7	5/9	Costa Rica		330.00						330.00
Stephen Rademaker	5/24	5/26	China		514.00		4,527.00				5,041.00
	5/26	5/30	North Korea		1,016.00						1,016.00
	5/30	6/1	Japan		552.00						552.00
	6/1	6/2	South Korea		262.00						262.00
Grover Joseph Rees	5/25	5/27	Indonesia		494.00		4,549.00				5,043.00
Francis Record	5/24	5/27	Japan		628.00		5,452.0				6,080.00
	5/27	5/31	South Korea		648.00						648.00
Hon. Dana Rohrabacher	4/5	4/8	Taiwan		805.00		2,968.02				3,773.02
	4/8	4/14	Thailand		1,140.00						1,140.00
	4/14	4/15	Malaysia		102.00						102.00
	4/15	4/17	Philippines		198.00						198.00
Kimberly Roberts	4/2	4/3	Colombia		271.00						271.00
	4/3	4/5	Chile		548.00						548.00
	4/5	4/7	Argentina		546.00						546.00
	4/7	4/9	Peru		612.00						612.00
Hon. Marshall Sanford	4/2	4/3	Colombia		271.00						271.00
	4/3	4/5	Chile		548.00						548.00
	4/5	4/7	Argentina		546.00						546.00
	4/7	4/9	Peru		612.00						612.00
Hon. Christopher Smith	5/25	5/27	Indonesia		494.00		4,601.00				5,095.00
Hillel Weinberg	5/25	5/28	Austria		483.00		5,351.84				5,834.84
	5/28	5/30	Belgium		410.00						410.00
Committee total					63,394.06		83,545.73				146,939.79

[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.

BEN GILMAN, Chairman, Mar. 1, 2000.

AMENDED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1998

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]
David Adams	8/10	8/12	Venezuela		265.00		4,162.50				4,427.50
	8/13	8/15	Argentina		966.00						966.00
Paul Bonicelli	8/10	8/12	Venezuela		265.00		4,162.50				4,427.50
	8/13	8/15	Argentina		966.00						966.00
Hon. Matt Salmon	7/1	7/6	Israel		1,719.00		5,544.00				7,263.00

AMENDED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 1998—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]
Hillel Weinberg	7/1	7/8	Israel		[3] 1,087.00		5,169.99				6,256.99
Kristen Gilley	7/6	7/8	Czech Republic		450.00						450.00
	7/8	7/11	United Kingdom		1,260.00		6,115.47				7,375.47
Mark Kirk	6/30	7/5	Yugoslavia		[3] 850.00		5,796.00				6,646.00
	7/6	7/9	Czech Republic		[3] 450.00						450.00
	7/9	7/11	United Kingdom		[3] 1,260.00						1,260.00
Richard Garon	6/30	7/4	Yugoslavia		550.00		4,171.18				4,721.18
John Herzberg	6/30	7/4	Yugoslavia		550.00		4,171.18				4,721.18
Maria Pica	6/30	7/4	Yugoslavia		500.00		4,171.18				4,671.18
Lester Munson	8/23	8/26	South Africa		532.00		7,532.80				8,064.80
	8/26	8/28	Zimbabwe		368.00						368.00
Peter Mamacos	8/23	8/26	South Africa		[3] 434.00		7,454.93				7,888.93
	8/26	8/28	Zimbabwe		[3] 552.00						552.00
Hon. Eni Faleomavaega	6/27	7/3	French Polynesia		105.45		3,163.52				3,268.97
Caleb McCarry	8/11	8/13	Haiti				907.00				907.00
Denis McDonough	8/12	8/16	Cuba		375.00		1,387.39				1,762.39
	8/16	8/20	Mexico		[3] 1,027.00						1,027.00
Hon. Jay Kim	8/9	8/15	South Korea		1,484.00		3,999.00				5,483.00
Ronald Crump	8/9	8/15	South Korea		1,484.00		4,087.00				5,571.00
Hon. Alcee Hastings	8/9	8/12	Jordan		829.00						829.00
	8/13	8/14	Turkey		452.00						452.00
	8/15	8/16	Kyrgyzstan		558.00						558.00
	8/17	8/18	Mongolia		354.00						354.00
	8/19	8/20	China		552.00						552.00
	8/21	8/23	South Korea		524.00						524.00
Mark Gage	8/9	8/12	Jordan		[3] 779.00						779.00
	8/13	8/14	Turkey		[3] 422.00						422.00
	8/15	8/16	Kyrgyzstan		[3] 478.00						478.00
	8/17	8/18	Mongolia		[3] 329.00						329.00
	8/19	8/20	China		[3] 261.00						261.00
	8/21	8/23	South Korea		[3] 484.00						484.00
Mark Gage	6/28	7/2	Ukraine		[3] 613.00		4,736.18				5,349.18
	7/2	7/6	Moldova		[3] 613.00						613.00
Elana Broitman	6/29	7/2	Ukraine		[3] 700.00		4,509.17				5,209.17
Clifford Kupchan	6/28	7/2	Ukraine		[3] 680.00		4,736.18				5,416.18
	7/2	7/6	Moldova		[3] 680.00						680.00
Paul Berkowitz	7/18	7/21	Germany		600.00		5,511.11				6,111.11
	8/10	8/18	India		2,201.00		5,850.52				8,051,52
	8/19	8/20	Nepal								
	8/20	8/21	Thailand		190.00						190.00
Stephen Rademaker	7/8	7/10	Panama		334.00		1,323.00				1,657.00
	8/3	8/4	Canada		184.00		293.61				477.61
John Mackey	7/8	7/10	Panama		334.00		1323.00				1,657.00
Thomas Sheehy	6/28	7/4	Congo		1,240.00		7,179.77				8,419.77
	7/4	7/6	Uganda		310.00						310.00
Gregory Simpkins	6/28	7/4	Congo		1,240.00		7,179.77				8,419.77
	7/4	7/6	Uganda		310.00						310.00
Amos Hochstein	6/28	7/4	Congo		1,240.00		7,179.77				8,419.77
	7/4	7/6	Uganda		310.00						310.00
Jodi Christiansen	6/28	7/4	Congo		1,240.00		7,179.77				8,419.77
	7/4	7/6	Uganda		310.00						310.00
Hon. Christopher Smith	8/13	8/16	Thailand		760.00		706.00				1,466.00
G. Joseph Rees	7/7	7/9	Czech Republic		[3] 430.00		4,988.22				5,418.22
	7/9	7/11	Switzerland		[3] 500.00						500.00
	8/13	8/18	Thailand		760.00		3,858.00				4,618.00
	8/18	8/21	Philippines		594.00						594.00
Robert King	7/4	7/7	Germany		916.00		1,203.11				2,119.11
	7/7	7/10	Czech Republic		846.00				716.52		1,562.52
	7/10	7/14	Poland		1,112.00						1,112.00
Lester Munson	7/8	7/12	Morocco		447.20		4,834.25				5,281.45
	7/12	7/13	Algeria								
Celes Hughes	7/8	7/12	Morocco		447.20		4,834.25				5,281.45
	7/12	7/13	Algeria								
Maria Pica	8/10	8/13	China		[3] 718.00		4,846.00				5,564.00
	8/13	8/19	North Korea		[3] 1,028.00						1,028.00
	8/19	8/24	China		408.00						408.00
Mark Kirk	8/10	8/13	China		828.00		4,846.00				5,674.00
	8/13	8/19	North Korea		1,428.00						1,428.00
	8/19	8/24	China		408.00						408.00
Peter Brookes	8/10	8/13	China		828.00		4,846.00				5,674.00
	8/13	8/19	North Korea		1,428.00						1,428.00
	8/19	8/24	China		(3)						
Committee total					50,736.85		163,959.32		716.52		215,412.69

[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] Represents refund of unused per diem.

BEN GILMAN, Chairman, Feb. 8, 2000.

AMENDED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1998

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. Cass Ballenger	11/29	12/1	Nicaragua		[3] 74.00						74.00
Paul Berkowitz	12/7	12/10	Taiwan		934.50						934.50
	12/10	12/12	Hong Kong		694.00						694.00
	12/12	12/15	Thailand		[3] 720.00						720.00
Commercial airfare							4,266.46				4,266.46
Hon. Cass Ballenger	12/1	12/2	Mexico		[3] 188.99						188.99
	12/2	12/4	El Salvador		[3] 30.00						30.00
	12/4	12/6	Nicaragua		[3] 176.25						176.25
Paul Berkowitz	12/3	12/4	India		365.25						365.25
	12/4	12/7	Nepal		712.00						712.00
	12/8	12/10	Bhutan		312.00						312.00

AMENDED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 1998—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]
	12/11	12/13	India		385.00						385.00
Commercial airfare							7,408.70				7,408.70
Deborah Bodlander	11/15	11/19	Qatar		900.00						900.00
Commercial airfare							5,697.90				5,697.90
Deborah Bodlander	12/2	12/6	England		1,416.00						1,416.00
Malik Chaka	12/3	12/6	Senegal		687.50						687.50
Commercial airfare							4,220.78				4,220.78
Jodi Christiansen	11/29	12/1	Nicaragua		187.50						187.50
Theodros Dagne	11/21	11/25	Cote d'Ivoire		625.00						625.00
	11/25	11/28	Ghana		[3] 634.00						634.00
	11/28	12/1	Nigeria		[3] 770.00						770.00
	12/1	12/3	Mali		250.00						250.00
	12/3	12/5	Senegal		487.50						487.50
	12/6	12/8	Rwanda		264.00						264.00
Commercial airfare							9,383.49				9,383.49
John Herzberg	11/5	11/9	Serbia-Montene		596.00						596.00
	11/9	11/11	Bosnia-Herzego		[3] 542.00						542.00
	11/11	11/13	Austria		376.00						376.00
Commercial airfare							4,576.76				4,576.76
Amos Hochstein	12/9	12/12	Turkey		[3] 443.00						443.00
	12/2	12/13	Qatar		[3] 159.00						159.00
	12/13	12/15	Saudi Arabia		[3] 72.00						72.00
Commercial airfare							6,332.54				6,332.54
Celes Hughes	12/7	12/9	Jordan		438.00						438.00
	12/9	12/12	Turkey		563.00						563.00
	12/12	12/13	Qatar		199.0						199.00
	12/13	12/15	Saudi Arabia		[3] 272.00						272.00
Commercial airfare							6,485.00				6,485.00
Kenneth Katzman	12/7	12/9	Jordan		[3] 423.00						423.00
	12/9	12/12	Turkey		[3] 513.00						513.00
	12/12	12/13	Qatar		199.00						199.00
	12/13	12/15	Saudi Arabia		[3] 272.00						272.00
Commercial airfare							6,485.00				6,485.00
Mark Kirk	11/5	11/9	Servia-Montenegro		650.00						650.00
	11/10	11/15	Argentina		918.99		7,568.97				8,487.96
John Mackey	11/10	11/12	Belgium		498.00						498.00
	11/12	11/13	United Kingdom		315.00						315.00
	11/13	11/17	Ireland		892.00						892.00
Commercial airfare							4,811.48				4,811.48
John Mackey	12/5	12/11	Ireland		1,431.00						1,431.00
Commercial airfare							6,605.52				6,605.52
Caleb McCarry	11/11	11/13	Nicaragua		[3] 366.00						366.00
Commercial airfare							1,176.00				1,176.00
Caleb McCarry	11/29	12/1	Nicaragua		[3] 137.50						137.50
Denis McDonough	11/11	11/13	Nnicaragua		[3] 366.00						366.00
Commercial airfare							1,176.00				1,176.00
Hon. Robert Menendez	11/29	12/1	Nicaragua		187.50						187.50
Hon. Donald Payne	11/21	11/25	Code d'Ivoire		625.00						625.00
	11/25	11/28	Ghana		695.97						695.97
	11/28	12/1	Nigeria		831.00						831.00
	12/1	12/3	Mali		[3] 50.00						50.00
	12/3	12/5	Senegal		[3] 100.00		6,611.68				6,711.68
Maria Pica	11/5	11/9	Serbia		596.00						596.00
	11/9	11/11	Bosnia		554.00						554.00
	11/11	11/13	Austria		376.00						376.00
Commercial airfare							4,517.76				4,517.76
Stephen Rademaker	12/7	12/9	Jordan		438.00				66.84		504.84
	12/9	12/12	Turkey		563.00						563.00
	12/12	12/13	Qatar		199.00						199.00
	12/13	12/15	Saudi Arabia		286.00						286.00
Commercial airfare							6,485.00				6,485.00
Francis Record	11/9	11/13	Kazakstan		1,100.00						1,100.00
Commercial airfare							5,223.54				5,223.54
Francis Record	12/7	12/9	Jordan		388.00						388.00
	12/10	12/11	Turkey		413.00						413.00
	12/11	12/12	Qatar		149.00						149.00
	12/12	12/16	Saudi Arabia		72.00						72.00
Commercial airfare							6,485.00				6,485.00
Grover Joseph Rees	12/7	12/10	Taiwan		589.50				12.00		601.50
	12/10	12/12	Hong Kong		584.00						584.00
	12/12	12/15	Thailand		960.00				13.00		973.00
Commercial airfare							4,053.46				4,053.46
Dana Rohrabacher	11/30	12/2	Kuwait		676.00						676.00
	12/2	12/5	Taiwan		1,180.00						1,180.00
	12/5	12/11	Philippines		804.00						804.00
Commercial airfare							6,378.89				6,378.89
Tom Campbell	11/22	11/25	Cote D'Ivore		625.00		2,438.84				3,063.84
	11/25	11/28	Ghana		695.97						695.97
	11/28	12/1	Nigeria		970.00						970.00
	12/1	12/3	Mali		250.00						250.00
	12/3	12/6	Senegal		587.50						587.50
	12/7	12/12	Morocco		604.00						604.00
Malik Chaka	11/22	11/25	Cote D'Ivore		625.00						625.00
	11/25	11/28	Ghana		695.97						695.77
	11/28	12/1	Nigeria		970.00						970.00
	12/1	12/3	Mali		250.00						250.00
Committee total					40,145.39		118,388.77		91.84		158,626.00

[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] Represents refund of unused per diem.

BEN GILMAN, Chairman, Mar. 1, 2000.

AMENDED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1, AND MARCH. 31, 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. Gary Ackerman	1/10	1/12	Finland		568.00						568.00

AMENDED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1, AND MARCH. 31, 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]
	1/12	1/14	Germany		508.00						508.00
	1/14	1/16	France		502.00						502.00
Commercial airfare							1,664.00				1,664.00
Hon. Cass Ballenger	2/13	2/14	El Salvador		210.00						210.00
	2/14	2/15	Panama		217.00						217.00
	2/15	2/16	Colombia		145.00						145.00
	2/16	2/18	Venezuela								
	2/18	2/21	Mexico		368.00						368.00
Hon. Doug Bereuter	1/9	1/11	South Korea		136.00						136.00
	1/11	1/14	Indonesia		699.00						699.00
	1/14	1/16	China		334.00						334.00
Paul Berkowitz	2/14	2/18	India		867.00						867.00
Commercial airfare							6,744.18				6,744.18
Hon. Doug Bereuter	1/16	1/18	Taiwan		1,335.00						1,335.00
	1/18	1/19	Japan								
Deborah Bodlander	1/9	1/13	Yemen		1,132.00						1,132.00
	1/13	1/15	Egypt		417.00						417.00
	1/15	1/18	Lebanon		190.00						190.00
	1/18	1/23	Israel		1,465.00						1,465.00
Commercial airfare							6,524.00				6,524.00
	3/7	3/10	Qatar		597.00						597.00
Commercial airfare							6,015.40				6,015.40
Hon. Kevin Brady	1/14	1/16	France		502.00						502.00
	1/16	1/18	Austria		480.00						480.00
Commercial airfare							3,137.20				3,137.20
Brent Parker	1/10	1/12	Finland		568.00						568.00
	1/12	1/14	Germany		508.00						508.00
	1/14	1/16	France		502.00						502.00
	1/16	1/18	Austria		480.00						480.00
Peter Brookes	1/10	1/13	Australia		517.00						517.00
	1/14	1/16	New Zealand		300.00						300.00
Commercial airfare							8,213.70				8,213.00
Hon. John Cooksey	2/12	2/14	United Kingdom		610.08						610.08
	2/14	2/16	Jerusalem		360.50						360.50
	2/16	2/17	Turkey		88.00						88.00
	2/17	2/19	Bahrain		390.64						390.64
	2/19	2/20	Turkey		181.31						181.31
	2/20	2/21	Ireland		264.00						264.00
Hon. Joseph Crowley	2/25	2/28	Colombia		386.00						386.00
Commercial airfare							1,651.40				1,651.40
Michael Ennis	1/10	1/11	South Korea		136.00						136.00
	1/11	1/14	Indonesia		661.00						661.00
	1/14	1/16	Hong Kong		334.00						334.00
	1/16	1/18	Taiwan		667.50						667.50
Richard Garon	1/10	1/12	Finland		568.00						568.00
	1/12	1/14	Germany		508.00						508.00
	1/14	1/16	France		502.00						502.00
	1/16	1/18	Austria		480.00						480.00
	1/27	1/28	Dominican Republic		161.00						161.00
Kristin Gilley	1/9	1/13	Yemen		962.00						962.00
	1/13	1/15	Egypt		452.00						452.00
	1/15	1/18	Lebanon		400.00						400.00
	1/18	1/22	Israel		1,415.00						1,415.00
Commercial airfare							6,524.16				6,524.16
Hon. Benjamin Gilman	1/10	1/12	Finland		568.00						568.00
	1/12	1/14	Germany		508.00						508.00
	1/14	1/16	France		502.00						502.00
	1/16	1/18	Austria		480.00						480.00
	1/27	1/28	Dominican Republic		161.00						161.00
Charisse Glassman	2/24	3/1	Nigeria		1,607.00						1,607.00
	3/1	3/2	Cape Verde		75.00						75.00
Jason Gross	2/13	2/16	Greece		625.00						625.00
	2/16	2/17	Cyprus		200.00						200.00
	2/17	2/18	Greece		124.00						124.00
	2/18	2/20	Turkey		678.00						678.00
Commercial airfare							2,714.72				2,714.72
John Herzberg	1/10	1/12	Finland		568.00						568.00
	1/12	1/14	Germany		508.00						508.00
	1/14	1/16	France		502.00						502.00
	1/16	1/18	Austria		480.00						480.00
	2/14	2/16	Greece		626.00						626.00
Commercial airfare					2,714.72						2,714.72
Hon. Earl Hilliard	1/10	1/12	Finland		568.00						568.00
	1/12	1/14	Germany		508.00						508.00
	1/14	1/16	France		502.00						502.00
	1/16	1/18	Austria		480.00						480.00
Charmaine Houseman	2/14	3/1	Nigeria		1,532.00						1,532.00
	3/1	3/2	Cape Verde		75.00						75.00
Robert King	1/10	1/12	Finland		568.00						568.00
	1/12	1/14	Germany		508.00						508.00
	1/14	1/16	France		502.00						502.00
	1/16	1/18	Austria		480.00						480.00
Hon. Barbara Lee	2/25	2/27	Nigeria		1,255.00						1,255.00
Commercial airfare							3,726.60				3,726.60
John Mackey	1/10	1/12	Finland		568.00						568.00
	1/12	1/14	Germany		508.00						508.00
	1/14	1/16	France		502.00						502.00
	1/16	1/18	Austria		480.00						480.00
	2/14	2/18	Colombia		950.00						950.00
	2/18	2/21	Mexico		455.00						455.00
Commercial airfare							1,439.67				1,439.67
Caleb McCarry	1/27	1/28	Dominican Republic		111.0						111.00
	1/26	2/28	Colombia		361.00						361.00
Commercial airfare							1,662.40				1,662.40
Dennis McDonough	1/27	1/28	Dominican Republic		91.00						91.00
	2/26	2/28	Colombia		386.00						386.00
Commercial airfare			Commercial				702.40				702.40
Hon. Cynthia McKinney	12/27	12/28	United Kingdom		365.00						365.00
	1/1	1/02	Burundi		197.00				1,876.96		2,073.96
Commercial airfare							7,700.92				7,700.92
	2/4	2/7	Netherlands		754.87						754.87
Commercial airfare							4,780.47				4,780.47
Hon. Gregory Meeks	2/24	3/1	Nigeria		1,532.00						1,532.00
	3/1	3/2	Cape Verde		117.52						117.52
Lester Munson	2/24	3/1	Nigeria		1,532.00						1,532.00

AMENDED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JAN. 1, AND MARCH. 31, 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]
	3/1	3/2	Cape Verde		75.00						75.00
Hon. Donald Payne	2/24	3/1	Nigeria		1,607.00						1,607.00
	3/1	3/2	Cape Verde		75.00						75.00
Alfred Prados	1/9	1/13	Yemen		650.14						650.14
	1/13	1/15	Egypt		81.96						81.96
	1/15	1/18	Lebanon								
	1/18	1/23	Israel		904.92						904.92
Commercial airfare							6,524.16				6,524.16
Joseph Rees	1/24	1/25	Taiwan		217.00						217.00
	1/25	1/30	Vietnam		541.00						541.00
	1/30	1/31	Philippines		198.00						198.00
Commercial airfare							3,931.40				3,931.40
Walker Roberts	1/10	1/13	Australia		517.00						517.00
	1/14	1/16	New Zealand		300.00						300.00
Commercial airfare							8,213.70				8,213.70
	2/14	2/16	Greece		626.00						626.00
	2/16	2/18	Turkey		200.00						200.00
Commercial airfare							2,714.72				2,714.72
Hon. Dana Rohrabacher	2/20	2/21	Marshall Islands		185.00						185.00
Hon. Edward Royce	2/25	3/1	Nigeria		1532.00						1532.00
	3/1	3/2	Cape Verde		75.00						75.00
Thomas Sheehy	2/24	3/1	Nigeria		1,532.00						1,532.00
	3/1	3/2	Cape Verde		75.00						75.00
Linda Solomon	1/10	1/12	Finland		568.00						568.00
	1/12	1/14	Germany		508.00						508.00
	1/14	1/16	France		502.00						502.00
	1/14	1/16	France		502.00						502.00
	1/16	1/18	Austria		480.00						480.00
Hillel Weinberg	1/10	1/12	Finland		404.00						404.00
	1/12	1/14	Germany		319.00						319.00
	1/14	1/18	France		329.00						329.00
	1/16	1/18	Austria		288.00						288.00
Hon. Robert Wexler	1/17	1/21	Czech Republic		928.00						928.00
Commercial airfare							2,201.05				2,201.05
Committee total					63,607.26		86,786.25		1,876.96		152,270.47

[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.

BEN GILMAN, Chairman, Mar. 1, 2000.

AMENDED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, 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. Cass Ballenger	5/28	5/30	Venezuela		205.00						205.00
	5/30	5/31	Honduras		152.00						152.00
	5/31	6/2	El Salvador		320.00						320.00
Paul Berkowitz	3/29	3/30	Italy		276.00						276.00
	3/30	4/3	India		1,476.00						1,476.00
	4/3	4/4	Czech Republic		127.00						127.00
	4/4	4/8	Switzerland		1,100.00						1,100.00
Commercial airfare							1,898.05				1,898.05
Nancy Bloomer	3/27	3/28	Italy		328.00						328.00
	3/28	3/30	Israel		658.00						658.00
	3/30	4/1	Egypt		452.00						452.00
	4/1	4/3	Jordan		588.00						588.00
	4/3	4/5	Tunisia		358.00						358.00
	4/5	4/8	Morocco		569.00						569.00
Jason Gross	3/29	3/30	U.K.		315.00		5,824.23				6,139.23
	3/30	4/1	Ireland		412.00						412.00
	4/1	4/3	U.K.		520.00						520.00
Deborah Bodlander	3/27	3/28	Italy		228.00						228.00
	3/28	3/30	Israel		578.00						578.00
	3/30	4/1	Egypt		337.00						337.00
	4/1	4/3	Jordan		448.00						448.00
	4/3	4/5	Tunisia		238.00						238.00
	4/5	4/8	Morocco		501.00						501.00
Paul Bonicelli	5/28	5/30	Venezuela		515.00						515.00
	5/30	5/31	Honduras		152.00						152.00
	5/31	6/2	El Salvador		320.00						320.00
Peter Brookes	3/28	3/30	Japan		502.00						502.00
	3/30	4/1	South Korea		476.00						476.00
	4/1	4/4	Taiwan		955.50						955.50
Commercial airfare							2,971.20				2,971.20
Malik Chaka	6/2	6/5	Kenya		780.00						780.00
	6/5	6/7	Sudan				714.28				714.28
	6/7	6/7	Kenya								
	6/7	6/7	Amsterdam								
							4,951.09				4,951.09
Marion Chamber	3/26	3/28	Turkmenistan		382.00		114.00				496.00
	3/28	4/1	Uzbekistan		1,063.00		106.00				1,169.00
	4/1	4/3	Kazakhstan		783.00						783.00
	4/3	4/5	Kyrgystan		272.00						272.00
	4/5	4/6	Kazakhstan								
Commercial airfare							6,407.59				6,407.59
Mark Clack	3/30	4/1	Egypt		452.00		2,487.38				2,939.38
	4/1	4/3	Jordan		588.00						588.00
	4/3	4/5	Tunisia		358.00						358.00
	4/5	4/8	Morocco		661.00						661.00
Michael Ennis	3/26	3/28	Turkmenistan		382.00						382.00
	3/28	4/1	Uzbekistan		1,063.00						1,063.00
	4/1	4/3	Lazaljstam		783						783.00
	4/3	4/5	Kyrgystan		272.00						272.00
	4/5	4/6	Kazakhstan								
Commercial airfare							6,407.59				6,407.59
Hon. Eni Faleomavaega	4/3	4/5	South Korea		576.00						576.00

AMENDED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1, AND JUNE 30, 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]
	4/5	4/8	Australia		354.00						354.00
	4/8	4/11	New Zealand		259.00						259.00
Commercial airfare							799.67				799.67
Hon. Sam Gejdenson	5/28	5/30	Lithuania		397.00						397.00
	5/30	6/1	Belarus		492.00						492.00
Commercial airfare					.00		4,508.58				4,508.58
Hon. Benjamin Gilman	3/27	3/28	Italy		328.00						328.00
	3/28	3/30	Israel		658.00						658.00
	3/30	4/1	Egypt		452.00						452.00
	4/1	4/3	Jordan		588.00						588.00
	4/3	4/5	Tunisia		358.00						358.00
	4/5	4/8	Morocco		661.00						661.00
Charisse Glassman	6/1	6/5	Kenya		900.00						900.00
	6/5	6/7	Sudan				714.28				714.28
	6/7	6/7	Kenya								
	6/7	6/7	Amsterdam								
Commercial airfare							5,960.25				5,960.25
Hon. Alcee Hastings	4/22	4/24	Denmark		720.25						720.25
Commercial airfare							4,411.01				4,411.01
	6/11	6/14	Haiti		455.50						455.50
Hon. Earl Hilliard	3/27	3/28	Italy		328.00						328.00
	3/28	3/30	Israel		658.00						658.00
	3/30	4/1	Egypt		452.00						452.00
	4/1	4/3	Jordan		588.00						588.00
	4/3	4/5	Tunisia		358.00						358.00
	4/5	4/8	Morocco		661.00						661.00
Amos Hochstein	3/27	3/30	Italy		300.00						300.00
	3/28	3/30	Israel		587.00						587.00
	5/28	5/30	Finland		384.00						384.00
	5/30	6/1	Belgium		438.00						438.00
Commercial airfare							4,369.46				4,369.46
Hon. Amo Houghton	6/15	6/17	South Africa				5,559.31				5,559.31
Hon. Barbara Lee	4/1	4/4	South Africa								
	4/5	4/7	Ghana								
	4/8	4/10	South Africa								
Commercial airfare							8,019.20				8,019.20
John Mackey	5/27	6/1	Spain		1,347.50						1,347.50
Commercial airfare							2,862.84				2,862.84
Michelle Maynard	5/28	5/30	Lithuania		297.00						297.00
	5/30	6/1	Belarus		342.00						342.00
Commercial airfare							4,697.58				4,697.58
Caleb McCarry	5/29	5/30	Ecuador		325.00						325.00
	5/30	5/31	Peru		103.00						103.00
	5/31	5/31	Aruba		73.00						73.00
	5/31	6/1	Curacao		177.00						177.00
	6/1	6/3	Panama		323.00						323.00
Commercial airfare							2,109.62				2,109.62
Denis McDonough	5/29	5/30	Ecuador		325.00						325.00
	5/30	5/31	Peru		103.00						103.00
	5/31	6/2	Colombia		386.00						386.00
Commercial airfare							856.20				856.20
Kathleen Moazed	3/30	4/1	South Korea		476.00						476.00
	4/1	4/2	China		276.00						276.00
	4/2	4/3	Hong Kong		297.00						297.00
	4/3	4/5	Vietnam		456.00						456.00
Commercial airfare							6,625.88				6,625.88
Lester Munson	3/27	3/28	Italy		328.00						328.00
	3/28	3/30	Israel		658.00						658.00
	3/30	4/1	Egypt		452.00						452.00
	4/1	4/3	Jordan		588.00						588.00
	4/3	4/5	Tunisia		350.00						350.00
	4/5	4/8	Morocco		569.00						569.00
Hon. Donald Payne	6/4	6/6	Kenya		750.00						750.00
	6/6	6/7	Sudan				714.28				714.28
	6/7	6/7	Kenya								
	6/7	6/7	Amsterdam								
Commercial airfare							5,752.20				5,752.20
Stephen Rademaker	3/28	3/30	Japan		502.00						502.00
	3/30	4/1	South Korea		476.00						476.00
	4/1	4/2	Taiwan		409.50						409.50
Commercial airfare							3,132.73				3,132.73
	6/1	6/3	Panama		348.00						348.00
Commercial airfare							1,694.40				1,694.40
Grover Joseph Rees	4/3	4/5	Czech Republic		400.00						400.00
	4/5	4/8	Switzerland		900.00						900.00
Commercial airfare							4,493.73				4,493.73
	5/30	5/31	Singapore		233.00						233.00
	5/31	6/10	Indonesia		1,627.00						1,627.00
	6/10	6/11	Singapore		254.00						254.00
Commercial airfare							4,344.40				4,344.40
John Mackey	3/29	3/30	U.K.		315.00						315.00
	3/30	4/3	Ireland		824.00						824.00
Commercial airfare							5,087.68				5,087.68
John Walker Roberts	3/28	3/30	Japan		502.00						502.
	3/30	4/1	South Korea		476.00						476.00
	4/1	4/4	Taiwan		955.50						955.50
Commercial airfare							3,864.73				3,864.73
Kimberly Roberts	3/27	3/28	Italy		328.00						328.00
	3/28	3/30	Israel		658.00						658.00
	3/30	4/1	Egypt		452.00						452.00
	4/1	4/3	Jordan		588.00						588.00
	4/3	4/5	Tunisia		358.00						358.00
	4/5	4/8	Morocco		569.00						569.00
Hon. Mark Sanford	5/28	5/30	Venezuela		205.00						205.00
	5/30	5/31	Honduras		152.00						152.00
	5/31	6/2	El Salvador		320.00						320.00
Hon. Tom Tancredo	6/2	6/2	Amsterdam		900.00						900.00
	6/2	6/5	Kenya								
	6/5	6/7	Sudan				714.28				714.28
	6/7	6/7	Kenya								
	6/7	6/7	Amsterdam								
Commercial airfare							6,961.09				6,961.09
Hillel Weinberg	5/28	5/30	Finland		384.00						384.00
	5/30	6/1	Belgium		438.00						438.00
Commercial airfare							4,467.73				4,467.73

AMENDED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 1, AND JUNE 30, 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]
Peter Yeo	3/30	4/1	South Korea		476.00						476.73
	4/1	4/2	China		276.00						276.00
	4/2	4/3	Hong Kong		297.00						297.00
	4/3	4/5	Vietnam		456.00						456.00
Commercial airfare							6,625.88				6,625.88
Mark Kirk	3/27	3/28	Italy		328.00						328.00
	3/28	3/30	Israel		658.00						658.00
	3/30	4/1	Egypt		452.00						452.00
	4/1	4/3	Jordan		588.00						588.00
	4/3	4/5	Tunisia		358.00						358.00
	4/5	4/7	Morocco		255.00						255.00
	4/7	4/11	Macedonia				4,717.55				4,717.55
Committee total					59,617.75		135,725.97				195,343.72

[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.

BEN GILMAN, Chairman, Mar. 1, 2000.

AMENDED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 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]
David Adams	8/8	8/10	Japan		522.00						522.00
	8/10	8/11	Hong Kong		297.00						297.00
	8/11	8/14	China		621.00						621.00
	8/14	8/18	Mongolia		483.00						483.00
Commercial airfare							6,514.68				6,514.68
Hon. Cass Ballenger	8/29	8/30	Venezuela		103.65						103.65
	8/30	9/1	Colombia		108.65						108.65
	9/1	9/3	Nicaragua		402.65						402.65
Hon. Doug Bereuter	8/31	9/3	Australia		664.00		178.02				842.02
Sean Carroll	8/17	8/19	Venezuela		541.94		1,521.40				2,063.34
Mark Kirk	8/24	8/25	Macedonia		95.30		4,638.40				4,733.70
	8/25	8/27	Serbia		114.60						114.60
	8/27	8/29	Montenegro		120.60						120.60
	8/29	9/1	Bosnia		701.85						701.85
Paul Berkowitz	7/3	7/4	Thailand		796.00						796.00
	7/5	7/6	Cambodia		472.00						472.00
	7/7	7/8	Laos								
	7/8	7/10	Thailand								
Commercial airfare							4,753.40				4,753.40
	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
Nancy Bloomer	7/8	7/10	United Kingdom		766.00						766.00
Commercial airfare							534.52				534.52
Deborah Bodlander	7/3	7/6	Syria		540.00						540.00
	7/6	7/8	Lebanon		70.00						70.00
Commercial airfare							6,924.71				6,924.71
Paul Bonicelli	8/17	8/19	Venezuela		514.94						514.94
Commercial airfare							1,521.40				1,521.40
Parker Brent	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
Peter Brookes	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
Thomas Callahan	7/8	7/11	South Africa		208.50						208.50
Commercial airfare							7,280.11				7,280.11
	8/17	8/24	Ethiopia		1,421.00						1,421.00
	8/24	8/25	Saudi Arabia		166.00						166.00
	8/25	8/28	Eritrea		524.00						524.00
Commercial airfare							6,641.81				6,641.81
Hon. Tom Campbell	7/5	7/8	Zimbabwe		477.00						477.00
	7/8	7/11	South Africa		300.00						300.00
Commercial airfare							3,632.11				3,632.11
	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
	9/10	9/12	Haiti		183.00						183.00
Sean Carroll	8/29	8/30	Venezuela		283.65						283.65
	8/30	9/1	Colombia		386.00						386.00
	9/1	9/3	Nicaragua		427.50						427.50
Malik Chaka	8/8	8/9	Guinea		1,450.00						1,450.00
	8/9	8/11	Sierra Leone								
	8/11	8/16	Guinea								
Commercial airfare							4,379.40				4,379.40
Mark Clack	8/8	8/9	Guinea		1450.00						1450.00
	8/9	8/11	Sierra Leone								
	8/11	8/16	Guinea								
Commercial airfare							4,379.40				4,379.40
Theodore Dagne	7/5	7/8	Zimbabwe		477.00						477.00
	7/8	7/11	South Africa		300.00						300.00
Commercial airfare							7,280.11				7,280.11
Hon. William Delahunt	9/1	9/2	Nicaragua		232.50						232.50
Commercial airfare							1,127.60				1,127.60
Michael Ennis	8/21	8/24	Turkey		579.00						579.00
	8/24	8/25	Armenia		300.00						300.00
	8/26	8/30	Georgia		300.00						300.00
	8/30	9/2	Azerbaijan		808.00						808.00
Commercial airfare							5,926.60				5,926.60
Hon. Eni Faleomavaega	8/9	8/10	Taiwan		265.00		2,060.76				2,325.76
	8/10	8/12	Thailand		498.00						498.00

AMENDED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 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]
	8/13	8/17	Australia		1,078.67						1,078.67
	8/17	8/20	New Zealand		713.19						713.19
	9/10	9/12	Haiti		183.00						183.00
Mark Gage	8/28	8/31	Slovak Republic		519.50						519.50
	8/31	9/2	Romania		492.00						492.00
	9/2	9/4	Bulgaria		190.00						190.00
	9/4	9/6	Hungary		553.00						553.00
	9/6	9/7	Netherlands		207.00						207.00
Rich Garon	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
Kristen Gilley	8/8	8/10	Taiwan		530.00						530.00
	8/10	8/12	Thailand		498.00						498.00
	8/12	8/17	Australia		1,325.43						1,325.43
	8/17	8/19	New Zealand		641.14						641.14
Commercial airfare							3,624.41				3,624.41
Hon. Benjamin Gilman	7/8	7/10	United Kingdom		766.00						766.00
Commercial airfare							534.52				534.52
	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
Charisse Glassman	7/5	7/8	Zimbabwe		477.00						477.00
	7/8	7/11	South Africa		300.00						300.00
Commercial airfare							6,008.17				6,008.17
	9/10	9/12	Haiti		183.00						183.00
Jason Gross	8/24	8/25	Macedonia		160.00						160.00
	8/25	8/27	Serbia		244.00						244.00
	8/27	8/29	Montenegro		250.00						250.00
	8/29	8/31	Bosnia		602.00						602.00
Commercial airfare							4,638.40				4,638.00
Hon. Alcee Hastings	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
John Herzberg	8/24	8/25	Macedona		160.00						160.00
	8/25	8/27	Serbia		238.00						238.00
	8/27	8/29	Montenegro		250.00						250.00
	8/29	8/31	Bosnia		602.00						602.00
Commercial airfare							4,638.40				4,638.40
Amos Hochstein	7/3	7/6	Syria		612.00						612.00
	7/6	7/10	Lebanon		105.00						105.00
Commercial airfare							6,924.71				6,924.71
Mark Kirk	8/24	9/1	Yugoslavia		1032.25						1032.35
Commercial airfare							4,638.40				4,638.40
John Mackey	8/8	8/10	Taiwan		530.00						530.00
	8/10	8/12	Thailand		498.00						498.00
	8/12	8/14	Ireland		380.00						380.00
Commercial airfare							2,685.20				2,685.20
	8/30	8/31	Slovak Republic		293.50						293.50
	8/31	9/2	Romania		492.00						492.00
	9/2	9/4	Bulgaria		250.00						250.00
	9/4	9/6	Hungary		502.00						502.00
	9/6	9/7	Netherlands		207.00						207.00
Commercial airfare							2,340.85				
Caleb McCarry	8/29	8/30	Venezuela		283.65						283.65
	8/30	9/1	Colombia		386.00						386.00
	9/1	9/3	Nicaragua		427.50						427.50
	9/10	9/12	Haiti		118.00						118.00
Cynthia McKinney	8/26	8/28	Democratic Republic of the Congo		579.00		197.21				776.21
Commercial airfare							6,043.40				6,043.40
Kathleen Moazed	8/23	8/26	Armenia		400.00						400.00
	8/26	8/30	Georgia		300.00						300.00
	8/30	9/2	Azerbaijian		950.00						950.00
Commercial airfare							5,924.63				5,924.63
Vince Morelli	8/17	8/19	Venezuela		541.94						541.94
Commercial airfare							1,521.40				1,521.40
Hon. Donald Payne	7/5	7/8	Zimbabwe		477.00						477.00
	7/8	7/11	South Africa		300.00						300.00
Commercial airfare							5,704.17				5,704.17
	9/10	9/12	Haiti		183.00						183.00
Joseph Rees	8/9	8/11	Switzerland		3,200.00						3,200.00
	8/11	8/14	Macedonia								
	8/14	8/18	Kosovo								
	8/18	8/19	Macedonia								
	8/19	8/24	Italy								
Commercial airfare							5,031.39				5,031.39
Matthew Reynolds	8/8	8/10	Japan		522.00						522.00
	8/10	8/11	Hong Kong		297.00						297.00
	8/11	8/14	China		621.00						621.00
	8/14	8/18	Mongolia		388.00						388.00
Commercial airfare							6,514.68				6,514.68
Hon. Dana Rohrabacher	8/28	8/31	Slovak Republic		589.50						589.50
	8/31	9/2	Romania		522.00						522.00
	9/2	9/4	Bulgaria		250.00						250.00
	9/4	9/6	Hungary		502.00						502.00
	9/6	9/7	Netherlands		207.00						207.00
Linda Solomon	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
Matthew Reynolds	8/8	8/10	Japan		522.00						522.00
	8/10	8/11	Hong Kong		297.00						297.00
	8/11	8/14	China		621.00						621.00
	8/14	8/18	Mongolia		388.00						388.00
Commercial airfare							6,514.68				6,514.68
Hon. Dana Rohrabacher	8/28	8/31	Slovak Republic		589.50						589.50
	8/31	9/2	Romania		522.00						522.00
	9/2	9/4	Bulgaria		250.00						250.00
	9/4	9/6	Hungary		502.00						502.00
	9/6	9/7	Netherlands		207.00						207.00
Linda Solomon	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

AMENDED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 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]
	8/17	8/20	New Zealand		713.19						713.19
Committee total					69,639.58		136,264.37				205,903.95

[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.

BEN GILMAN, Chairman, Mar. 1, 2000.

AMENDED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 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]
David Abramowitz	12/14	12/17	Argentina		825.00						825.00
	12/17	12/18	Paraguay		135.00						135.00
	12/18	12/20	Brazil		474.00						474.00
Commercial airfare							4,032.45				4,032.45
Hon. Cass Ballenger	12/2	12/4	Curacao		455.06						455.06
	12/4	12/6	Aruba		353.60						353.60
	12/6	12/8	Ecuador		310.04						310.04
	12/8	12/10	Panama		295.23						295.23
Peter Brookes	12/6	12/9	Philippines		627.00						627.00
	12/9	12/11	Singapore		398.00						398.00
	12/11	12/12	Hong Kong		594.00						594.00
Commercial airfare							6,605.79				6,605.79
Hon. Tom Campbell	11/21	11/22	Thailand		249.00						249.00
	11/22	11/26	Burma		626.00						626.00
	11/26	12/1	Vietnam		1,390.00						1,390.00
	12/1	12/2	Thailand		498.00						498.00
Commercial airfare							3,053.45				3,053.45
Malik Chaka	12/2	12/8	Cote d'Ivoire		1,027.00						1,027.00
	12/8	12/9	France		283.00						283.00
Commercial airfare							6,385.94				6,385.94
Mark Clack	11/29	12/2	Nigeria		835.00						835.00
	12/2	12/3	Ghana		200.00						200.00
Commercial airfare							5,974.20				5,974.20
David Fite	12/8	12/9	Philippines		209.00						209.00
	12/9	12/11	Singapore		398.00						398.00
	12/11	12/13	Hong Kong		594.00						594.00
	12/13	12/16	China		693.00						693.00
Commercial airfare							6,605.79				6,605.79
Mark Gage	11/29	12/3	Russia		1,450.00						1,450.00
Commercial airfare							5,003.61				5,003.61
Hon. Sam Gejdenson	11/29	12/2	Nigeria		900.00						900.00
	12/2	12/3	Ghana		200.00						200.00
Commercial airfare							6,054.45				6,054.45
Kristen Gilley	12/14	12/17	Argentina		825.00						825.00
	12/17	12/18	Paraguay		135.00						135.00
	12/18	12/20	Brazil		474.00						474.00
Commercial airfare							4,032.45				4,032.45
Charisse Glassman	11/19	11/20	Thailand		249.00						249.00
	11/21	11/26	Burma		626.00						626.00
	11/27	11/29	Vietnam		754.00						754.00
	11/30	12/1	Thailand		498.00						498.00
Commercial airfare							5,148.45				5,148.45
Hon. Barbara Lee	11/29	12/2	Nigeria		900.00						900.00
	12/2	12/3	Ghana		200.00						200.00
Commercial airfare							6,274.20				6,274.20
John Mackey	11/4	11/6	Colombia		486.00						486.00
Commercial airfare							1,744.45				1,744.45
John Mackey	12/14	12.17	Argentina		825.00						825.00
	12/17	12/18	Paraguay		135.00						135.00
	12/18	12/20	Brazil		474.00						474.00
Commercial airfare							4,032.45				4,032.45
John Mackey	12/2	12/3	United Kingdom		349.00						349.00
	12/3	12/4	Ireland		311.00						311.00
Commercial airfare							5,006.55				5,006.55
Kathleen Moazed	11/13	11/17	England		730.000				420.00		1,150.00
Commercial airfare							5,029.66				5,029.66
Larry Nowels	11/21	11/22	Thailand		249.00						249.00
	11/22	11/26	Burma		626.00						626.00
	11/26	12/1	Vietnam		1,390.00						1,390.00
	12/1	12/2	Thailand		263.00						263.00
Commercial airfare							4,596.45				4,596.45
Hon. Donald Payne	11/20	11/21	Thailand		249.00						249.00
	11/21	11/26	Burma		626.00						626.00
	11/27	11/28	Thailand		249.00						249.00
Commercial airfare							10,469.20				10,469.20
Douglas Rasmussen	11/21	11/22	Thailand		249.00						249.00
	11/22	11/26	Burma		626.00						626.00
	11/26	12/1	Vietnam		1,390.00						1,390.00
Douglas Rasmussen	12/1	12/2	Thailand		243.00						243.00
Commercial airfare							4,937.45				4,927.45
Grover Joseph Rees	11/22	11/25	Switzerland		536.00						536.00
Commercial airfare							4,138.24				4,138.24
Grover Joseph Rees	12/12	12/15	Philippines		573.00						573.00
	12/15	12/19	Vietnam		398.00				26.26		424.26
	12/20	12/20	Japan		105.00						105.00
Commercial airfare							4,214.76				4,214.76
Francis Record	10/29	10/31	Germany		602.00						602.00
Commercial airfare							5,067.01				5,067.01
John Walker Roberts	12/6	12/9	Philippines		627.00						627.00
	12/9	12/11	Singapore		398.00						398.00
	12/11	12/13	Hong Kong		594.00						594.00
	12/14	12/16	China		543.00						543.00
Commercial airfare							6,605.79		450.00		7,055.79
Hon. Edward Royce	11/20	11/21	Moldova		225.00						225.00
	11/21	11/24	Russia		797.00						797.00
	11/24	11/25	Norway		276.00						276.00

AMENDED REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 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]
Tanya Shamson	11/29	12/3	Russia		1,450.00						1,450.00
Commercial airfare							5,003.61				5,003.61
Thomas Sheehy	12/2	12/8	Cote d'Ivoire		1,027.00						1,027.00
Commercial airfare							4,355.13				4,355.13
Hon. Christopher Smith	11/22	11/24	Switzerland		536.00						536.00
Commercial airfare							4,138.24				4,138.24
Hon. Christopher Smith	12/16	12/18	Vietnam		366.00				26.26		392.26
	12/19	12/19	Japan		201.00						201.00
	12/15	12/16	Hong Kong		212.00		4,045.20				4,257.20
Hillel Weinberg	10/29	10/31	Germany		434.00						434.00
Commercial airfare							4,417.01				4,417.01
Hillil Weinberg	11/29	11/30	Portugal		166.00						166.00
	11/30	12/3	Belgium		826.00						826.00
Commercial airfare							4,470.00				4,470.00
Peter Yeo	12/8	12/9	Philippines		209.00						209.00
	12/9	12/11	Singapore		398.00						398.00
Peter Yeo	12/11	12/13	Hong Kong		594.00						594.00
	12/13	12/16	China		693.00						693.00
Commercial airfare							6,605.79				6,605.79
Rohrabacher, Dana	11/18	11/22	Kuwait		887.00		6,393.17				7,280.17
Hickey, Peter	12/15	12/16	Hong Kong		297.00						297.00
	12/16	12/19	Vietnam		441.00		4,057.88		26.26		4,525.14
Cooksey, John	11/20	11/22	Thailand		498.00		4,666.00				5,164.00
	11/22	11/26	Burma		626.00						626.00
	11/26	12/1	Vietnam		1,390.00						1,390.00
	12/1	12/2	Thailand		249.00						249.00
Committee total					45,323.93		163,164.82		948.78		209,437.53

[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.

BEN GILMAN, Chairman, Mar. 1, 2000.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 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. Dana Rohrabacher	10/8	10/11	Hungary	144,090			3,644.24			144,090	3,644.24
Harlan Watson	10/29	11/6	Germany		1,422.00		956.00	179.80	70.00	179.80	2,448.00
Hon. F. James Sensenbrenner	11/18	11/21	Spain		819.00		5,791.96				6,610.96
Jeff Lungren	11/18	11/21	Spain		819.00		5,791.96				6,610.96
Committee total					3,060.00		16,184.16				19,314.16

[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.

F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR., Chairman, Mar. 1, 2000.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, HOUSE DELEGATION TO RUSSIA AND GERMANY, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN FEB. 3 AND 6, 2000

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. Porter Goss	2/3	2/4	Russia		381.00						
Hon. Norman Dicks	2/3	2/4	Russia		381.00						
Hon. Howard Berman	2/3	2/4	Russia		381.00						
Hon. Norman Sisisky	2/3	2/4	Russia		381.00						
Hon. Doug Bereuter	2/3	2/4	Russia		381.00						
Hon. Julian Dixon	2/3	2/4	Russia		381.00						
Jim Boxold (Goss)	2/3	2/4	Russia		381.00						
Hon. Porter Goss	2/4	2/6	Germany		454.00						
Hon. Norman Dicks	2/4	2/6	Germany		454.00						
Hon. Howard Berman	2/4	2/6	Germany		454.00						
Hon. Norman Sisisky	2/4	2/6	Germany		454.00						
Hon. Doug Bereuter	2/4	2/6	Germany		454.00						
Hon. Julian Dixon	2/4	2/6	Germany		454.00						
Jim Boxold (Goss)	2/4	2/6	Germany		454.00						
Committee total					5,845.00						

[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.

PORTER J. GOSS, Chairman.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6571. A letter from the Office of the Administrator, Agricultural Research Center, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—National Agricultural Library Fees for Loans and Copying—received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6572. A letter from the Administrator, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—1999 Crop and Market Loss Assistance (RIN: 0560–AG13) received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6573. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Melon Fruit Fly [Docket No. 99–097–1] received February 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6574. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket No. FEMA–7305] received February 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

6575. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Final Flood Elevation Determinations—received February 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

6576. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting Rehabilitation Training: Rehabilitation Short-Term Training, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(f); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6577. A letter from the Administrator, Food and Nutrition Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC): Bloodwork Requirements (RIN: 0584–AC30) received February 18, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6578. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the annual report to Congress on progress in achieving the performance goals referenced in the Prescription Drug User Fee Act of 1992 (PDUFA), for the Fiscal Year 1999, pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 379g nt.; to the Committee on Commerce.

6579. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Medical Devices; Reclassification and Codification of Neodymium: Yttrium: Aluminum: Garnet (Nd:YAG) Laser for Peripheral Iridotomy [Docket No. 93P–0277] received February 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

6580. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification that the Iran emergency is to continue in effect beyond March 15, 2000, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1622(d); (H. Doc. No. 106–210); to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed.

6581. A letter from the Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting List of all reports issued or released by the GAO in January 2000, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 719(h); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6582. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Management and Budget, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a copy of the revised commercial activities inventory; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6583. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the 1997–1998 report to Congress on programs for the utilization and donation of Federal personal property, pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 484(o); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6584. A letter from the Executive Officer, National Science Board, transmitting a copy of the annual report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act during the calendar year 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6585. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—West Virginia Regulatory Program [WV0077–FOR] received February 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6586. A letter from the Director, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants: Endangered Status for the Armored Snail and Slender Campeloma (RIN: 1018–AF29) received February 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6587. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock by Vessels Not Participating in Cooperatives that are Catching Pollock for Processing by the Inshore Component in the Bering Sea Subarea of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No. 000119015–0015–01; I.D. 021100A] received February 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6588. A letter from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the FY 1998 annual report, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

6589. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting notification of the actions the Secretary has taken regarding security measures at Port-au-Prince International Airport, Port-au-Prince, Haiti, pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 44907(d)(3); jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and International Relations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. TALENT: Committee on Small Business. H.R. 3845. A bill to make corrections to the Small Business Investment Act of 1958, and for other purposes (Rept. 106–520). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 3908. A bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes (Rept. 106–521). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. TALENT: Committee on Small Business. H.R. 3843. A bill to reauthorize programs to assist small business concerns, and for other purposes (Rept. 106–522). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REYNOLDS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 438. Resolution waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany the bill (H.R. 1000) to amend title 49, United States Code, to reauthorize programs of the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes (Rept. 106–523). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 439. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3843) to reauthorize programs to assist small business concerns, and for other purposes (Rept. 106–524). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BLILEY (for himself, Mr. UPTON, Mr. BARTON of Texas, and Mr. BURR of North Carolina):

H.R. 3906. A bill to ensure that the Department of Energy has appropriate mechanisms to independently assess the effectiveness of its policy and site performance in the areas of safeguards and security and cyber security; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Armed Services, and Science, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BLILEY (for himself, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. UPTON, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. CALVERT):

H.R. 3907. A bill to provide for the external regulation of nuclear safety and occupational safety and health at Department of Energy facilities; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Science, Armed Services, and Education and the Workforce, 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 Florida:

H.R. 3908. A bill making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 3909. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4601 South Cottage Grove Avenue in Chicago, Illinois, as the ''Henry W. McGee Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. BOEHNER:

H.R. 3910. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make grants to assist low and moderate income individuals to finance the construction, refurbishing, and servicing of individual household water well systems in rural areas; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. COLLINS (for himself, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. WISE, Mr. GOSS, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mr. MCDERMOTT):

H.R. 3911. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the Medicare Program for surgical first assisting services of certified registered nurse first assistants; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DEAL of Georgia (for himself, Mr. CHAMBLISS, and Mr. NORWOOD):

H.R. 3912. A bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to make optional the requirement that a State seek adjustment or recovery from an individual's estate of any medical assistance correctly paid on behalf of the individual under the State plan under such title; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. LEACH:

H.R. 3913. A bill to authorize the acceptance of endowment contributions for educational and cultural international exchange programs of the Department of State and the designation of such programs in recognition of the contributions; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. MENENDEZ:

H.R. 3914. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act to prevent credit card issuers from advertising and offering 1 type of credit card and then issuing another type of credit card without the informed consent of the consumer, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. NETHERCUTT (for himself, Mr. CALLAHAN, Mr. FOLEY, Mrs. THURMAN, Mrs. MYRICK, and Mr. FROST):

H.R. 3915. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow employers a credit

against income tax with respect to employees who participate in the military reserves, to allow a comparable credit for participating self-employed individuals, and to restore the pre-1986 status of deductions incurred in connection with services performed as a member of a Reserve component of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PORTMAN (for himself, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. DREIER, Mr. FROST, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. DUNN, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. TERRY, and Mr. BENTSEN):

H.R. 3916. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on telephone and other communication services; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANGEL:

H.R. 3917. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that the penalty on the reimportation of tobacco products exported from the United States shall not apply in certain cases; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS (for himself, Mr. SMITH of Texas, and Mr. REYES):

H.R. 3918. A bill to establish the Bureau of Immigration Services and the Bureau of Immigration Enforcement within the Department of Justice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SAXTON (for himself, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BILBRAY, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. GOSS, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SHAW, and Mr. UNDERWOOD):

H.R. 3919. A bill to provide assistance for the conservation of coral reefs, to coordinate Federal coral reef conservation activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Ms. WATERS (for herself, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. CAPUANO, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. HILLIARD, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. OWENS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. KILPATRICK, Ms. CARSON, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. MORELLA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CONYERS, and Mr. PAYNE):

H.R. 3920. A bill to improve the conditions for women inmates in jails and correctional facilities; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. HOYER):

H. Con. Res. 279. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the 200th birthday celebration of the Library of Congress; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey:

H. Con. Res. 280. Concurrent resolution authorizing the 2000 District of Columbia Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run to be run through the Capitol Grounds; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SHUSTER (for himself and Mr. OBERSTAR):

H. Con. Res. 281. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the East Front of the Capitol Grounds for performances sponsored by the John F. KENNEDY Center for the Performing Arts; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. HAYES:

H. Con. Res. 282. Concurrent resolution declaring the ''Person of the Century'' for the 20th century to have been the American G.I.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mrs. MINK of Hawaii:

H. Res. 440. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that there should be established a National Ocean Day to recognize the significant role the ocean plays in the lives of the Nation's people and the important role the Nation's people must play in the continued life of the ocean; to the Committee on Resources.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. GOSS:

H.R. 3921. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsement for employment in the coastwise trade for the vessel ANTJA; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. WU:

H.R. 3922. A bill for the relief of Zhen Shang Lin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WU:

H.R. 3923. A bill for the relief of En Chung Wu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WU:

H.R. 3924. A bill for the relief of Jin Shaun Huang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WU:

H.R. 3925. A bill for the relief of Han Lin; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 7: Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. ROHRABACHER, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 49: Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO.

H.R. 110: Ms. CARSON.

H.R. 410: Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 488: Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mrs. MCCARTHY, of New York, Mr. WALSH, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, and Mr. BORSKI.

H.R. 534: Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky.

H.R. 566: Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey.

H.R. 583: Mrs. MEEK of Florida and Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 601: Mr. JENKINS and Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 625: Mr. KLINK.

H.R. 637: Mr. FLETCHER and Ms. PELOSI.

H.R. 645: Mrs. CLAYTON.

H.R. 721: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. KIND.

H.R. 745: Mr. CANADY of Florida.

H.R. 827: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.

H.R. 828: Mr. EHLERS.

H.R. 937: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 941: Mrs. MORELLA.

H.R. 957: Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1001: Mr. NETHERCUTT.

H.R. 1008: Mr. KLINK.

H.R. 1044: Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mr. BOSWELL.

H.R. 1046: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island and Mr. MCINTYRE.

H.R. 1111: Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 1160: Mr. KLINK.

H.R. 1168: Mr. HILL of Indiana and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 1227: Mr. SABO.

H.R. 1248: Mr. GEJDENSON.

H.R. 1322: Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 1405: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. HINCHEY, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, and Mr. SNYDER.

H.R. 1456: Mr. RADANOVICH.

H.R. 1531: Mr. MCNULTY and Mr. BECERRA.

H.R. 1592: Mr. HALL of Ohio.

H.R. 1621: Mr. LAMPSON.

H.R. 1681: Mr. OWENS and Mr. CLAY.

H.R. 1769: Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. STUPAK, and Mr. LATOURETTE.

H.R. 1770: Ms. NORTON, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. STARK, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. FROST, and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 1775: Mr. CAMPBELL and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 1798: Mr. BILBRAY and Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 1899: Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. LAHOOD, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. SABO, Ms. CARSON, and Mr. WEYGAND.

H.R. 1954: Mr. ROGAN.

H.R. 2129: Mr. COLLINS and Mr. TAUZIN.

H.R. 2175: Mr. COYNE, Ms. CARSON, and Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 2265: Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 2341: Mrs. NORTHUP.

H.R. 2382: Mr. SOUDER and Mr. MCINTYRE.

H.R. 2391: Mr. RILEY, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. WICKER, Mr. HOYER, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 2459: Mr. LAHOOD.

H.R. 2544: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. LATOURETTE, and Mr. HILL of Montana.

H.R. 2573: Mr. GREENWOOD.

H.R. 2660: Mr. MASCARA.

H.R. 2686: Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 2697: Mr. GILMAN.

H.R. 2720: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 2749: Mr. HOBSON and Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma.

H.R. 2814: Mr. STUMP.

H.R. 2842: Mr. ROTHMAN.

H.R. 2870: Mr. SNYDER.

H.R. 2883: Mrs. BONO, Mr. NADLER, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. SABO, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. WAMP, and Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 2888: Ms. CARSON.

H.R. 2892: Mr. CRANE.

H.R. 2927: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 2945: Mr. BENTSEN, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. BALDACCI, and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 2964: Mr. STRICKLAND.

H.R. 2966: Mr. BASS, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 3004: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 3100: Mr. DUNCAN and Mr. CLEMENT.

H.R. 3116: Ms. DUNN.

H.R. 3141: Mrs. MINK of Hawaii and Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 3155: Mr. GOODLING, Mr. ENGLISH, and Mr. BLUNT.

H.R. 3193: Mr. SPRATT, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. DICKS, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BROWN of Florida, and Mr. CANADY of Florida.

H.R. 3212: Mr. BORSKI and Mr. TANCREDO.

H.R. 3224: Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. QUINN.

H.R. 3244: Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 3278: Mrs. CLAYTON and Mr. BRYANT.

H.R. 3290: Mr. BARR of Georgia and Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 3293: Mr. RUSH, Mr. WOLF, Mr. LARSON, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. DICKS, Ms. DUNN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. POMBO, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Ms. SANCHEZ, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. BARR of Georgia, and Mrs. TAUSCHER.

H.R. 3410: Mr. BONILLA and Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 3413: Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. MOAKLEY, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. DELAURO, MR. KILDEE, Mr. KIND, Mr. CAPUANO, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. OLVER, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. FORD, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. DELAHUNT, MR. WU, Ms. LEE, Mr. NADLER, Mr. OWENS, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO.

H.R. 3514: Mr. ALLEN and Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 3536: Mrs. ROUKEMA.

H.R. 3540: Mr. NUSSLE, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. BAIRD, and Mr. STUPAK.

H.R. 3544: Mr. COX, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. WAMP, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. QUINN, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. SALMON, Mr. PETRI, Mr. METCALF, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. GUTKNECHT, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. EVANS, Mr. COYNE, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. FORBES, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. SOUDER, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and Mrs. KELLY.

H.R. 3560: Mr. OWENS and Mr. GOODLING.

H.R. 3564: Mr. DEAL of Georgia.

H.R. 3573: Mr. BASS, Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. COYNE, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. HOLT, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KLINK, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. VITTER, and Mr. WICKER.

H.R. 3575: Mr. BARR of Georgia and Mrs. EMERSON.

H.R. 3594: Mr. HAYES, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. WEYGAND, and Mr. BRYANT.

H.R. 3614: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. SUNUNU, and Mr. DEAL of Georgia.

H.R. 3623: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. FARR of California.

H.R. 3628: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.

H.R. 3639: Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. HOYER, and Mr. WEYGAND.

H.R. 3649: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 3656: Mrs. THURMAN and Mr. ENGLISH.

H.R. 3671: Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Mr. CANNON.

H.R. 3657: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Mr. WOLF.

H.R. 3692: Mr. GOODLING.

H.R. 3694: Mr. CUNNINGHAM and Mr. MCHUGH.

H.R. 3698: Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. PHELPS, and Mr. GOODE.

H.R. 3705: Mr. GORDON, Ms. WATERS, Mr. NADLER, Mr. WEYGAND, Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 3707: Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 3710: Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. BARCIA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. RUSH, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. PHELPS, Mr. HILLIARD, and Mr. GOODE.

H.R. 3732: Mr. STUPAK, Mr. PAUL, Mr. VENTO, Mr. OLVER, and Mrs. BIGGERT.

H.R. 3766: Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BAIRD, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. OLVER, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. PHELPS, and Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 3809: Mr. FILNER and Mr. KLECZKA.

H.R. 3822: Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. UPTON, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. MICA, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. GOODE, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. LOBIONDO, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. GOODLING, and Mr. REYNOLDS.

H.R. 3826: Mr. OWENS, Mr. BOEHLERT, and Mr. SABO.

H.R. 3840: Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 3842: Mr. WHITFIELD.

H.R. 3844: Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. PAUL, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. COX, Mr. SHADEGG, and Mr. JONES of North Carolina.

H.R. 3849: Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. HAYWORTH, and Mr. NETHERCUTT.

H.R. 3861: Mr. INSLEE, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. WATERS, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 3873: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO.

H.R. 3887: Mr. CARDIN, Mr. MATSUI, and Mr. STARK.

H.J. Res. 53: Mr. CALVERT.

H.J. Res. 55: Mr. BLUNT.

H.J. Res. 90: Mr. NEY.

H. Con. Res. 62: Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. SHAYS, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, and Mr. POMEROY.

H. Con. Res. 139: Mrs. NORTHUP.

H. Con. Res. 225: Mr. STUPAK, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. KLINK, and Mr. RUSH.

H. Con. Res. 252: Mr. EWING, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. SOUDER, and Mr. LATOURETTE.

H. Con. Res. 253: Mr. GUTKNECHT, Mr. ENGLISH, and Mr. STUPAK.

H. Con. Res. 273: Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. DELAHUNT, and Ms. DELAURO.

H. Con. Res. 275: Mr. BATEMAN.

H. Con. Res. 276: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. STARK, and Mr. BALDACCI.

H. Res. 187: Mr. SABO and Mr. NADLER.

H. Res. 430: Ms. MCKINNEY.

H. Res. 431: Mr. DIXON, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. OWENS, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. NADLER, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. BERMAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

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. Res. 396: Mr. OWENS.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

INTRODUCTION OF THE CORAL REEF CONSERVATION AND RESTORATION PARTNERSHIP ACT OF 2000

HON. JIM SAXTON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 2000

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to introduce the Coral Reef Conservation and Restoration Partnership Act of 2000. I am joined in this effort by the distinguished gentleman from American Samoa, who is the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Fisheries Conservation, Wildlife and Oceans, along with 12 other bipartisan cosponsors.

Coral reefs support the economies of many local communities throughout the Atlantic Ocean, Carribean Sea, and Pacific Ocean. Coral reefs provide important areas for tourism, diving, fishing, scientific research and offers potential life saving pharmaceutical advances to treat human diseases. Unfortunately, many of our coral reef areas are threatened by a variety of natural impacts and human activities including coral disease, hurricanes, destructive fishing practices, over fishing, pollution, and changing ocean conditions. Under ideal circumstances, coral reefs can take decades or more to recover, and it is critical that we address the most serious problems facing these valuable marine areas. In cases where damage has occurred, we need to develop the technologies to help repair and restore coral reefs. Further, we need to improve our abilities to recognize areas that are susceptible to coral reef loss. This requires developing comprehensive maps of U.S. coral reef resources using new remote as well as using satellite data to monitor coral reef change.

Last year, I introduced H.R. 2903, the Coral Reef Conservation and Restoration Act, which was based on a bill approved by the House of Representatives in the 105th Congress. The Subcommittee on Fisheries Conservation, Wildlife and Oceans held a hearing on H.R. 2903 on October 21, 1998. The bill I am introducing today replaces that legislation and incorporates suggestions from that hearing, as well as provisions from H.R. 3133, the Coral Reef Protection Act, which was introduced by my friend and colleague from American Samoa, ENI FALEOMAVAEGA. Over the last several months, I have worked closely with him to craft the Coral Reef Conservation and Restoration Partnership Act. This bill represents a major step forward in this nation's efforts to conserve valuable coral reef ecosystems.

The Coral Reef Conservation and Restoration Partnership Act represents a combination of the best ideas for enhancing and conserving coral reefs. The bill greatly assists ongoing efforts to understand, map and conserve U.S. coral reefs. Our bill authorizes $15 million per year for coral reef conservation, for a total of $60 million over four years. This level of funding is consistent with the FY 2001 budget request of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

The bill establishes a grant program to provide funding for coral reef projects carried out in local communities, States and U.S. Insular Areas that have limited sources of funding. Eligible grantees include local and State governments, certain nonprofit groups and educational institutions. A grant partner can receive up to 50 percent Federal matching funds for a variety of projects, such as mapping, monitoring, assessment, restoration and law enforcement. The Secretary of Commerce is given flexibility in the match requirements for small projects carried out in the Insular Areas.

The bill also provides statutory authority for the Coral Reef Task Force, which was established by Presidential Executive Order 13089. The Departments of Interior and Commerce are the designated Task Force co-chairs. The co-chairs can jointly designate the governors of the States and Territories to serve on the Task Force. The Task Force is charged with coordinating Federal agency activities, establishing a national coral reef action strategy, developing a comprehensive mapping, monitoring and assessment program for U.S. coral reefs, and providing regular reports to Congress on activities to conserve coral reefs.

Finally, our bill authorizes the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) to carry out a variety of coral reef-related conservation activities, including restoration, mapping, and monitoring. The proposed legislation recognizes NOAA's important role in managing coral reef resources, and authorizes ongoing activities consistent with the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, the Coastal Zone Management Act and the National Marine Sanctuaries Act.

Sine the Year of the Reef in 1997, I have been working to enact legislation that would focus the necessary resources to protect and restore coral reefs. I believe that the Coral Reef Conservation and Restoration Partnership Act will accomplish this goal, and I intend to work to ensure that this bill is signed into law. It is essential that we work to conserve our coral reef ecosystems for future generations. These ecosystems are the marine equivalent of the rain forest, rich in biological diversity and they provide innumerable benefits to the Nation.

I urge my colleagues to join with us by cosponsoring this important measure.

ROBERT ''BAT'' BATINOVICH HONORED WITH SAN FRANCISCO CATHOLIC CHARITIES' LOAVES AND FISHES AWARD

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 2000

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, it is my great privilege today to call to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress the extraordinary accomplishments of Mr. Robert ''Bat'' Batinovich of San Mateo, California. Bat brings the same extraordinary leadership qualities and generosity of spirit to his charitable contributions that he does to his entrepreneurial enterprises.

A shining example in the business community of the possibilities for philanthropic contribution, Bat Batinovich has for years made quiet contributions to causes ranging from women's athletics to services for homeless families. This Saturday, March 18, 2000, the Catholic Charities of San Francisco will honor Mr. Batinovich with its annual Loaves and Fishes Award for outstanding service to the community. This award recognizes the distinguished charitable efforts of individuals and organizations, and Mr. Batinovich reflects perfectly the spirit of commitment and service that define the work of Catholic Charities.

Robert Batinovich is Chairman and CEO of Glenborough Realty Trust, a San Mateo-based real estate investment trust. He is a self-made man whose drive has taken him from tuna-fishing on the high seas to chairing the California Public Utilities Commission during the energy crisis. His passion and vivacity have marked every step along the way with joie de vivre. As a leader, Mr. Batinovich has gained the respect and affection of our entire community. His reputation for honesty and tenaciousness is unassailable, but Bat's most admirable quality is his discernment that true success extends beyond the business arena and necessarily includes one's relationship to one's family, friends and community.

I invite my colleagues to join me and the Catholic Charities of San Francisco in honoring the remarkable accomplishments of the benevolent Robert ''Bat'' Batinovich in business, in life and in our community.

CONGRATULATIONS TO MISSOURI SPORTS HALL OF FAME INDUCTEE TOM HENKE

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 2000

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that retired major league baseball pitcher Tom Henke, of Taos, Missouri, was inducted into the Missouri Sports Hall of Fame on February 6, 2000.

Tom began his major league baseball career with the Texas Rangers in 1982, then continued with the Toronto Blue Jays in 1985. He became the Blue Jays career leader with 217 saves during his eight years in Toronto, including a save during the 1992 World Series. In 1993, Tom returned to the Rangers and recorded a career-high 40 saves. He spent the final year of his sterling career pitching for the St. Louis Cardinals, the team he cheered for while growing up in Missouri. His 1995 season was one of the finest of his 15-year professional career. Tom was named to

the National League All-Star team, was voted the Cardinals Player of the Year and won the Rolaids National League Relief Man Award. He donated the $25,000 award to the Taos Parks and Recreation Board and St. Francis Xavier School, and now devotes a portion of his time to helping local high school baseball programs.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to extend my congratulations to Tom Henke for his most deserved induction into the Missouri Sports Hall of Fame.

THE IMPORTANCE OF RURAL EDUCATION

HON. BILL BARRETT

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 2000

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Rural Caucus, I would like to share my strong support for one of the most vibrant sectors of rural America—our rural schools. Out in my part of the country, schools, along with churches, are at the heart of a community. And, rural administrators, teachers, and school boards should be commended for the educational opportunities they work to offer rural school students.

Rural schools offer students the types of educational experiences we hope all students can have—small classes, quality basic academic programs, personal relationships with teachers and administrators, hands-on vocational education opportunities, and the chance to participate in a variety of quality extracurricular activities. In fact, more than 20 percent of students in this country attend small, rural schools. Rural schools in my district have done an exceptional job maximizing learning opportunities for their students by investing in distance learning technology, forming educational service units to offer special education and gifted and talented programs, and holding themselves accountable, not only to the federal government and to the state, but, most importantly, to parents.

When I consider excellent rural schools in my district, several examples come to mind. For instance, I think of the one-room Kindergarten through 6th grade Macon School in the tiny village of Macon, Nebraska, where students receive one-on-one attention in basic academic areas and the arts. From the first grade on, every student at the Macon School receives individual piano lessons from their teacher, Mrs. Johnson; writes plays, songs, and poems; and performs original programs to packed houses of family and friends. There aren't too many one-room schools left, but the Macon School is an example of how tiny rural schools can offer their students more enriching experiences than larger schools may be able to offer.

Rural schools also work together to keep their standards high. Schools like Franklin and Hildreth, Nebraska, have invested in state-of-the-art distance learning facilities so foreign language, advanced math, and other advanced courses can be available to all students, regardless of the size of their school or the distance between the teacher and the students. This year, these schools banded together to hire an exchange teacher, Cristina Bermejo, from Spain to teach Spanish. This teacher is physically located in the Franklin school, but her courses are beamed via two-way audio-video connection to Hildreth.

Because of their size and location, many schools in our rural areas are able to reach out to underserved and at-risk populations, like the Santee School in Santee, Nebraska. Led by a dedicated superintendent, Chuck Squire, the Santee School works to empower children from the Santee tribe and helps them gain the skills they need for the 21st Century workplace.

These are just a few examples of the high quality educational experiences students in rural school districts benefit. But, while there are certainly many benefits to rural education, there are also some real challenges facing rural schools. One is the difficulty of attracting teachers to work in far-flung school districts, especially in fields like foreign language, music, advanced math, and science. Recently, many schools in Nebraska have started offering signing bonuses to draw teachers to their schools.

In addition to staffing issues, federal funding formulas have not addressed the unique funding needs of these districts. The problem is that not all schools are created equal. Bigger schools have an advantage when it comes to attracting federal funds and resources. By their very nature, small, rural schools have their own strong points, as I have mentioned, but they struggle, nearly always, for needed funding. All current federal education formula grants unintentionally ignore small, rural schools by not producing enough revenue for rural schools to carry out the program the grant is intended to fund. To address this problem, together with Mr. Pomeroy, I introduced a bill, H.R. 2725, the Rural Education Initiative Act, which was later incorporated into the reauthorization package for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) and passed by the House last October.

This program is completely optional, but if a school district chooses to participate, the rural provisions will allow a small, rural school district with fewer than 600 students and located in a community with a Beale Code of 6, 7, 8, or 9 (the Beale Code is a measure used by the USDA to determine ruralness) to combine its federal education dollars in selected programs.

Small schools qualifying for this program would have the option to apply for a flexible lump-sum in place of funds from federal education formula grants. While federal education formula grants normally include strict rules for how they must be used, schools receiving the lump-sum grant could make their own decisions about how to use the money. For example, they could use the money to support local education and to improve student achievement or the quality of instruction. In exchange for this flexibility, school districts would have to meet high accountability standards.

When I've been in my congressional district, I have heard from many rural school administrators who have told me that this particular provision will help them serve their students even better. They can't wait for this provision to become law so rural America's students will be able to benefit from the same types of programs as their urban and suburban counterparts.

This provision has broad bipartisan support and more than 80 endorsements from education organizations across the country. It provides a commonsense approach to using federal dollars in the way Congress intended—to insure that all students, regardless of their background, have the opportunity to receive a high quality education.

As the ESEA reauthorization efforts continue during this session of Congress, I look forward to helping this provision and others designed to strengthen rural school districts become law. I am pleased that the Rural Caucus is taking a step forward to highlight some of the issues facing rural America, including rural education.

THE PASSING OF GOVERNOR MALCOLM WILSON

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 2000

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I inform our colleagues of the passing of one of the outstanding political leaders of New York State over the past century.

Malcolm Wilson was first elected to our New York State Assembly in 1938, at the young age of 24, representing a portion of Westchester County. Throughout his 20 years as a member of that chamber, he earned a statewide reputation for his honesty, integrity, and for his thorough understanding of our legislative process.

Malcolm Wilson was known as a superb debater, a skill he honed during his years as a star member of the debate team at Fordham University in the Bronx.

In the years following World War II, I came to know Malcolm Wilson quite well, as he was the coordinator of our Young Republican organization for the 9th Judicial District of New York. In that position, he impressed us all with his leadership and organizational skills.

In 1958, many leaders throughout New York State considered Malcolm Wilson their logical choice for Governor. But the nomination that year was won instead by Nelson Rockefeller, who brought to his candidacy extensive experience in the business world and in the State Department, but none in the legislative process. Accordingly, Rockefeller recognized that Malcolm Wilson would be a superb Lieutenant Governor, due to the universal respect held for him in the legislature and his skill at maneuvering bills into law.

For 15 years, Malcolm Wilson served faithfully as our State's Lieutenant Governor. Often, during the end of that tenure, Malcolm cracked that he was number two ''longer than Avis.'' But no one disputed his dedication to the cause of good government.

Late in 1973, when Governor Rockefeller resigned from office, Malcolm Wilson became the 50th Governor of New York State. While he brought his common sense principles to the Governor's mansion, he was denied election to a full term as Governor the following fall. It was the only time in his career that Malcolm Wilson lost an election.

Upon his passing yesterday, William Harrington, who served a decade as his legal counsel during the Lieutenant Governor years, stated: ''When Malcolm spoke, people listened. I don't think there was anyone more learned about state government than Malcolm Wilson.''

Mr. Speaker, during my own years as a New York State Assemblyman, Malcolm Wilson served as a great inspiration and was of immense assistance to our efforts. I can well remember that his door was always open to me or to any other legislator who sought his assistance.

In addition to being an outstanding public servant, Malcolm Wilson was a courageous veteran, having served in our Navy during World War II. He served on an ammunition ship and participated in the invasion of Normandy.

Malcolm was also a devoted husband to his wife, Katherine, who he married in 1941 and who died in 1980.

Gov. Malcolm Wilson was also known for his dedication to his faith. He was a trustee at St. Patrick's Cathedral in New York City and was an active member of St. Denis Church in Yonkers. He was a major sponsor of State legislation to provide secular textbooks and bus transportation to students at parochial schools.

Mr. Speaker, I invite our colleagues to join with me in extending our condolences to his daughters, Katharine and Anne, and to his six grandsons.

Gov. Malcolm Wilson was a giant of New York State history who will long be missed.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON S. 376, OPEN-MARKET REORGANIZATION FOR THE BETTERMENT OF INTERNATIONAL TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. CLIFF STEARNS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 2000

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I think that the compromise before us accurately reflects the consensus of the Congress that we must encourage the privatization of INTELSAT without diminishing competition. I strongly support the satellite reform conference agreement and I urge my colleagues in the House to vote for its passage today.

As many of you know, for the last few years, there has been great disagreement between the House and Senate on how to craft a meaningful satellite communications reform bill. Under the leadership of Chairman BLILEY, Representative TAUZIN and Representative OXLEY, and Senator BURNS, we have reached the point in the debate where there is finally an agreement that can be enacted into law. I believe that the conference agreement achieves the core objectives of everyone who cares about satellite reform without imposing substantial threats to genuine market competition or breaching the Constitution.

When the House passed its satellite reform bill at the end of the first session of the 106th Congress, I expressed some concerns of mine about a provision in the House bill that seemed to place unnecessary conditions on lifting COMSAT's ownership caps. In my opinion, retaining this language would have continued to block the consummation of the Lockheed Martin-COMSAT merger. I am pleased that this issue I raised was addressed by the conferees. The conference agreement now before us does not impose any conditions on the removal of COMSAT's board and ownership restrictions. Those restrictions are eliminated upon enactment without conditions. This change will enable Lockheed Martin to acquire 100% of COMSAT without further delay. I thank Chairman BLILEY and the other conferees for amending this provision so that Lockheed Martin can more quickly enter the satellite communications market.

I am also pleased that the conference agreement does not contain fresh look and so-called Level IV direct access, which would have been confiscatory and punitive. Extracting those provisions, along with the significant improvements that were made to the House-passed privatization criteria, have put us in the position of being able to pass a compromise satellite reform bill that can be signed into law.

I congratulate my colleagues in the House and in the Senate on a job well done, and I look forward to the enactment of this legislation.

AMERICAN JOURNALIST KATI MARTON ADDRESSES THE STOCKHOLM HOLOCAUST CONFERENCE ON ''REMEMBERING WALLENBERG''

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 2000

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, just a few weeks ago in Stockholm representatives of 40 countries—including the Prime Ministers of Israel, Germany and Austria, and the President of Poland—as well as Holocaust survivors and spiritual leaders met to focus attention on the legacy of the Holocaust. This three-day international conference was organized by the government of Sweden as part of an effort to raise awareness among young people about the genocide of six million Jews and two million others, including Roma (Gypsies) and homosexuals, under the Nazi German regime.

All who participated in the conference spoke of the importance of remembering that most heinous tragedy and of fighting against anti-Semitism, racism and bigotry. In his address to the conference, German Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder said: ''We must support each other in the teaching of humanity and civil courage, so that normal people shall never again, in the name of some criminal ideology, turn normal places into grim factories of execution.''

Mr. Speaker, one of the highlights of this conference was the address by Hungarian-born American journalist Kati Marton entitled ''Remembering Wallenberg.'' As she explained in her outstanding speech, the Swedish humanitarian Raoul Wallenberg was one of the true heroes during this blackest of chapters in the history of humankind. Against almost insurmountable odds, he went to Budapest at the height of the Nazi effort to extinguish the Jews of Hungary, and through courage, intelligence and incredible effort, he was instrumental in saving the lives of as many as one hundred thousand Jews.

Mr. Speaker, Kati Marton is superbly qualified to provide this outstanding appraisal of Wallenberg. She was born in Hungary, and both of her parents were journalists who suffered the Nazi occupation and the Communist takeover that followed. She and her parents were able to escape to the West, and eventually she came to the United States. Kati is a journalist and author of the first rank. She currently serves as the president of the Committee to Protect Journalists, a nonpartisan nongovernmental organization dedicated to protecting journalists and press freedom throughout the world. She is also the author of Wallenberg: Missing Hero and Death in Jerusalem.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the text of Kati Marton's Stockholm address ''Remembering Wallenberg'' to be placed in the RECORD, and I urge my colleagues to give it thoughtful attention.

REMEMBERING WALLENBERG

I am immensely grateful for this chance to talk about Raoul Wallenberg.

Fifty-five years after the Holocaust we are still learning things about that shameful chapter in history. The Swedish government's recent admission of its mistakes is both commendable and essential . . . Not only for the sake of historical truth—but to put present and future leaders on notice that they will be held accountable. Sweden did misjudge the character of the evil represented by Hitler . . . but this country also gave the world Raoul Wallenberg . . . one of the Holocaust's few genuine heroes. And today . . . thanks to Sweden . . . we are gathered here to learn not only from the misjudgements of the past terrible century . . . but from its extraordinary moments of humanity . . . If those terrible times are to remain real . . . and cautionary . . . to those who are lucky enough never to have experienced them . . . a great deal of the credit goes to conferences like this one . . . for which I thank the Swedish Government and the American Jewish Committee.

The historians of the Century that has just ended have the responsibility to tell the story of Wallenberg so that the next generation can understand humanity's extraordinary power for both perversity and compassion. Our responsibility is to shape public memory . . . and ultimately to stand against evil by bearing witness.

Since we are here in search of Historical Truth . . . I would like to say a few words about another Swede whose role in the Holocaust and its aftermath has for too long been forgotten or misunderstood . . . buried under rumor and misinformation: Count Folke Bernadotte. Bernadotte's assassination at the hands of Jewish extremists over half a century ago is a tragically prophetic tale . . . as we continue to search for peace in the Middle East.

In many ways, Folke Bernadotte was not the right man for the role of the United Nations first Arab-Israeli mediator . . . not in the overheated emotional climate . . . and volatile military situation . . . which prevailed during that traumatic first year of Israel's life. But—whatever his personal shortcomings or the weakness of his peace effort . . . Folke Bernadotte was a good man who threw caution to the winds and acted out of humanity. In the '40s . . . as now . . . those qualities were in short supply. He deserved better than he got: death at the hands of extremists opposed to any negotiated settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict.

Long before Bernadotte landed in Palestine, he had proved himself a skilled negotiator and committed humanitarian. He was responsible for the War's most unsung, most controversial, and most successful rescue effort inside Germany.

Through many hours of hard nosed negotiations with the notorious Heinrich Himmler . . . Bernadotte extricated 21,000 prisoners . . . including 6,500 Jews . . . citizens

of 20 different countries . . . bound for certain extermination . . . from the Nazi's grasp.

In carrying out his rescue, Bernadotte became the first representative of a humanitarian organization from a neutral country to set foot in one of the Reich's death camps.

Of course, 21,000 souls saved is a tiny number compared to the final death count . . . but it does mock such assertions as the one in the recent book, *The Myth of Rescue,* by Prof. William D. Rubinstein, ''that not one plan or proposal made anywhere in the democracies by either Jews or non-Jewish champions of the Jews after the Nazi conquest of Europe could have rescued one single Jew who perished in the Holocaust.'' Moreover, how would Rubinstein account for the even more spectacular rescue of up to 100,000 Hungarian Jews by Raoul Wallenberg?

The line between the core subject of our conference: the Holocaust and Bernadotte's assassination, is direct and clear. The Holocaust had taught Bernadotte's assassins the bitter lesson of self-reliance in an unforgiving world. Suspicious even of their own country's founding fathers, they believed they alone were fit to determine Israel's future. Israel's leaders—people like David Ben Gurion and Golda Meir . . . the fabled pioneers revered by so many other Jews—were dismissed by Bernadotte's killers as cowards and compromisers.

Israelis today have chosen the pragmatic solution over the biblical one. Today, we can have an honest discussion of Bernadotte's tragic fate—and his very real contribution to the search for peace in the region.

We don't use the world hero much any more . . . we tend to be skeptical about those to whom it is attached. . . . If ever there was a period with a desperate hero shortage it is the Holocaust . . . that chapter of our Century which has changed our view of man and his capacity for inhumanity to his fellow man. . . . There were so few heroes in that bleak period from 1941 until 1945. . . . Heroism is not simply enduring when you have no choice . . . as a prisoner does . . . or an inmate in a camp . . . that is courage . . . Heroism is of a different order . . . it is when you have a choice and you embrace danger for the sake of others. . . . that is what Raoul Wallenberg did . . . and that is why he is that rare breed: a genuine Hero.

If Sweden made grave mistakes—so too did Washington during the Holocaust. Our leaders had known since 1942 that there were killing camps in Hitler's empire. . . . But Churchill and Roosevelt's only goal was to win the war. . . . They had been persuaded by the military that any large scale effort to save refugees from the Nazis killing camps would divert resources that should be channeled to the War effort. . . . There was also the ever-present poison of anti-Semitism, which still permeated the State Department . . . which, before the war, could have issued life-saving visas to hundreds of thousands of Jews. But, masquerading behind bureaucratic mumbo jumbo, American consular offices dragged their feet until it was too late, though Hitler made no secret of his plan to rid Germany of Jews . . . although at the outset he was willing to let German Jews leave, if they could find sanctuary. When America and the rest of the world was unwilling to take in more than a trickle it confirmed Hitler's view that the world really didn't give a damn about Jews anyway . . . so he proceeded to the Final Solution.

Why did Wallenberg volunteer to walk into the jaws of the Kafkaesque nightmare of Budapest? He had seen the Nazi's brutality, so he wasn't naive about their capacity for inhumanity. He had been to Berlin . . . to Palestine, . . . had seen the Jewish refugees and heard their stories of terror. He thought he could help. He was young . . . 31, and brave, recklessly brave. He was in part American educated . . . the University of Michigan. . . . so he had a larger view of the world than most Europeans. But we run out of rational explanations for why this well born young man with everything to live for packed a backpack in the hellish summer of 1944 and set off for the country that sheltered the largest Jewish community left in Europe . . . Hungary. He packed a pistol . . . and he packed dollars . . . from American sources: the War Refugee Board which was FDR's creation . . . an attempt to compensate for Washington's dismal record of nonrescue of Jews. Wallenberg knew he would need money to bribe Nazis and Hungarians. He was a coolheaded man. But nothing could have prepared him for what he found in the once graceful city of Budapest . . .

The Jews of the city knew their relatives and friends in the provinces . . . a half a million of them in fact . . . had already taken their final train to Auschwitz. Adolf Eichmann had broken all his prior records for speed and efficiency in rounding up the Jews of the Hungarian countryside . . . including my grandparents. He had to work fast because by now even the most fanatic Nazi knew the War was lost. It would be just a matter of weeks . . . maybe months . . . until the combined force of the Red Army and the Allies brought Hitler to his knees. So the Jews of Budapest played a waiting game . . . and watched their city slowly turn into a Nazi garrison. They lived on rumors. Jews could no longer work, or take public transport, or sit on park benches. They could leave their homes only between 11 am and 5 pm. Many of them were hidden in the homes of Christian friends—waiting . . . for something.

Raoul Wallenberg started his rescue mission on a small scale . . . giving Swedish passports first only to Hungarian Jews who had business dealings with Sweden . . . or Swedish relatives . . . a few hundred. Raoul was testing the waters. The passports seemed to impress the local Nazis. They kept their hands off these freshly minted Swedes.

So Wallenberg got bolder . . . he started printing his own passports . . . which bore the Swedish royal emblem—thousands of them. And as word spread around the terrorized city that they were available, lines of Jews twisted around the Swedish embassy in Buda waiting for the magic passports. Those holding them didn't have to wear the yellow star . . . and were promised repatriation to Sweden. It was a young man's bluff . . . but in the atmosphere of near total anarchy which prevailed in this twilight time . . . the bluff seemed to be working.

With the dollars he was receiving from American Jewish organizations and the U.S. Government, he rented and even bought houses around the city. He declared them diplomatic property . . . flew the yellow and blue flag of Sweden . . . making them technically off limits to the legalistic-minded Germans. By the end of the War 30,000 Hungarian Jews lived in these safe houses.

Wallenberg played for time that summer . . . for the Russians were within earshot of the city . . . and the Allies were making their way to Berlin. He wrote his mother, ''I'll try to be home a few days before the Russians arrive in Budapest . . .'' Like everybody else, he assumed the Russians would be better than the Nazis. He did not imagine that the Russian liberation would turn into an Occupation.

In October 1944, Hungry's ruler, Regent Horthy, tried to bolt from Hitler's grip and declare Hungary's neutrality. Horthy was captured and replaced by a thug from Hungary's indigenous fascists, the Arrow Cross—a man completely loyal to Hitler and ready to resolve the festering problem of what to do with Budapest's resilient Jews. This was Wallenberg's real testing . . . now he was a man possessed . . . there was so little time. ''These are extraordinary and tense times,'' he wrote his mother, ''but we are struggling, which is the main thing. I am sitting by candelight with a dozen people around me . . . each with a request. I don't know who to deal with first. The days and nights are so filled with work . . .''

The city was in total panic now as the Arrow Cross broke into homes looking for Jews and then marched them to the edge of the frozen Danube to face firing squads . . . or line them up to die on the forced march to the German border.

Wallenberg was at his most resourceful . . . and most frenetic. He befriended the pretty Austrian wife of the Hungarian Foreign Minister and used that relationship to wring concessions from the Hungarian Nazis. He followed the endless columns of miserable humanity marching in rain and sleet the 120 miles to the border. When he could do nothing more he thrust blankets and food at them. But he always tried to pull people from the line. Sometimes he saved dozens this way, or, on a bad day, only one or two. Each life was sacred to him. Nearly one hundred thousand Jews were left in the city. Wallenberg even arranged to meet the Jews' executioner, to attempt to reason with him—Eichmann. ''Leave now, while you can'', Wallenberg urged Eichmann. Eichmann shook his head. ''Budapest will be held as if it were Berlin.'' Eichmann tried to have Wallenberg killed. A traffic ''accident'' was arranged but Wallenberg was not in his car.

The siege of Budapest . . . one of the War's bloodiest struggles . . . began in December 1944 and turned the entire city into a battleground. Under the Allies' bombs the City was starving to death . . . living in cellars and praying for the Russians to arrive. The Nazis now rounded up 60,000 Jews who were not sheltered in Wallenberg's safe houses and forced them into a ghetto in the heart of Pest . . . living under conditions of far greater misery than anyone else in the hellish city.

Wallenberg, who always put things in writing (he had post War justice in mind), drew up sort of a contract guaranteeing the safety of the Jews in the ghetto and got an SS General to sign it. When the Arrow Cross men came to start the slaughter, the General blocked their way. Wallenberg had persuaded him that he would personally charge him with genocide before the War Crimes Tribunal that Churchill and Roosevelt had avowed would be convened after the war.

Early in January, the starving, ravaged city was at last ''liberated''. The Russians looted, pillaged and raped their way across the city . . . unleashing a new brand of terror. Everywhere the Russian soldiers turned there were reminders of the Swede. Who was this one man rescue squad? The fact that more Jews had survived the Hungarian Holocaust than any other was largely the result of his courage. His passports were scattered throughout the city, stories of his exploits were told by survivors.

The Russians came with their own plans for the city and the country. They were not just passing through . . . they were going to construct a Communist State, ruled by a single party, controlled by Moscow . . . it was the end of even the modicum of freedom the Hungarians had known before the War. But that was all carefully kept from the exhausted people . . . including Raoul Wallenberg. He should have at this point stayed underground—hidden like his fellow diplomats until the situation calmed down. But that was not Wallenberg's way. He had survived six months of savage Nazi brutality.

He had begun to believe in his own immortality. He had plans for rebuilding the Jewish community of Budapest. He could not now abandon the people he had just saved.

So, in a supreme act of courage and recklessness, Wallenberg went looking for the Russian High Command. He found them . . . and at that point his good fortune ran out. His reward for saving up to one hundred thousand lives was not the warm homecoming he had dreamed of. In January 1945 Wallenberg began his long journey into the Soviet Gulag. He never returned.

His precise odyssey is a subject to some speculation and some dispute. Some things regarding his fate are indisputable. He was taken to the Lubyanka . . . the dreaded hell hole that is the KGB's headquarters in Moscow. Wallenberg was accused of being a spy . . . the catchall crime in the paranoid Stalinist state. The Soviets claimed he died of a heart attack two years later. But they never produced a body or a death certificate . . . In my research I interviewed former Gulag inmates who swore Wallenberg was alive through the Fifties, Sixties and even Seventies. The trail has gone cold in the last decade . . . and no one can wish this man such a long ordeal at the hands of his captors.

The injustice of this story is almost too much to bear . . . For Raoul Wallenberg had stood up to the two greatest evils of our Century . . . the Nazis and the Communists. He proved that one man acting fearlessly and with great imagination could make the brutes back off.

In a way, Wallenberg's story is a terrible reminder of the world's cowardice. How many people, how many countries, pleaded that there was nothing to be done. Hitler had power and numbers on his side. Wallenberg made liars of them all.

After the last few years of intimate contact with the savage ethnic wars of the Balkans . . . from Bosnia to Kosovo . . . to Rwanda . . . I have seen how quickly demagogues . . . from Hitler to Milosevic . . . can fan the flames of nationalism and hatred among their people . . . turning former neighbors into murderous enemies.

I hear so often in my prosperous, privileged country the question raised, ''Why should we get involved in other's problems? Why should we risk our lives to stop genocidal warfare in another country, another continent?'' I have a single word answer to those who say, ''Let them take care of themselves. There is nothing to be done. It is inevitable.'' My answer is: Wallenberg.

TRIBUTE TO HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE STAFF MEMBER DOUGLAS H. NECESSARY

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 2000

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate and pay tribute to Douglas H. Necessary, on the occasion of his retirement from the House Armed Services Committee staff after more than 15 years. He will be greatly missed by Members and staff alike.

Doug began his public service in the U.S. Army where he distinguished himself over a 20-year career. He rose from the enlisted ranks, received his commission, and was highly decorated during two combat tours in Vietnam as an infantry officer and retired as a lieutenant colonel. While in the Army, Doug also earned a Bachelor of Science degree from Auburn University and a Master of Arts degree from the Florida Institute of Technology.

Doug's accomplishments on the committee are numerous. He came to the House Armed Services Committee in October 1984, bringing skills that were especially useful in the areas of military procurement, acquisition reform, and research and development. Since 1993, Doug has served as the lead staff person responsible for those issues while working for both the full committee and for the Ranking Minority Member. Doug guided two legislative initiatives, the Federal Acquisition Streamlining Act of 1994 and the Clinger/Cohen Federal Acquisition Reform Act of 1996, that were landmark efforts to modernize and rectify a severely troubled military procurement process. Doug also pioneered efforts, in concert with Chairman Ron Dellums (D-CA), to better develop the Department of Defense's Small and Disadvantaged Business initiatives, particularly the Mentor-Protege program.

Doug had a profound effect on the procurement of all of the Department of Defense's major weapons programs. At various times, he was the committee's staff person in charge of each of the services procurement programs, before becoming the lead staff with responsibility for all of the Department's programs. Doug became the ultimate expert on complex systems such as Ballistic Missile Defense, Theater Missile Defense, the V–22 Osprey, the B–2 bomber, the C–17, the F/A–18, and many others. His expertise was recognized not only by the Members of the House, but was also highly regarded by senior officials in the Department of Defense. His decisions about hardware programs were frequently guided by the awareness that the programs would result in weapons systems that would have to be used by real people, and he brought that kind of common sense approach to all of the issues he worked.

Doug has always integrated the depth of his factual knowledge with a keen sense of the realities that existed in the political and fiscal environment of the time. His advice allowed Members to understand what was important and what was possible. Because we knew what options existed, we were able to significantly advance our legislative initiatives. His work was always thorough and unbiased, and he had a unique knack for being able to explain complex and arcane subjects to novices and experts alike.

Perhaps the hallmark of Doug's career on the Hill was that he never lost sight of the ultimate goals of good government and sound national security policies. Good stewardship of the taxpayers' dollars and doing what was in America's best interests were always the guiding principles in his work. There is no doubt that the country is better off because of his extraordinary efforts.

I know I speak for countless members and staff when I thank Doug Necessary for his outstanding service to the country, to the House of Representatives, and to the Armed Services Committee. His expertise, his honesty, his friendliness, his availability, and perhaps especially his sense of humor, will be sorely missed. We wish Doug well as he moves on to the next phase of his life, knowing that he will make a difference for the better wherever he goes.

TRIBUTE TO JOHN F. HILBRICH AND WILLIAM J. BORAH

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 2000

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, It is with great pride and honor that I commend Mr. John F. Hilbrich and Mr. William J. Borah for their extraordinary service to their Northwest Indiana and Illinois communities. On Wednesday, March 15, 2000, these men will be honored at the 2000 Legal Community Recognition dinner, a benefit for the Calumet Council, Boy Scouts of America. This event, chaired by David E. Wickland, will be held at the Center for Visual and Performing Arts in Munster, IN.

John Francis Hilbrich, a northwest Indiana native, has dedicated his life to serving his community and his country. After completing his undergraduate work cum laude at the University of Notre Dame, he enrolled in their distinguished law program which he successfully completed in 1951. Mr. Hilbrich was admitted to the bar later that year. He Went on the serve in the U.S. Army as a Counter-Intelligence Special Agent from 1951–53. He later became the Lake County Deputy Prosecuting Attorney as well as a member of the Diocesan Council, Roman Catholic Diocese of Gary. Mr. Hilbrich is currently a partner at the Hilbrich, Cunningham, and Schwerd law firm in Portage, IN.

In addition to his impressive career achievements, John Hilbrich has always used his skills to improve his community. He is a charter member on the Board of Directors for the Lake County Bar Association. Mr. Hilbrich is also a member of the Real Property, Probate, and Trust Law section of the Indiana Bar Association. He is a proud member of the National Diocesan Attorney Association and a Regional Director for Bank One.

William J. Borah was born and raised in Calumet City, IL. In 1971, he graduated with a bachelors degree in history from Christian Brothers University in Memphis, TN. He subsequently attended the University of Saint Louis, where he earned his education administration degree as well as a masters degree in history. He went on to receive his Juris Doctor from the University of Memphis School of Law in 1982.

In addition to owning his own law firm where he performs a multitude of tasks, Mr. Borah has taken an active interest in helping youth. He taught History at St. Louis High School form 1971–76, where he received the Superb Teacher Award. From 1976–79 he served as the Dean of Instruction at Frontier Community College in Fairfield, IL. In addition to carrying a full course schedule during his law school years, Mr. Borah served as a Dorm Director at Christian Brothers University.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and my other distinguished colleagues join me in commending John F. Hilbrich and William J. Borah for their lifetime commitment to service in Northwest Indiana and Illinois, respectively. Our communities have greatly benefited from their selflessness and dedication.

IMPROVING PUBLIC TRUST IN GOVERNMENT

HON. TIM ROEMER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 2000

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an address by the distinguished former Member of the House, Lee Hamilton. I had the honor of serving with Lee for a number of years and he was widely respected as a reasoned and perceptive voice on how to improve the image and public understanding of Congress. The topic of his speech, ''Improving Public Trust in Government'' is especially timely. I encourage all Members to give it careful consideration and submit it for the RECORD.

IMPROVING PUBLIC TRUST IN GOVERNMENT

(By the Honorable Lee H. Hamilton)

INTRODUCTION

I am honored to be speaking at this John C. Whitehead Forum.

John Whitehead is one of the preeminent public servants of our time. He has been a friend for many years, and on countless occasions I have had reason to appreciate his constructive, problem-solving approach to national challenges. He will go into my Hall of Fame of distinguished public servants. His accomplishments in the private, public and nonprofit sectors make him a ''triple threat'' kind of performer. Our nation is deeply indebted to him for his remarkable service.

It is also a pleasure to be here because I have the highest esteem for the work of your Council. Your goal of improving the performance of government is tremendously important. I always think of such efforts as part of the quest for truth and justice. So I commend and encourage you in your good work.

Your partnerships with other organizations and the private sector help build the kind of large base we need to push for positive change in government performance.

I especially want to thank Pat McGinnis for her extraordinary leadership at the Council. She has done a remarkable job advancing the cause of good governance.

Pat has asked me to speak today about trust in government—with a particular emphasis on the Congress.

I approach the task with trepidation. I am only too aware of the low esteem in which the public holds the Congress—we rank only slightly above drug dealers and other felons. Having served in Congress for 34 years, that reputation does not fill me with confidence about my credibility on the topic of trust in government.

My constituents would often tell me just how awful my colleagues and I were. They would say to me fondly:

''You must be a bunch of idiots up there.''

''You are irrelevant. Get out of my life.''

''I know you have your hands in the till, Hamilton. Come clean!''

''Hell must be full of politicians like you.''

Public distrust of government—always present in our history—has been on the rise over the past few decades. In the mid-1960s, three-quarters of Americans said they trusted the federal government to do the right thing most of the time. In the Council's poll this year, that number was down to 29 percent.

This decline in public confidence in government is deeply worrisome to all of us. It signals a great chasm between the government and the people, and makes it all the more difficult for government officials to carry out their responsibilities.

I. Reasons for public cynicism and distrust

The reasons why Americans are turned off by American politics today are many:

(1) Declining trust generally: Declining trust in government reflects a broader trend in our society of diminished confidence in authority and institutions generally—not just government. Since the 1960s, Americans have become less deferential and more skeptical of authority. Our government's involvement in Vietnam, Watergate, and other scandals contributed to this broad societal change. But many other institutions—including even our churches and synagogues—have suffered a drop in public trust as well.

(2) Changing economy: Even though the American economy has done exceedingly well in recent years, economic anxieties run high for many Americans worried about how to pay for education, health care, and retirement. Workers feel the threats of globalization and technology, and growing income inequality. I have always been impressed how economic pressures bear down on families, in good and bad times. To many people, government seems less relevant and not particularly helpful with their difficult work transitions and burdensome costs. Many Americans see the government as an obstacle rather than a helping hand to achieving the American dream.

(3) Poor leadership: There is disillusionment with the personal flaws of political leaders. This disillusionment is felt most strongly with respect to the misconduct of some of our presidents, but is also felt towards Members of Congress, cabinet members, and many other public officials. Many Americans believe public officials look out for themselves and pursue their own agendas rather than the interests of the people and the nation.

(4) Money and special interests: Americans feel that money and special interests have excessive influence in politics. Most Americans believe their own representative has traded votes for campaign contributions. They know our system of financing elections degrades politician and donor alike, and arouses deep suspicion of undue, disproportionate influence in exchange for the large contributions.

Special interests often contribute to public distrust of government by portraying government negatively—by using overblown rhetoric to convince people they are being endangered by sinister politicians and corrupt government. These groups excel at making themselves look good and the government look bad.

(5) Negative campaigns: Americans dislike the dirty, negative election campaigns that have become so common. They are turned off by personal attacks, and the view held by many politicians that to win a close race you must tear down your opponent. Americans disapprove of the way politicians attack other politicians' motives and criticize the very institutions they are seeking to join and lead. Candidates run for Congress today by running against Congress and often against government, too. It is really rather easy for a candidate for Congress to go before any audience in America and make himself look frugal, wise and compassionate and the Congress look extravagant, foolish and cold-hearted.

(6) Partisanship: There is a widespread belief that politics has become too partisan, too sharp-edged, too mean-spirited. The messy political process and the constant bickering signal to many Americans that partisan considerations take precedence in Washington over sound policy formulation.

(7) Performance of government: Large numbers of Americans are simply disappointed by the performance of government. They think it spends their money wastefully, is ineffective, or too intrusive. In a survey taken a couple years ago, 42 percent of Americans couldn't name a single important achievement of the federal government over the past 30 years.

(8) Media: The role of the media in politics exacerbates public disdain of government. The media accentuate differences and conflicts between politicians. I can remember many times when I was rejected for a TV talk show because my views were too moderate. The media focus on the personal lives of politicians, on style rather than substance, entertainment over education. Since the 1960s, newspaper and television coverage has become increasingly negative, cynical and adversarial.

So it is not surprising that many people think there is nothing right with our political system at all.

II. Consequences of skepticism

What are the consequences of this public distrust and skepticism of government?

Skepticism is healthy: To an extent, skepticism is healthy. Voters should not take everything politicians say at face value, or blindly trust everything the government does.

Skepticism is part of our American heritage. We can trace it back to the battle for independence, which was triggered by a growing disillusionment with British rule. The Constitution is based on assumptions of wariness of government and the need for checks and balances to restrain the branches.

Skepticism indicates an attitude of questioning, of independence of thought, of challenging the status quo. It suggests to our leaders that people will not believe them if they do not fully explain their views, or, of course, if they lie or act deceitfully. In this sense, it serves us well.

Too much skepticism is unhealthy: The program arises when skepticism becomes so deep that Americans have no trust in government.

The effectiveness of our public institutions depends on a basic foundation of mutual trust between the people and public officials. When skepticism turns to cynicism, our political system works only with great difficulty.

If politicians' character and motives are constantly attacked, reasoned debate and consideration of their views becomes impossible. The dialogue of democracy, upon which our system depends, comes to an end.

Often when I was meeting with a group of constituents, I could feel a curtain of doubt hanging between them and me: I took the positions I did, they believed, because of this or that campaign contribution, not because I'd spent time studying and weighing the merits of issues. I would often ask myself what I had done to prompt such profound doubt about my motives and actions. For whatever reason, those constituents had given themselves over to cynicism, and cynicism is the great enemy of democracy. It is exceedingly difficult for public officials to govern when their character, values and motives are always suspect.

III. What to do?

So how can we improve public trust in government?

I want to focus on what government—especially the Congress—can do.

Some of the factors contributing to the decline in public trust are not easily changed. The government cannot readily affect the negative tone of the media or the broad decline in confidence in authority and institutions.

But there is much that government can do to restore and build public trust.

1. Improve the way government works

The most basic and important way to restore confidence in government is to make the government work better and cost less—to make it more responsive, accountable, accessible, and efficient.

On this subject, let me say a few words about the role of the Congress.

In a number of ways, current practices of the Congress help alienate people from the political process, and weaken trust in government.

Several trends have made Congress less deliberative, less transparent, and less accountable.

Omnibus legislation: Congress is increasingly unable to pass its spending bills on time, and then makes major legislative decisions through huge omnibus measures that are shaped in a great hurry and in secret by a limited group of congressional leaders and staff. 5 of 13 appropriations bills were dumped into one omnibus bill this year, totaling $385 billion and composed of 2,000 pages. These bills—often gauged more by weight than the number of pages—are—from the standpoint of good process, if not content—an abomination.

Riders: Congress increasingly loads appropriations bills with legislative riders dealing with controversial policy measures that should be dealt with in other committees. These devices short-circuit deliberation and accountability.

Earmarks: There has been a proliferation of appropriations ''earmarks,'' which target federal money to specific projects favored by individual Members. Many earmarks are just wasteful pork barrel spending inserted into an appropriations bill by a powerful Member, often without the knowledge or consent of his colleagues or the executive branch—on everything from the production of fighter aircraft to manufacturing chewing gum.

Circumventing committees: It has become common practice to bring bills directly to the House and Senate floor without full committee consideration. In 1995, for instance, a major Medicare reform package was crafted in the Speaker's office, rather than the appropriate committee which had jurisdiction over it. This practice excludes the main sources of policy expertise, cuts short deliberation, expands the influence of powerful lobbying groups, and places decisions more tightly in the hands of the congressional leadership and their staff.

Restrictive rules: Restrictive rules for the consideration of bills in Congress undermine debate. He who controls the rules of procedure almost always controls the results. Procedures are often used that sharply restrict debate, reduce the amendments and policy options that can be considered, and greatly advantage the leadership.

Scheduling practices: Selecting practices in the Congress weaken accountability. There is typically a rush of major legislation in the closing days of a session. Major policy choices are made with little advance notification, often late at night, and with inadequate information. The Congress now works a 2½ to 3 day week, except in the closing days of a session. The result is too little time for committee deliberation and floor consideration.

Senate filibusters: Senate filibusters, or the threat of them, have become too common. On many issues, the Senate no longer operates by majority rule because 60 Senators are needed to prevent an individual Senator from blocking consideration of legislation. Thirty years ago, filibusters were rare, and primarily occurred on issues of major constitutional importance. Today, the filibuster may be the single most important way in which the majority will is frustrated, and the greatest source of institutional gridlock in Washington.

Congress should make reforms to remedy these practices and make itself more efficient, accountable and transparent. It should:

Streamline and strengthen the committee system;

Reduce the use of omnibus legislation, riders and earmarks;

Adopt fairer rules and a more reasonable schedule; and

Diminish the number of Senate filibusters.

Campaign finance reform: Also critical to restoring trust in government is enacting campaign finance reform. Poll after poll shows that most Americans believe our campaign finance system corrupts the political process, and should be reformed. If Congress enacts serious campaign finance reform, it will make itself more accountable and boost public trust.

Oversight: Congress should also do a better job of performing its important task of overseeing executive branch operations. Monitoring executive branch implementation of legislation is one of the core responsibilities of Congress. If done properly, congressional oversight can protest the country from the imperial presidency and bureaucratic arrogance. It can maintain a degree of constituency influence in an administration, encourage cost-effective implementation of legislation, ensure that legislation achieves its intended purposes, and determine whether changing circumstances have altered the need for certain programs.

But in recent years, congressional oversight has declined and has shifted away from the systematic review of programs to highly politicized investigations of individual public officials—looking at great length, for instance, at Hilliary Clinton's commodity transactions or charges of money-laundering and drug trafficking at an Arkansas airport when Bill Clinton was governor. These personal investigations, while sometimes necessary, have been used excessively. They exacerbate partisan tensions and reduce the time and political will available for rooting out flaws in public policy.

A renewed commitment to congressional oversight will show that Congress is taking its responsibility seriously and help restore public confidence in the institution.

Tackle issues that concern voters most: Congress, and the government in general, can also strengthen public trust by tackling the big issues that concern voters most. In recent years, public confidence in Congress rose as Congress took tough steps to reduce the government's deficit and balance the federal budget. Today, the public is most concerned about the long-term outlook for Social Security and Medicare, education, and health care. In each of these areas, most Americans are looking to the government to act in a substantial and productive way. If the government addresses these issues, even if with only partial success, public perceptions of government will improve.

2. Improve public understanding of government

Yet improving the way government operates is not enough. We also need to do a better job explaining to Americans what the government does—how it works, why it is important, how it affects their everyday lives. We need to clear away misperceptions, and strengthen public appreciation for the political process. So we need to make government reforms, but we also need to educate people about the government's activities and importance.

I have often been struck by the extent to which Americans have incorrect assumptions about government spending and programs. For instance, Americans frequently complain about the large amount of money our government spends on foreign aid, which they think is around 20 percent of the total federal budget and say should be closer to 10 percent. It is small wonder, then, that foreign aid is a much criticized program. Yet only one percent of the federal budget actually goes to foreign aid.

We should better explain to people that most government spending goes to programs, such as national security, Social Security and Medicare, that are widely popular and beneficial to Americans. Support for the federal government improves considerably when people appreciate the influence of government and are informed about the government's role in improving health care for seniors, insuring food safety, discovering medical cures, and protecting the environment.

We should also work to improve public understanding of the way our system works. We should emphasize that the political process is adversarial, untidy and imprecise. Politicians may not be popular, but they are indispensable. Politics is the way that we express the popular will of the people in this country. At its best, our representative democracy gives us a system whereby all of us have a voice in the process and a stake in the product.

While we should work to make government as efficient as possible, we should explain that legislative deliberation and debate—even heated debate—and delay, are important parts of the legislative process. Delay occurs because the issues before the government are very complicated and intensely debated. It's an incredibly difficult job making policy for a country of this vast size and remarkable diversity. It's the job especially of the Congress to give the various sides a chance to be heard and to search for a broadly acceptable consensus. The founders established our system of checks and balances so that policies could not be rammed through the government with little debate or deliberation.

The Council for Excellence in Government, of course, plays a critical role in the area of public education about government. I have been trying to contribute to the effort through The Center on Congress, which I direct at Indiana University. The central mission of the Center is to help improve the public's understanding of Congress—its role in our country, its strengths and weaknesses, and its daily impact on the lives of ordinary Americans. Through newspaper columns, a website, videos, radio segments, and other media, we seek to explain to ordinary people the role and importance of Congress.

Finally, we must also include a dose of civic responsibility. Citizens must understand their own responsibility to be involved in the political process. I was particularly pleased the Council's poll found that a majority of Americans believe citizen engagement is the single most important change necessary to improve government.

My observation is that participation is the best antidote to cynicism. A person who is deeply involved in fighting for a better school board, a safer railroad crossing, or a more effective arms control treaty, is rarely cynical.

Effective government is a two-way street. Our system of government simply does not work very well without popular support and participation.

Freedom is not free.

IV. Optimism

I've recommended a lot of changes today, but let me not mislead you. Like you, I have concerns about declining trust in government. But I am confident that our political system still basically works. It has a remarkable resilience and underlying strength.

Our government needs reforms, and we need to work to rebuild confidence in government, but we do not need a radical overhaul of our institutions.

Given the size and diversity of our country, and the number and complexity of the challenges we confront, it seems to me that representative democracy works reasonably well in America. The system may be—and at times is—slow, messy, cumbersome, complicated, and even unresponsive, but it has served us well for many years, and continues to do so.

Just think about the condition of our country today. In general I think America is a better place today than it was when I came to Congress almost four decades ago.

The Cold War is over, and we are at peace.

Our economy is thriving and is the envy of the world.

We have greatly improved the lot of older Americans with programs like Social Security and Medicare.

Women and minorities have had new doors opened to them as never before.

The Internet has brought a world of knowledge to the most remote classrooms and homes.

And, most important of all, this is still a land of opportunity where everyone has a chance, not an equal chance unfortunately, but still a chance to become the best they can be.

We must be doing something right.

As I look at the government today, I'm not cynical, pessimistic or discouraged. I'm optimistic about the institutions of government and about the country. I am confident that our government will continue to meet the important challenges we will face in the coming years.

This was indeed the most encouraging finding in the Council's poll this summer—that despite their distrust, Americans still believe that government has an important role to play in the next century, particularly in defense, education, helping senior citizens, medical research, reducing violence and cleaning up the environment. Americans still recognize the importance of government, and look to government to better their lives and our nation.

So the opportunity for improving the relationship between government and the people is clearly there for all of us to seize.

Thank you.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE OHIO VALLEY CHAPTER OF THE ASSOCIATED BUILDERS AND CONTRACTORS AND OSHA

HON. ROB PORTMAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 2000

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the partnership the Ohio Valley Chapter of the Associated Builders and Contractors, Inc. recently forged with the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA). These two groups have mutually recognized the importance of providing a safe work environment for our nation's construction workforce.

I am pleased to see the federal government and the private sector working so closely toward a common goal—worker safety and health. As part of this innovative partnership, participating contractors from the Ohio Valley chapter will voluntarily improve their current safety and health programs and adhere to a more stringent set of standards. In return, OSHA will recognize contractors who have demonstrated exemplary safety records.

According to the agreement, ABC and OSHA will take positive steps together, such as: maintaining an open communications policy at the regional, chapter, and national levels; sharing knowledge of the best industry technology, innovations, and practices that improve safety; cooperating in the development and improvement of safety programs; ensuring that policies and practices are effective, consistent, and fair; and promoting the principles of good faith and fair dealings.

This agreement is good for ABC contractors, OSHA, and most importantly, workers on the job site. I firmly believe that commonsense partnerships such as these, characterized by cooperation and communication, will best serve those it was meant to help—the worker.

MOTHER NATURE WAITS ON NO ONE

HON. LOUISE McINTOSH SLAUGHTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 2000

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, oil prices have tripled since the end of 1998 and are higher than they have been in nearly a decade. Today in response, I am cosponsoring legislation that is an aggressive response to the reduction in oil produced by the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) nations. This legislation would direct the Administration to file a case with the World Trade Organization (WTO) against oil-producing countries. Article XI of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) prohibits members of the WTO from setting quantitative restrictions on imports or exports. I believe oil-producing countries' production limits fall within this Article, therefore these countries have violated the rules of the WTO. With the majority of oil-producing nations already members of the WTO or in the process of applying for membership, a complaint filed by the United States would have an immediate impact on the current and future behavior of these countries.

This particular crisis has to be investigated. I consider these actions a shameful display of ingratitude on the part of Kuwait and Saudi Arabia, after Americans put their lives on the line to safeguard the stability and oil fields of these nations in the Gulf War.

I was pleased with Secretary Richardson's efforts to meet with oil industry representatives and OPEC members, but I frankly think that the cautious approach that the White House is taking is still too little and too late. We know that actions will speak louder than words.

The people that I represent in Monroe County, New York, have the dubious distinction this year of having had more snow than any place else in the United States. My constituents were then especially hard hit by the high heating oil and diesel fuel costs this winter. Now, the rest of the country is being affected by the soaring cost of gasoline. These enormous oil price increases pose a significant threat to our nation's continued economic growth by increasing the likelihood of inflation and the costs of doing business.

So, on behalf of all my constituents today who are still shoveling snow, paying their heating oil bills and now paying these high gas prices, I want to say to my colleagues and to everyone in this Congress that quick action is needed now. Mother Nature waits on no one.

A TRIBUTE TO KRISTEN THALMAN—A DEDICATED PUBLIC SERVANT

HON. EDWARD R. ROYCE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 2000

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize a distinguished American, Kristine Thalman.

She dedicated her career to public service in city government and she ensured that our local citizens received the services they expect from their municipalities.

She has been the Intergovernmental Relations Director for the City of Anaheim California, for the last thirteen years of her career. She retires this month. Her career at Anaheim has been admired by many of us here in Congress.

I want to take this opportunity to thank Kris for her assistance to me since I am pleased to have part of the City of Anaheim in my Congressional District.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that this Thursday is Kris' birthday and certainly greetings are also in order at this time.

THE ORDEAL OF ANDREI BABITSKY

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 2000

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, a small bit of good news has emerged from the tortured region of Chechnya, where the Russian military is killing, looting, and terrorizing the population under the guise of an ''anti-terrorism operation.''

Andrei Babitsky, the Radio Liberty correspondent who had disappeared in Chechnya in early February after Russian authorities had ''exchanged'' him to unknown persons in return for some Russian prisoners of war, has emerged in Dagestan and is now in Moscow recuperating from his ordeal. Mr. Babitsky's courageous reporting from the besieged city of Grozny had infuriated Russian military authorities, and he was arrested in mid-January and charged with ''participating in an unlawful armed formation.''

Prior to his release, Mr. Babitsky had spent time in the notorious Chernokozovo ''filtration'' camp where the Russian military has been detaining and torturing Chechens suspected of aiding the resistance. Following his arrival in Moscow, Mr. Babitsky provided a harrowing account of his incarceration at the Chernokozovo prison, and especially the savage treatment of his fellow prisoners. It is another graphic reminder that for all the fine words and denials coming out of Moscow, the Russian military has been conducting a brutal

business that makes a mockery of the Geneva Conventions and the code of military conduct stipulated in the 1994 Budapest Document of the OSCE.

Mr. Speaker, last month President Clinton stated that Russia's Acting President Putin is a man the United States ''can do business with.'' With this in mind, I would suggest for the RECORD excerpts from Mr. Babitsky's interview with an NTV reporter in Russia. If Mr. Putin is aware of the state of affairs at Chernokozovo and condoning it, I would submit that our business with Mr. Putin should be extremely limited. If he is not aware of the truth, then his authority over Russia is a chimera, and we might better deal with the real rulers of Russia.

Babitsky's statement follows:

[From Hero of the Day NTV Program, 7:40 p.m., Feb. 29, 2000]

INTERVIEW WITH RADIO LIBERTY CORRESPONDENT ANDREI BABITSKY

BABITSKY. On the 16th I tried to leave the city of Grozny through the settlement of Staraya Sunzha, a suburb of Grozny which at the time was divided into two parts. One part was controlled by federal troops and the other by the Chechen home guard.

I entered the territory controlled by the federals and it was there that I was recognized. I was identified as a journalist, I immediately presented my documents. All the subsequent claims that I was detained as a person who had to be identified are not quite clear to me. I had my passports with me, my accreditation card of a foreign correspondent.

Then I was taken to Khankala. Not what journalists who had covered the first war regarded as Khankala but to an open field. There was an encampment there consisting of trucks used as their office by army intelligence officers. Two of my cassettes that I had filmed in Grozny were taken from me. They contained unique frames. I think those were the last video pictures ever taken by anyone before Grozny was stormed. Those, again, were pictures of thousands of peaceful civilians many of whom, as we now know, were killed by federal artillery shells.

I spent two nights in Khankala, in the so-called Avtozak, a truck converted into a prison cell. On the third day I was taken to what the Chechens call a filtration center, the preliminary detention center in Chernokozovo.

I believe I am the only journalist of those who covered the first and the second Chechen wars who has seen a filtration center from the inside. I must say that all these horrors that we have heard from Chechens who had been there have been confirmed. Everything that we read about concentration camps of the Stalin period, all that we know about the German camps, all this is present there.

The first three days that I spent there, that was the 18th, 19th and the 20th, beatings continued round the clock. I never thought that I would hear such a diversity of expressions of human pain. These were not just screams, these were screams of every possible tonality and depth, these were screams of most diverse pain. Different types of beatings cause a different reaction.

Q. Are you saying that you got this treatment?

A. No, that was the treatment meted out to others. I was fortunate, it was established at once that I am a journalist, true, nobody knew what type of journalist I was. Everybody there were surprised that a journalist happened to be there. In principle, the people there cannot be described as intellectuals. They decided that there was nothing special about this, that such things do happen in a war. As a journalist I was ''registered'', as they say, only once. They have this procedure there. When a new detainee is being taken from his cell to the investigator he is made to crawl all the way under a rain of blows with rubber sticks.

It hurts but one can survive it. This is a light treatment as compared with the tortures to which Chechens are subjected day and night, those who are suspected of collaborating with the illegal armed formations. There are also cases when some testimony is beaten out of detainees.

Q. What is the prison population there?

A. In my opinion . . . I was in cell No. 17 during the first three days. In that cell there were 13 inhabitants of the village Aberdykel (sp.—FNS). Most of them were young. Judging by their stories, I am not an investigator and I could not collect a sufficiently full database, but in such an atmosphere one very rarely doubts the veracity of what you are told. Mostly these were young men who had nothing to do with the war. They were really common folk. They were treating everything happening around them as a calamity but they were not taking any sides. They were simply waiting for this calamity to pass either in this direction or that direction.

Beatings as a method of getting testimony. This is something that, unfortunately, is very well known in Russian and not only Russian history and tradition. But I must say that apart from everything, in my opinion, in all this torture, as it seemed to me, a large part is due to sheer sadism. In other words, an absolutely unwarranted torturing of people.

For instance, I heard . . . You know, you really can't see this because all this happens outside of your cell. But the type of screams leaves not doubt about what is happening. You know, this painful reaction. For two hours a woman was tortured on the 20th or the 19th. She was tortured, I have no other word to explain what was happening. That was not a hysteria. I am not a medic but I believe that we all know what a hysteria is. There were screams indicting that a person was experiencing unbearable pain, and for a long period of time.

EXPRESSING SORROW OF THE HOUSE AT THE DEATH OF THE HONORABLE CARL B. ALBERT, FORMER MEMBER OF CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA

SPEECH OF

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 8, 2000

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Speaker Carl Albert passed away Friday, February 4, 2000, after a distinguished career during which he shepherded the nation through some of its most difficult years. The people of the Thirtieth Congressional District of Texas pay tribute to this great American and join the nation to express sincere sorrow regarding his passing.

Beginning in the Eightieth Congress, Speaker Albert spent the next thirty years representing the citizens of the Third Congressional District of Oklahoma in the U.S. Congress and helped create a new era of American opportunity. He supported civil rights and antipoverty legislation. Speaker Albert provided invaluable leadership to the House of Representatives as majority leader during the Eighty-seventh through Ninety-first Congresses. As leader of this legislative body during the Ninety-second through Ninety-fourth Congresses, Speaker Albert fostered a lasting legacy.

Speaker Albert successfully steered the nation through difficult times and ensured a fair forum for democratic discussion on issues ranging from the impeachment of President Richard Nixon to the war in Vietnam. He provided the nation with stability and security while he was first in line to succeed the President of the United States, in 1973 and again in 1974.

Speaker Albert personified great American values throughout his life. He rose from childhood poverty to become a Rhodes Scholar, winner of the Bronze Star, and a distinguished U.S. Congressman.

During a time when we sometimes let partisanship get the better of us, we should look at Carl Albert as a symbol of the most esteemed values of the U.S. Congress. I join the nation in paying tribute to an exemplary citizen, who was during his lifetime and continues to be an inspiration in the greatest traditions of domestic representation.

THE AFFORDABLE DRINKING WATER ACT OF 2000

HON. JOHN A. BOEHNER

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 2000

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce the Affordable Drinking Water Act of 2000. This legislation provides a new and creative way to bring safe drinking water in a cost-effective manner to those rural Americans who will struggle to meet this most basic need.

Under the bill, the government, working in partnership with nonprofit entities, would assist low to moderate-income individuals secure financing for the installation or refurbishing of individual household water well systems. The legislation authorizes a public/private partnership that allows homeowners of modest means to bring old household water well systems up to current standards, replace systems that have met their expected life, or provide homeowners without a drinking water source with a new individual household water well system.

The Affordable Drinking Water Act is a targeted approach. Only low to moderate income Americans who request assistance with their drinking water needs are eligible. The traditional federally subsidized long-pipe water systems run water lines across the countryside in front of homes that are experiencing drinking water problems, but also homes that are not. The current system serves customers without adequate financial means but also many that do not need financial help. This lack of targeting federal dollars is often a waste of scarce resources. This legislation creates a financing option to install individual wells where they make the most economic sense.

This bill also provides assistance to the drinking water delivery option many rural Americans prefer. In a recent national survey, more than 80% of well owners prefer their individual household water well systems to other

drinking water delivery options. Only 8.3% said they would rather have their drinking water from a water utility company. This legislation gives consumers the ability to pay for new or refurbished individual household water well systems with convenient monthly payments, like other utility bills.

It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that organizations like the National Ground Water Association, a group that has a long and distinguished record preserving and protecting America's precious ground water resources, strongly endorses this legislation. It is my hope that other organizations and communities that support common sense, innovative approaches to providing affordable, safe water to rural Americans will also endorse the Affordable Drinking Water Act of 2000.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation that provides a cost-effective alternative to meeting the drinking water needs of rural America.

IVANPAH VALLEY AIRPORT PUBLIC LANDS TRANSFER ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. JIM GIBBONS

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 2000

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1695) to provide for the conveyance of certain Federal public lands in the Ivanpah Valley, Nevada, to Clark County, Nevada, for the development of an airport facility, and for other purposes:

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Chairman, I include the following letters of support for H.R. 1695, the Ivanpah Valley Airport Public Lands Transfer Act.

AIRPORTS COUNCIL INTERNATIONAL,
Washington, DC, March 7, 2000.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: Airports Council International-North America urges your strong support of H.R. 1695, the Ivanpah Valley Airport Public Lands Transfer Act. This legislation would enable the Clark County, Nevada Department of Aviation to buy 6,500 of federal land for a new airport to serve Las Vegas.

The number of air passengers traveling in the United States in expected to increase from less than 700 million to over a billion in just a few short years. We need to add airport capacity across the nation to accommodate this growth.

Air traffic at Las Vegas McCarran International airport grew 11 percent last year alone, creating the prospect of significant future delays if new runway and terminal facilities are not built. Las Vegas is currently the tenth busiest airport in the nation with connections to over 50 other cities. Delays in Las Vegas will mean delays in other cities as well.

The FAA Reauthorization package agreed to by the conferees this week provides airports with much of the funding they require to meet tomorrow's needs. In order for this important work to be done, airports such as Las Vegas must be able to overcome the environmental opposition to their expansion projects. Existing airports all across the nation are facing congestion in terminals and on runways. New airport capacity is needed today.

We urge you to support H.R. 1695.

Sincerely,

JEFFREY GOODELL,
Vice President, Government Affairs.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF AIRPORT EXECUTIVES,
Alexandria, VA, March 3, 2000.

Hon. JAMES GIBBONS,
U.S. Representative, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE GIBBONS: The U.S. House of Representatives will shortly be considering H.R. 1695, which would permit Clark County, Nevada to purchase 6,500 acres of federal land in the Ivanpah Valley for a future commercial airport site. Your support, and that of your colleagues, is critical to ensuring the continued economic vitality of Southern Nevada well into the 21st Century.

Passenger traffic at McCarran International Airport has been increasing for the past 16 consecutive months. During that period, passenger enplanements have risen by over 11 percent. Continued growth, at even a moderate rate, will bring the Airport to its effective capacity by 2012. The Clark County Department of Aviation estimates it will take at least seven years to plan, design and construct the new airport. I think you will agree that prompt congressional action is critical.

The Ivanpah Valley is the best location for a future second airport to serve the Las Vegas metropolitan area. The proposed location is 35 miles from the heart of the Las Vegas valley, between Jean and Prim, Nevada. Also, it is bounded by Interstate Highway 15 and main line of the Union Pacific Railroad, giving the new airport excellent and essential multimodal/intermodal surface access opportunities.

Thank you again for your support and assistance. If further information is desired, please do not hesitate to contact Randall H. Walker, Director of Aviation at (702) 261–5150.

Sincerely yours,

TODD HAUPTLI,
Senior Vice President for Policy and Government Affairs.

LAS VEGAS CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF IVANPAH AIRPORT LAND SALE

Whereas, visitors from outside the state directly and indirectly account for more than half the state's economic activity thereby constituting the economic lifeblood of Nevada; and

Whereas, airline passengers constitute nearly 50% of the visitors to the Las Vegas Valley and this percentage is likely to increase as Las Vegas adds to its presence as a gateway for international travelers; and

Whereas, McCarran International Airport has a capacity to handle 55 million passengers annually. In 1999, over 33.6 million passengers used McCarran and growth projections indicated the Airport could reach its capacity by the end of this decade; and

Whereas, having explored numerous options, the Clark County Department of Aviation believes the Ivanpah Valley offers the only feasible location for a second airport to service commercial air cargo and passenger traffic; and

Whereas, the County has committed to pay the Bureau of Land Management fair market value for the property, conduct an airspace analysis to minimize overflights of the Mojave National Preserve, and draft a thorough Environmental Impact Statement prior to initiating construction of the Ivanpah Valley Airport; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, the Las Vegas Chamber of Commerce endorses and supports the Department of Aviation's efforts to acquire Ivanpah Valley land for an airport; and be it further

Resolved, that the Las Vegas Chamber of Commerce as the representative of more than 6,000 member businesses in Southern Nevada, encourages the House of Representatives to pass H.R. 1695, providing the Bureau of Land Management with the authority to sell the identified land in the Ivanpah Valley to Clark County; and be it further

Resolved, that copies of this Resolution be transmitted to Nevada's Congressional delegation.

DONALD L. ''PAT'' SHALMY,
President General Manager.

MIRAGE RESORTS,
Las Vegas, NV, March 1, 2000.

Hon. JAMES GIBBONS,
U.S. Representative, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GIBBONS: The U.S. House of Representatives will shortly be considering HR 1695 which would permit Clark County, Nevada to purchase 6,500 acres of federal land in the Ivanpah Valley for a future commercial airport site. Your support, and that of your colleagues, is critical to ensuring the continued economic vitality of Southern Nevada well into the 21st Century.

Passenger traffic at McCarran International Aiport has been increasing for the past 16 consecutive months. During that period, passenger enplanements have risen by over 11%. Continued growth, at even a moderate rate, will bring the Airport to its effective capacity by 2012. The Clark County Department of Aviation estimates it will take at least seven years to plan, design and construct the new airport. I think you will agree that prompt congressional action is critical.

The Ivanpah Valley is the best location for a future second airport to serve the Las Vegas metropolitan area. The proposed location is 35 miles from the heart of the Las Vegas valley, between Jean and Prim, Nevada. Also, it is bounded by Interstate Highway 15 and main line of the Union Pacific Railroad, giving the new airport excellent and essential multimodal/intermodal surface access opportunities.

Thank you again for your support and assistance. If further information is desired, please do not hesitate to contact Randall H. Walker, Director Aviation at (702) 261–5150.

Sincerely yours,

PUTNAM MATHUR.

MGM GRAND,
Las Vegas, NV, March 1, 2000.

Hon. JAMES GIBBONS,
U.S. Representative, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GIBBONS: The U.S. House of Representatives will shortly be considering HR 1695 which would permit Clark County, Nevada to purchase 6,500 acres of federal land in the Ivanpah Valley for a future commercial airport site. Your support, and that of your colleagues, is critical to ensuring the continued economic vitality of Southern Nevada well into the 21st Century.

Passenger traffic at McCarran International Airport has been increasing for the past 16 consecutive months. During that period, passenger enplanements have risen by over 11%. Continued growth, at even a moderate rate, will bring the Airport to its effective capacity by 2012. The Clark County Department of Aviation estimates it will take at least seven years to plan, design and construct the new airport. I think you will agree that prompt congressional action is critical.

The Ivanpah Valley is the best location for a future second airport to serve the Las Vegas metropolitan area. The proposed location is 35 miles from the heart of the Las Vegas valley, between Jean and Primm, and

is bounded by Interstate Highway 15 and main line of the Union Pacific Railroad, giving the new airport excellent and essential multimodal/intermodal surface access opportunities.

Thank you again for your support and assistance. If further information is desired, please do not hesitate to contact Randall H. Walker, Director of Aviation at (702) 261–5150.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM J. HORNBUCKLE,
President and Chief Operating Officer.

DEL WEBB CORPORATION,
Henderson, NV, March 1, 2000.

Hon. JAMES GIBBONS,
U.S. Representative, 100 Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN JIM GIBBONS: As you are well aware, the House of Representatives will shortly consider H.R. 1695, which will permit Clark County, Nevada to purchase 6,500 acres of federal land in the Ivanpah Valley for a future commercial airport site.

I'm writing to encourage your support, and that of your colleagues, for this important piece of legislation. It is our belief that this bill is critical in order to ensure the continued economic vitality of Southern Nevada for decades to come. In just the last 16 months McCarran International Airport has seen an 11% increase in passenger traffic and will reach its effective capacity by the year 2012. Given the time constraints and requirements to plan, design and construct such a complex structure, the ability to acquire the site through immediate passage is crucial.

As a company that develops large tracts of land into master-planned communities, we're well acquainted with the limited land availability in the Las Vegas area and we believe the Ivanpah Valley is the best location for a future second airport. Also, immediate freeway access makes it an ideal location.

Additionally, we support the Clark County Department of Aviation's attempt to purchase these needed lands from the BLM. It is our understanding that they will pay for these lands at an agreed upon value based upon appraisals acceptable to both the BLM and the airport.

Therefore, we join with other community business leaders and agencies in encouraging your active support of this legislation. We are prepared to assist in moving this legislation forward.

I look forward to seeing you again in the near future.

Sincerely,

SCOTT HIGGINSON,
Vice President, Government Affairs.

THE CITY OF HENDERSON,
Henderson, NV, August 5, 1998.

Re S. 1964 and H.R. 3705.

Hon. JIM GIBBONS,
Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GIBBONS: I would like to let you know that I am in full support of the above referenced legislation. As you know Henderson's Sky Harbor Airport currently is a reliever airport of small aircraft from the McCarran air space and air traffic. As this region continues to grow, our modes of effective and efficient transportation become an increasingly important part of maintaining and improving our economic strength.

The Clark County Department of Aviation staff has identified the Ivanpah Valley Airport as the prime location for future air transportation into this region. This new airport is absolutely critical for the Department of Aviation to fulfill its mission of never allowing the lack of airport infrastructure to be an impediment to people coming to visit Las Vegas, the Grand Canyon or other destinations in this region. I would like to thank you for your efforts to date regarding this legislation and would encourage you to continue to make every effort to seek passage this session.

Legislation of this type is visionary and will help ensure a bright future for Southern Nevada.

Sincerely,

JAMES B. GIBSON,
Mayor.

HOTEL EMPLOYEES & RESTAURANT EMPLOYEES INTERNATIONAL UNION,
Washington, DC, March 7, 2000.

Hon. SHELLEY BERKLEY,
Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN BERKLEY: On behalf of the Hotel Employees and Restaurant Employees International Union I want to convey support for enactment of H.R. 1965, the Ivanpah Valley Airport Public Lands Transfer Act. This bill will facilitate the purchase of federal land approximately 35 miles south of Las Vegas for the construction of an additional airport to serve southern Nevada. The phenomenal growth of the Las Vegas economy has in turn triggered double digit growth at McCarran International Airport.

It is vitally important that the transportation infrastructure be able to keep pace with growth in the hotel industry. This bill is important if the tourist based economy of Las Vegas is expected to continue to provide good paying employment opportunities. I urge you and your colleagues in the Congress to enact H.R. 1965 without amendment to pave the way for a second airport for southern Nevada.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

JOHN W. WILHELM,
General President.

NEVADA SERVICE EMPLOYEES UNION,
Las Vegas, NV, March 3, 2000.

Hon. JAMES GIBBONS,
U.S. Representative, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GIBBONS: On behalf of Nevada Service Employees Union, SEIU, Local 1107, we are writing to communicate our support for the enactment of H.R. 1965, the Ivanpah Valley Airport Public Lands Transfer Act.

This bill is of extreme importance to the community and is strongly supported by the membership of NSEU, SEIU, Local 1107.

It is our belief that the Ivanpah Valley is the best location for a second airport to serve the Las Vegas metropolitan area.

It is our further belief that the construction of this additional facility is critical with respect to ensuring the continued economic growth of Southern Nevada in that the additional airport will be able to accommodate the needs of Southern Nevada's vital industries.

Accordingly, we urge your colleagues to enact H.R. 1965.

Thank you in advance for your attention in this matter.

Sincerely,

VICKY HEDDERMAN,
President.
THOMAS M. BEATTY,
Executive Director.

SOUTHERN NEVADA BUILDING & CONSTRUCTION TRADES COUNCIL,
Las Vegas, NV, March 2, 2000.

Hon. JAMES GIBBONS,
U.S. Representative, Cannon House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GIBBONS: The U.S. House of Representatives will shortly be considering HR1695 which would permit Clark County, Nevada to purchase 6,500 acres of federal land in the Ivanpah Valley for a future commercial airport site. Your support, and that of your colleagues, is critical to ensuring the continued economic vitality of Southern Nevada well into the 21st Century.

This bill is very important to the construction industry and is strongly supported by the Southern Nevada Building and Construction Trades.

Passenger traffic at McCarran International Airport has been increasing for the past 16 consecutive months. During that period, passenger traffic has risen by over 11%. Continued growth, at even a moderate rate, will bring the Airport to its effective capacity by 2012. The Clark County Department of Aviation estimates it will take at least seven years to plan, design and construct the new airport. I think you will agree that prompt congressional action is critical.

The Ivanpah Valley is the best location for a future second airport to serve the Las Vegas metropolitan area. The proposed location is 35 miles from the heart of the Las Vegas valley, between Jean and Primm, Nevada. Also, it is bounded by Interstate Highway 15 and the main line of the Union Pacific Railroad, giving the new airport excellent and essential multimodal/intermodal surface access opportunities.

Thank you again for your support and assistance. If further information is desired, please do not hesitate to contact Randall H. Walker, Director Aviation at (702) 261–5150.

Sincerely yours,

JACK JEFFREY.

INTRODUCTION OF CORAL REEF CONSERVATION LEGISLATION

HON. ENI F.H. FALEOMAVAEGA

OF AMERICAN SAMOA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 2000

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. I am pleased to rise today with my good friend from New Jersey, the Chairman of the Fisheries Conservation, Wildlife and Oceans Subcommittee, Mr. SAXTON, to introduce bipartisan legislation to authorize a coral reef conservation program.

For many people, coral reefs are distant marine environments that they might never come in contact with unless they are fortunate enough to go on a tropical vacation. For too long now, as a Nation we have enjoyed the biological wealth provided by coral reefs, but failed in our obligations to devote the resources necessary to protect these vital treasures. While these precious ecosystems appeared to be in balance until not long ago, today human activities have significantly altered that balance—much to the detriment of the corals, and much to the demise of people who depend on coral reefs to sustain their communities and economies.

Unlike many other members of Congress, I come from a place where the coral reefs are essential to the very fabric of everyday life. Until recently, those of us from the Pacific islands have literally lived off our reefs and the surrounding local lands. We have recognized

for generations that coral reefs form the fundamental building block of an intricate marine food chain, providing nutrients, food and habitats for a tremendous diversity of fish and other marine animals. And intuitively, we have all come to appreciate that without healthy coral reefs, our abundance of marine resources might soon come to a sudden end.

Unfortunately, the sad reality is that we have discovered that the coral reefs we depend on are under numerous threats. These threats come from many sources, including polluted run off, increased siltation, mining, and destructive fishing practices, notably the use of dynamite and cyanide, to name only a few. We have even come to appreciate that the decline in coral health could be linked to global climate change, and events such as El Nino.

But with recognition of the problem, and with increased resources to address it, we can begin to reverse the degradation of our coral reefs and achieve a sustainable balance towards the long-term conservation of these important marine ecosystems. Several recent activities, including the initiation of the International Coral Reef Initiative, the development of U.S. Coral Reef Initiative and the International Year of the Coral Reef, were all good beginnings. And just last week, the U.S. Coral Reef Task Force published a national action plan to conserve coral reefs. It is vital that we continue this positive momentum.

As the Senior Democrat on the Subcommittee on Fishery Conservation, Wildlife and Oceans, I have enjoyed working collaboratively with Chairman SAXTON and his able staff to address my concerns and issues raised by other Democrats in order to develop this consensus legislation.

The legislation we introduce today addresses many of the priorities I consider essential to any comprehensive coral reef conservation bill. Perhaps most significant, the legislation would codify the Coral Reef Task Force established under Executive Order 13089 to give this panel the authority it needs to address the myriad of problems confronting coral reefs today.

Importantly, this legislation would require the Task Force to initiate fundamental baseline research and management activities, most notably, the mapping of all coral reef resources in the U.S. Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ). The bill would provide to the Task Force, through a National Program coordinated by the Department of Commerce, up to $5 million per year for 4 years to initiate this and other baseline activities, especially the development of comprehensive coral reef monitoring and assessment programs. It is expected that scientists and resource managers will gain from this previously unavailable information new insights regarding how human activities and other environmental factors are contributing to the degradation of coral reef ecosystems, and optimistically, how this degradation might be reversed. To ensure the continued comment from a broad range of interests involved in the management of coral reefs, it is anticipated that those Regional Fishery Management Councils established under the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act which have corals within their jurisdiction, would be involved.

Of equal significance, this legislation would also authorize a coral reef conservation grant program to assist States and local communities in the protection, conservation and sustainable use of their coral reef resources. The bill would provide up to $10 million per year for 4 years for coral reef conservation grants and it is expected that these grants will help improve local capabilities, raise local public awareness, and promote the long-term conservation and restoration of coral reef ecosystems. I am also pleased that this legislation would ensure the equitable distribution of grant funds to applicants in the Pacific and Atlantic Oceans, the Gulf of Mexico and the Carribean Sea.

Allow me to close by simply saying that while this bill is not perfect, it is a fair and honorable compromise. The bill would establish a targeted, focused and locally-driven coral reef conservation program; importantly, a program grounded in science and built upon the ground-breaking and successful work of the Coral Reef Task Force. I commend Chairman SAXTON for his leadership and commitment to coral reef protection, and I thank my Democratic colleagues on the Fisheries Subcommittee who have worked with me throughout these negotiations.

A TRIBUTE—GARFIELD COUNTY 1999 EMPLOYEE OF THE YEAR

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 2000

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to take this moment to recognize the career of one of Garfield County's community leaders, and recipient of the Garfield County 1999 Employee of the Year award, Judy Blakeslee. In doing so, I would like to honor this individual who, for many years, has exhibited dedication and experience to the Sheriff's Department of Garfield County.

As a Civil Deputy for the last 18 years, Judy handles restraining orders, evictions, garnishment of wages and custody orders in the county. Before becoming a Civil Deputy, Ms. Blakeslee spent her first year as Garfield County's Animal Control Officer. She took her role as a Civil Deputy to another level. She would go out of her way to aid displaced and needy families to the best of her ability.

Judy Blakeslee has more than proven herself as a valuable asset to the Sheriff's Department of Garfield County, therefore, receiving this award. This achievement recognizes her compassion, professionalism and dedication to her County.

It is with this, Mr. Speaker, that I say thank you to Judy Blakeslee on a truly exceptional career as a Garfield County employee. Ms. Blakeslee's dedicated service stands out and sets a standard for those who follow.

In conclusion I would note that as a police officer and attorney-at-law I had the privilege to work with Judy. I felt fortunate to have her as a friend and as a coworker.

CONGRATULATING THE U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

HON. GENE GREEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 2000

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct the attention of the House to a recent article in the Chicago Tribune about one of our oldest friends . . . the U.S. Government Printing Office. I have a real appreciation of the GPO, having started as a printer's apprentice in 1968 as a member of Houston Typographic Union Local 87.

The article is profuse in its praise of the GPO, stating that while the agency usually "wears a low profile," the service that it provides the Congress and the Nation is absolutely crucial in our democratic system of government. In noting the vast range of publications the GPO handles—from the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to the Findings of Fact in the Microsoft case—the article describes how the GPO has moved from a traditional ink-on-paper factory to a widely heralded provider of Government information over the Internet.

It is a success story that is worthy of everyone's attention.

A generation ago, the GPO had a workforce of 8,500. Today, there are about 3,300, yet not only does the GPO continue to print government publications, it is now a key player in the world of online government information. The incredible success of cutting staff by more than 50 percent while expanding services to Congress and the Nation is virtually without comparison.

The GPO's expert use of technology has made this achievement possible—technology which has transformed the way the GPO processes printing, and technology which makes it possible for the public to download more than 20 million publications a month from the GPO's online service, GPO Access.

Mr. Speaker, this is an incredible achievement, and I include the text of this excellent article for all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

We are fortunate, indeed, to have an agency of this caliber, with its expert workforce and its record of savings and technological achievement, working in support of the Congress and the American people.

[From the Chicago Tribune, Tues., Mar. 7, 2000]

FROM THE STARR REPORT TO WHITE HOUSE MENUS, GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE IS PAPERWORK CENTRAL

(By Glen Elsasser)

WASHINGTON—In a fortresslike complex near Capitol Hill, Kenneth Fatkin occupies the front lines of government. Though safely distanced from the frenzy of politics, he still confronts the handiwork of legions of federal agencies, Congress and the White House, handiwork that affects the lives of millions of Americans.

Amid shelves of reference books, Fatkin on a recent morning was scanning a set of proposed rules from the Federal Aviation Agency about the takeoff and landing of airplanes. Despite the abstruse language, he quickly marked up the page.

Fatkin works for the Government Printing Office, an agency that considers itself the largest supplier of government informational materials in the world. Those materials include everything from Independent Counsel

Kenneth Starr's case against President Clinton to a ''My Wetlands Coloring Book'' for kids.

It also prints the Federal Register, which 100 proofreaders including Fatkin work around the clock to produce. Five days a week, the register provides a complete update of government rules, executive orders, presidential proclamations and proposed regulations.

Within the monstrous federal bureaucracy, the Government Printing Office generally wears a low profile, but a brief moment of fame came in 1998 when, under deadline, heavy security and massive publicity, the GPO published the Starr report. In all, the report and its two supplements took up five volumes totaling more than 8,000 pages.

The sale of the report, which detailed the president's relationship with former White House intern Monica Lewinsky, drew lines of purchasers outside its main bookstore and gave TV viewers a rare glimpse of the GPO headquarters.

More recently, the GPO played a crucial role in circulating the long-awaited findings in the ongoing Microsoft antitrust case. Within two hours after U.S. District Judge Thomas Penfield Jackson had announced his initial ruling at 4:30 p.m. on Nov. 4, printed copies were available at the GPO bookstore and the electronic version was ready on-line. A printed copy of the 207-page document, and an electronic disk, had been sent to the GPO immediately after his decision.

Another GPO staple is the Congressional Record, which chronicles the daily proceedings in Congress and prints debates verbatim. Requiring all-night production, an average copy of the Record runs 200 pages and must be available on the floor of both houses by 9 a.m. when Congress is in session.

Among the GPO's other key functions is printing the federal budget, which this year was accompanied by five related publications totaling 2,808 pages and weighing 12 pounds. The 2001 budget was also available immediately on CD–ROM and on the Internet.

The GPO prints congressional bills and reports, passports and Civil Service exams, the last of which is done under tight security at the Denver plant. It turns out postal cards, congressional stationery, White House invitations and menus, and the Supreme Court briefs of the Justice Department.

It also runs 24 bookstores in major cities, including Boston, Chicago, Columbus, Cleveland, Dallas, Detroit, Kansas City, Los Angeles, Milwaukee, San Francisco and Seattle. The subjects of the publications for sale cover an eclectic mix of titles and are reasonably priced.

Take, for example, the publications recently displayed in the window of the GPO bookstore near the White House.

A number of the titles are clearly self-help and offer practical advice on a variety of problems—''Eat Right to Lower Your Blood Pressure,'' ''A Working Woman's Guide to Her Job Rights,'' ''Marijuana: Facts Parents Need to Know'' and ''Safe and Smart: Making the After School Hours Work for Kids.'' All cost less than $10.

Other titles clearly appeal only to wonks, such as ''Investigating the Year 2000 Problem: The 100 Day Report,'' a summary of findings by the Special Commission on the Year 2000 Technology Problem.

History is also well represented in the offerings: ''Boston and the American Revolution,'' ''Rise of the Fighter Generals, 1945–1982'' and ''The Three Wars of Lt. Gen. George Stratemeyer: His Korean War Diary.'' There are also art books such as ''Language of the Land: The Library of Congress Book of Literary Maps'' and titles obviously geared to children, like ''My Wetlands Coloring Book.''

The GPO maintains a list of its monthly bestsellers, and among the 1999 winners were ''21st Century Skills for 21st Century Jobs,'' ''Buying Your Home: Settlement Costs and Helpful Information,'' ''Federal Benefits for Veterans and Dependents'' and the ''The Constitution of the United States and the Declaration of Independence.''

Overseeing the operation is Michael DiMario, who was named public printer by President Clinton in 1993. He is the nation's 23rd public printer, chief of an agency that dates to the Civil War era but has changed substantially with technology.

''The computer has changed everything and is now fundamental to the printing process,'' said DiMario, a lawyer who has worked in various posts since joining the GPO in 1971. The only linotype operator left in the 33-acre facility is the one who sets type for book titles in gilt.

''In the late 1960s we moved into electronic photo composition, and the computer was used to compose data for printing,'' he said. ''Today our presses are controlled by the computer.''

Even though the computer now does much of the work, however, human skills—such as a broad knowledge of government, its lingo and methods of lawmaking—remain critical to the editing process.

By DiMario's count, the GPO handles 50 percent of the government's printing needs. Notable exceptions are the nation's currency, postage stamps, Treasury securities and certificates, done by the Bureau of Engraving and Printing; and the classified documents of intelligence agencies.

Since 1993, pursuant to a new federal law, the GPO has made the Congressional Record and other government publications available in an electronic format. In 1997, for example, the GPO and the Commerce Department teamed up to offer free Internet access to the Commerce Business Daily, which keeps tabs on government contract and subcontracting opportunities, small business and other set asides, special notices and sales of surplus U.S. property.

Today thousands of publications are available electronically—far surpassing the number of print titles available for sale in the GPO bookstores. In fact, PC Week magazine in 1999 rated the GPO as one of the nation's top technology innovators.

Every month, DiMario estimates, 20 million GPO publications are downloaded from the Internet. During the first hour after the release of the Microsoft ruling, 152,000 successful connections were made on the GPO's popular Internet information service.

''The GPO has about 100,000 titles on-line that are on our own server here, and we provide links through our Web site [www.access.gpo.gov] to an additional 60,000 titles from other agencies,'' he said. ''That's a moving target, and it is growing.''

The GPO's publications are also available in electronic and traditional print formats at some 1,350 federal depository libraries. These are located at most colleges and universities, many public libraries and state and local government libraries.

Switching to electronics and decentralizing production has caused a massive reduction in the number of employees at the GPO complex, for many years ranked as the world's largest printing plant. This record, DiMario concedes, now probably belongs to private-sector companies such as Chicago's R.R. Donnelley & Sons.

''When I came here in the early 1970s, we had 8,500 employees,'' recalled DiMario. ''Now we have 3,300 employees. Primarily the change occurred early when we retired the traditional letterpress operations. This transition continued, especially after Congress required the agency to acquire as much of its printing as possible from the private sector.''

In recent years the GPO has contracted out 70 to 75 percent of its printing. ''We have 10,000 contractors on a bid list to do this work,'' said DiMario, ''and about 3,000 participate on a regular basis through the central office or the 20 regional and satellite printing procurement offices.''

During the early years of the Reagan administration, labor relations at the GPO were stormy, with proposed furloughs and pay cuts as high as 22 percent. Things are much quieter now; prominently displayed on DiMario's office wall is an award from the Printing, Publishing and Media Workers Sector of the Communications Workers of America citing him for ''maintaining equitable management relations.''

Fatkin has seen the GPO go through many of these changes. Hired by the GPO in 1971, his job at first was to repair linotype machines. ''Everything switched over after the computer hit big time in 1981,'' recalled Fatkin, who describes himself as a printer-proofreader. ''There was a lot of ongoing retraining. The trouble today is that new people come in who can type 100 words a minute [on a computer] but don't know type faces and sizes. You learn that as an apprentice printer.''

MINIMUM WAGE INCREASE ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 2000

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, at a time of unprecedented economic prosperity and growth, many American families are left behind. Those families work hard and play by the rules. They deserve a raise. But many of my colleagues on the other side are standing in the way of giving 10 million workers a raise in the minimum wage. Instead, they insist on sending to the President a bill to raise the minimum wage that is tied to a tax giveaway to the rich. As a result, we will see the economic gap expand even more. I applaud the President for making it clear that he will veto this dreadful bill.

This is not a minimum wage increase bill; it is a maximum giveaway to the wealthy. Under their $120 billion tax cut, the wealthiest 1% of all taxpayers, or those earning more than $319,000 a year, would get 73% of the total tax cut. This is not a surprise. The leaders of the other party have demonstrated many times during the past year that they would rather pass bills that benefit special interests and the rich instead of hardworking families.

A minimum wage worker earns $10,700 a year. That means a single mother on minimum wage with two kids earns $2,600 below the poverty line. Many of my colleagues on the other side would prefer to give her 33 cents a year over 3 years. Their tax plan gives millionaires $6,128 a year. Is this what Republicans meant by compassionate conservatism?

Sixty percent of minimum wage earners are women; nearly 75% are adults; ⅗ are the sole breadwinners in their families; and more than 50% work full-time. Those who have to take care of our children at daycare centers and our parents at nursing homes deserve better. They deserve more than $5.15 an hour. A raise in the minimum wage is about economic fairness and social justice. It is a small step in ensuring that all Americans share in our nation's economic prosperity and growth. I urge

my Republican colleagues to stop playing politics with the economic welfare of 10 million hard working people.

HONORING LIEUTENANT RICHARD BEIRNE AS IRISHMAN OF THE YEAR

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 2000

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise today to join West Haven's Irish community as it honors Lieutenant Richard Beirne as Irishman of the Year. His outstanding record of service, both professional and volunteer, serves as an example to us all.

Lieutenant Beirne has dedicated his lifetime to the West Haven community, devoting himself to improving the lot of our children and families. He began his career as a volunteer fireman in 1975, and was inducted as a career firefighter with the West Shore Fire Department in 1980. Few things are more important than feeling safe in our homes and workplaces. Whether hosing down flames, rescuing a child from a burning house, or waiting for our call, firefighters are there to protect us and provide us with the peace of mind we need to sleep at night. For twenty-five years, Lieutenant Beirne has shown a commitment to protect our community. There are no words that can express our sincere thanks and appreciation for his service.

Beyond his commendable professional career, Lieutenant Beirne has an unparalleled record of community involvement. A member of several service organizations, Lieutenant Beirne has made a tremendous effort to promote Irish-American culture. In addition, Lieutenant Beirne currently serves as the Vice President of Local 1198 Professional Firefighters Union AFL–CIO, he is working to ensure that firefighters—hard working men and women—are assured livable wages, quality health benefits, and secure pensions to support themselves and their families. Despite all of these commitments, Lieutenant Beirne still finds time to volunteer as the EMT for the Pop Warner Football League. Providing this service at practices as well as games, he ensures the safety of every child participating in the league. Lieutenant Beirne has shown an incredible level of commitment to his community. He has been a mentor to many youngsters and serves as an inspiration to us all.

Today, a community will gather to honor Richard Beirne as Irishman of the Year. I cannot thing of a more deserving individual to be given such a title. I am pleased to join with his wife, Susan, children, Patrick and Katie, friends and the entire West Haven community in congratulating him on this very special honor. My best wishes to Richard and his family for continued health and happiness.

A TRIBUTE TO LEVERT HOAG A WONDERFUL AMERICAN

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 2000

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I wish to take this moment to recognize the remarkable life and significant achievements of one of Pueblo's leading ladies. Though she is gone, she will live on in the hearts of all who knew her and be remembered for long years by many who didn't.

LeVert Hoag, married to the late Pueblo chieftain publisher, Frank Hoag, Jr., died at the age of 87. She was known as a outgoing, enthusiastic, kind and warm person. Mrs. Hoag had a deep interest in the community, from the time she moved there in 1935. She was an integral part to Pueblo, helping out any where she could to make the Pueblo community a better place to live.

She was the chairman of the first Service League Follies in 1937, member of the Pueblo Community College Foundation, sponsor of the Hoag Theater, member of the Pueblo Hall of Fame and was also active in the United Way, the Pueblo County Tuberculosis and Health Association and the Muscular Dystrophy Association. Mrs. Hoag also served on the board of the Pueblo Civic Symphony and was also an honorary chairman of the Pueblo Metropolitan Museum.

LeVert Hoag is someone who will be missed by all of us. Those who knew of her will miss spending time with her. We, as a society, have lost someone who was rare to begin with. Mrs. Hoag made the ultimate sacrifice to help a total stranger. Hopefully we can all learn from the example that LeVert Hoag set. And, perhaps, we can all try to become a little bit more like her.

RECOGNIZING THE FORMATION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RURAL CAUCUS

HON. IKE SKELTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 2000

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, this week marks the official rebirth of the Congressional Rural Caucus. I am so pleased to have the opportunity to recognize the efforts of Representatives EVA CLAYTON of North Carolina, JO ANN EMERSON of Missouri, JERRY MORAN of Kansas, and EARL POMEROY of North Dakota to re-establish this important Caucus, and to thank the dozens of organizations and associations which have helped during the planning process and will continue to work with the Congressional Rural Caucus in the days ahead.

I am very excited to be a member of this new caucus. A number of years ago, I served a term as Chairman of the previously organized Congressional Rural Caucus. That group was extraordinarily valuable as an outlet for Members representing rural districts to discuss issues and work together to communicate the particular needs and concerns of rural America to the Congress as a whole. After several years of inactivity, I am glad that like-minded Members will once again have a bi-partisan organization that focuses on bringing the priorities of rural America to the forefront in the Congress.

In addition to recognizing the new membership of the Congressional Rural Caucus, I would like to say just a few words about one of the groups that has recently assisted with the organization of the Caucus and has for decades worked to improve life in rural America—the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association (NRECA).

One of our nation's greatest achievements during the last century was the electrification of rural America. Before the third decade of the 20th Century, only about 10 percent of America's rural population enjoyed the benefits of electricity. The rest chopped wood, pumped water by hand or carried it from a stream, washed and rinsed the laundry in tubs in the yard. Life without electricity was especially hard on women. They aged early and died young because of the hardships of rural living.

Rural electrification provides us with a wonderful example of American ingenuity and federal cooperation. The people of rural America who needed electric service came together as cooperatives to organize and run their own electric utilities, and the government provided loans that most bankers, then or today, could not have provided prudently.

Electricity—and the Rural Electrification Administration and the vision of Congress—made a huge difference. Today, more than 99 percent of rural Americans can watch television in the comfort of an all-electric home, can enjoy the efficiencies of all manner of appliances—from toasters to air-conditioners, from grain dryers to milking machines and refrigeration.

Because now most rural Americans have electric service, some would say the job is done. I would say the job is just begun. Rural America today faces a different set of challenges. Electric cooperatives have deep roots in their communities, and they have a stake in improving the quality of life, the economics, the health and education of their communities. Electric cooperatives have traditionally provided services well beyond basic electricity, from something as simple as lighting the little league field to something as complex as providing distance learning in rural schools, Internet access, water and sewer, satellite television, economic and community development. They could do more; they would do more. We need to consider how rural Americans across the country could benefit by harnessing the talent of rural electric cooperatives in new ways in this new century.

I look forward in the coming months and years, as a member of the Congressional Rural Caucus, to addressing our new rural challenges. Again, I would like to thank the co-chairs of the Caucus and all of the organizations that have worked to bring the Congressional Rural Caucus back to life. Together I think we can be a positive force to bring true and consistent prosperity and a high quality of life to rural Americans.

NRA RHETORIC

HON. JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 2000

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, Shame, shame, shame. The NRA's leadership has once again shamed our nation, the American people, and its own members. Wayne LaPierre, the NRA's Executive Vice President, on national television, suggested that the President of the United States promotes violence for his political gain. LaPierre said, ''I've come to believe that he needs a certain level of violence in this country. He's willing to accept a certain level of killing to further his political agenda and his vice president too.''

To all the parents who lost a son or daughter to gun violence, LaPierre is telling them to blame the President and not the guns. I would not be surprised to hear the NRA's leadership blaming school grief counselors of inciting more school shootings so they can have more business.

How can the NRA leadership ignore the fact that thirteen children die each day from gun violence? How can they ignore the fact that a majority of Americans want Congress to pass sensible gun safety measures? How can they lay blame on a President who supports background checks at gun shows, a ban on the import of large-capacity ammunition clips, and the sale of child safety locks with every handgun?

It's time for the NRA leadership to wake up and smell the gunpower in our communities and classrooms, and step out of the way of meaningful gun safety legislation. I submit the following New York Times editorial entitled ''Desperate Rhetoric from the NRA,'' for the RECORD.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 14, 2000]

DESPERATE RHETORIC FROM THE N.R.A.

Americans have become used to hearing nutty talk from leaders of the National Rifle Association. But Sunday's outrageous assertion by the group's executive vice president, Wayne LaPierre, that President Clinton is ''willing to accept a certain level of killing to further his political agenda'' deserves special condemnation.

Mr. LaPierre made his sick suggestion that the president relishes having gun tragedies to exploit in an interview on ABC's ''This Week.'' He was there to push the N.R.A.'s demonstrably false line that the nation already has enough gun laws on the books if only the administration would enforce them. Thanks largely to the N.R.A.'s lobbying, those laws do not adequately address issues of supply, distribution, design or child access.

In a new advertising campaign the N.R.A.'s president, Charlton Heston, accuses Mr. Clinton of engaging in lying and scare tactics to win support for gun control measures bottled up in Congress. But for dishonesty, it is hard to beat the N.R.A.'s own whopper in trying to portray the group as a friend of the reasonable gun safety measures it has been fighting to defeat or water down.

The sparring came just days after Mr. Clinton's meeting with key Congressional leaders at the White House failed to produce progress in freeing a modest gun control package from the House-Senate conference committee where it has been stalled for months. The sticking point remains the strong gun-show provision that cleared the Senate last May over the N.R.A.'s vehement opposition. This provision would extend to gun-show sales the same background check requirement that now applies to guns purchased from licensed dealers.

Two Democratic senators, Charles Schumer of New York and Richard Durbin of Illinois, are planning to step up the pressure by attaching gun control amendments to other legislation coming to the floor. This will force recorded votes on matters with broad public support, like mandatory trigger locks and background checks of buyers at gun shows, flea markets and Internet sales.

Only two weeks ago a 6-year-old killed a classmate with a handgun, one of many reasons gun regulation promises to be an issue in the long political campaign ahead. The chief obstacle to saner gun control remains the obstructionism of the N.R.A., whose extremist views and rhetoric should offend Americans fed up with all the gunfire.

CONGRESSIONAL RURAL CAUCUS

HON. ALLEN BOYD

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 2000

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Speaker, today more than one hundred of my colleagues and I celebrate the formation of the Congressional Rural Caucus. Our bipartisan group will serve as a unified voice on behalf of rural Americans. One in every four Americans, or 62 million people, reside in rural areas and an additional 15 million Americans live in small cities and towns. Unfortunately, too often the logistical difficulties rural residents face prevent their concerns on issues like education, healthcare and agriculture from being heard. Our caucus hopes to share with our colleagues in Congress the unique needs of rural citizens and remind them of the important contributions rural America makes.

One of the most important concerns facing rural areas is the current agriculture crisis. While the majority of the United States has enjoyed a decade of unprecedented economic prosperity, our nation's family farmers have not benefited from this abundance. In the wake of NAFTA and the implementation of a national farm policy destined for failure, America's farmers have suffered, and many are on the verge of bankruptcy. This economic distress has impacted not just farmers, but the entire rural community.

Ensuring our farmers have the opportunity to compete with international growers on a level playing field is more than an issue of protecting the way of life of rural Americans; it is an issue of national security. No one wants our country to be dependent on third world nations to supply our evening suppers, but if we fail to act now, when our farmers are in need, that scenario could become a reality.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on the Congressional Rural Caucus to develop a viable alternative to the 1996 Freedom to Farm Act. Now that we are united, our caucus has the strength in numbers to turn Congress's attention to this important issue.

HONORING THE O'NEILL SCHOOL OF IRISH DANCING

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 2000

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to rise today to thank the O'Neill School of Irish Dancing for taking part in the New Haven's St. Patrick's Day Parade during their visit to the United States. It is an honor for New Haven to host them at this annual celebration.

In my hometown of New Haven, Connecticut, St. Patrick's Day is a very special holiday. Every year the parade committee works diligently to sponsor a group from Ireland to participate in the celebration. This year we are honored to have the O'Neill School of Irish Dancing join us from Bornacoola, representing communities from Leitrim and Longford Counties in Ireland. In all, 57 boys and girls, ages 8 to 15 will travel to the U.S. to perform in the New Haven Parade and will be featured in the big parade in New York. These exceptionally talented young people will be performing a combination of traditional Irish step-dancing with pieces from the popular shows of Riverdance and Lord of the Dance. Our community certainly shares the excitement in their attendance.

Even more impressive than their young talent is the commitment and dedication they have put into making this trip possible. Inspired by the excitement of performing, these young people managed a variety of fundraisers to finance the trip. With tremendous community support and enthusiasm, both in Ireland and in the States, they achieved their goal and were able to raise enough money for the trip. They are truly a remarkable group of youngsters.

On behalf of the New Haven community, I am pleased to welcome the O'Neill School of Irish Dancers—we are certainly thrilled to host them during their visit. My sincere appreciation to the many people who have helped them join us for the upcoming celebration. I would like to extend my very best wishes for continued success. Happy St. Patrick's Day!

THE OCCASION OF THE CONGRESSIONAL RURAL CAUCUS KICK-OFF

HON. EVA M. CLAYTON

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 2000

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, not long ago I made a statement on the Floor of the House that, I believe, underscores the pressing need for a new and revived Rural Caucus.

I noted that, at the Farm Resource Center, a national crisis line for farmers, those seeking help can not get through.

The line is always busy. Small farmers and ranchers are struggling to survive in America. In fact, small farmers and ranchers are a dying breed. And, because they are a dying breed, quality and affordable food and fiber for all of us is at risk.

Passage of the 1996 Farm Bill sounded the death knell for many of our Nation's farmers and ranchers.

Farmers and ranchers, able to eke out a living from the land in past years, now find it almost impossible to break even. Most are losing money and fighting to stay in the farming business. And, the crisis line is busy.

We are all aware of the problems tobacco is having.

But, in North Carolina, according to a recent news report, the state's top farm commodity, hogs, have experienced a fifty percent drop in prices since 1996. Wheat is down forty-two percent. Soybeans are down thirty-six percent. Corn—thirty-one percent; peanuts—twenty-eight percent.

Turkey and cotton prices are down twenty-three percent, since 1996.

In fact, my friends, at the time I made my remarks, there was no commodity in North Carolina that makes money for farmers. And, the crisis line is busy. In 1862, the year the Department of Agriculture was created, ninety percent of the population farmed for a living.

Today, American producers represent less than 3 percent of the population.

By 1992, there were only 1.1 million small farms left in the United States, a 45 percent decline from 1959! North Carolina had only a little over 39,000 farms left in 1992, a 23 percent decline. In 1920, there were over 6 million farms in the United States and close to a sixth—926,000 were operated by African-Americans. In 1992, the landscape was very, very different.

Only 1 percent of the farms in the United States are operated by African-Americans.

One percent—18,816, is a paltry sum when African-Americans comprise 13 percent of the total American population.

In my home state of North Carolina, there has been a 64 percent decline in minority farmers, just over the last 15 years, from 6,996 farms in 1978 to 2,498 farms in 1992.

All farmers are suffering under this severe economic downturn.

Just before I made my remarks on the Floor, I spoke with a farmer who was working off the farm—not to earn extra money—but, to earn enough money to save his small farm.

He made no money from the farm, in fact he lost money.

Taking a job off the farm was the only thing he could do to save his farm and pass it on to his children.

The man is seventy years old.

And, the crisis line is busy.

Mr. Speaker, when next you drive through a state where the food and fiber for America is produced—the least expensive and best quality food and fiber in the world—take note of the farm, and the people who are trying to make their living from the land.

It will take us, Congress, to relieve the pressure on the national crisis lines.

Farmers and farm families deserve a chance—a chance for the dwindling number of farmers and ranchers who feed and help clothe us at prices that are unmatched around the world.

I am reminded of the story that the former Chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, Kika De LeGarza, would tell.

While touring a nuclear submarine, he asked the Commander how long could it stay submerged.

After some reluctance in responding to what the Commander considered top secret information, he finally told the Chairman, ''As long as the food lasts.''

Food, my friends, is vital to America's defense and national security.

And, the crisis line is busy.

Before the ''Freedom to Farm'' Bill of 1996, the farm price safety net was shield against uncertain and fluctuating commodity prices.

When that Bill was being considered, we referred to it as ''Freedom to Fail.'' I am sad to report that our admonitions have been far too accurate. We must now correct that error.

If we do nothing about the real problems facing these hard-working citizens, they may not be there at a later time.

And, that will hurt all of us, because we too, as human beings, can stay only as long as the food lasts.

That is why we need a Rural Caucus, and that is why we are here today.

A TRIBUTE—LOUIS BRACH WAS TRULY A HERO

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 2000

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask that we all pause for a moment to remember a man who we have lost, Louis Brach. Though he is gone, he will live on in the hearts of all who knew him and be remembered for long years by many who didn't.

Mr. Brach was a former mayor, city councilman, as well as, an entrepreneur in Grand Junction. He was known as a wonderful businessman and had the gift of recognizing opportunity well ahead of others. As the owner of Brach's Market, he would go out of his way to tend to all of his customers. When he moved to Grand Junction at the age of 5, he knew that he was destined to make a difference.

Louis Brach is someone who will be missed by many. His friends and family will miss the man that they all enjoyed spending time with. The rest of us will miss the man who exemplified the selflessness that so few truly possess. But, when we lose a man such as Mr. Brach, being missed is certainly no precursor to being forgotten. And, everyone who ever knew him, will walk through life differently for it.

RECOGNITION OF JO-ANNE F. WILKIE

HON. DAVID E. BONIOR

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 2000

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Jo-Anne Wilkie of St. Clair, Michigan for her inexhaustible efforts to further her community's appreciation of the arts.

For the past fifteen years, Jo-Anne has served as the Executive Director of The Art Center in Mount Clemens, Michigan. She has worked relentlessly to expose our community to the fine arts, as well as to preserve the historic center for generations to come. Under Jo-Anne's direction the center has truly prospered, and her work on the ''Art in Public Places'' program has made a tangible contribution to the lives of thousands by bringing fine art out of the confines of museums and into the streets and parks of our community.

Jo-Anne's work in Mount Clemens is only one chapter in a life that has been devoted to serving her community. Before coming to Mount Clemens, Jo-Anne was an elementary school vocal music teacher, the Founding Executive Director of the Downriver Council for the Arts, and the General Supervisor of Arts and Special Programs for the City of Indianapolis Department of Parks and Recreation. For her extraordinary commitment and hard work, Jo-Anne was awarded the key to the City of Indianapolis.

Jo-Anne is now being honored by the Daughters of Isabella Queen of the Skies Circle No. 683, and I ask that you join with me in commending Jo-Anne Wilkie for her inspiring devotion to the improvement of our community through the arts.

HONORING THE LATE WALTER HALL

HON. NICK LAMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 2000

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with great sadness to honor Walter Hall, who passed away on Sunday afternoon at age 92. Walter Hall, known by many as ''Mr. Democrat'' was a man who not only talked the talk, but walked the walk. He was a true visionary with a vision of a better life for all Americans.

He spent his life fighting for equality, justice, and opportunity. Walter was at the forefront of the civil rights movement, he spoke out eloquently about his belief that all men were created equal. He lead the charge to abolish the poll tax, supported equal rights for women, and worked for the Civil Rights Act in 1964 and the Voting Rights Act of 1965.

He was a community activist who believed in opportunity for all, and was always looking to the future of the Southeast Texas-Gulf Coast area. He negotiated with the city of Houston to supply clean drinking water to Galveston County cities, and helped build the first water and sewer facilities in League City, Hitchcock, La Marque, Dickinson, Alta Loma, Kemah and Friendswood. He is credited with bringing NASA to the Clear Lake area, for the location of the Mainland Medical Center, and for the expansion of the seawalls of Texas City and Galveston. Throughout his long and successful career as a banker he provided opportunity to many through small business loans.

He was a man of humble beginnings who became a man of great fortune and power. He served as a mentor for many young people interested in politics, and was a close friend of President Lyndon B. Johnson and Speaker of the House Sam Rayburn. ''Mr. Democrat'' was a liberal Democrat and proud of it. Walter was a tremendous influence on the political community in Texas, and those in the political arena often sought his advice. He was actively involved with Lyndon Johnson, Ralph Yarborough, Jack Brooks, myself, and numerous other national, state, and local public officials.

Walter was a family man. He married his high school sweetheart Helen, had three sons, 8 grandchildren, and 5 great grandchildren. In 1999 he donated Helen's Garden to the City of League City, a park in the Historical section

of town featuring 100 year old Butler Oaks, to honor his late wife and to protect the oak trees. His hobbies included hunting and fishing, activities he could pursue with his family in tow.

Mr. Speaker, despite all his clout, Walter Hall remained a man of the people, honest and forthright. His was of the utmost character, and his attributes of selflessness and commitment to others are rare gifts that the Southeast Texas-Gulf Coast area was lucky to have. His work and his dedication to the people of this great country is unparalleled. Walter will be sorely missed.

INTRODUCTION OF THE HENRY W. MCGEE POST OFFICE BUILDING BILL

HON. BOBBY L. RUSH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 2000

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce H.R. 3909, designating a United States Postal Service facility in the First Congressional District of Illinois as the ''Henry W. McGee Post Office Building.''

Henry McGee, the first black Postmaster of Chicago, gave 44 years of outstanding and exemplary service to the Post Office Department, now known as the U.S. Postal Service. He began his career in 1929 as a temporary substitute letter carrier and ended it in 1973 as General Manager of the eight metropolitan districts of Chicago.

For this reason alone, I think it is more than fitting to honor his service and commitment to excellence, by naming the post office facility at 4601 South Cottage Grove Avenue as the ''Henry W. McGee Post Office Building.'' But Mr. McGee's accomplishments do not end here and neither should the praise.

Mr. McGee coordinated the arrangements for the 1939 convention of the National Alliance of Postal and Federal Employees and in 1945 he served as president of the Chicago branch of the National Alliance. In 1948, Mr. McGee was appointed by the postmaster to comanage the employment office, later becoming the manager and overseeing the conversion to career employment for a large number of female employees.

Continuing to strive for excellence, Mr. McGee acquired his bachelor of science degree from the Illinois Institute of Technology, and earned a promotion making him General Foreman. Later, he became Superintendent of the largest finance station of the Post Office Department. In 1961, Mr. McGee received a master's degree in Public Administration from the University of Chicago, while concurrently being promoted to Personnel Manager for the Chicago region of the Post Office Department, which encompassed Illinois and Michigan. Five years later, Mr. McGee became the first black Postmaster of Chicago.

Abraham Lincoln said: ''. . . in the end it's not the years in your life that count. It's the life in your years.''

I am honored to submit this legislation saluting 90-year-old Henry McGee, a praiseworthy and admirable man. I urge my colleagues to support this worthwhile measure.

A TRIBUTE TO FRUITA MONUMENT HIGH SCHOOL'S WILD CAT DEBATE TEAM

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 2000

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to recognize the accomplishments of an outstanding student organization, the Fruita Monument High School Speech and Debate Team. In doing so I would like to honor the following individuals on the team for their superb contributions to the speech and debate team: Juli Carrillo, Ginger Jacobson, Jenna Birkhold, and Eric Slater.

The stellar performance by the team is a direct indication to why they qualified for the national competition, to be held in Portland, OR. Their love of argumentation and debating issues helped them become victorious. They have proven to be an asset to their school and community.

It is with this, Mr. Speaker, that I say congratulations to the Fruita Monument's Speech and Debate team on a truly exceptional accomplishment.

HONORING ANTHONY GENTILE

HON. ROBERT W. NEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 2000

Mr. NEY. Mr. Speaker, I commend and submit the following article to my colleagues:

Anthony Gentile has spent his life serving people. In 1965 he traveled to nine countries in Europe with Ohio Governor Jim Rhodes on a trade mission and was honored with an Executive Order of Ohio Commodore. In 1967, he was named ''Citizen of the Year'' by the Wintersville, Ohio Chamber of Commerce. Also that year, he was one of forty-two American Delegates to the Fifth International Mining Congress held in the Soviet Union. In 1977, he was the recipient of an honorary degree ''Doctor of Humane Letters'' by the Franciscan University of Steubenville as well as the Conservation and Reclamation Award for the State of Ohio, the only award given by the Governor.

Additionally, Mr. Gentile is a past member of the Board of Franciscan University of Steubenville and has served on the Board of the Union Bank in Steubenville, Ohio. He is currently listed in the World Who's Who in Commerce and Industry and Who's Who in Finance and Industry. Despite all of these efforts, he also finds time to devote to the cause of cancer research.

Mr. Gentile is married to the former Nina A. DiScipio. The couple have been married for fifty-six years and have four children.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleagues join me in honoring Anthony Gentile. His lifelong service and commitment are to be commended. I am proud to call him a constituent and a friend.

CONGRESSIONAL RURAL CAUCUS

HON. JO ANN EMERSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 2000

Mrs. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to speak out for our rural American communities and to join my colleagues, Mrs. CLAYTON from North Carolina, Mr. MORAN from Kansas, Mr. POMEROY from North Dakota to celebrate the formation of the new Congressional Rural Caucus.

This morning we held a press conference to formally announce the formation of our new Congressional Rural Caucus. We were joined by several Members of the Rural Caucus, the Speaker of the House DENNIS HASTERT, former Representative Glenn English from Oklahoma who was representing the National Rural Network, and many Americans who live and work in our rural communities across our great nation.

Those attending the press conference expressed such strong support for our initiative to review the Congressional Rural Caucus. It really says to me that there is a great deal of support for our rural American communities. That there's a real recognition of just how important rural America is to our nation. It tells me that we're on the right track here with our Rural Caucus. And there is absolutely no doubt in my mind that our Rural Caucus can and will help communities achieve real results.

Since last August my colleagues, Mrs. CLAYTON from North Carolina, and Misters MORAN from Kansas, and POMEROY from North Dakota, have been hard at work laying the ground work for the Rural Caucus. And we've been hard at work recruiting Members to join and take an active part in the Rural Caucus. We set a goal of 100 Members by our kick-off date. We not only met our goal, we surpassed it. To date, there are well over 110 bipartisan Members of the Rural Caucus. And more Members are joining every day. We've all joined together to raise a loud voice for rural America on Capitol Hill. Think about it. With nearly a fourth of the House on board, that's one heck of a loud voice. And the list just keeps growing.

To my Rural Caucus colleagues I want to say ''thank you.'' Thank you for standing up and speaking out for your rural communities. Together we can make a real difference for all of rural America, and I look forward to the work that lies ahead of us.

Now to be honest, we couldn't have done this alone. It took a lot of work and assistance and support from the many, many organizations of the National Rural Network. To all of the groups who have supported our efforts for the Rural Caucus, thank you. Because of your experience, your knowledge, and your living connections with rural America, you all are an integral part of the success of the Rural Caucus. And I look forward to working with you on all that lies ahead.

Now I want to briefly talk about why I think the Rural Caucus is so important and why I think it's needed here on Capitol Hill. You may know that about one in every four Americans—that's 62 million people—live in rural America. That's also about the same number of people who live in inner cities. And an additional 15 million people live in small cities and towns.

These 77 million Americans share many of the same problems of big city residents—such as poverty, high unemployment, and chronic underemployment. But rural Americans face unique challenges because they are dispersed over hundreds and thousands of miles. And despite the similarity of some of the issues faced in urban and rural America, rural communities consistently get the short end of the stick when it comes to federal funding. And this is across the board in all agencies and all sectors—from economic development, to health care, to education and everything in between and beyond.

Now I represent a very rural district in Southern Missouri. And if you visited my district, I think many of you'd be amazed to see that white the American economy has been booming, communities in my district—like so many of our agricultural and rural communities across the nation—are being left behind.

The past several years have been very hard on American producers. And the hard times on the farm and ranch don't stop at the gate. These hard times impact rural main street, from the local shops, to the communities, schools and homes. The fact is, our rural communities are faced with a Catch-22 situation. They don't have the infrastructure needed to attract new and high-tech businesses. At the same time, they don't have the resources needed to invest in the infrastructure that can attract new and high-tech businesses.

The bottom line is that we simply must do all we can to ensure that rural communities have the tools they need to turn their challenges into real opportunities for growth and prosperity in the 21st century. Rural America is just too important to our nation to not do all we can. The Congressional Rural Caucus can play an important part in seeing this goal become a reality. After all, our rural American communities are our past, our present, and our future.

MINIMUM WAGE INCREASE ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. EARL POMEROY

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 9, 2000

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, virtually every day we hear reports of our booming economy and the unprecedented economic expansion. Unemployment and inflation rates are at historic lows. Today we will debate the merits of a one-dollar pay raise for the American worker—a pay raise the American people overwhelmingly support, need and deserve.

The 1990s brought our nation's CEOs a 481% rise in pay while the average American worker saw an increase of only 28%. If the minimum wage earner's pay had increased at the same level as the CEOs, they would be now earning nearly $46,000 a year.

In order to have the same purchasing power of the 1968 minimum wage, the current minimum wage would have to be raised to $7.49 per hour. Further, the one-dollar wage increase we are debating would only restore the real value of the minimum wage to 1982 levels. As it stands, a working parent with two children will earn $10,700 a year at the current minimum wage—$3,200 below the poverty line.

When we debated the last minimum wage increase in 1996, many of my colleagues voiced fears that it would reduce the number of jobs in the workplace, particularly for those harder-to-place employees or welfare recipients moving back into the workforce. It is clear that in the four years since Congress passed the last wage hike, the opposite occurred: nearly 10 million new jobs were created, the unemployment rate dropped and employers are actually having trouble finding enough workers to fill job openings.

Mr. Speaker, this increase is about raising the standard of living for more than 10 million hard-working Americans. It is time that we stop delaying and pass this increase in the minimum wage.

TRIBUTE TO KRISTINE ELLIOT-THALMAN

HON. GARY G. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 2000

Mr. GARY MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a fine public servant, Kristine Elliot-Thalman, who will be retiring this month from her distinguished career at the City of Anaheim, California. As part of her service to the City, especially for the last 13 years, she has headed intergovernmental affairs matters involving local, state, and federal initiatives that are so important to Anaheim's vital needs.

Mr. Speaker, I am especially honored to bring Kris Thalman to the attention of the U.S. House of Representatives, because on the very same day as her retirement, she is having a birthday as well and congratulations are doubly in order.

My colleagues in Congress, many of whom have had the pleasure to know and work with Kris through the years, wish her Godspeed in whatever endeavors she may choose in the future.

HONORING MICHELLE KATHERINE MIHIN

HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 2000

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a special member of the staff of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Michelle Katherine Mihin, who is leaving us this week to return to her home in Ohio and accept a position with the Charles Schwab organization, an exciting and richly deserved opportunity.

Originally from Youngstown, OH, Michelle came to the Washington area to attend Marymount University where she earned her Bachelor of Arts Degree in Political Science. Of particular relevance to us, Michelle was active for a number of years in, and served as President of, Marymount's Society for Political and Government Awareness. After graduation she stayed in the area and worked as an intern in the office of her Ohio Congressman, our colleague, JIM TRAFICANT.

Shortly thereafter in 1996, Michelle joined the Committee to work as a staff assistant with both our Aviation and Railroad Subcommittees. During her time with us, she has earned a solid reputation for excellence and dedication in her work. What has especially impressed us is the initiative she has taken to reach beyond her assigned responsibilities. Michelle has always been ready to volunteer and see what jobs needed to be done and plunge in to help to do them no matter what the issue or hour of the day. As an avocation, she has become our unofficial ''Social Director''. If there is an occasion to celebrate or a staff member to bid farewell, Michelle is always ready to volunteer and put her organizational talents to work. Above all, we will miss the sparkle, enthusiasm and the laughter she brings to the Committee.

On many occasions I have quoted one of those gems of wisdom where the thought stays with you but the author's name does not: ''Success is getting what you want, happiness is wanting what you get''—Michelle has earned both. I join with all Michelle's friends on the Committee in wishing her every success and happiness in her future endeavors.

IMPROVE THE QUALITY AND COST EFFICIENCY OF THE MEDICARE SYSTEM: SUPPORT REIMBURSEMENT FOR CERTIFIED REGISTERED NURSE FIRST ASSISTANTS

HON. MAC COLLINS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 2000

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, today, I am pleased to introduce The Certified Registered Nurse First Assistant (CRNFA) Direct Reimbursement Act of 2000, which will provide equity in reimbursement for certified registered nurse first assistants who provide surgical first assisting services to Medicare patients.

Having received more advanced education and training in first assisting than any other non-physician provider, CRNFAs serve a vital role, directly assisting physicians with surgical procedures. Additionally, CRNFAs and RNFAs are the only providers—aside from the rare physician making house calls—who sometimes provide post-operative care by actually visiting patients at home following surgery. Thus, not only do CRNFAs have more clinical experience and education than other non-physician providers, but they also provide continuity of care to patients enabling higher quality and better patient outcomes.

CRNFAs also provide the additional benefit of cost efficiency. Health claims data from the Health Care Financing Administration (HCFA) reveal that physicians file more than 90% of the first assistant at surgery claims for Medicare reimbursement. Physicians receive 16 percent of the surgeon's fee for serving as a surgical first assistant. Under this legislation, CRNFAs will receive only 13.6 percent of the surgeon's fee for providing first assistant services. Furthermore, CRNFAs are equally as cost-effective as other non-physician first assisting providers who currently are reimbursed at 13.6 percent of the surgeon's fee for first assisting. Use of CRNFAs would, therefore, be a high quality yet cost-effective alternative for the nation's health care delivery system, affording additional flexibility to surgeons, hospitals and ambulatory surgery centers.

In closing, I would like to express my appreciation for the hard work of the Association of periOperative Registered Nurses (AORN) and its president, Patricia Seifert, RN, in bringing this issue forward. As a provider of health care, the CRNFA is a viable solution for controlling rising health care costs. Working in collaborative practice with surgeons, CRNFAs are cost-effective to the patient and to the health care delivery system. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting equity for certified registered nurse first assistants by cosponsoring The Certified Registered Nurse First Assistant Direct Reimbursement Act of 2000.

HONORING MICHAEL VICK

HON. ROBERT C. SCOTT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 2000

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I take this time to acknowledge the accomplishments of one of Newport News, Virginia's hometown heroes, Michael Vick, who recently led the Virginia Tech Hokies to this year's Sugar Bowl. His leadership and humanity during this exciting battle of champions continue to make a lasting impression on the minds of many in Newport News and indeed throughout Virginia.

Michael's talent on the field is more than evident. His remarkable athletic achievements as quarterback for the Hokies included being named Big East Conference Offensive Player of the Year and Rookie of the Year, Player of the Year by Virginia's sports information directors for the Division I all-state football team, and being named to the all-state team. To top off this impressive list, Michael led the Nation in pass efficiency and earned third place in the Heisman Trophy balloting.

Although Michael has gained national prominence for his athletic achievements, he remains well aware that he is a role model to young people in the local community. As a graduate of Warwick High School in Newport News, he returns often to speak with young students. Michael encourages them to set goals and work hard to achieve success. In doing so, he displays humility and an appreciation for his own accomplishments. These are the same skills he champions on the field and in the classroom at Virginia Tech where he is a sophomore studying criminal justice.

The City of Newport News will join with Michael's family and friends to salute him and celebrate his accomplishments throughout the weekend of March 17. These activities include a student assembly at his alma mater, where his high school football jersey number will be retired. The program also includes a recognition dinner and a community rally.

In a time where we are inundated with negative media accounts of our Nation's youth and sports figures, Michael shines as a positive example that hard work, determination and perseverance do, in fact, equal success. Newport News will long remember his outstanding role as an athlete and a gentleman while leading the Hokies to a national championship game. I join with the citizens of Newport News, Virginia in looking forward to Michael's continued legacy of success.

A TRIBUTE—RECOGNIZING RACHEL OWEN

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 14, 2000

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to recognize the accomplishments of one of Colorado's bright youth, and participant in the JASON Project in Houston, TX, Rachel Owen. In doing so, I would like to honor this teenager for her academic accomplishments.

As a student in middle school, Rachel became very active in the Science Outreach Center in Carbondale, CO. She then became an Argonaut in the JASON Project and from there, was chosen to attend a program at NASA in Houston. She is the first student from the Roaring Fork Valley to participate in this program.

Rachel is active in the Kids Teaching Kids program through the Science Outreach Center. She is also an exemplary student, receiving A's throughout her academic career. Her peers and teachers recognized her great accomplishments and held a pep rally in her honor.

It is with this, Mr. Speaker, that I say thank you to Rachel Owen on a truly exceptional accomplishment at the age of 14. If we had more citizens like her, I am certain that we would live in a very harmonious place.

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

The Senate was not in session today. It will next meet on Monday, March 20, 2000, at 12 noon.

Committee Meetings

No committee meetings were held.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Bills Introduced: 14 public bills, H.R. 3906–3907, 3909–3920; 5 private bills, H.R. 3921–3525; and 5 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 279–282 and H. Res. 440, were introduced. **Pages H996–97**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 3845, to make corrections to the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 (H. Rept. 106–520);

H.R. 3908, making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000 (H. Rept. 106–521);

H.R. 3843, to reauthorize programs to assist small business concerns (H. Rept. 106–522);

H. Res. 438, waiving points of order against the conference report to accompany H.R. 1000, Wendell H. Ford Aviation Investment and Reform Act for the 21st Century (H. Rept. 106–523); and

H. Res. 439, providing for consideration of H.R. 3843, Small Business Reauthorization Act of 2000 (H. Rept. 106–524). **Page H996**

Recess: The House recessed at 1:02 p.m. and reconvened at 2:00 p.m. **Page H938**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Joint Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies: S. Con. Res. 89, to establish the Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies for the inauguration of the President-elect and Vice President-elect of the United States on January 20, 2001; **Pages H939–40**

Use of the Capitol Rotunda for Inaugural Proceedings and Ceremonies: S. Con. Res. 90, to authorize the use of the rotunda of the Capitol by the Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies in connection with the proceedings and ceremonies conducted for the inauguration; **Page H940**

Small Business Investment Act Corrections: H.R. 3845, amended, to make corrections to the Small Business Investment Act of 1958; **Pages H940–42**

Joel T. Broyhill Postal Building: H.R. 3699, To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 8409 Lee Highway in Merrifield, Virginia, as the "Joel T. Broyhill Postal Building" (passed by a yea and nay vote of 405 yeas with none voting "nay", Roll No. 46); **Pages H942–44, H951–52**

Joseph L. Fisher Post Office Building: H.R. 3701, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 3118 Washington Boulevard in Arlington, Virginia, as the "Joseph L. Fisher Post Office Building" (passed by a yea and nay vote of 400 yeas with none voting "nay", Roll No. 47); and **Pages H944–46, H952–53**

Humanitarian Assistance to Mozambique: H. Res. 431, amended, expressing support for humanitarian assistance to the Republic of Mozambique. **Pages H946–50**

Transportation and Infrastructure Committee Resolutions: Read a letter from Chairman Shuster wherein he transmitted copies of resolutions adopted on February 16, 2000 by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure—referred to the Committee on Appropriations. **Pages H950–51**

Recess: The House recessed at 3:31 p.m. and reconvened at 6:02 p.m. **Page H951**

Motion to Instruct Conferees: Representative Lofgren notified the House of her intention to offer a motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 1501, Juvenile Justice Reform Act. **Page H953**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Two yea and nay votes developed during the proceedings of the House today and appear on pages H951–52 and H952–53. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 12:30 p.m. and adjourned at 11:56 p.m.

Committee Meetings

INTERIOR APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Interior held a hearing on the Department of Energy—Fossil Energy. Testimony was heard from Robert Gee, Assistant Secretary, Fossil Energy, Department of Energy.

LABOR-HHS-EDUCATION APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education continued appropriations hearings. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

TREASURY, POSTAL SERVICE, AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government held a hearing on the Customs Service and the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of the Treasury: Raymond W. Kelly, Commissioner, U.S. Customs Service; W. Ralph Basham, Director, Federal Law Enforcement Training Center; and James E. Johnson, Under Secretary, Enforcement.

NAVY AND MARINE CORPS PROGRAMS

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Military Procurement and the Subcommittee on Military Research and Development held a joint hearing on Navy and Marine Corps programs. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Defense: Lee Buchanan, Assistant Secretary, Navy (Research, Development and Acquisition); Vice Adm. Conrad Lautenbacher, USN, Deputy Chief, Naval Operations (Resources, Warfare Requirements and Assessments); and Lt. Gen. Michael Williams, USMC, Deputy Chief of Staff, Programs and Resources, Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps.

AMERICAN HOMEOWNERSHIP AND ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT

Committee on Banking and Financial Services: Ordered reported, as amended, H.R. 1776, American Homeownership and Economic Opportunity Act of 2000.

NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION—SAFETY AND SECURITY

Committee on Commerce: Subcommittee on Energy and Power and the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations held a joint hearing on safety and security of the new National Nuclear Security Administration. Testimony was heard T. J. Glauthier, Deputy Secretary, Department of Energy; Gary L. Jones, Associate Director, Energy, Resources, and Science Issues, GAO; and public witnesses.

TELECOMMUNICATIONS MERGER ACT

Committee on Commerce: Subcommittee on Telecommunications, Trade, and Consumer Protection held a hearing on the Telecommunications Merger Act of 2000. Testimony was heard from the following Commissioners of the FCC: Harold W. Furchtgott-Roth; and Michael K. Powell; and a public witness.

OVERSIGHT—2000 CENSUS

Committee on Government Reform: Subcommittee on the Census held an oversight hearing on the 2000 Census: Status of Key Operations. Testimony was heard from J. Christopher Mihm, Acting Associate Director, Federal Management and Workforce Issues, GAO.

HHS DRUG TREATMENT SUPPORT

Committee on Government Reform: Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources concluded hearings on HHS Drug Treatment Support: Is SAMHSA Optimizing Resources? Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Health and Human Services: Nelba R. Chavez, M.D., Administrator, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration; and Alan I. Leshner, M.D., Director, National Institute on Drug Abuse.

OVERSIGHT—FOREST SERVICE ROAD MANAGEMENT POLICY

Committee on Resources: Subcommittee on Forests and Forest Health held an oversight hearing on Forest Service Road Management Policy. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Forest Service, USDA: Michael P. Dombeck, Chief; and Dale Bosworth, Regional Forester, Northern Region.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Resources: Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands held a hearing on H.R. 2557, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a feasibility study on the inclusion in Biscayne National Park, Florida, of the archaeological site known as the Miami Circle; and H.R. 3084, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to contribute funds for the establishment of an interpretative center on the life and contributions of President Abraham Lincoln. Testimony was heard from Representatives Meek of Florida, Shimkus and LaHood; Terrel Emmons, Associate Director, Professional Services, National Park Service, Department of the Interior; Susan Mogerman, Director, Historic Preservation Agency, State of Illinois; and public witnesses.

SMALL BUSINESS REAUTHORIZATION ACT

Committee on Rules: Granted, by voice vote, an open rule providing one hour of general debate on H.R. 3843, Small Business Reauthorization Act of 2000, equally divided between the chairman and ranking member of the Committee on Small Business. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill. The rule provides that the bill will be open for amendment by section. The rule authorizes the Chair to accord priority in recognition to Members who have pre-printed their amendments in the Congressional Record. The rule allows the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to postpone votes during consideration of the bill, and to reduce voting time to five minutes on a postponed question if the vote follows a fifteen minute vote. The rule provides one motion to recommit, with or without instructions. Finally, the rule lays H. Res. 432 (providing for consideration of the conference report to accompany S. 376) on the table. Testimony was heard from Chairman Talent and Representative Velazquez.

WENDELL H. FORD AVIATION INVESTMENT AND REFORM ACT FOR THE 21ST CENTURY

Committee on Rules: Granted, by voice vote, a rule waiving all points of order against the conference report to accompany H.R. 1000, Wendell H. Ford Aviation Investment and Reform Act for the 21st Century and against its consideration. Testimony was heard from Chairman Shuster and Representatives Duncan, Oberstar, and Lipinski.

VETERANS ENTREPRENEURSHIP AND SMALL BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT ACT

Committee on Small Business: Subcommittee on Government Programs and Oversight and the Subcommittee on Benefits of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs held a joint hearing with respect to Public Law 106–50, Veterans Entrepreneurship and Small Business Development Act of 1999. Testimony was heard from Darryl Dennis, Assistant Administrator, SBA; representatives of veterans organizations; and public witnesses.

BUDGET REQUEST

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence: Met in executive session to hold a hearing on fiscal Year 2001 JMIP/TIARA. Testimony was heard from departmental witnesses.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, MARCH 15, 2000

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: to hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs on the Legislative recommendation of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, 10 a.m., 345 Cannon Building.

House

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies, on Marketing and Regulatory Programs, 10 a.m., 2362–A Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State, and Judiciary, on Supreme Court, 10 a.m., and on State and Local Law Enforcement, 2 p.m., H–309 Capitol.

Subcommittee on Defense, on Fiscal Year 2001 Navy/Marine Corps Budget Overview, 9:30 a.m., 2212 Rayburn; and, executive, on Fiscal Year 2001 Navy/Marine Corps Acquisition Program, 1:30 p.m., H–140 Capitol.

Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs, on Secretary of State, 2 p.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Interior, on Woodrow Wilson Center, 10 a.m., on Holocaust Museum, 11 a.m., on Kennedy Center, 11:30 a.m., and on Secretary of Energy, 2 p.m., B–308 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, on Vocational and Adult Education and Educational Research and Improvement, 10 a.m., and on Office of Higher Education/Office of Student Financial Aid, 2 p.m., 2358 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Military Construction, on Family Housing Privatization, 9:30 a.m., B–300 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Transportation, on National Railroad Passenger Corporation, 10 a.m., 2358 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government, on Secret Service, 10 a.m., and on Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, 2 p.m., 2362–B Rayburn.

Subcommittee on VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies, on NASA, 9:30 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Committee on Armed Services, to continue hearings on the Fiscal Year 2001 National Defense authorization budget request, with emphasis on the regional commanders, 10 a.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Special Oversight Panel on Morale, Welfare and Recreation, hearing on morale, welfare and recreation resale systems and programs, 1 p.m., 2212 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Military Personnel, hearing on removing the barriers to TRICARE, 1:30 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on Banking and Financial Services, to mark up H.R. 3519, World Bank AIDS Prevention Trust Fund Act, 11 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Domestic and International Monetary Policy, hearing on The Reagan Legacy, 2 p.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on the Budget, to mark up the Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2001, 10 a.m., 210 Cannon.

Committee on Commerce, to mark up the following bills: H.R. 1089, Mutual Fund Tax Awareness Act of 1999; H.R. 887, to amend the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934 to require improved disclosure of corporate charitable contributions; and H.R. 1954, Rental Fairness Act of 1999, 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Government Reform, Subcommittee on Government Management, Information, and Technology, hearing on the Results of the Health Care Financing Administration's Fiscal Year 1999 Financial Statement Audit, 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on National Security, Veterans' Affairs and International Relations, hearing on Agent Orange: Status of the Air Force's Ranch Hand Study, 10 a.m., 2247 Rayburn.

Committee on International Relations, hearing on the Administration's Fiscal Year 2001 Foreign Assistance Request; followed by a markup of H.R. 3822, Oil Price Reduction Act of 2000, 10 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere, hearing on the U.S. and Latin America in the New Millennium: Outlook and Priorities, 1:30 p.m., 2200 Rayburn.

Committee on the Judiciary, to continue mark up of H.R. 1283, Fairness in Asbestos Compensation Act of 1999; and to mark up the following bills: H.R. 1304, Quality Health-Care Coalition Act of 1999; and H.R. 3660, Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act of 2000, 10:15 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Resources, to consider the following measures: H. Con. Res. 89, recognizing the Hermann Monument and Hermann Heights Park in New Ulm, Minnesota, as a national symbol of the contributions of Americans of German heritage; H. Res. 182, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the National Park Service should take full advantage of support services offered by the Department of Defense; H.R. 2958, to provide for the continuation of higher education through the conveyance of certain public lands in the State of Alaska to the University of Alaska; H.R. 3182, Craig Municipal Equity Act of 1999; H.R. 3417, Pribilof Islands Transition Act; and H.R. 3671, Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs Improvement Act of 2000, 11 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Rules, to consider H.R. 2372, Private Property Rights Implementation Act of 1999, 2 p.m., H–313 Capitol.

Committee on Science, Subcommittee on Basic Research, to continue hearings on National Science Foundation Fiscal 2001 Budget Authorization Request, Part III: A View from Outside NSF, 2 p.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Technology, hearing on Standards Conformity and the Federal Government: A Review of Section 12 of Public Law 104–113, 10 a.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, hearing on Helping Agricultural Producers ''Re-Grow'' Rural America'', Providing the Tools, 2 p.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation, hearing on the United States Coast Guard Fiscal Year 2001 budget request, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings, Hazardous Materials and Pipeline Transportation, to mark up the following: H.R. 938, to designate the Federal building located at 290 Broadway in New York, New York, as the ''Ronald H. Brown Federal Building''; H.R. 1279, to designate the Federal building and United States post office located at 223 Sharkey Street in Clarksdale, Mississippi, as the ''Aaron E. Henry Federal Building and United States Post Office''; H.R. 1605, to designate the United States courthouse building located at 402 North Walnut Street and Prospect Avenue in Harrison, Arkansas, as the ''J. Smith Henley Federal Building''; H.R. 2412, to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 1300 South Harrison Street in Fort Wayne, Indiana, as the ''E. Ross Adair Federal Building and the United States Courthouse''; a concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the 200th birthday celebration of the Library of Congress; a concurrent resolution authorizing the District of Columbia Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run to be run through the Capitol Grounds; a concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the East Front of the Capitol Grounds for performances by the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts Millennium Stage; a concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby; and a concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the 19th annual National Peace Officers' Memorial Service, 11:30 a.m., 2253 Rayburn.

Joint Meetings

Senate Committee on Veterans' Affairs, to hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs on the Legislative recommendation of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, 10 a.m., 345 Cannon Building.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

12 noon, Monday, March 20

Senate Chamber

Program for Monday: Senate will be in a period of morning business, during which two Senators will be recognized.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10 a.m., Wednesday, March 15

House Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Consideration of the conference report on H.R. 1000, Aviation Investment and Reform Act for the 21st Century (rule waiving points or order);

Consideration of H.R. 3843, Small Business Reauthorization Act of 2000 (open rule, one hour of general debate); and

Motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 1501, Juvenile Justice Reform Act.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Barrett, Bill, Nebr., E294
Boehner, John A., Ohio, E301
Bonior, David E., Mich., E308
Boyd, Allen, Fla., E307
Clayton, Eva M., N.C., E307
Collins, Mac, Ga., E310
DeLauro, Rosa L., Conn., E306, E307
Emerson, Jo Ann, Mo., E309
Faleomavaega, Eni F.H., American Samoa, E303
Gibbons, Jim, Nev., E302
Gilman, Benjamin A., N.Y., E294
Green, Gene, Tex., E304
Johnson, Eddie Bernice, Tex., E301
Lampson, Nick, Tex., E308
Lantos, Tom, Calif., E293, E295
McInnis, Scott, Colo., E304, E306, E308, E309, E311
Miller, Gary G., Calif., E310
Ney, Robert W., Ohio, E309
Oberstar, James L., Minn., E310
Pomeroy, Earl, N.D., E310
Portman, Rob, Ohio, E300
Roemer, Tim, Ind., E298
Royce, Edward R., Calif., E300
Rush, Bobby L., Ill., E309
Saxton, Jim, N.J., E293
Schakowsky, Janice D., Ill., E305, E307
Scott, Robert C., Va., E311
Skelton, Ike, Mo., E293, E297, E306
Slaughter, Louise McIntosh, N.Y., E300
Smith, Christopher H., N.J., E300
Stearns, Cliff, Fla., E295
Visclosky, Peter J., Ind., E297

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 5:30 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, $179.00 for six months, $357.00 per year, or purchased for $3.00 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.