United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 146 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, APRIL 3, 2000 No. 39

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
April 3, 2000.

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

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 835. An act to encourage the restoration of estuary habitat through more efficient project financing and enhanced coordination of Federal and non-Federal restoration programs, and for other purposes.

S. 2097. An act to authorize loan guarantees in order to facilitate access to local television broadcast signals in unserved and underserved areas, and for other purposes.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 19, 1999, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 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 Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

TIME TO BREAK THE ADDICTION TO CHEAP OIL

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, recent disruption in oil supply has created problems with heating oil prices, costs to truckers for their diesel fuel, and increased gasoline prices. The response and the proposed solutions have ranged from the ridiculous to the absurd, even the destructive. Most reasonable people agree that the United States cannot always have unlimited supply of oil at the lowest cost in the developed world. Such assumptions are not just wrong headed, they are impossible to maintain and they encourage behaviors that are costly to the American public. We are, as a Nation, addicted to cheap oil. It skews our policy in the Mideast; discourages development of alternative fuels and energy conservation. It encourages waste, pollution and the negative side effects of our exclusive reliance on the automobile for personal transportation. It also makes us much more vulnerable to disruption in oil supply and price whether by natural market forces, unintended disaster or unfriendly policies from OPEC nations.

It is important for us to acknowledge that the United States consumes three times as much fuel per capita as any other developed country. Just 5 percent of the world's population of the United States consumes over a quarter of the world's oil supply, equivalent to Western Europe and Japan combined. For all the hysteria about recent price increases, we are still well below the 1981 high of $2.49 per gallon in today's dollars, and a little over a year ago we had the cheapest gasoline prices in our history in real terms.

Amongst the most unfortunate so-called solutions has been the proposal to cut the Federal gasoline tax 4.3 cents or more. There is no indication at all that a tax reduction will mean any reduction in price for the consumer. So long as supplies are constrained and demand is high, the market will charge what the market will bear. A tax cut will simply mean more profit for oil producers and distributors. This is also an invitation for people to manipulate oil supply and prices. If the United States Congress, led by the Senate, is so misguided as to cut the gasoline price to take the pain out of higher prices, even if it would work, and there is no evidence that it would, it is simply an invitation for OPEC or others to continue manipulation because Uncle Sam will take up the slack and reduce the pain. It is further ill conceived because the gas tax now is largely dedicated to funding our transportation infrastructure.

At a time when communities are struggling to maintain the condition of their roads, wrestling with capacity questions and looking for ways to provide support for transit so that the traveling public has choices, losing $7.2 billion a year of infrastructure investment will be counterproductive, making our problems harder while costing us more money.

How we move and organize our energy supplies and their environmental consequences has everything to do with a community's livability. Instead of pandering to OPEC and playing an elaborate game of pretend with the American public and certainly instead of making the problem worse, Congress should be part of the solution. We should now have an energy policy in this country. There has been little discussion in recent years. We ought to use this occasion to reexamine our attitudes regarding the utilization of energy.

Instead of Congress interfering with the administration's efforts to increase energy standards for automobiles, we ought to have minimum fuel efficiency standards for all motorized vehicles. It is time to stop pretending that pickups and SUVs are anything but what the vast majority of people use them for,

Printed on recycled paper.

personal transportation. They ought to be subject to the same standards as cars. Instead of giving billions of dollars of extra profit to OPEC and oil distributors, if people really think that government does not need the money, we should invest it in the development of alternative energy sources. Wind, solar, fuel cells and higher-efficiency vehicles are all ways to cut down on our dependence on oil, and especially oil imports.

There ought to be a premium placed on energy efficiency in building design and land use. This could have a huge impact on energy utilization. Most important, it is time for politicians to stop treating the public as spoiled children who cannot accept the truth or modify behavior. If we treat the American public like grown-ups, as full partners in the development of energy strategies and more livable communities, our families and businesses will, in fact, rise to the occasion. And our communities will be more livable, our families will be safer, healthier and more economically secure.

ADMINISTRATION'S COERCION OF SMITH AND WESSON POSES SERIOUS THREAT TO OUR FORM OF GOVERNMENT

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, on March 17, President Clinton announced that the firearms manufacturer, Smith and Wesson, had agreed to a certain number of gun safety proposals and the agreement reached, quote, ''an unprecedented partnership between the government and the gun industry,'' end quote.

Partnership: now there is a very euphemistic term of what was accomplished. It obviously was high-handedness, to say the least. The Wall Street Journal ran an article on March 21 regarding this action by the administration. Here is a brief description of how the administration approached the CEO of Smith and Wesson, Ed Shultz. Quote, ''In late January two young Clinton administration lawyers flew to Nashville, Tennessee, where they handed Mr. Shultz, the chief executive officer of Smith and Wesson, a list of gun control demands. Agree to this, the government attorneys said, and the legal assault on the Nation's largest handgun manufacturer would be called off.''

Now, I am not sure exactly where this so-called partnership began, but such a story reeks of coercion. It reminds me of the old protection racket, pay up because you need my protection; otherwise, bad things can happen to you.

Mr. Speaker, this action taken by the administration is a serious threat to our form of government. Our President should not attempt to change public policy by threatening a company with bankruptcy by way of lawsuits. As such, I have introduced legislation disapproving the use of this heavy-handedness by the administration. This agreement establishes a terrible precedent, one that can have enormous ramifications on our society. Where will the administration turn next? HMOs, utilities, pharmaceutical companies, tobacco companies and maybe, liquor, beer and wine companies?

Mr. Speaker, there is a Washington Post editorial of April 2, Sunday, which I will make a part of the RECORD at this point.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 2, 2000]

GOVERNMENT BY LAWSUIT . . .

For those who favor robust federal regulation of tobacco and strict controls on handguns, as we do, it is tempting to cheer any use of the courts to circumvent Congress' unwillingness to implement common-sense policy. Litigation has caused tobacco companies to improve the way they operate. A recent deal with gun maker Smith & Wesson, is, in substance, similarly in the public interest.

But the process is worrisome—prone to abuse. Filing lawsuits is generally speaking a bad way to make policy. The government has nearly unlimited resources; should it use them, in court, against law-abiding companies that it happens to dislike? Even a weak case can be used to bully those who lack the resources to fight to the end. So where is the line between legitimate governance and extortion?

The tobacco case falls on the legitimate side of the line. The government has at least put its name on a complaint. Attorney General Janet Reno is politically accountable for that suit, which the industry is now asking the court to throw out. If she loses, Ms. Reno will have to answer for filing litigation the courts deemed frivolous. Moreover, the tobacco companies for decades misrepresented the state of their knowledge about the lethality of their products, engineered them to be addictive and marketed them to children. The government's argument that it has a cause of action under federal law remains untested, but it isn't laughable.

Against the gun makers, the government does not even claim to have its own cause of action. Rather it is organizing a suit by local authorities and then stepping into negotiations to push its policies as a basis for settlement. If this is a legitimate strategy, it's hard to see why an anti-abortion administration, say, could not encourage litigation against drug companies marketing abortion-inducing drugs and then demand that those drugs be withdrawn as a condition of settlement. Abortion foes might cheer then as gun foes do now.

Federal lawsuits can redress unjust readings of the law, as in the civil rights era. Novel legal theories surely have a place in government litigation. But this is not a broad license to use suits or the threat of suits to get around democratic policy-making. To do so undermines the legislative branch, demeans the judicial and poses threats to the liberty of those who obey the law but fall out of official favor.

This article goes on to say, quote, ''The government has nearly unlimited resources. Should it use them in court against law-abiding companies that it happens to dislike? Even a weak case can be used to bully those who lack the resources to fight to the end. So where is the line between legitimate government and extortion,'' end quote?

Mr. Speaker, the administration's action was wrong, and it speaks directly to the point of my resolution. The Constitution, article 1, section 1, states that all legislative power herein granted shall be vested in the Congress of the United States. The framers of our constitution created this body to formulate public policy. What they did not intend was for the executive branch to circumvent Congress any time it disagrees with our actions.

Furthermore, we in Congress are elected to uphold the Constitution and represent the views of our constituents, most of whom believe we need to enforce the 20,000-plus gun laws that are on the books to reduce gun violence.

Now, the administration may use polling, but 800 or 1,000 people who are polled is hardly an indication of where Americans all stand on a particular issue.

It is well known that any question can be skewed towards getting a specific answer. The administration consistently presents Americans with a one-sided version with regard to gun violence in this country. Why do we not hear from the administration that it has failed to enforce the 20,000-plus gun laws that are already on the books?

In fact, Syracuse University did a study, and it shows that this enforcement is down 44 percent since 1993. So, the President, and the media, by not reporting things accurately, have demonstrated to Americans the extraordinary ability to change facts and statistics and season them with emotional hype while at the same time neglecting the information that may give Americans an equal opportunity to make an informed decision on guns.

So I urge my colleagues to support my House resolution, which I intend to drop today. It basically says we cannot have government by lawsuit, and it talks about our country is a Republic while the government is the supreme power, it's power is vested in a its citizens who select and elect officers and representatives who govern them appropriately. We can not have the Government go out and use high-handed techniques to force corporations to comply with their wishes and omit the legislative process.

RECESS

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

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

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, offered the following prayer:

Lord God Almighty, to call You Eternal is to place You in every moment yet beyond time. Be attentive to our prayer.

We bless You and praise You for the time this weekend we have gathered with Your people of faith. In those moments we listened to Your Word, we thanked You with our brothers and sisters of faith for Your presence and guidance in our daily lives. We are grateful to You, O Lord, for the moments we had this weekend to spend with family and friends. These relationships ground us in love and sustain us in all that we do. Take care of those committed to our care by life or by constitution.

Time is a most precious commodity to us and to all in the human family. To the wealthy and successful, time is a priceless gift. Never enough. To those suffering, in pain or incarcerated, time is elongated and penetrating. On them, Lord, have mercy. Help the people of this assembly and of this Nation to seize the present moment and to fill our day with works of peace and justice.

Over this weekend we have taken time in our hands and through agreement we have changed time. Lord, let this be a sign of hope to all of us and to peoples of the world. If we can change this measure of motion which governs so much of our lives; if we can agree to meet one another on a new common perception of Your unfolding mystery, such as time change, how close we are to realizing the true power You give us to negotiate change and how myriad are the possibilities for other common endeavors in the future.

Give us time to work through our problems. Help us to seek out the time to be truly present to one another. Help us, enable us to so enter this week, this day with open minds and hearts that we find You, Lord of life and light, here in the present moment. For You live and reign now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. TRAFICANT led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

NCAA AND ILLEGAL GAMBLING

(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, last week before a hearing at the Senate Commerce Committee, I voiced my strong opposition to legislation currently pending before both houses of Congress which would ban college sports betting in just Nevada. While I oppose this legislation, I support the goal of maintaining the integrity of college athletics. But there is simply no evidence, Mr. Speaker, to suggest that the highly regulated and legal sports betting industry in Nevada is responsible in any way for the illegal sports wagering and the point shaving scams that are taking place on our college campuses.

Mr. Speaker, I challenge the NCAA, the leading supporter of this legislation, to look in the mirror. Certainly the numerous Final Four sweepstakes promoted by the NCAA and its corporate sponsors encourages illegal wagering on college sports more than the existence of Nevada's strictly regulated sports books. Let us not punish a respected industry for a societal problem. Active and effective enforcement of current laws is the only way to stop point shaving scams and illegal gambling on our college campuses.

TIME TO SECURE OUR BORDERS

(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, the Mexican drug cartel crossed our border and opened fire on our security forces. Reports say the Mexican drug barons have placed a $200,000 bounty on any American border guard. Think about it. If these assassins kill five American guards, they make $1 million. If that is not enough to bust your buns, Mexico apologized by saying it was very, quote-unquote, regrettable.

Beam me up. It is time to secure our borders. If our military can vaccinate dogs in Haiti, they can secure our borders.

I yield back the fact that Congress keeps turning the other cheek, and Mexican drug barons are now servicing all four cheeks. Think about it.

U.N. PEACEKEEPING COSTS ON THE RISE

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I do not think my colleagues would be surprised to hear that the U.N. peacekeeping costs are on the rise. A recent Washington Post article reported that peacekeeping costs are expected to double this year to nearly $2 billion. This means that the United States will again be strapped with a financial and a personal burden, especially since the administration has stretched our military so much.

Under the current formula, the U.S. pays about 30 percent, almost one-third of all the peacekeeping costs. Contrast that with China who is a member of the United Nations and they contribute a little less than 1 percent. The same China that the administration wants Congress to recognize for permanent normal trade relations. This antiquated formula has not changed for 26 years.

A Republican led Congress has finally addressed this problem by requiring that United States arrears be tied to a more equitable formula. But this change is likely to meet with conflict. So who is shocked that many countries that have a free ride are balking at financial responsibility? Congress must maintain fiscal responsibility by requiring all members of the U.N. to do their share, including China.

IT IS TIME AMERICAN PEOPLE LEARNED THE TRUTH

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, last month the Democrats criticized our budget resolution with their standard risky rhetoric, claiming our budget would cause children to starve and deny health care for the elderly. Ironically, it is the irresponsible accounting of the Clinton-Gore administration that really puts our children and seniors at risk. In fiscal year 1997, the Clinton-Gore Agriculture Department wasted $1 billion in erroneous food stamp payments, money that could have fed 5 percent more of our Nation's impoverished children. In fiscal year 1998, Medicare wasted $12.6 billion in overpayments to health care providers, money that could have helped thousands of American seniors. And in 1995, the Veterans' Administration nonchalantly ignored nearly $12 million in benefits owed to the Veterans' Administration, even though many elderly American veterans are struggling to get by.

It is time the American people learned the truth. The risky wasteful policies belong to the Clinton-Gore Democrats, not the Republicans.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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.

SCIENCE COMMITTEE REPORTS RESTORATION ACT

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3904) to prevent the elimination of certain reports.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3904

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

SECTION 1. REPORTS.

Section 3003(a)(1) of the Federal Reports Elimination and Sunset Act of 1995 (31 U.S.C. 1113 note) does not apply to any report required to be submitted under any of the following provisions of law:

(1) Section 801(b) and (c) of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7321(b) and (c)).

(2) Section 603 of the National Science and Technology Policy, Organization, and Priorities Act of 1976 (42 U.S.C. 6683).

(3) Section 822(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1992 and 1993 (42 U.S.C. 6687).

(4) Section 7(a) of the Marine Resources and Engineering Development Act of 1966 (33 U.S.C. 1106(a)).

(5) Section 206 of the National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 (42 U.S.C. 2476).

(6) Section 404 of the Communications Satellite Act of 1962 (47 U.S.C. 744).

(7) Section 205(a)(1) of the National Critical Materials Act of 1984 (30 U.S.C. 1804(a)(1)).

(8) Section 17(c)(2) of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3711a(c)(2)).

(9) Section 10(h) of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Act (15 U.S.C. 278(h)).

(10) Section 212(f)(3) of the National Institute of Standards and Technology Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1989 (15 U.S.C. 3704b(f)(3)).

(11) Section 11(g)(2) of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3710(g)(2)).

(12) Section 5(d)(9) of the National Climate Program Act (15 U.S.C. 2904(d)(9)).

(13) Section 7 of the National Climate Program Act (15 U.S.C. 2906).

(14) Section 703 of the Weather Service Modernization Act (15 U.S.C. 313 note).

(15) Section 118(d)(2) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1268(d)(2)).

(16) Section 304(d) of the Federal Aviation Administration Research, Engineering, and Development Authorization Act of 1992 (49 U.S.C. 47508 note).

(17) Section 2367(c) of title 10, United States Code.

(18) Section 303(c)(7) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (41 U.S.C. 253(c)(7)).

(19) Section 102(e)(7) of the Global Change Research Act of 1990 (15 U.S.C. 2932(e)(7)).

(20) Section 5(b)(1)(C) and (D) of the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977 (42 U.S.C. 7704(b)(1)(C) and (D)).

(21) Section 11(e)(6) of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3710(e)(6)).

(22) Section 2304(c)(7) of title 10, United States Code, but only to the extent of its application to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

(23) Section 4(j)(1) of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 (42 U.S.C. 1863(j)(1)).

(24) Section 36(f) of the Science and Engineering Equal Opportunities Act (42 U.S.C. 1885c(f)).

(25) Section 37 of the Science and Engineering Equal Opportunities Act (42 U.S.C. 1885d).

(26) Section 108 of the National Science Foundation Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1986 (42 U.S.C. 1886).

(27) Section 101(a)(3) of the High-Performance Computing Act of 1991 (15 U.S.C. 5511(a)(3)).

(28) Section 3(a)(7) and (f) of the National Science Foundation Act of 1950 (42 U.S.C. 1862(a)(7) and (f)).

(29) Section 7(a) of the National Science Foundation Authorization Act, 1977 (42 U.S.C. 1873 note).

(30) Section 16 of the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 (15 U.S.C. 2215).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. 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. 3904.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Reports and Elimination and Sunset Act of 1995 calls for the sunset of all periodic reports submitted to Congress by the executive branch. Congress has extended the sunset date of these reports until May of this year.

The committee on science highlighted nearly 100 reports relevant to its jurisdiction from the thousands scheduled for sunset. Out of that group, 30 were considered to be important to the committee's oversight responsibilities and have been incorporated into H.R. 3904. These reports serve a useful purpose within the agency themselves as a part of their internal review and evaluation process. The agency reports exempted under H.R. 3904 originate from NASA, the National Science Foundation, NOAA and others.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3904 is a bipartisan effort of the Committee on Science to maintain a fundamental oversight tool. I urge its adoption.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin has accurately described the bill. We support it. It was passed by a bipartisan effort. We support the bill.

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

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. 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 Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3904.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONCURRING IN SENATE AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 1753, METHANE HYDRATE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 2000

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 453) providing for the consideration of the bill H.R. 1753 and the Senate amendments thereto.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 453

Resolved, That, upon the adoption of this resolution, the House shall be considered to have taken from the Speaker's table the bill H.R. 1753 together with the Senate amendments thereto, and to have (1) concurred in the amendment of the Senate to the title, and (2) concurred in the amendment of the Senate to the text with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Methane Hydrate Research and Development Act of 2000''.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) CONTRACT.—The term ''contract'' means a procurement contract within the meaning of section 6303 of title 31, United States Code.

(2) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT.—The term ''cooperative agreement'' means a cooperative agreement within the meaning of section 6305 of title 31, United States Code.

(3) DIRECTOR.—The term ''Director'' means the Director of the National Science Foundation.

(4) GRANT.—The term ''grant'' means a grant awarded under a grant agreement, within the meaning of section 6304 of title 31, United States Code.

(5) INDUSTRIAL ENTERPRISE.—The term ''industrial enterprise'' means a private, nongovernmental enterprise that has an expertise or capability that relates to methane hydrate research and development.

(6) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term ''institution of higher education'' means an institution of higher education, within the meaning of section 102(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1002(a)).

(7) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Energy, acting through the Assistant Secretary for Fossil Energy.

(8) SECRETARY OF COMMERCE.—The term ''Secretary of Commerce'' means the Secretary of Commerce, acting through the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

(9) SECRETARY OF DEFENSE.—The term ''Secretary of Defense'' means the Secretary of Defense, acting through the Secretary of the Navy.

(10) SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.—The term ''Secretary of the Interior'' means the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the United States Geological Survey and the Director of the Minerals Management Service.

SEC. 3. METHANE HYDRATE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) COMMENCEMENT OF PROGRAM.—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of

this Act, the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Director, shall commence a program of methane hydrate research and development in accordance with this section.

(2) DESIGNATIONS.—The Secretary, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Director shall designate individuals to carry out this section.

(3) COORDINATION.—The individual designated by the Secretary shall coordinate all activities within the Department of Energy relating to methane hydrate research and development.

(4) MEETINGS.—The individuals designated under paragraph (2) shall meet not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act and not less frequently than every 120 days thereafter to—

(A) review the progress of the program under paragraph (1); and

(B) make recommendations on future activities to occur subsequent to the meeting.

(b) GRANTS, CONTRACTS, COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS, INTERAGENCY FUNDS TRANSFER AGREEMENTS, AND FIELD WORK PROPOSALS.—

(1) ASSISTANCE AND COORDINATION.—In carrying out the program of methane hydrate research and development authorized by this section, the Secretary may award grants or contracts to, or enter into cooperative agreements with, institutions of higher education and industrial enterprises to—

(A) conduct basic and applied research to identify, explore, assess, and develop methane hydrate as a source of energy;

(B) assist in developing technologies required for efficient and environmentally sound development of methane hydrate resources;

(C) undertake research programs to provide safe means of transport and storage of methane produced from methane hydrates;

(D) promote education and training in methane hydrate resource research and resource development;

(E) conduct basic and applied research to assess and mitigate the environmental impacts of hydrate degassing (including both natural degassing and degassing associated with commercial development);

(F) develop technologies to reduce the risks of drilling through methane hydrates; and

(G) conduct exploratory drilling in support of the activities authorized by this paragraph.

(2) COMPETITIVE MERIT-BASED REVIEW.—Funds made available under paragraph (1) shall be made available based on a competitive merit-based process.

(c) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary shall establish an advisory panel consisting of experts from industrial enterprises, institutions of higher education, and Federal agencies to—

(1) advise the Secretary on potential applications of methane hydrate;

(2) assist in developing recommendations and priorities for the methane hydrate research and development program carried out under subsection (a)(1); and

(3) not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, and at such later dates as the panel considers advisable, submit to Congress a report on the anticipated impact on global climate change from—

(A) methane hydrate formation;

(B) methane hydrate degassing (including natural degassing and degassing associated with commercial development); and

(C) the consumption of natural gas produced from methane hydrates.

Not more than twenty-five percent of the individuals serving on the advisory panel shall be Federal employees.

(d) LIMITATIONS.—

(1) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Not more than 5 percent of the amount made available to carry out this section for a fiscal year may be used by the Secretary for expenses associated with the administration of the program carried out under subsection (a)(1).

(2) CONSTRUCTION COSTS.—None of the funds made available to carry out this section may be used for the construction of a new building or the acquisition, expansion, remodeling, or alteration of an existing building (including site grading and improvement and architect fees).

(e) RESPONSIBILITIES OF THE SECRETARY.—In carrying out subsection (b)(1), the Secretary shall—

(1) facilitate and develop partnerships among government, industrial enterprises, and institutions of higher education to research, identify, assess, and explore methane hydrate resources;

(2) undertake programs to develop basic information necessary for promoting long-term interest in methane hydrate resources as an energy source;

(3) ensure that the data and information developed through the program are accessible and widely disseminated as needed and appropriate;

(4) promote cooperation among agencies that are developing technologies that may hold promise for methane hydrate resource development; and

(5) report annually to Congress on accomplishments under this section.

SEC. 4. AMENDMENTS TO THE MINING AND MINERALS POLICY ACT OF 1970.

Section 201 of the Mining and Minerals Policy Act of 1970 (30 U.S.C. 1901) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (6)—

(A) in subparagraph (F), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(B) by redesignating subparagraph (G) as subparagraph (H); and

(C) by inserting after subparagraph (F) the following:

''(G) for purposes of this section and sections 202 through 205 only, methane hydrate; and'';

(2) by redesignating paragraph (7) as paragraph (8); and

(3) by inserting after paragraph (6) the following:

''(7) The term 'methane hydrate' means—

''(A) a methane clathrate that is in the form of a methane-water ice-like crystalline material and is stable and occurs naturally in deep-ocean and permafrost areas; and

''(B) other natural gas hydrates found in association with deep-ocean and permafrost deposits of methane hydrate.''.

SEC. 5. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of Energy to carry out this Act—

(1) $5,000,000 for fiscal year 2001;

(2) $7,500,000 for fiscal year 2002;

(3) $11,000,000 for fiscal year 2003;

(4) $12,000,000 for fiscal year 2004; and

(5) $12,000,000 for fiscal year 2005.

Amounts authorized under this section shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 6. SUNSET.

Section 3 of this Act shall cease to be effective after the end of fiscal year 2005.

SEC. 7. NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL STUDY.

The Secretary shall enter into an agreement with the National Research Council for such council to conduct a study of the progress made under the methane hydrate research and development program implemented pursuant to this Act, and to make recommendations for future methane hydrate research and development needs. The Secretary shall transmit to the Congress, not later than September 30, 2004, a report containing the findings and recommendations of the National Research Council under this section.

SEC. 8. REPORTS AND STUDIES.

The Secretary of Energy shall provide to the Committee on Science of the House of Representatives copies of any report or study that the Department of Energy prepares at the direction of any committee of the Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. COSTELLO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, methane hydrates which consist of a mixture of methane and water frozen into a solid crystalline state have great energy potential and are found in many areas throughout the world. The U.S. Geological Survey's 1995 national assessment of United States oil and gas reserves estimated the value of U.S. in-place methane hydrate resources to be an astounding 320 quadrillion cubic feet of gas.

By comparison, the United States annually consumes about 33 trillion cubic feet of methane as natural gas. The world's currently known gas reserves are about 5 quadrillion cubic feet. H.R. 1753 directs the Secretary of Energy in consultation with the Secretaries of Commerce, Defense and the Interior and the director of the National Science Foundation to commence a program of methane hydrate R&D. It authorizes the Secretary of Energy $5 million for fiscal year 2001, $7.5 million for fiscal year 2002, $11 million for fiscal year 2003, and $12 million for each of fiscal years 2004 and 2005 to carry out the programs.

The bill also authorizes the Secretary of Energy to award grants or contracts to, or enter into cooperative agreements with, institutions of higher education and industrial enterprises to conduct methane hydrate R&D.

□ 1415

It requires that all such awards be made available based upon a competitive merit review process. It limits administrative expenses to not more than 5 percent and prohibits any funds from being used for either the construction of the new building or alteration of an existing building, including site grading and improvement in architect fees.

It allows the Secretary of the Interior to award methane hydrate R&D

contracts and grants to and to enter into cooperative agreements with qualified entities under the Marine Mineral Resources Research Act of 1996. It sunsets the methane hydrate R&D program after the end of fiscal year 2005, and it requires the Secretary of Energy to engage the national research council to conduct a study of the progress of the program and to make recommendations for future methane hydrate R&D needs. The NRC report is to be transmitted to Congress not later than September 30, 2004.

Mr. Speaker, the House unanimously approved a similar version of H.R. 1753 last October, which the Senate amended in November. I commend this revised version of the bill which represents the bipartisan agreement with the Senate to the House for its adoption.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be here today to move one step closer to enactment of the Gas Hydrates Research and Development Act. I am happy that we have reached an agreement that everyone can support. I would like to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), the chairman of the full committee, and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), the ranking member, along with the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), the chairman of the subcommittee, for all of their hard work on this bill. I would also like to commend my good friend and colleague from Pennsylvania (Mr. DOYLE) for his leadership and his hard work on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, gas hydrates have the potential to provide a significant natural gas resource to this country if they can be safely and economically extracted from the ocean floor, where they are found. This legislation establishes an interagency research and development program to examine many issues associated with the extraction of gas hydrates, including the possible economic, environmental, and energy benefits.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, as the chairman of the Energy and Environment Subcommittee, I am pleased that we are considering H.R. 1753, the Methane Hydrate Research and Development Act of 2000. My friend and colleague on the subcommittee, Mr. DOYLE, introduced H.R. 1753 in May 1999, and last October 26, the House unanimously approved a similar version of the bill. The Senate amended the House-passed bill last November, and this revised version of the bill represents a bipartisan agreement with the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I have the distinct pleasure of serving on both the House Science Committee and the Resources Committee which shared jurisdiction on this bill. I want to thank my friends on Resources for all their hard work in getting H.R. 1753 to the floor. I would especially like to thank Chairman YOUNG and Congresswoman CUBIN for their willingness to work with me and the chairman of the Science Committee on this important piece of legislation.

Methane hydrates are ice-like substances found in undersea sediments and in Arctic permafrost. These hydrates will one day provide an abundant supply of clean natural gas if science can discover practical and environmentally sound extraction methods. However, much more research is needed before we can attain that goal. H.R. 1753 brings us closer to the day when we can safely and effectively begin to use this abundant, new source of energy.

This legislation will make funds available to continue research into extracting this clean and bountiful potential source of energy. It also seeks to better coordinate the research efforts of the Department of Energy, the U.S. Geological Survey, the U.S. Navy, the Minerals Management Service, and NOAA.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, which will help secure our energy future. I thank the Chair.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the House is considering H.R. 1753. The Methane Hydrate Research and Development Act, a five year authorization measure that will promote the research, identification, assessment, exploration and development of methane hydrate resources.

As members will recall, H.R. 1753 was previously considered on the suspension calendar and passed by the House on October 26, 1999. Under the leadership of Senator AKAKA, the bill was subsequently passed by the Senate in November of 1999. The version before us today does not differ in scope or direction, but does incorporate minor changes agreed to by all parties that have been involved in this most important energy initiative.

In my view, the need for heightened methane hydrate research has always been critical in nature. But the attention being paid to the recent increase in oil prices and cost hikes at the gas pump has served to reinforce our nation's need to become less dependent on foreign oil and to enhance the use of our domestic fuel base in a manner that meets the requirements for cleaner fuels and reduced emissions.

The potential for significant benefits to consumers, the environment, and business exist in methane hydrate research. I have previously sited the following information, but it bears repeating. It has been projected that U.S. gas consumption is expected to increase by 40% by the year 2020. Couple this with the fact that currently more than half of the present U.S. oil supply is imported and without natural gas production, our oil import volume would be much larger. But if only 1% of the methane hydrate resource could be made recoverable, the United States could more than double its domestic natural gas resource base. In short, when a new, abundant resource is found that meets a growing demand with a greater level of efficiency, consumers will not only have a greater selection of options, but more affordable costs as well.

I am particularly proud of the existing research into this area that has been done by DOE's National Energy Technology Laboratory in Pittsburgh, as well as the recognized efforts of Gerald Holder at the University of Pittsburgh. I am confident that framework, guidance, and authority embodied in The Methane Hydrates Research and Development Act will enable further examination into what could conceivably save consumers billions of dollars, make difficult national environmental decisions easier, and strengthen our Nation's energy security.

Once again, I want to extend my sincerest appreciation to Senator AKAKA, Chairman SENSENBRENNER, Representative CALVERT, and Representative COSTELLO for their efforts and support in moving forward with H.R. 1753, The Methane Hydrate Research and Development Act of 2000.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, House Resolution 453.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING USE OF EAST FRONT OF CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR PERFORMANCES SPONSORED BY JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 281), authorizing the use of the East Front of the Capitol Grounds for performances sponsored by the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 281

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

SECTION 1. AUTHORIZING USE OF EAST FRONT OF CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR PERFORMANCES SPONSORED BY KENNEDY CENTER.

In carrying out its duties under section 4 of the John F. Kennedy Center Act (20 U.S.C. 76j), the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, in cooperation with the National Park Service (in this resolution jointly referred to as the ''sponsor''), may sponsor public performances on the East Front of the Capitol Grounds at such dates and times as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate may approve jointly.

SEC. 2. TERMS AND CONDITIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Any performance authorized under section 1 shall be free of admission charge to the public and arranged not to interfere with the needs of Congress, under conditions to be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board.

(b) ASSUMPTION OF LIABILITIES.—The sponsor shall assume full responsibility for all liabilities incident to all activities associated with the performance.

SEC. 3. PREPARATIONS.

(a) STRUCTURES AND EQUIPMENT.—In consultation with the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate, the Architect of the Capitol shall provide upon the Capitol Grounds such stage, sound amplification devices, and other related structures

and equipment as may be required for a performance authorized under section 1.

(b) ADDITIONAL ARRANGEMENTS.—The Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board may make such additional arrangements as may be required to carry out the performance.

SEC. 4. ENFORCEMENT OF RESTRICTIONS.

The Capitol Police Board shall provide for enforcement of the restrictions contained in section 4 of the Act of July 31, 1946 (40 U.S.C. 193d; 60 Stat. 718), concerning sales, displays, and solicitations on the Capitol Grounds, as well as other restrictions applicable to the Capitol Grounds, with respect to a performance authorized by section 1.

SEC. 5. EXPIRATION OF AUTHORITY.

A performance may not be conducted under this resolution after September 30, 2000.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE).

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

Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 281, introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), the chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and cosponsored by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), the ranking member of the committee, authorizes the use of the East Front of the Capitol for performances by the Millennium Stage of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. It is expected that performances will take place on Tuesdays and Thursdays from Memorial Day to September 30, 2000.

The performances will be open to the public, free of admission charge, and the sponsors of the event, the Kennedy Center and the National Park Service, will assume responsibility for all liabilities associated with the event. The resolution expressly prohibits sales, displays, advertisements, and solicitation in connection with the event.

Mr. Speaker, this unique event allows the Kennedy Center to provide leadership in the national performing arts education policy and programs and could conduct community outreach as provided for in its mission statement. By permitting these performances on the east front, the Congress is assisting the Kennedy Center in fulfilling this mission.

Mr. Speaker, I support this resolution, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I join with the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) in supporting House Concurrent Resolution 281, which authorizes a series of summer concerts sponsored by the JFK Center to be conducted here on Capitol Hill. These concerts are held from Memorial Day throughout the summer and conclude around Labor Day. I must say they have enriched my tenure here on the Hill.

On Tuesdays and Thursdays during the summer months, residents, many tourists and other visitors to Capitol Hill are treated to wonderful, free concerts, with entertainment provided by some of America's most enduring and endearing artists.

As with all events on the Capitol grounds, these concerts are free, open to the entire public, and will be arranged in accordance with the rules and regulations of the Office of the Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Hill police. We do owe a debt of gratitude to the Kennedy Center for its sponsorship of the summer program which includes all types of music, dance, and vocal performances.

I thank the chairman for his expeditious handling of this resolution, and I urge my colleagues to support House Concurrent Resolution 281.

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 281, which authorizes a series of summer concerts, sponsored by the John F. Kennedy Center to be conducted here on Capitol Hill.

Consistent with past summers, the concerts are held from Memorial Day throughout the summer, and conclude at the end of summer, around Labor Day. The musical performances feature the best of American talent, and provide hours of enjoyment for all listeners.

The Kennedy Center is to be commended for its solid commitment to educating the American public to the joys of the performing arts. The Millennium stage at the Kennedy Center has been an enormous hit. Free concerts are arranged each day in the Great Hall, all you need to do is to show up and be treated to wonderful free performances.

The summer concerts series is another sign of the Center's commitment to bring performing art to all Americans, consistent with President Kennedy's devotion to the arts.

As with all events on Capitol grounds, these concerts are free, open to the entire public, and will be arranged in accordance with rules and regulations of the office of the Architect of the Capitol, and the Capitol Police.

I look forward to this very enjoyable summertime entertainment and I urge my colleagues to support House Concurrent Resolution 281.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of the resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 281.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JUDGE J. SMITH HENLEY FEDERAL BUILDING

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1605) to designate the United States courthouse building located at 402 North Walnut Street and Prospect Avenue in Harrison, Arkansas, as the ''Judge J. Smith Henley Federal Building,'' as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1605

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

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The Federal building and United States courthouse located at 402 North Walnut Street in Harrison, Arkansas, shall be known and designated as the ''J. Smith Henley Federal Building and United States Courthouse''.

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE).

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1605, as amended, designates the Federal building and United States courthouse in Harrison, Arkansas as the ''J. Smith Henley Federal Building and United States Courthouse.''

Judge Henley was a lifelong resident of northwest Arkansas. He was born in Saint Joe, Arkansas, attended the University of Arkansas, and practiced law in Boone County. Judge Henley was appointed as a United States district judge in 1958 for the eastern and western districts of Arkansas, and in 1975 was appointed to the United States Circuit Court of Appeals for the 8th District. He took senior status in 1982 and continued to carry an active docket until his death in 1987.

This designation is a fitting tribute, and I urge enactment of the bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1605 is a bill to designate the courthouse building located at 402 North Walnut Street, Harrison, Arkansas, as the ''Judge J. Smith Henley Federal Building.'' Judge Henley served the citizens of Arkansas for his entire life and was a revered and respected figure in Harrison. His family and roots are deep and longlasting in the county and city of Harrison.

Judge Henley's judicial career began with his appointment in October 1958 to the U.S. District Court for the eastern and western districts of Arkansas. He served as a chief judge of the eastern district during his entire tenure on the district bench. He also served as referee in bankruptcy for the western

district and as associate general counsel for the Federal Communications Commission here in Washington, D.C.

An active church member, devoted family man, and loving father are also characteristics of this beloved local figure.

Mr. Speaker, it is proper and fitting to honor the contributions of Judge Henley with this designation. I support H.R. 1605, and I urge its passage.

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

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1605, a bill to designate the Federal building located at 402 North Walnut Street in Harrison, Arkansas, as the ''Judge J. Smith Henley Federal Building''.

Judge J. Smith Henley had deep, longstanding roots in Harrison, Arkansas. He was born in 1917 in St. Joe, Arkansas, and died in October 1997 in Harrison. Judge Henley attended local schools, and received his law degree from the University of Arkansas at Fayetteville in 1941.

His long and distinguished career included work here in Washington for the Federal Communications Commission and the U.S. Department of Justice. Judge Henley was appointed to the United States Circuit Court for the Eighth Circuit in March 1975. In 1982, he took senior status and continued to perform substantial judicial work until his passing.

He is remembered for his kindness and fairness and for his deep reverence for judicial work.

He was a devoted father to his two daughters, and is survived by his wife of 59 years. Judge Henley was an active volunteer and member of various bar associations, including the American Bar Association, the Arkansas Bar Association, and the American Judicature Society.

I urge all Members to support H.R. 1605.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of the resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1605, as amended.

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

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

''A bill to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 402 North Walnut Street in Harrison, Arkansas, as the 'J. Smith Henley Federal Building and United States Courthouse'.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING USE OF CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR 19TH ANNUAL NATIONAL PEACE OFFICERS' MEMORIAL SERVICE

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 278) authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the 19th annual National Peace Officers' Memorial Service.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 278

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

SECTION 1. USE OF CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR NATIONAL PEACE OFFICERS' MEMORIAL SERVICE.

The National Fraternal Order of Police and its auxiliary shall be permitted to sponsor a public event, the 19th annual National Peace Officers' Memorial Service, on the Capitol Grounds on May 15, 2000, or on such other date as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate may jointly designate, in order to honor the more than 130 law enforcement officers who died in the line of duty during 1999.

SEC. 2. TERMS AND CONDITIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The event authorized by section 1 shall be free of admission charge to the public and arranged not to interfere with the needs of Congress, under conditions to be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board.

(b) EXPENSES AND LIABILITIES.—The National Fraternal Order of Police and its auxiliary shall assume full responsibility for all expenses and liabilities incident to all activities associated with the event.

SEC. 3. EVENT PREPARATIONS.

(a) STRUCTURES AND EQUIPMENT.—Subject to the approval of the Architect of the Capitol, the National Fraternal Order of Police and its auxiliary are authorized to erect upon the Capitol Grounds such stage, sound amplification devices, and other related structures and equipment, as may be required for the event authorized by section 1.

SEC. 4. ENFORCEMENT OF RESTRICTIONS.

The Capitol Police Board shall provide for enforcement of the restrictions contained in section 4 of the Act of July 31, 1946 (40 U.S.C. 193d; 60 Stat. 718), concerning sales, advertisements, displays, and solicitations on the Capitol Grounds, as well as other restrictions applicable to the Capitol Grounds, with respect to the event authorized by section 1.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE).

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

House concurrent resolution 278 authorizes the use of the Capitol grounds for the 19th Annual Peace Officers' Memorial Service on May 15 of 2000, or on such date as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration jointly designate.

The resolution authorizes the Architect of the Capitol, the Capitol Hill Police Board, and the National Fraternal Order of Police, the sponsor of the event, to negotiate the necessary arrangements for carrying out the event in complete compliance with the rules and regulations governing the use of the Capitol grounds. The Capitol Hill police will be the hosting law enforcement agency. The event will be free of charge, and open to the public.

Mr. Speaker, this service will honor Federal, State, and local law enforcement officers killed in the line of duty in the year 1999. This is a fitting tribute to the men and women who have given their lives in the performance of said duties.

Mr. Speaker, I support this measure, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, there is no more difficult job than those who have been charged with keeping public peace and order. They intervene under the most difficult of circumstances. We give them the power to use deadly force in connection with conducting their duties. Unfortunately, all too often, these men and women are themselves in harm's way.

Houses concurrent resolution 278 authorizes the use of the Capitol grounds for this most solemn service. I strongly support the resolution which honors these police officers, men and women who died in the line of duty in 1999.

During this last year, 134 brave peace officers from the ranks of State, local, and Federal service were killed in the line of duty. Mr. Speaker, 11 women lost their lives; 2 were members of the U.S. Army Police Corps. Sadly, history suggests that this week, 2 or 3 more officers will die in the line of duty; and there will be 350 more who will be injured or assaulted.

Mr. Speaker, in 1962, President Kennedy signed the law establishing National Police Week. May 15 is designated Peace Officers' Memorial Day, and the Capitol Hill ceremony will take place on that day. It is a day during which a grateful Nation will pay tribute to the sacrifice of all peace officers. As a caring Nation, we deeply appreciate that sacrifice.

Just 2 years ago in my district, on January 27, 1998, Portland police officer Colleen Waibel was killed during a drug raid. In honor of Officer Waibel and the other 28 Multnomah County, Clackamas County, and Portland police officers who were killed in the line of duty, I would like to enter their names into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this time.

MULTNOMAH COUNTY, CLACKAMAS COUNTY AND PORTLAND POLICE OFFICERS WHO WERE KILLED IN THE LINE OF DUTY

Thomas G. O'Conner
Charles F. Schoppe
Samuel S. Young
Albert W. Moe
James T. White
Ralph H. Stahl
James C. Gill
John J. McVarthy
Jerome Palmer
Robert E. Drake
Charles M. White
Phillip R. Johson
Charles E. Vincent
James A. Hines
Roy E. Mizner
Vernon J. Stroeder
Roger L. Davies
Robert P. Murray
Robert R. Ferron
Stephen M. Owens

Dennis A. Darden
David W. Crowther
Stanley Punds
Thomas L. Jeffries
Colleen Waibel
Jimmy Shoop
Robert ''Bobby'' Anderson
Scott Collins
Mark Whitehead

Mr. Speaker, to remember these officers, my city of Portland has built a monument in the Tom McCall Water Front Park that serves as a permanent recognition of the great sacrifice our officers made, as well as a tremendous service that all our officers provide. I was proud that my community recognized the importance of remembering these slain officers, and I think it is all together fitting to use the Capitol grounds to recognize those officers nationwide who gave their lives in the line of duty in 1999.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support and urge passage of House concurrent resolution 278.

□ 1430

Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor for me to yield such time as he may consume to my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT), who has provided such great leadership in the recognition of the sacrifice of police officers in the line of duty.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the ranking member for yielding time to me, and I want to thank the chairman for bringing this to the floor.

As sponsor of this legislation, I want to give my commendations to the National Fraternal Order of Police and its auxiliary. We will honor more than 130 law enforcement officers who died in the line of duty in 1999, 130 who put their lives on the line for our citizens.

As a former sheriff, this is a significant event for me. Officers across the country share an extraordinary bond with one another, and we are all saddened by their deaths. These 130 brave officers gave their lives to protect our cities, to protect our neighborhoods. They will be held up with the highest honor and will forever be remembered for their valor.

The United States Capitol is the one appropriate site for such a tribute. I want to thank the Fraternal Order of Police for sponsoring this important event, and I want to thank my good friend and neighbor, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) for his and the committee's leadership.

I would also like to say that while everyone is in town for this event, visit the D.C. Memorial that lists the names of all the police officers who were slain in the line of duty. I want to give a special commendation to my Chief of Staff, who had taken a leave from my office and who led that particular construction and development.

I thank Members for bringing this to the floor, and urge an aye vote.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) for his heartfelt eloquence and advocacy.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, our subcommittee is fortunate not only to have the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) ably managing the bills for the minority today, but the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. WISE), an outstanding ranking member.

The subcommittee misses the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT). As ranking member, he did a great job in the last Congress, as the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. WISE) does in this Congress. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) mentioned the police memorial here in D.C. One of the amazing things about that memorial is that it is not supported by taxpayer money.

By an Act of Congress, a coin was minted. As a result of that subscription and that sale, the police are able to maintain that memorial, and every year to inscribe and honor the names of those who have fallen in the line of duty.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting H. Con. Res. 278, to authorize use of the Capitol Grounds for the National Peace Officers' Memorial Service. President Kennedy proclaimed May 15th as National Peace Officers' Memorial Day. Each year on May 15th, we, as a Nation, have an opportunity to honor the devotion with which peace officers perform their daily task of protecting us, our families, our coworkers, and friends.

There are approximately 700,000 sworn law enforcement officers serving the American public today. During 1999, 134 peace officers were killed in the line of duty. In addition, approximately 65,000 officers are assaulted each year, with 23,000 sustaining serious injury.

It is most fitting and proper to honor the lives, sacrifices, and public service of our brave peace officers. I urge support and adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 278.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, this is a worthy bill. I urge its passage, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 278.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING USE OF CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR 200TH BIRTHDAY CELEBRATION OF LIBRARY OF CONGRESS

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 279), as amended, authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the 200th birthday celebration of the Library of Congress, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 279

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

SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION OF EVENT TO CELEBRATE THE 200TH BIRTHDAY OF THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS.

The Library of Congress (in this resolution referred to as the ''sponsor'') shall be permitted to sponsor a public event, the 200th birthday celebration of the Library of Congress (in this resolution referred to as the ''event''), on the Capitol Grounds on April 24, 2000, or on such other date as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate may jointly designate.

SEC. 2. TERMS AND CONDITIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The event shall be free of admission charge to the public and arranged not to interfere with the needs of Congress, under conditions to be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board.

(b) EXPENSES AND LIABILITIES.—The sponsor shall assume full responsibility for all expenses and liabilities incident to all activities associated with the event.

SEC. 3. STRUCTURES AND EQUIPMENT.

(a) STRUCTURES AND EQUIPMENT.—Subject to the approval of the Architect of the Capitol, the sponsor may erect upon the Capitol Grounds such stage, sound amplification devices, and other related structures and equipment as may be required for the event.

(b) ADDITIONAL ARRANGEMENTS.—The Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board are authorized to make any such additional arrangements as may be required to carry out the event, except that no arrangements may be made to limit access to any public road on the Capitol Grounds.

SEC. 4. ENFORCEMENT OF RESTRICTIONS.

The Capitol Police Board shall provide for enforcement of the restrictions contained in section 4 of the Act of July 31, 1946 (40 U.S.C. 193d; 60 Stat. 718), concerning sales, advertisements, displays, and solicitations on the Capitol Grounds, as well as other restrictions applicable to the Capitol Grounds, with respect to the event.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE).

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

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 279 authorizes the use of the Capitol grounds for the 200th birthday celebration of the Library of Congress on April 24, 2000, or on such date as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration jointly designate.

The resolution authorizes the Architect of the Capitol, the Capitol Police Board, and the Library of Congress, which is the sponsor of the event, to negotiate the necessary arrangements for carrying out the events in complete compliance with the rules and regulations governing use of the Capitol grounds.

The events will be free of charge and open to the public. April 24 is the 200th

anniversary when President John Adams signed into law an act establishing the Library of Congress, and appropriating the huge sum of $5,000 for the purchase of the books. The celebration will include a free concert on the Capitol grounds, and other events inside the Library.

Mr. Speaker, I support this measure, I urge my colleagues to do the same, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, it is a genuine pleasure for me to rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 279.

As my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, mentioned, it authorizes the use of the Capitol Plaza on April 24 for events commemorating the bicentennial of the Library of Congress.

This institution is America's national library, the oldest Federal cultural institution. It is the largest collection of information in the history of the world. We are hopeful that this event will highlight the important role that this library and all libraries play in our democratic society.

As the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) mentioned, the Library of Congress started with the magnificent sum of $5,000 authorized under the act, signed into law by President John Adams. But by 1812, the collection had grown to a phenomenal 3,076 books. However, during the war of 1812, the library, along with other prominent Washington buildings, was burned and the collection was lost.

In 1850, Thomas Jefferson, who then had the largest personal library in America, sold his personal collection to the library for a modest sum, a few thousand more than that. It was very important not only because it helped restart the Library of Congress, but it changed the nature of the collection. Prior to that, the Library of Congress was very narrowly focused in terms of legal and historical topics, but because Thomas Jefferson was truly a renaissance man and had a wide sweep of volumes in a number of different languages that he had collected in his travels and service to our country, it included material on literature, and the nature of the library thus was fundamentally changed.

I am proud to say that due to the diligence of our outstanding staff and a little bit of luck, many of the original Jefferson volumes are still present, available in the rare book room for viewing. I am proud to say that it was a lot of fun just a week ago to view them once again.

Today's collection contains 119 million other items, books, photographs, maps, music, movies, manuscripts, microfilm, all viewed as the world's premier collection of knowledge. Of course, it is housed in the flagship building, I think the most magnificent in our Nation's capital, the Jefferson Building, which we recently celebrated its centennial in 1997 and its painstaking and loving restoration.

We are here today to celebrate the potential on April 24 for a long series of events which shall include the unveiling of commemorative coins and stamps, the opening of a major exhibit on Thomas Jefferson, and a national birthday party consisting of free musical performances open to the public.

I support this resolution, and I urge my colleagues, in joining me, to celebrate it in renewing our commitment to this important institution.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 279 to authorize the use of the Capitol Grounds for the 200th birthday celebration of the Library of Congress.

This public event will be held on April 24. The daylong celebration will include musical performances and the opening of a major Library of Congress exhibition on Thomas Jefferson.

As with all events held on the Capitol Grounds this event will be free and open to the public. The Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board will determine the conditions under which the event will be held.

On April 24, 2000, the Library of Congress celebrates its bicentennial commemoration. The Library was established as the fledgling legislature of the new Republic prepared to move from Philadelphia to the new capital city of Washington. On April 24, 1800, President John Adams signed into law an act that appropriated $5,000 to purchase ''such books as may be necessary for the use of Congress.'' The first books, ordered from London, arrived in 1801 and were stored in the U.S. Capitol, the Library's first home. The collection consisted of 740 volumes and three maps.

A year later, President Thomas Jefferson signed the first law defining the role and functions of the new institution. This measure created the post of the Librarian of Congress and gave Congress, through a Joint Committee on the Library, the authority to establish the Library's budget and its rules and regulations. From the beginning, however, the institution was more than just a legislative library. The 1802 act permitted the President and Vice President to borrow books; a privilege that, in the next three decades, was extended to most government agencies and the judiciary.

President Jefferson, a man who stated he could not live without books, was a key architect to the Library that we know today. Jefferson took a keen interest in the Library and its collection while he was President of the United States from 1801–1809. Throughout his presidency, Jefferson personally recommended books for the Library and he appointed its first two Librarians.

In 1814, the British army invaded the city of Washington and burned the Capitol, including the 3,000-volume Library of Congress. In response, Jefferson, then retired at Monticello, sold his personal library, the largest and finest in the country, to Congress to ''recommence'' its library. The 6,487-volume library that Jefferson sold to Congress, not only included twice as many books as the destroyed Library, it expanded the scope of the Library far beyond the bounds of a legislative library devoted primarily to legal, economic, or historical works. The ''new'' Library contained books on architecture, the arts, science, literature, and geography. It contained books in French, Spanish, German, Latin, Greek, and one three-volume statistical work in Russian. Anticipating the argument that his collection might be too comprehensive, Jefferson argued that: ''There is, in fact, no subject to which a Member of Congress may not have occasion to refer.'' As today's Librarian of Congress, Dr. James Billington, recently pointed out: ''That statement has guided the collecting policies of the Library of Congress to this day and is one of the main reasons why the institution's collections have a breadth and depth unmatched by any other repository.''

Today's Library contains nearly 119 million books, maps, manuscripts, photographs, sound recording, and motion pictures. It has more than 18 million books, 30,000 newspapers, 4.5 million maps, and 12 million photographs on its 530 miles of bookshelves. The Library collects materials in more than 460 languages and has acquisition offices throughout the world, from Rio de Janeiro to New Delhi.

There have been 13 Librarians of Congress since its inception, and each Librarian has faced unique challenges. Throughout the 1990's and into the new century, the challenge is adapting the Library to the digital age. As it has throughout its history, the Library leads the way. The Library has enhanced public access to the Library through the National Digital Library. The Library's THOMAS system of legislative information serves Congress and the public each day.

We join Dr. Billington in acknowledging how libraries have influenced our lives, and we celebrate with him one of America's true national treasures, the Library of Congress.

I urge all Members to support adoption of this resolution.

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

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time, and I urge the passage of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 279, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE REPORTS RESTORATION ACT OF 2000

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4052) to preserve certain reporting requirements under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4052

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 ''Transportation and Infrastructure Reports Restoration Act of 2000''.

SEC. 2. PRESERVATION OF CERTAIN REPORTING REQUIREMENTS REGARDING WATER RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENT.

Section 3003(a)(1) of the Federal Reports Elimination and Sunset Act of 1995 (31 U.S.C. 1113 note) does not apply to any report required to be submitted under any of the following provisions of law:

(1) EXEMPTIONS FROM WATER POLLUTION CONTROL REQUIREMENTS FOR EXECUTIVE AGENCIES.—Section 313(a) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1323(a)).

(2) HEALTH HAZARDS OF ENVIRONMENTAL POLLUTION.—Section 501(d) of Public Law 91–515 (42 U.S.C. 4394(d)).

(3) REVIEW OF REMEDIAL ACTIONS AT CERTAIN FACILITIES TO ENSURE PROTECTION OF HUMAN HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENT.—Section 121(c) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9621(c)).

(4) DESIRABILITY OF ADJUSTING OIL POLLUTION LIABILITY LIMITS.—Section 1004(d)(3) of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2704(d)(3)).

(5) WORK OF RIVER BASIN COMMISSIONS.—Section 204 of the Water Resources Planning Act (42 U.S.C. 1962b–3(2)).

(6) AGENCY COMPLIANCE WITH COASTAL BARRIER RESOURCES ACT.—Section 7 of the Coastal Barrier Resources Act (16 U.S.C. 3506).

(7) COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT.—Section 316(a) of the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1462(a)).

(8) GREAT LAKES RESOURCES ON WHICH RESEARCH IS NEEDED.—Section 118(d)(2) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1268(d)(2)).

(9) ENVIRONMENTAL RESTORATION COSTS FOR FACILITIES SUBJECT TO BASE CLOSURE LAWS.—Section 2827(b) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Years 1992 and 1993 (105 Stat. 1551).

(10) COMPLIANCE WITH ANNEX V OF INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR PREVENTION OF POLLUTION FROM SHIPS.—Section 2201 of the Marine Plastic Pollution Research and Control Act of 1987 (33 U.S.C. 1913).

(11) COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT FUND.—Section 308(b)(3) of the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 1456a(b)(3)).

(12) RESULTS OF ENVIRONMENTAL MONITORING ACTIVITIES.—Section 104B(j)(4)(B) of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972 (33 U.S.C. 1414b(j)(4)(B)).

(13) ATSDR RESULTS ON HEALTH ASSESSMENTS.—Section 104(i)(10) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9604(i)(10)).

(14) NATIONAL ESTUARY PROGRAM ACTIVITIES.—Section 320(j)(2) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1330(j)(2)).

(15) MONITORING FOR COASTAL WATERS.—Section 112(m)(5) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7412(m)(5)).

(16) COMPREHENSIVE CONSERVATION AND MANAGEMENT PLAN FOR LONG ISLAND SOUND.—Section 119(c)(7) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1269(c)(7)).

(17) IMPLEMENTATION OF GREAT LAKES WATER QUALITY AGREEMENT OF 1978.—Section 118(c)(10) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1268(c)(10)).

(18) EFFECTS OF POLLUTION ON NATION'S ESTUARIES.—Section 104(n)(3) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1254(n)(3)).

(19) NATIONAL REQUIREMENTS AND COSTS OF WATER POLLUTION CONTROL.—Section 516 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1375).

(20) REGULATION OF OCEAN DUMPING.—Section 112 of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972 (33 U.S.C. 1421).

(21) ESTUARINE MONITORING PROGRAM OF ORGANOTIN.—Section 7(a) of the Organotin Antifouling Paint Control Act of 1988 (33 U.S.C. 2406(a)).

(22) PROGRESS OF IMPLEMENTING CERCLA.—Section 301(h) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9651(h)).

(23) STATUS OF WATER QUALITY IN UNITED STATES LAKES.—Section 314(a)(3) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1324(a)(3)).

(24) STATE REPORTS ON WATER QUALITY OF ALL NAVIGABLE WATERS.—Section 305(b) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1315(b)).

(25) LAKE WATER QUALITY DEMONSTRATION PROGRAM.—Section 314(d)(3) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1324(d)(3)).

(26) FINANCIAL STATEMENTS AND ANNUAL REPORTS (TVA).—Section 9(a) of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 (16 U.S.C. 831h(a)).

(27) LEVEL B PLAN ON ALL RIVER BASINS.—Section 209(b) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1289(b)).

(28) REPORTS ON CONTRACTS ENTERED INTO RELATING TO PROCUREMENT FROM VIOLATORS OF WATER QUALITY STANDARDS.—Section 508(e) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1368(e)).

SEC. 3. PRESERVATION OF CERTAIN REPORTING REQUIREMENTS REGARDING SURFACE TRANSPORTATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 3003(a)(1) of the Federal Reports Elimination and Sunset Act of 1995 (31 U.S.C. 1113 note) does not apply to any report required to be submitted under any of the following provisions of law:

(1) TRANSPORTATION STATISTICS ANNUAL REPORT.—Section 111(j) of title 49, United States Code.

(2) CURRENT PERFORMANCE AND CONDITION OF PUBLIC MASS TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS.—Section 308(e) of title 49, United States Code.

(3) STATE ENFORCEMENT OF VEHICLE WEIGHT LIMITATIONS.—Section 123(c) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1978 (23 U.S.C. 141 note; 92 Stat. 2701).

(4) STATE PROGRESS IN IMPLEMENTING HIGHWAY HAZARD ELIMINATION AND HIGHWAY-RAIL GRADE CROSSING PROGRAMS.—Section 130(g) of title 23, United States Code.

(b) STATE PROGRESS IN IMPLEMENTING HIGHWAY HAZARD ELIMINATION AND HIGHWAY-RAIL GRADE CROSSING PROGRAMS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 130(g) of title 23, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

''(g) ANNUAL REPORTS.—

''(1) STATE REPORTS.—Each State shall report to the Secretary not later than December 30 of each year on the progress being made to implement the railway-highway crossings program authorized by this section and to implement safety improvement projects for hazard elimination authorized by section 152 and the effectiveness of such improvements. Each State report shall contain an assessment of the cost of, and safety benefits derived from, the various means and methods used to mitigate or eliminate hazards and to improve railway-highway crossings and the previous and subsequent accident experience at improved locations.

''(2) SECRETARY'S REPORTS.—The Secretary shall submit a report to the Committee on Environment and Public Works of the Senate and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives not later than April 1 of each year, on the progress being made by the States in implementing projects to improve railway-highway crossings and in implementing the hazard elimination program (including any projects for pavement marking). The report shall include, but not be limited to, the number of projects undertaken, their distribution by cost range, road system, nature of treatment, means and methods used, and the previous and subsequent accident experience at improved locations. In addition, the Secretary's report shall analyze and evaluate each State program, identify any State found not to be in compliance with the schedule of improvements required by subsection (d) and section 152(a), and include recommendations for future implementation of the railroad highway crossings and hazard elimination programs.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—Section 152 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking subsection (g) and by redesignating subsection (h) as subsection (g).

(c) CURRENT PERFORMANCE AND CONDITION OF PUBLIC MASS TRANSPORTATION SYSTEMS.—Section 308(e) of title 49, United States Code, is amended by striking ''in March 1998, and in March of each even numbered year thereafter,'' and inserting '', together with each infrastructure investment needs report made under section 502(g) of title 23,''.

SEC. 4. PRESERVATION OF CERTAIN REPORTING REQUIREMENTS REGARDING EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT.

Section 3003(a)(1) of the Federal Reports Elimination and Sunset Act of 1995 (31 U.S.C. 1113 note) does not apply to any report required to be submitted under any of the following provisions of law:

(1) ANNUAL REVIEW OF FEDERAL AND STATE DISASTER PREPAREDNESS AND RELIEF PROGRAMS.—Section 313 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5156).

(2) AMOUNT OF EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE.—Section 503(b)(3) of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5193(b)(3)).

SEC. 5. PRESERVATION OF CERTAIN REPORTING REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO THE COAST GUARD AND MARITIME TRANSPORTATION.

Section 3003(a)(1) of the Federal Reports Elimination and Sunset Act of 1995 (31 U.S.C. 1113 note) does not apply to any report required to be submitted under any of the following provisions of law:

(1) LEASING OF HOUSING FACILITIES NEAR COAST GUARD INSTALLATIONS.—Section 475(e) of title 14, United States Code.

(2) COAST GUARD OPERATIONS AND EXPENDITURES.—Section 651 of title 14, United States Code.

(3) SUMMARY OF MARINE CASUALTIES REPORTED DURING PRIOR FISCAL YEAR.—Section 6307(c) of title 46, United States Code.

(4) USER FEE ACTIVITIES AND AMOUNTS.—Section 664 of title 14, United States Code.

(5) CONDITIONS OF PUBLIC PORTS OF THE UNITED STATES.—Section 308(c) of title 49, United States Code.

(6) ACTIVITIES OF FEDERAL MARITIME COMMISSION.—Section 208 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936 (46 App. U.S.C. 1118).

(7) ACTIVITIES OF INTERAGENCY COORDINATING COMMITTEE ON OIL POLLUTION RESEARCH.—Section 7001(e) of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2761(e)).

SEC. 6. PRESERVATION OF CERTAIN REPORTING REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT.

Section 3003(a)(1) of the Federal Reports Elimination and Sunset Act of 1995 (31 U.S.C. 1113 note) does not apply to any report required to be submitted under any of the following provisions of law:

(1) ACTIVITIES UNDER PUBLIC WORKS AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965.—Section 603 of the Public Works and Economic Development Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3213).

(2) ACTIVITIES UNDER APPALACHIAN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT ACT OF 1965.—Section

gional development act of 1965.—Section 304 of the Appalachian Regional Development Act of 1965 (40 U.S.C. App. 304).

SEC. 7. PRESERVATION OF CERTAIN REPORTING REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO RAILROADS.

Section 3003(a)(1) of the Federal Reports Elimination and Sunset Act of 1995 (31 U.S.C. 1113 note) does not apply to any report required to be submitted under any of the following provisions of law:

(1) NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD ACTIVITIES.—Section 1117 of title 49, United States Code.

(2) NTSB LEGISLATIVE RECOMMENDATIONS AND BUDGET ESTIMATES.—Section 1113(c) of title 49, United States Code.

(3) NTSB RECOMMENDATIONS AND RESPONSES.—Section 1135(d) of title 49, United States Code.

(4) SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD ANNUAL REPORT.—Section 704 of title 49, United States Code.

(5) SURFACE TRANSPORTATION BOARD BUDGET AND APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 703(f) and (g) of title 49, United States Code.

(6) NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD ANNUAL REPORT.—Section 4 of the Railway Labor Act (45 U.S.C. 154).

(7) RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD ANNUAL REPORT.—Section 7(b)(6) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1974 (45 U.S.C. 231f(b)(6)).

(8) RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACCOUNT.—Section 22(a)(1) of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1974 (45 U.S.C. 231u(a)(1)).

(9) ACTUARIAL STATUS OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT SYSTEM.—Section 502 of the Railroad Retirement Solvency Act of 1983 (45 U.S.C. 321f–1).

(10) AMTRAK REPORTS AND AUDITS.—Section 24315 of title 49, United States Code.

SEC. 8. PRESERVATION OF CERTAIN REPORTING REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

Section 3003(a)(1) of the Federal Reports Elimination and Sunset Act of 1995 (31 U.S.C. 1113 note) does not apply to any report required to be submitted under any of the following provisions of law:

(1) CONSERVATION IN FEDERAL FACILITIES.—Section 403(a)(2) of the Powerplant and Industrial Fuel Use Act of 1978 (42 U.S.C. 8373(a)(2)).

(2) ACTIVITIES OF ARCHITECTURAL AND TRANSPORTATION BARRIERS COMPLIANCE BOARD.—Section 7(b) of Public Law 90–480 (42 U.S.C. 4157(b)), commonly known as the ''Architectural Barriers Act of 1968''.

SEC. 9. PRESERVATION OF CERTAIN REPORTING REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO AVIATION.

Section 3003(a)(1) of the Federal Reports Elimination and Sunset Act of 1995 (31 U.S.C. 1113 note) does not apply to any report required to be submitted under any of the following provisions of law:

(1) TRANSPORTATION SECURITY.—Section 44938(a) of title 49, United States Code.

(2) SCREENING OF FOREIGN AIR CARRIER AND AIRPORT SECURITY.—Section 44938(b) of title 49, United States Code.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE).

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4052 would restore certain reporting requirements for agencies under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure that would otherwise be eliminated as part of the Federal Reports Elimination and Sunset Act of 1995.

Section 3003 of that Act eliminated thousands of reports that had been required by the Congress and were referenced in a communication from the Clerk of the House dated January 5, 1993. The 1995 Act had provided for a sunset date of December 21, 1999. Section 236 of the Omnibus Appropriations Act for year 2000 extended this deadline until May 15 of 2000.

While the Federal Reports Elimination and Sunset Act will reduce unnecessary paperwork and reduce agency expenditure, it would also inadvertently delete the requirement for certain reports that the committee believes are necessary in executing its oversight responsibilities.

H.R. 4052 corrects this by providing that the 1995 Act does not apply to specified reports. This will affect a small percentage of the total number of reporting requirements eliminated by the Federal Reports Elimination and Sunset Act. The number of reports restored by this bill is a paltry 61.

The bill does not address prospectuses or 11–b reports submitted to the Committee by the General Services Administration under the Public Buildings Act of 1959, since these reports do not fall under the definition of reports to be eliminated. The Committee received correspondence from the GSA stating that these reports will continue to be submitted.

Mr. Speaker, I support this bill, I urge its adoption, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, as was mentioned by my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio, H.R. 4052 is a bill to restore transportation reports that were to automatically sunset on May 15 pursuant to the Federal Reports Elimination and Sunset Act of 1995, as amended.

The Reports Sunset Act eliminated all annual or periodic reports listed in the 1993 report of the Clerk of the House of Representatives. Some of those reports, such as the President's annual budget, are tremendously important and should not be eliminated.

The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, on a bipartisan basis, reviewed the reports that fall within our committee's jurisdiction and determined which bills are necessary to maintain. This bill ensures that those important reports will not sunset.

These include a series of reports on such important items as water; air pollution; the safety, condition, and performance of our Nation's roads, highways, transit systems, bridges, and airports.

I strongly support the passage of H.R. 4052, and want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), the ranking member, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), and the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure for developing and passing this bipartisan legislation.

I note in passing that this, as reflected by our colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR), that there is in fact a better way of doing this, to take the sunset provisions and have them triggered by a proactive set of positive events, so that we are not in a position of unilaterally sunseting provisions that really should not be, but instead, having sort of performance indicators of why we want things to disappear, and that they would do so automatically when it is appropriate.

I look forward to pursuing this concept with our committee and staff to see if there is not a way to avoid going through this process in the future.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4052. This bill restores reports that ''sunset'' on May 15, 2000, pursuant to the Federal Reports Elimination and Sunset Act of 1995, as amended. The Reports Sunset Act eliminated all annual or periodic reports listed in the 1993 Report of the Clerk of the House of Representatives. Some of these reports, such as the President's annual budget, are tremendously important and should not be eliminated.

The Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, on a bipartisan basis, has reviewed the reports that fall within our Committee's jurisdiction and determined which reports are necessary to maintain. This bill ensures that those important reports will not sunset.

I thank Chairman SHUSTER and all of our Subcommittee Chairmen and Ranking Members for working together to develop this bill. I urge all Members to support H.R. 4052.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4052.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANK J. BATTISTI AND NATHANIEL R. JONES FEDERAL BUILDING AND UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1359) to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse to be constructed at 10 East Commerce Street in Youngstown, Ohio, as the ''Frank J. Battisti and Nathaniel R. Jones Federal Building and United States Courthouse.''

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1359

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

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The Federal building and United States courthouse to be constructed at 10 East Commerce Street in Youngstown, Ohio, shall be known and designated as the ''Frank J. Battisti and Nathaniel R. Jones Federal Building and United States Courthouse''.

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Federal building and United States courthouse referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Frank J. Battisti and Nathaniel R. Jones Federal Building and United States Courthouse''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE).

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1359 designates the Federal building and United States courthouse now under construction in Youngstown, Ohio, as the Frank J. Battisti and Nathaniel R. Jones Federal Building and United States Courthouse.

Our colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT), who I mentioned earlier, is a proud member of our committee and introduced this measure. As with so many of the bills he had an introduced, it was a good idea.

Judge Battisti and Judge Jones were both Ohio natives who had a positive impact on their communities. Judge Battisti was admitted to the Ohio Bar in 1950. Before being elected judge of the Common Pleas Court in Mahoning County, he served as an Assistant Attorney General for Ohio.

In 1961, he was appointed to the United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio. In 1969, he became the chief judge for the Northern District, and shortly after his retirement, Judge Battisti passed away.

□ 1445

Nathaniel Jones served in World War II in the United States Army Air Corps. He was admitted to the Ohio bar in 1957 while he was the executive director of the Fair Employment Practices Commission of the City of Youngstown. Judge Jones was later appointed assistant U.S. attorney for the Northern District of Ohio. He later served as assistant general counsel to the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders and was the general counsel for the NAACP for 10 years.

In 1979, Judge Jones was appointed to the United States Court of Appeals for the 6th Circuit and took senior status in 1995. This is a fitting honor for two of Youngstown's most distinguished natives. I support this measure and urge our colleagues to support it.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to rise in support of H.R. 1359 and I appreciate our colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT), for bringing it forward. The bill designating the new courthouse and Federal building under construction as the Frank J. Battisti and Nathaniel R. Jones Federal Building and U.S. Courthouse is an appropriate recognition for these two native sons of Youngstown, Ohio, who have contributed diligence and excellence to the judicial system and dedicated their lives to preserving the notion of equal justice under law.

Judge Battisti was born and brought up in Youngstown, attended Ohio University in 1950, receiving his JD from Harvard Law School. He was an assistant Attorney General, law instructor at Youngstown State University and director of law in Youngstown. He was elected judge of Common Pleas Court in Mahoning County, Ohio. In 1991, he was appointed to the U.S. District Court of the Northern District of Ohio by President Kennedy; and in 1969, he became chief judge.

Judge Nathaniel Jones was also born and brought up in Youngstown, is a World War II veteran. His civic and public appointments include being director of the Fair Employment Practices Commission, and, as was referenced, Executive Director of the Mayor'S Human Rights Commission. He was appointed by Attorney General Robert Kennedy as assistant U.S. attorney for the Northern District of Ohio in Cleveland.

In 1969, Roy Wilkins, then executive director of the NAACP, asked Judge Jones to serve as the NAACP general counsel. He accepted that offer and served for a decade from 1969 to 1979, when he was appointed by President Carter to the U.S. Court of Appeals in the 6th Circuit.

Both gentlemen have been active in numerous community and civic affairs. They were personal friends and professional colleagues, and it is entirely fitting and proper that we support this bill in both of their names.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT), the sponsor of this legislation

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman of our subcommittee, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRANKS) and our ranking member, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. WISE). I want to thank the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER), and our ranking member of the full committee, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR). I want to give a special thanks to Rick Barnett and Susan Brita of the staffs, who do one of the finest jobs on one of the finest subcommittees of the House.

This is a great day for the Mahoning Valley and for the City of Youngstown. Both the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) have given many of the credits; and I will not go into those credits except to say this, one of the legacies of Judge Battisti is he is being credited with one of the first desegregations of a major city in the United States of America, that being Cleveland, Ohio. And the other significant aspect of this, as brought out by Judge Jones, his work with the NAACP and his work through several landmark cases with the Supreme Court to strike down segregation.

One thing I did not know when I submitted this bill, that this will be the first building, Federal building in the history of the United States, to be named after both a black and white jurist, two native sons of Youngstown, who have given of themselves and their lives to make America a better place to live and to bring all of the diverse ethnic people of our country together; not an easy task.

I am so very proud of Judge Battisti, who is deceased, having been appointed by President Kennedy; Nathaniel R. Jones, still alive and still very productive, having been appointed by President Carter.

This is a day of tribute to the people of Youngstown, to all of the Mahoning Valley, to all of the State of Ohio, and, Mr. Speaker, to all of America for their profound contributions in making America a better and safer place to live.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES).

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to have an opportunity to speak in support of this legislation. I am particularly proud because I personally have had an opportunity to get to know Judge Frank Battisti, as well as Judge Nathaniel R. Jones. I will not try and repeat either of the backgrounds of either of these great jurists. Coming from Cleveland, clearly both of them had a significant impact on my legal career and my time in political life.

I am particularly proud today to speak up on behalf of Judge Nathaniel R. Jones because my new chief of staff, Stephanie Jones, is the daughter of Judge Nathaniel R. Jones; and she is staffing with me today on the floor. So it gives me great pleasure to have a chance to come to the floor in support of this piece of legislation.

I want to congratulate my colleagues in moving to pass such a piece of legislation. I stand wholeheartedly in support.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I just want to commend our colleague, the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES) for having the foresight to hire a chief of staff named Stephanie Jones. If there is anyone named STEVE LATOURETTE, I guess I could go shopping for that as well. Mr.

Speaker, I would urge passage of the bill.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 1359, a bill to designate the Federal building and courthouse under construction in Youngstown, Ohio, as the Frank J. Battisti and Nathaniel R. Jones Federal Building and United States Courthouse.

This bill recognizes the careers, contributions, and friendship of two very distinguished worthy public servants.

Judge Battisti was a Youngstown native, born on October 4, 1922. He attended local schools and received his undergraduate degree from Ohio University in 1947, and his law degree from Harvard in 1950. From 1950 to 1953, he served as the Assistant Attorney General of Ohio. In 1961, President Kennedy appointed him to the position of Judge of the U.S. District Court of Northern Ohio, and in 1969 he became the Chief Judge.

While serving as a Federal judge, he played a courageous and central role in ending school segregation in Ohio.

In 1976, Judge Battisti was named ''Outstanding Trial Judge'' by the Association of Trial Lawyers of America.

Nathaniel R. Jones is also a native of Youngstown, born in 1926. He attended local public schools, and is a veteran of World War II, serving in the U.S. Army Air Corps. He received his law degree from Youngstown State University. Jones' career is highlighted by extensive devotion to human rights, and service to the civil rights movement.

Attorney General Robert Kennedy appointed him as Assistant U.S. Attorney for the Northern District of Ohio in Cleveland. In 1967, he was appointed by President Johnson to serve as Assistant Counsel to the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders, also known as the Kerner Commission. In 1969, Roy Wilkins asked Jones to serve as the NAACP's general counsel. Judge Jones held that position for over a decade.

In 1979, President Carter appointed him to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit.

In addition to his outstanding legal career, Judge Jones is very active in numerous civic and professional organizations, including the National Conference of Christians and Jews, and the Judicial Committee on Codes of Conduct.

It is fitting and proper to honor the lives, careers, and lasting contributions of these two gentlemen with this designation.

I urge all Members to support H.R. 1359.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1359.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

C.B. KING UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 1567) to designate the United States courthouse located at 223 Broad Street in Albany, Georgia, as the ''C. B. King United States Courthouse,'' as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 1567

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

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The United States courthouse located at 223 Broad Avenue in Albany, Georgia, shall be known and designated as the ''C.B. King United States Courthouse''.

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the United States courthouse referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''C.B. King United States Courthouse''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) and the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE).

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

Mr. Speaker, S. 1567, as amended, designates the United States Courthouse nearing completion in Albany, Georgia, as the C. B. King United States Courthouse. Chevene Bowers King was born in Albany, Georgia, in 1923. He ably served his country in the United States Navy.

Mr. King attended Fisk University in Nashville and earned his law degree from Case Western University. C. B. King was a cooperating attorney with the NAACP Legal Defense and Education Fund. King handled cases involving school discrimination, voting and political rights, the right to serve on juries free of discrimination and employment discrimination. King's legal actions led to the passage of the Jury Selection and Service Act of 1968.

King used the legal process to achieve significant civil rights accomplishments. This is a fitting honor for a distinguished civil rights leader. I support this measure and urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, it is, I think, appropriate for us to designate the United States Courthouse in Albany, Georgia, after one of Albany's great sons, C. B. King. As was referenced by my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE), in terms of his history there is one other little item. He did attend Tuskeegee for a year before he joined the Navy and went on to Fisk.

He is most remembered for his legal activism in the South. In Southwest Georgia, he became a leading civil rights attorney working closely with other lawyers from Macon, Atlanta, and Savannah. He believed in using the courts as an agent for change. He participated in numerous landmark civil rights cases, including cases to ensure the basic rights of American citizens to sit on juries free from racial discrimination. He was a firm believer in the provisions of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 that provided equal job opportunities for African Americans.

King was a superior legal scholar and an excellent orator. He joined scholarship with these oratorical skills to produce a powerful presence in courtrooms. It is most fitting that we honor C. B. King with this designation. I support the bill and commend our colleague, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP) for his diligence in pursuing this legislation.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of S. 1567, a bill to designate the courthouse in Albany, Georgia, as the ''C.B. King United States Courthouse.''

Chevene Bowers King was a native of Albany, Georgia, the third child in a middle-class African-American family. He attended local schools and attended Tuskeegee for a year before he decided to join the Navy. After his three years in the service, he enrolled at Fisk University. After graduating from college, he attended Case Western Reserve University, School of Law in Cleveland, Ohio.

Over the course of his career, C.B. King led the legal fight in the courts for civil rights in Albany, Georgia. Using his intimate knowledge of the court system, King was able to advance the cause of civil rights by defending his colleagues who participated in marches and sit-ins. He worked closely with the NAACP, and was the cooperating attorney with the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund. King played a key role in cases involving important civil rights issues such as school desegregation, voting rights, political rights, and employment discrimination.

King was also a pioneer in his community to advance employment opportunities for African Americans—encouraging people to move from low-skilled, low-paying jobs to high-paying, professional occupations that required advanced degrees. In particular, King firmly believed that courts were an agent for change and he strongly encouraged young African Americans to turn to the law for a career.

King was a devoted family man, husband, and father. His public career is marked with great success and his private life was enriched with family, children and friends.

It is fitting and proper to honor the significant contributions of C.B. King by designating the U.S. courthouse in Albany, Georgia, in his honor. The Gentleman from Georgia, Mr. BISHOP, has introduced a companion bill to the Senate bill that we consider today and I thank him for all of his efforts on behalf of this legislation.

I urge Members to support S. 1567.

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

Mr. LATOURETTE. 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 Ohio (Mr. LATourette) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 1567, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof)

the rules were suspended and the Senate bill, as amended, was passed.

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

''A bill to designate the United States courthouse located at 223 Broad Avenue in Albany, Georgia, as the 'C.B. King United States Courthouse'.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Con. Res. 278; H. Con. Res. 279, as amended; H. Con. Res. 281; H.R. 1359; H.R. 1605, as amended; H.R. 4052; and S. 1567, as amended, the measures just considered by the House.

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

There was no objection.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES CONCERNING PARTICIPATION OF EXTREMIST FPO IN GOVERNMENT OF AUSTRIA

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 429) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives concerning the participation of the extremist FPO in the Government of Austria.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 429

Whereas the extremist, racist, and xenophobic FPO has entered into a coalition agreement and is participating in the new Government of Austria;

Whereas the long-time-leader of the FPO, Joerg Haider, praised Adolf Hitler's ''sound employment policy'' and called Waffen SS veterans ''decent people with character who stuck to their belief through the strongest headwinds'';

Whereas Joerg Haider and his party in the recent election campaign decried the ''overforeignization'' of Austria, which was an expression that was coined and used by Nazi leaders;

Whereas at a time when the European Union, the United States, and other nations are working actively to discourage ethnic hatred in the republics of the former Yugoslavia and elsewhere, the FPO shamelessly appealed to racist sentiment and based its political campaign on racism and xenophobia;

Whereas in the past Joerg Haider and his party have expressed fundamental disagreement with the principles of freedom, democracy, and respect for human rights, which are the foundation of a modern, democratic, open, and tolerant Europe and which Austria, as a member of the European Union, is committed by treaty to uphold; and

Whereas the inclusion of the FPO in the Austrian governing coalition serves to legitimize and encourage the extreme right in other countries of Europe: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes the right of the Austrian people to express their political views through a democratic election, but also reaffirms the right and the obligation of the United States House of Representatives to express its opposition to the anti-democratic, racist and xenophobic views that have been expressed by Joerg Haider and other leaders of the FPO, and, because of these publicly expressed views, to state its opposition to the party's participation in the Austrian Government;

(2) condemns the insulting, racist, and xenophobic statements which have been made over many years by Joerg Haider, the long-time leader of the FPO, and by other leaders of the party;

(3) expresses profound regret and dismay that the FPO will play a major role in the new Government of Austria;

(4) commends the leaders of the European Union, the fourteen other member states of the European Union, Canada, Norway, and other countries which have expressed their serious concerns regarding the participation of the FPO in the Government of Austria;

(5) calls upon the President, the Secretary of State, and other officials and agencies of the United States Government to emphasize to Austrian Government officials our concern about the inclusion of any party in the Government of Austria, including the FPO, that has been associated with xenophobic, racist policies, and statements supportive of Nazi-era programs;

(6) urges Members of Congress to use any meetings with ministers and other political leaders of the Government of Austria to express concern for Austria's continued adherence to democratic standards and full respect for human rights;

(7) calls upon the Secretary of State to continue to scrutinize the policies of the new Government of Austria and to be prepared to take additional measures if circumstances so warrant; and

(8) directs the Clerk of the House to send a copy of this resolution to the Secretary of State with the request that it be forwarded to the President of Austria.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WEXLER) each will control 20 minutes.

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

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

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

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 429 was adopted by a voice vote by the Committee on International Relations. It places on the record the concern of the House about the inclusion of an extremist party in the government of Austria, formed at the beginning of the year.

I believe this is a fair and a balanced measure and I ask my colleagues to adopt it and also, since the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) is not here, I would insert in the RECORD his statement.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 429 places the House on record regarding our concerns over the participation of the extremist Freedom Party, the FPO, in the government of Austria that was recently formed. The former leader and founder of the FPO, Joerg Haider has propelled the FPO into the mainstream of Austrian politics by appealing to some of the frustrations of Austria's people. He has also capitalized on a large measure of dissatisfaction with the political status quo that was represented by Austria's traditional political establishment among the Austrian electorate.

Nevertheless, I join with the gentleman from California, Mr. LANTOS and my colleagues in condemning many of the statements that Joerg Haider has made, his demagogic attempts to stir up resentment of Austria's large immigrant community, and his apparent sympathies for Austria's tragic Nazi past.

This measure is balanced. It is aimed at the government of Austria and not at the people of Austria with many of whom I have enjoyed a close and enduring friendship. While we are expressing our concern, we are also withholding our final judgment with regard to the direction that the new government of Austria will pursue. We are calling upon our own government to make clear our concerns and to monitor Austrian policies so that if any further action on our part becomes necessary, we will be able to pursue it without delay.

Accordingly, I invite the support of my colleagues for H. Res. 429 so that Austrian officials will fully understand the depth of our concern.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of House Resolution 429, expressing the serious concerns of the United States Congress over the participation of the extremist Freedom Party in the Government of Austria. Unfortunately, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), who had every intention of leading this debate, was delayed in flight.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS) for introducing this timely resolution. Its content echoes the sentiment of many in the international community who are deeply disturbed by events taking place in Austria. I know many of my colleagues were shocked and dismayed on February 4, 2000, when we learned that despite massive international opposition, Thomas Klestil, Austria's President and leader of the People'S Party, swore in a new government that included the Freedom Party, a xenophobic, right-wing organization, led by Mr. Haider, a dangerous extremist known for praising aspects of the Nazi era.

The participation of the Freedom Party in the new Austrian government is deeply disturbing to all who remember recent European history. Mr. Haider has made several statements praising Adolf Hitler's orderly employment policies in lauding veterans of the Waffen SS as decent people of good character who stuck to their belief through the strongest headwinds.

Haider and the FPO campaigned on a policy of racism and xenophobia, urging an immediate halt to the immigration in Austria due to the over foreignization of Austria. Haider also waged a campaign to expel all foreign workers.

In 1997, he called for one-third of all foreigners to be sent home within 2

years. According to Haider, ''We take the right stand at the right time to save Austria against the dangers of the outside.''

□ 1500

The international community has responded strongly to the dangers posed by Mr. Haider and his party. Fourteen European Union members have banned bilateral contacts with Austria at the political level. They have also agreed to oppose Austrian candidates for positions in international organizations and have limited Austrian ambassadors to meetings on a technical level. Israel has withdrawn its ambassador in response to Haider's party joining the government.

The intense pressure and worldwide opposition placed on Austria played an important role in forcing Mr. Haider to resign as Freedom Party chairman on February 29. However, we should not be confused about the true intentions of Mr. Haider as they relate to his control over the Freedom Party. In his own words, Mr. Haider stressed that his move, and I quote, ''is not a withdrawal from politics.''

Sixty years ago, Adolph Hitler followed a path of power similar to that of Mr. Haider. He, too, played on fear and xenophobic racist policies. Unfortunately, Austrian President Klestil's decision to include the FOP is a victory for neo-Nazi and far-right groups all across Europe. The president of Austria and Mr. Haider must understand that the United States will not tolerate any government that violates the rights of ethnic and religious minorities.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 429. Congress must speak out wherever human rights and democracy are threatened, as they are unfortunately today threatened in Austria.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I will vote for H. Res. 429 because I agree that it is right and proper for this House to condemn the racist and xenophobic statements of Jeorg Haider, who until a few weeks ago was the leader of the Austrian Freedom Party. Mr. Haider's statements and political activity relating to Austria's past are alarming. Clearly, many in Austria have yet to come to grips with Austria's Nazi past. That Haider, a governor of a province and the head of a major political party, went to a reunion of SS veterans (and praised them) is unforgivable and should sound alarm bells.

In some of his statements that I have read, Haider is trying to create a moral equivalency between wartime deaths and destruction caused by the Allies during the war, and the crimes and mass genocide caused by Hitler and his henchmen (including many Austrians). This mindset is delusional. It deserves the forceful condemnation contained in this resolution, and I join the resolution's author, Mr. LANTOS, who could not be here today, in support of this resolution.

I see Haider as an Austrian version of David Duke, someone who is hiding his respect for an historic movement that was monstrously evil. This is obviously the result of nationalistic emotions that are totally negative and can have serious consequences, and thus should be of utmost concern. Yes, Haider is no Nazi. But yes, it is clear that he has sympathy for them.

While I agree with the part of this resolution condemning Mr. Haider's views, I am uncertain whether those views reflect the mindset of the Austrian Freedom Party or the people who voted for them. Furthermore, this resolution states that Haider and his party have ''expressed fundamental disagreement with the principles of freedom, democracy, and respect for human rights.'' I don't believe the evidence supports this charge. The reports that I have read indicate, on the contrary, that notwithstanding the reprehensible statements of its former leader, the Freedom Party is, in fact, a democratic party that supports freedom; and that where and when they have been in power, they have respected human rights.

The resolution also states that the Freedom Party has been associated with unspecified ''xenophobic, racist policies,'' not just statements. To the degree that that is true, then this Congress rightfully condemns whatever those policies are. However, many of us voting for this resolution, perhaps a majority voting for it, have no complaint with Austria running its own immigration policy in a way it believes consistent with the best interests of the Austrian people. Americans, especially this Californian, are proud of America's melting pot that includes people of every race, religion and ethnic background. Diversity and freedom is the culture of America. If other countries, like Austria, desire an immigration policy that maintains traditional patterns and culture, rather than becoming a melting pot like the United States, they have every right to immigration laws consistent with that goal. The immigration policies advocated by the Freedom Party, I would note, are very similar to the actual immigration laws of Israel, Switzerland, Australia, Japan and several other democratic countries. If it's not considered xenophobic and racist for Israel and Japan to have such laws, then it shouldn't be considered xenophobic and racist to propose them in Austria. Of course this resolution does not specify which policies are xenophobic and racist. If there are such policies, I certainly agree to condemning them.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution reaffirms that Austrian people have the right ''to express their political views through a democratic election.'' More than that, they have the right to choose who will govern them, even if we disagree with the people they choose. This House is the greatest representative body in the world. We would never suggest that an election not determine who governs a nation.

Yes, by all means, let's condemn the horrific statements of Mr. Haider and any racist or xenophobic policies that are part of the Austrian Freedom Party's agenda, if such policies are part of their agenda. But many of those voting for this resolution, again, perhaps a majority, are not attacking Austria. In this last four decades, Austria has had an exemplary record as far as a respect for human rights and democratic institutions. With vicious dictatorships and corrupt regimes abounding on this planet, it would be imprudent for this body to condemn Austria itself. However, it is clear from the words of Mr. Haider that a significant number have not come to grips with their country's part involvement with one of the most monstrous evils ever to threaten humankind. Any attempt to minimize this evil, to excuse the inexcusable, to portray the Nazi movement and those who participated in it, including Austrians, in any other way than despicable and bestial, deserves America's collective condemnation.

I was visited the other day by members of the Jewish War Veterans from my district. I am proud of them, along with the other members of the ''Saving Private Ryan'' generation, people like my father, who saved this world from Nazism and Japanese militarism. They then went on to stand up to and defeat Communism. Communism and Nazism were the twin evils of this century. To claim or imply a moral equivalency to our brave saviors of the World War II brave saviors of the World War II generation is an insult we will not bear. This resolution, while I don't agree with all of it, vocalizes our outrage at such rhetoric. I have joined with Mr. LANTOS many times in the past in condemning anti-Semitism, warning political forces in Hungary, Romania, Iran, Russia, and elsewhere that anti-Semitism will not be tolerated. Today, I join Mr. LANTOS in condemning an Austrian political leader's reprehensible and alarming statements minimizing the crimes and evils of the Nazis and their army and SS storm troopers. I ask my colleagues to join in on this condemnation.

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. BALLENGER, for managing this bill on behalf of the majority, and I want to thank my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Florida, Mr. WEXLER, for managing this bill on behalf of the minority. I also want to thank our colleagues who have cosponsored this resolution and helped bring it to the floor: Chairman BEN GILMAN of New York who cosponsored this resolution and brought it up for consideration in the International Relations Committee; Majority Leader DICK ARMEY of Texas who worked with me to bring this resolution to the floor of the House today for consideration. This resolution has been cosponsored by a number of our colleagues from both sides of the aisle and both sides of the political spectrum. I appreciate their endorsement and their strong support for the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution condemns the extremist, racist, and xenophobic statements and positions of leaders of the FPO party of Austria and expresses profound regret and dismay that the FPO will play a major role in the new government of Austria.

It is most appropriate for the House of Representatives to express our serious concern about the participation of such a political party in the government of Austria. Austria has a difficult background, and has had problems dealing with its legacy during World War II. Unlike Germany, Austria never underwent the ''de-Nazification'' process that took place in Germany after the war. Austria was treated as ''Hitler's first victim'' when, in fact, many Austrians were perpetrators of Nazi violence. As a young boy in neighboring Hungary, I saw the newsreels in 1938 of the Austrian people throwing flowers to German soldiers who marched into Austria at the time of the Anschluss. I saw few signs then that Austrians considered themselves ''victims.'' As historians have noted, Mr. Speaker, the proportion of Austrians who were members of the Nazi Party was higher than the proportion of Germans.

The unfortunate recent experience of the people of Austria electing Kurt Waldheim as

president of the republic after his deplorable Nazi past became known publicly, indicates the necessity and importance of dealing with instances of extremism and racism in Austria in particular. In view of this background, it is extremely important that the Congress make clear to the people of Austria and to the government of Austria that xenophobia, extremism, and racism have no place in a free and open and democratic society.

Mr. Speaker, other countries around the world have made known their disapproval of the inclusion of the FPO in the Austrian coalition government, and they have taken diplomatic action against Austria. The fourteen other member countries of the European Union—Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, and the United Kingdom—have limited diplomatic contacts with the new Austrian Government. The European Parliament, the Council of Ministers and the Commission of the European Union have all expressed opposition to the new government. Similar actions showing disapproval have been taken by other democratic countries, including Canada, Norway, and our own Administration. The ambassador of Israel has returned to Jerusalem.

Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize that this action by governments throughout Europe is not inspired by narrow political considerations. It is not simply center left governments in Europe condemning a political party on the right. In the European Parliament, the center right political faction, including representatives of the conservative German Christian Democratic Party, led the fight for the resolution condemning the participation of the FPO in the Austrian Government. The President of the European Parliament, Madame Nicole Fontaine, who is a member of the Center Right political faction of the European Parliament, expressed support for the adoption of the Parliament's resolution criticizing the FPO. The Resolution adopted by the European Parliament was practically unanimous.

Mr. Speaker, the concern of the European Union for the consequences of the FPO participating in the Austrian Government coalition are valid. A country such as Austria, which is a member of a union of European states which had adopted a common currency and which are regulated by common economic legislation, must avoid xenophobia and racism. Unfortunately, that is precisely the platform on which the FPO ran its last election campaign.

A disturbing element of this extremist campaign is the position that Joerg Haider, the former leader of the FPO, and the party itself have sought to minimize the Holocaust and the Crimes of the Nazi Era, and they have been remarkably public in their praise of Nazi Germany. In the past, Haider praised Adolf Hitler's ''sound employment policy'' during a debate in the Carinthian parliament. On another occasion, Haider called Waffen SS veterans ''decent people with character who stuck to their belief through the strongest headwinds.'' On yet another occasion, Haider called the Nazi death camps ''punishment camps.'' That glibly ignores the fact that a quarter of those killed in Nazi death camps were children, not capable of crimes. It is significant that the FPO was the only major Austrian political party which was not represented at the 50th anniversary of the liberation of the Mauthausen Nazi death camp a few years ago.

Mr. Speaker, I do want to make clear that the Resignation of Joerg Haider as leader of the FPO a few weeks ago does not change the necessity for this resolution. Haider remains the guiding light of the party. He is still the Governor of one of Austria's most populous provinces. The Deputy Speaker of the Austrian Parliament and a leader of the FPO, Thomas Prinzhorn, made the following statement after Haider's resignation: ''It is not a resignation. He [Haider] is a provincial governor and remains our strong man.'' It is a step backward which is necessary in order to make two solid steps forward.'' Haider's resignation from the post of party leader does not reflect any fundamental change whatsoever in the party's program.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution. It is important that the Congress of the United States make a clear and unequivocal statement on the issue of a xenophobic, racist, and extremist political party participating in the new coalition government of Austria.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that a White Paper on Joerg Haider and the Freedom Party (FPO) in Austria which I prepared for our colleague DANA ROHRABACHER be placed in the RECORD at this point. This includes an excellent analysis by the Anti-Defamation League of Haider and FPO policies and statements on racism and xenophobia. I think it is important to include this material in our debate today.

WHITE PAPER: JOERG HAIDER AND THE FREEDOM PARTY OF AUSTRIA—(FPO)

Reaction of the International Community—Statements by international leaders regarding the inclusion of the FPO in the Austrian coalition government.

ISRAELI PRIME MINISTER EHUD BARAK

''The inclusion of an extreme right-wing party . . . in the government of a European country such as Austria should outrage every citizen of the free world.'' (Reuters, ''What they said in row over Austrian Freedom Party,'' February 2, 2000)

GERMAN CHANCELLOR GERHARD SCHROEDER

''What he [Haider] said about the SS and about foreigners expresses a kind of thinking which to me is undemocratic.'' (Reuters, ''Haider 'undemocratic,' Germany's Schroeder Says,'' February 20, 2000.)

FRENCH PRIME MINISTER LIONEL JOSPIN

''The ideas of the Freedom Party are contradictory to the principles on which the European Union was founded . . . No, Haider's party is not a National Socialist party, but it is an extreme right-wing, xenophobic party, whose leader has in his time paid homage to Hitler, his labour policies and the Waffen SS.'' (Reuters, ''Jospin Says Austria Must Wake Up to Haider 'Threat,'" February 1, 2000.)

PORTUGUESE PRIME MINISTER ANTONIO GUTERRES

''It (the EU's sanctions against Austria) is a position that represents a symbol and a lesson for the world. It is a battle for the ideals of tolerance, opposition to xenophobia and against the mistreatment of foreigners in any country.'' (Reuters, ''What they say about Austria's Haider,'' February 1, 2000.)

POLISH FOREIGN MINISTER SPOKESMAN PIOTR DOBROWOLSKI

''What Haider says is dangerous, xenophobic . . . It brings back Europe's worst memories.'' (Reuters, ''What they say about Austria's Haider,'' February 1, 2000.)

LORD DAVID RUSSELL-JOHNSTON, HEAD OF THE PARLIAMENTARY ASSEMBLY OF THE COUNCIL OF EUROPE

''Haider is an opportunist who has, in the past, come often very close to or even crossed the boundaries of acceptability when it comes to the respect of our basic values of democracy, human rights and tolerance.'' (Reuters, ''Council of Europe Says Haider a Worry for Europe,'' February 2, 2000.)

AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE STATEMENT

''We are certain that Americans are appalled at this development and will consider what appropriate steps can be taken to impress upon Austria that it cannot invite extremist and racist groups into its new government with impunity and without penalty.'' (American Jewish Committee, ''Austria's Inclusion of Haider's Party in its Government Brings Deserved International Ostracism and Isolation,'' Press Release, February 4, 2000.)

ANTI-DEFAMATION LEAGUE STATEMENT

''Bringing Joerg Haider and his Freedom Party into the government is a disservice to Austria . . . It is astonishing that a significant portion of the population is ready to embrace a party and leadership that espouses xenophobic and nativist positions and statements.'' (Anti-Defamation League, ''ADL Reacts to Announcement that Haider and His Xenophobic Party May Join Austrian Government,'' Press Release, February 1, 2000.)

JOERG HAIDER—ANTI-IMMIGRANT STATEMENTS: DEFENDING NAZI POLICY AND NAZIS

(The following is an excerpt from Joerg Haider—The Rise of an Austrian Extreme Rightist, an Anti-Defamation League publication dated February 2000. For the complete text, go to http://www.adl.org/backgrounders/joerg__haider.html)

POLITICAL AGENDA

Xenophobic and racist sentiment have permeated Haider's political career.

ANTI-IMMIGRANT STATEMENTS

According to Haider, immigration offers no benefits to Austrian society. Rather, immigrants take jobs away from Austrians and bring in crime from Africa, Eastern Europe and elsewhere. His 1999 election campaign poster slogans include: ''Stop the foreign infiltration'' and ''Stop the abuse of asylum.'' Posters showing Haider and his prime ministerial candidate Thomas Prinzhorn say ''Two real Austrians.''

Other infamous Haider statements on immigrants include: ''The Africans who come here are drug dealers and they seduce our youth,''; ''We've got the Poles who concentrate on car theft,'' he claims. ''We've got the people from the former Yugoslavia who are burglary experts. We've got the Turks who are superbly organized in the heroin trade. And we've got the Russians who are experts in blackmail and mugging.''

In February 1993, Haider and the Freedom Party launched a twelve-point petition campaign for ending immigration and keeping the proportion of non-German speaking children in schools under 30%. Haider predicted he would get at least one million signatories. In what was viewed as a major defeat, the petition was signed by only 417,000, or 7.5% of the population.

During the 1994 election campaign, Haider's linkage of immigration and unemployment continued, causing the ruling coalition to accuse Haider of manipulating public fears over joblessness. Haider announced to Austrians ''we have to stop immigration until unemployment is reduced to under 5 percent,'' claiming that the unemployment rate was 5.8%. The official unemployment figure at that time was 4.4%.

In 1996, Haider called ''The government's so-called integration policy a disaster. They are ready to open the doors to another 153,000 foreigners who will take school places, training places and flats (apartments),'' Haider said. He continued, ''When Turkish children demand protection money from our children at the playground, it's time to say, this is our state,'' Haider declared.

Haider has continued to wage a xenophobic campaign to expel foreign workers. In March 1997, Haider stated that he wants one third of all foreigners working in Austria to be sent home over the next two years.

According to Haider, ''We take the right stand at the right time to save Austria against the dangers coming from outside.''

DEFENDING NAZI POLICY AND NAZIS

According to his critics, despite public disclaimers and overtures, Haider has a public record of defending the policies of Nazi Germany and of justifying individual actions during those years. Haider has utilized terminology reminiscent of the Nazis, announcing, for example in October 1990 a ''final solution to the farm question.'' Upon his election to the leadership of the Freedom Party, Haider rejected comparisons with the German Nazi Party, saying ''The Freedom Party is not the descendant of the National Socialist Party. If it were, we would have an absolute majority.''

Indeed, Haider first gained international attention in March 1986 during the controversy surrounding the return of Walter Reder, an Austrian born former major in the Nazi SS, who was freed by Italy from a life sentence he was serving for his role in the mass killing of Italian civilians in 1944. For Haider, the controversy was ridiculous, as Reder was ''a soldier who had done his duty.'' Dismissing Reder's wartime activities, Haider stated: ''If you are going to speak about war crimes, you should admit such crimes were committed by all sides.''

Haider's most infamous comment came during a July 1991 debate in the Carinthia provincial parliament, when Haider, then governor, declared: ''An orderly employment policy was carried out in the Third Reich, which the government in Vienna cannot manage,'' In face of a national and international uproar, Haider apologized for his remarks, but said ''What I said was a statement of fact: that in the Third Reich a large number of workplaces were created through an intensive employment policy and unemployment was thereby eliminated.'' Haider, of course, did not mention to particulars of Nazi labor policy, including military buildup, slave labor, and concentration camps. Recently, Haider defended his 1991 statement, claiming he was referring to Nazi policy between 1933 and 1936.

In May 1992, while the government was embroiled in a scandal involving a provincial government's decision to honor a gathering of Waffen SS veterans, Haider defended the decision. Haider instead accused the Interior Minister in Parliament of engaging in ''primitive attacks'' on ''respectable'' war veterans, while turning a blind eye to immigrant perpetrated crime.

More recently, Haider spoke out against the Austrian government's plans to compensate 30,000 Austrian victims of Nazi rule, including Jews, Communists and homosexuals, claiming that Austrian victims of the allies, such as civilians who fled Austria's occupation by US, Soviet, French and British troops, should also be compensated. As he told an elderly Austrian audience in April 1995, ''It is not fair if all the money from the tax coffers goes to Israel.'' However, when the Parliament voted in June to set up a $50 million compensation fund, Haider voted in its favor. Still insisting on the need for compensation for victims of the allies, Haider explained, ''But we do not intend to be petty. Even though you will not join us to widen the scope of the fund we will not vote against the bill. We too want to draw a line under a chapter we are also responsible for.''

In May 1995, the Freedom Party was the only major Austrian political party absent from ceremonies at Mauthausen death camp marking the 50th anniversary of the liberation of the camp. Just before the anniversary, Haider had referred to Mauthausen as a ''punishment camp,'' implying that those interred there were criminals.

While addressing the reunion of Waffen-SS veterans, Haider declared that the reason people opposed them was ''simply that in this world there are decent people who have character and who have stuck to their beliefs through the strongest headwinds and who remained true to their convictions until today.'' Haider's appearance at the ceremony was unknown until days before amateur videotape of the gathering was broadcast on German television in December 1995.

Following these revelations, Haider defended his appearance at the event, saying: ''The Waffen SS was a part of the Wehrmacht and hence it deserves all the honor and respect of the army in public life.'' ''Everything I said in that video was completely acceptable.'' ''I participated in this event and I don't see any reason not to. While I reject National Socialism, I certainly do not approve of the wholesale disparagement of the older war generation. I stand by this generation and I fight against the way it is disparaged.'' Haider claimed he did not know the Waffen SS had been branded a criminal organization by the post-war Nuremberg war crimes tribunal, adding: ''It doesn't interest me in the least.''

In December 1995, after viewing the video which captured Haider addressing and mingling with former SS officers, Austrian public prosecutors launched a criminal investigation into Haider's comments and speech on the basis of the law against reviving Nazism. Following the investigation by the public prosecutor's offices, the Austrian ministry of justice announced that it was to drop the proceedings because of insufficient grounds.

During the parliamentary debate in July 1998 on a proposed new law requiring applicants for Austrian citizenship to prove knowledge of German, Franz Larfer, an MP of the Freedom Party, used the word Umvolkung. This term was used by the Nazis to define the forced change of the ethnic composition of a population by immigration or compulsory transfer. This happened in Eastern Europe during the Nazi-period leading consequently to the annihilation of the inhabitants. The term is comparable to the expression ethnic cleansing.

In reaction to the use of this expression, members of the Austrian parliament booed and shouted and the session had to be interrupted. After Heinz Fischer, the president of the Austrian parliament, explained to Larfer the meaning of the word, Larfer returned to the microphone apologizing for applying it. As the media reported extensively on this incident, Haider defended Laufer's use of this term, and reiterated in a press conference the following day that his colleague was right in using this expression, explaining that the government applying a liberal immigration policy allows for extensive ''foreign infiltration,'' which subsequently leads to Umvolkung.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, before I begin, I would first like to thank Congressman LANTOS for taking the lead on this important Resolution.

As a survivor of the horrors of the Nazi regime, he knows better than anyone on the International Relations Committee or in this Congress the dangers of complacency. Congressman LANTOS knows that remaining silent when hate-mongers come to power is not an option. And I thank him again for his leadership and his dedication.

Mr. Speaker, everyone in this Congress has heard the comments made by Jorg Haider and leaders of the Freedom Party. Comments praising Hitler's policies. Statements praising the Waffen S.S. Assertions consistently blaming problems in Austria, including low employment, high taxes and the spread of disease on immigrants.

Mr. Haider's views are clear and his intentions are known. And his attempt to apologize each time he makes an offensive statement has grown as tiresome to me as his hateful statements. And although Mr. Haider has resigned his position, his party, the Freedom Party, remains in a coalition government in Austria with the People's Party. This must not be accepted.

That is why I have joined with Congressman LANTOS, Chairman GILMAN, Ranking Member GEJDENSON, another survivor of the Nazi era, and a number of my colleagues in introducing H. Res. 429. The House International Relations Committee has passed this Resolution and it is appropriate and necessary that the U.S. Congress put itself on record as disapproving of such a Government.

Once again, I would like to thank Congressman LANTOS for his leadership on this pressing issue, as well as Chairman GILMAN and Ranking Member GEJDENSON for their support.

I urge my colleagues to support this important Resolution.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 429.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Res. 429.

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

There was no objection.

MUTUAL FUND TAX AWARENESS ACT OF 2000

Mr. GILLMOR. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1089) to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to require the improved disclosure of after-tax returns regarding mutual fund performance, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1089

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 ''Mutual Fund Tax Awareness Act of 2000''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) Taxes can be the single biggest cost associated with mutual funds. The average stock fund investor has lost up to 3 percentage points of return every year to taxes.

(2) The average portfolio turnover rate for an actively managed (nonindex) fund has increased from 30 percent 20 years ago to almost 90 percent today, and average capital gains distributions of growth funds, per share, have more than doubled in the last 10 years.

(3) If a fund's performance is based mostly on short-term gains, investors can lose a significant part of their return to taxes.

(4) Performance figures that mutual funds generally disclose to their shareholders are net of fees and expenses, but not taxes, and therefore do not represent the impact taxes have on an investor's return.

(5) This disclosure focuses on how much money investors made before taxes, and not on how much money investors actually got to keep.

(6) Improved disclosure of the effect of taxes on mutual fund performance would allow shareholders to compare after-tax returns to raw performance, and would permit the investors to determine whether the fund manager tries to minimize tax consequences for shareholders.

(7) While the mutual fund prospectus details the average annual portfolio turnover rate, the prospectus may not expressly inform shareholders about the impact the portfolio turnover rate has on total returns.

SEC. 3. IMPROVEMENTS IN DISCLOSURE REQUIREMENTS.

Within 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission shall revise regulations under the Securities Act of 1933 and the Investment Company Act of 1940 to require, consistent with the protection of investors and the public interest, improved disclosure in investment company prospectuses or annual reports of after-tax returns to investors.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GILLMOR).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GILLMOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 1089, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

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

One of the most important changes in America in the last couple of decades has been the tremendous expansion of direct ownership by individuals of America's businesses.

More people than ever now have a direct stake in the profitability of American companies. In fact, 80 million Americans own stocks. Some of those 80 million own stocks in individuals companies, and many others own shares in mutual funds. Those 80 million shareholders represent half of America's households.

More and more Americans are utilizing mutual funds because of the ease of investing and for the diversification that they provide. Investors have done well in recent years in most mutual funds. But there is a major category of critical information that investors have not had access to in the past and generally do not have access to now.

I originally introduced this legislation 2 years ago to assure that investors could obtain access to that information. I am happy that the Committee on Commerce has by unanimous vote recommended this bill for passage, and that is why H.R. 1089 is before the body today.

Also, I want to thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY), the subcommittee chairman; the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY), the full committee chairman; as well as the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY), the ranking member, for their support of this legislation.

The critical information that I am talking about is the actual after-tax return of various funds. Without that information, it is almost impossible for investors to make a meaningful comparison of real returns between different funds. This bill provides for the Securities and Exchange Commission to require all funds to make this information available. All funds report their pre-tax returns; however, very few funds report their after-tax returns, which can be dramatically lower.

Because of the way different funds operate, the tax consequences and the real returns for an individual investor can vary tremendously from fund to fund. Some funds have very little turnover in the stocks they manage and, therefore, impose a relatively small tax burden on their investors. Other funds trade frequently. Each trade imposes some type of tax consequences on the investor.

Often, all of that frequent trading, which is sometimes called churning, does not even result in a higher pre-tax return. Certainly it results in a lower after-tax return. But that fact is seldom disclosed to a mutual fund investors.

This chart shows the hypothetical mutual fund return over a 1-year, 5-year, 10-year, 15-year and 20-year period using the average mutual fund return over the past several years of 16.4 percent per year. First, the investor never really sees that 16.4 percent. On average, 2.8 percent of that return goes to mutual fund fees and expenses, bringing the return down to 13.6 percent. Then one has in the average fund an additional 3 percent for the investor that goes for taxes. Factoring that in, the return drops to 10.6 percent.

Well, what does that mean in real dollars? It means a lot. Over a 20-year period, an initial investment of $10,000 at 16.4 percent grows to $208,000, which is represented by the yellow. However, when one takes out the fees and expenses, that shrinks to $128,000, represented by the red. Finally, after taxes, the investor is left with only $75,000, represented by the blue. In other words, over 20 years, the investor loses $133,000 of the $208,000 to costs and to taxes.

Now, this bill does not in any way tell the mutual fund what stocks to buy. It does not limit in any way the amount of trading a fund can do. All it says is that an investor should know the after-tax return as well as the pre-tax return when making an investment. This is the type of information a fund investor should have, but does not now generally receive. It is very difficult to make an intelligent investment decision without it.

The bill provides an important protection for investors by making available critical information which was not available before. It will also, I suspect, result in increased competition in the mutual fund industry.

Now, over the course of the 2 years since I introduced this legislation, I have worked with Securities and Exchange Commission Chairman Arthur Levitt and the commission as well as the mutual fund industry. I am encouraged by the responsible efforts of the mutual fund industry to improve after-tax disclosure.

I would like to commend both the industry and the SEC for the forward-looking approach that they have indicated they will be taking toward this problem.

I urge the Members to join me in approving H.R. 1089.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by complimenting the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GILLMOR). He has been a real national leader, looking at this whole area of how much information a mutual fund investor should receive just as a matter of course with regard to their investment and how much of what was managed by a mutual fund company over the preceding year had led to tax consequences for investors across the country. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GILLMOR) has been pressing on this issue for several years. Without question, today is a historic day because we are moving very close now with passage here today to this becoming a national law.

I want to commend the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) on the Democratic side, along with the gentleman from New York (Mr. TOWNS), ranking Democratic Member of the subcommittee, for their work on this issue, along with the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY) for the majority and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY), who is the subcommittee chair.

This has been put together in a bipartisan manner towards the goal of ensuring that all Americans, whether they be Democrat or Republican or liberal or conservative, have access to their tax obligations as a result of their mutual fund investment.

The bill that we are taking up today is one that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GILLMOR) and I introduced about 1½ years ago. It is something that occurred to us as an area that really did need some redressing.

Now, the good news is that, since the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GILLMOR) and I have introduced this legislation, the Securities and Exchange Commission has now taken an interest; and they in fact are now in the process of promulgating regulations in this area that are consistent with the objectives that the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GILLMOR) and I had in introducing the legislation. That is the good news. The legislation itself has prompted that kind of a discussion at the Securities and Exchange Commission.

The essence of the bill is that it requires the Securities and Exchange Commission to issue rules aimed at ensuring that mutual fund investors receive disclosure regarding the after-tax performance of their fund. This type of information, in combination with the other disclosures already required under Federal laws, can be very useful to investors in making fully informed investment decisions.

Capital gains taxes have a material effect upon the overall performance of a mutual fund. Information regarding the impact of such taxes is clearly material information which every investor in the United States should be entitled to receive.

In 1998, these are big numbers, Mr. Speaker. Mutual funds distributed approximately $166 billion in capital gains and $134 billion in taxable dividends.

So as we approach April 15th, as we approach tax day, mutual investors all around the country become acutely aware of the importance which capital gains taxes have on their personal investments and on whether they will owe Uncle Sam any additional taxes based on the gains their investments have made in the preceding year.

Indeed, we know today that the average domestic equity mutual fund has lost nearly 2½ percentage points per year to taxes on distribution of dividend and capital gains made to the fund shareholders.

In the last 5 years, it is estimated that investors in diversified U.S. stock funds surrendered an average of 15 percent of their annual gains to taxes. Fifteen percent of the annual gains for mutual fund investors just went to taxes in the way in which the funds were managed.

□ 1515

Clearly, taxes are one of the most significant costs of mutual fund investment, and investors need to have clear, comprehensive understandings of how, in fact, each one of the mutual fund companies are managing similar portfolios. Because then the consumer can select the fund which is more judiciously managing in order to avoid that tax incident for investors.

In pressing for better disclosure in this area, we recognize that disclosure regarding past tax performance, like all historical data regarding a fund's past performance, does not have precise predictive value. The past does not give us any indication of what is going to happen in the future. However, we do believe that such information is, nevertheless, important and useful to each investor so that they can have an idea of how a fund has been managed, and we believe that each prospectus should have that information. Since there are so many mutual funds out there with similar investment objectives, investors could evaluate key factors like overall performance, fees, and tax efficiency in choosing a particular fund.

So H.R. 1089 directs the SEC to issue rules within 1 year to provide mutual fund investors with disclosures regarding the tax-adjusted value of their mutual funds. It does not mandate the specific form or the content of such disclosures. Instead, the Gillmor-Markey bill gives the commission the flexibility to develop rules which are consistent with the public interest and the protection of investors following public notice and comment.

The SEC has submitted testimony on the bill in which it has stated that the Commission supports the goals of H.R. 1089. In fact, they have already issued draft disclosure rules which, again, seem to be consistent with the bill's objective. In adopting a final rule, the Commission should take into account the views of investors, the mutual fund industry, and other commentators regarding the precise form and content of the new disclosure requirements, but it should move forward quickly so that by next year mutual fund investors have this type of disclosure at hand.

In conclusion, my colleagues, this is a good bill. It is noncontroversial. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GILLMOR) and I, along with all the members of the committee, have worked out this Gillmor-Markey legislation in a way that ensures that there is no controversy. And the reason there is no controversy is that it is good for investors, and it is good for our financial markets. The more information which investors in our country are given access to, the more likely that we will have efficient and intelligent markets that are moving America's investment dollars towards those funds, towards those companies which are going to result in the highest degree of productivity for our society.

So, again, I want to bow in recognition of the great leadership of the gentleman from Ohio and to the chairman of the committee in moving this bill forward through the legislative process.

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

Mr. GILLMOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to once again express my appreciation to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) for his stalwart support of this legislation; as well as the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY); the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY); and the ranking members, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. TOWNS).

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

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to once again urge support of all Members for the Gillmor-Markey tax disclosure legislation.

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

Mr. GILLMOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to once again urge passage of the bill.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, today the House is considering H.R. 1089, the Mutual Fund Tax Awareness Act of 2000. This legislation, introduced by my friend and colleague, Mr. GILLMOR of Ohio, will benefit mutual fund investors by providing them with better information about the performance of their funds.

Presently, mutual fund companies list fund performance rates net of expenses and fees, with no consideration given to the taxes that fund investors must pay on a yearly basis. I believe it is important that investors be given information about the effect of taxes on their funds' performance.

The Gillmor legislation would change present law by requiring the S.E.C. to promulgate new regulations to improve disclosure of the effect of taxes on listed mutual fund rates of return. By doing so, investors will be able to shop around for a fund which best suits their needs. Individuals with large yearly capital losses can look for a fund with large capital gains distributions, as a means of offset. Individuals who do not wish large capital gains or ordinary income distributions will be able to opt for a fund specifically managed for tax efficiency purposes.

Some may say, ''Why is this bill necessary now?'' The S.E.C. is trying to accomplish the same purpose as this bill. I believe this bill is necessary because we must ensure that these regulations go into effect on a date certain. This legislation gives the S.E.C. 18 months to promulgate revised regulations. Mr. GILLMOR has worked with the S.E.C. for years, asking them to revise these regulations on their own, without Congressional action. It was only after Mr. GILLMOR was stymied at the administrative level that he pushed for enactment of this bill.

I know of no opposition to this legislation. Because it is so important to American investors that they have a better idea about the effect of taxes on listed rates of performance in mutual funds, I urge an ''aye'' vote on this bill.

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I urge the House to pass H.R. 1089, the Mutual Fund Tax Awareness Act of 2000.

In some form or another, 83 million Americans, or one in every other household, are invested in mutual funds. While many are invested in tax deferred accounts, through pensions, IRA's, or other retirement vehicles, millions are invested in taxable mutual funds.

That is, on a yearly basis, these shareholders must pay ordinary income and capital gains taxes on distributions they receive from their mutual funds.

Yet when present or prospective shareholders review annual fund performance results in annual reports or prospectuses, the rates of return listed do not account for the impact of taxes. This should not be the case. Given that the average fund loses almost three percentage points from their listed rates of return due to taxes, investors should be presented with information about how much money they got to keep, not how much money they received before paying the tax man. Only then will investors better be able to invest in mutual funds which best suit their needs.

To respond to this problem our colleague, Mr. GILLMOR, drafted this legislation before the House today. Among other things, this bill would require the SEC to revise their regulations to require that mutual fund companies list performance figures on an after-tax basis. While it is impossible to predict precisely the tax impact for every shareholder—because taxpayers are subject to differing federal and state tax rates due to their incomes—the information to be presented is highly informative nonetheless. Such information will allow shareholders to determine which funds are more tax efficient, enabling investors with tax concerns to opt for funds which best suit their tax needs.

Federal securities law has always focused on disclosure, and that is the objective of this bill. By providing investors with better information about their funds, investors will be empowered. I know that Mr. GILLMOR has worked with the SEC in developing this legislation, and that the SEC has responded on their own by issuing a proposed regulations which aims to do what the Gillmor bill does. It is important to pass the legislation before the House today to ensure that the final SEC rule is promulgated by a date certain.

I know of no opposition to this bill, and I urge the support of the House.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Mutual Fund Awareness Act of 2000. This Act will ensure that the mutual fund industry clearly discloses the performance and costs to investors on all funds. Improved methods of disclosing the after-tax effects of portfolio turnover on investment company returns to investors is a significant step in providing those who invest in our capital markets with all the information needed to make prudent investment decisions.

The Mutual Fund Tax Awareness Act would require the Securities and Exchange Commission to revise its regulations to improve methods of disclosing to investors in mutual fund prospectuses and annual reports the after-tax effects of portfolio turnover on mutual fund returns. While investment company disclosure regarding a fund's performance is conveyed net of fees and expenses, often the tax effects of a portfolio's activity are usually not included in released performance information. However, the tax consequences of mutual fund portfolio turnover may significantly effect the overall performance of an investor's fund selection.

During this age of often-volatile stock market trading days, the portfolio turnover rate for actively managed funds have increased during the 1990's, this activity has lead to an increase in the average capital gains distribution per share. This measure will enhance shareholder understanding of the impact taxes may have on fund performance.

Allowing the Securities and Exchange Commission to revise regulations pertaining to the mutual fund industry will also inform investors about the relative tax efficiencies of different funds and how much of a fund's reported pretax return will be paid by an investor in taxes. The Commerce Committee reported that taxes cut mutual fund returns by an average of more than 2.5 percentage points. This measure will permit investors to determine whether mutual fund managers try to minimize tax consequences for shareholders.

The transparency of American capital markets is crucial to our continued prosperity. I support efforts to enhance transparency and consumer protection. This is why I support the Mutual Fund Awareness Act of 2000.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GILLMOR) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1089, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. GILLMOR. 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.

AWARDING GOLD MEDAL TO FORMER PRESIDENT AND MRS. RONALD REAGAN IN RECOGNITION OF SERVICE TO NATION

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3591) to provide for the award of a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to former President Ronald Reagan and his wife Nancy Reagan in recognition of their service to the Nation.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3591

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

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) Both former President Ronald Reagan and his wife Nancy Reagan have distinguished records of public service to the United States, the American people, and the international community.

(2) As President, Ronald Reagan restored ''the great, confident roar of American progress, growth, and optimism'', a pledge which he made before elected to office.

(3) President Ronald Reagan's leadership was instrumental in uniting a divided world by bringing about an end to the cold war.

(4) The United States enjoyed sustained economic prosperity and employment growth during Ronald Reagan's presidency.

(5) President Ronald Reagan's wife Nancy not only served as a gracious First Lady but also as a proponent for preventing alcohol and drug use among the Nation's youth by championing the ''Just Say No'' campaign.

(6) Together, Ronald and Nancy Reagan dedicated their lives to promoting national pride and to bettering the quality of life in the United States and throughout the world.

SEC. 2. CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL.

(a) PRESENTATION AUTHORIZED.—The Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President Pro Tempore of the Senate shall make appropriate arrangements for the presentation, on behalf of the Congress, of a gold medal of appropriate design to former President Ronald Reagan and his wife Nancy Reagan in recognition of their service to the Nation.

(b) DESIGN AND STRIKING.—For the purpose of the presentation referred to in subsection (a), the Secretary of the Treasury (hereafter in this Act referred to as the ''Secretary'') shall strike a gold medal with suitable emblems, devices, and inscriptions, to be determined by the Secretary.

SEC. 3. DUPLICATE MEDALS.

Under such regulations as the Secretary may prescribe, the Secretary may strike and sell duplicates in bronze of the gold medal struck pursuant to section 2 at a price sufficient to cover the costs of the medals (including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, and overhead expenses) and the cost of the gold medal.

SEC. 4. NATIONAL MEDALS.

The medals struck under this Act are national medals for purposes of chapter 51 of title 31, United States Code.

SEC. 5. FUNDING AND PROCEEDS OF SALE.

(a) AUTHORIZATION.—There is hereby authorized to be charged against the United States Mint Public Enterprise Fund an amount not to exceed $30,000 to pay for the cost of the medals authorized by this Act.

(b) PROCEEDS OF SALE.—Amounts received from the sale of duplicate bronze medals under section 3 shall be deposited in the United States Mint Public Enterprise Fund.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS).

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS).

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS) who is the principal sponsor of the gold medal bill to honor President Ronald Reagan and Nancy Reagan.

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, first I would like to thank my colleague and friend, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Domestic and International Monetary Policy of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services for granting me this time to address this bill.

Mr. Speaker, in recognition of their distinguished record of service to the United States, I introduced, along with the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DUNN), H.R. 3591 to award a Congressional Gold Medal to former President Ronald Reagan and former First Lady Nancy Reagan.

The Congressional Gold Medal is considered the most distinguished form of recognition that Congress has bestowed. I wholeheartedly believe, as do

more than 290 of our colleagues, that the Congressional Gold Medal would be a fitting tribute to the dedicated service that Ronald and Nancy Reagan have given to our Nation.

Former President Ronald Reagan began his public life as a successful Hollywood actor. However, he always had an interest in politics; and, in 1966, he was elected governor of the great State of California by nearly a million votes.

As a popular two-term governor and, later, as President of the United States, Ronald Reagan was dedicated to encouraging economic growth, recognizing the value of hard work, and igniting the spirit, hope and pride among all Americans. He believed that everyone can rise as high and as far as their ability will take them. This principle became a guiding creed of Reagan's presidency as he successfully turned the tide of public cynicism and sparked a national renewal.

President Reagan fulfilled his pledge to restore the great confident roar of American progress, growth, and optimism. Americans, for the first time in a long time, Mr. Speaker, once again believed in the American Dream.

Standing by his side, President Reagan's wife Nancy served as a gracious First Lady and as a distinguished leader in her own right. While her husband served as governor of California, Mrs. Reagan made regular visits to hospitals and homes for the elderly, as well as to schools for physically and emotionally handicapped children.

As First Lady of the United States, Mrs. Reagan had the unique opportunity to expand her public service nationally. Perhaps her most notable and longest lasting achievement was her ''Just Say No'' campaign aimed at preventing alcohol and drug abuse among our youth.

Even today, Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Reagan continues to be an active public leader. As a champion for increasing funding for research on Alzheimer's disease, Mrs. Reagan has become a role model to all caregivers of Alzheimer's patients.

Together, the Reagans have dedicated much of their lives to our Nation. Their leadership and service extended well beyond President Reagan's tenure in office. It has been an honor for me to lead this effort of awarding the Congressional Gold Medal to this deserving couple.

I must admit that I have greatly enjoyed reading and hearing of the support and high praise that distinguished Americans and world leaders have expressed for Ronald and Nancy Reagan.

For example, Mr. Speaker, recently Mikhail Gorbachev wrote that President Reagan will ''go down in history as a man profoundly dedicated to his people and committed to the values of democracy and freedom.''

Former U.S. Senator Paul Laxalt recalled how President Reagan ''always placed doing what was right ahead of doing what was politically expedient.''

Finally, former Ambassador Jeane Kirkpatrick expressed how Nancy Reagan's dedication and grace in her role as First Lady were ''outstanding and uncompensated.''

H.R. 3591 provides the opportunity for this Congress to finally recognize the Reagans' extraordinary contributions to the United States and to say thank you.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend and give great credit for this legislation to my colleague from the 8th Congressional District of the State of Washington (Ms. DUNN). Her longstanding friendship with the Reagans gives this bill the great recognition it deserves and it gives great credit not only to her constituents but to all Americans.

It has been my pleasure to work with the gentlewoman from Washington and the chairman of the subcommittee on this piece of legislation. Mr. Speaker, I would urge passage of H.R. 3591, which will award the Congressional Gold Medal to former President and First Lady Ronald and Nancy Reagan.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the bonds that unite us as a Nation go far beyond the partisanship that we sometimes inevitably encounter in this House; and so it is appropriate today that this House, Republicans and Democrats alike, join together to honor former President Ronald Reagan and former First Lady Nancy Reagan through the awarding of a gold medal. The medal recognizes the dedication to public service of both the Reagans.

I personally remember President Reagan for many things, but primarily for being such a person of good will toward all. I really do not think he ever harbored any ill will toward any human being. And today we express our good will toward him and his wife. Most especially our prayers and good wishes for the good health and well-being go to them today.

Our House would be remiss if we did not highlight and acknowledge the important role and contribution to the Nation of former presidents, regardless of their party affiliation. And I look forward to working with Members in this Congress in a bipartisan spirit to honor the work in particular of former President Carter and his wife Rosalyn.

In this vein, I would like to acknowledge the efforts my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN), to honor President Carter with a gold medal through an impending introduction of a bill. It is my understanding that the chairman of the banking subcommittee of jurisdiction has expressed a willingness to cosponsor this bill when it is introduced, and I appreciate the bipartisan spirit in doing so.

In the next Congress, I would also look forward to considering honoring the work of our present President and First Lady.

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

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

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

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, Ronald Wilson Reagan became the 40th President of the United States on January 20, 1981. It was a time when America seemed to have lost hope as a result of the Vietnam War, the Watergate scandal, the oil crisis, and a failing economy. We were divided, drifting, and seemingly void of purpose. Then someone emerged who never doubted us or our destiny. That man, Ronald Reagan, personally embarked on a mission to restore hope in the American Dream.

He set forth two goals: First, revitalize the American economy and, second, rebuild our military capability and restore our position in world leadership.

□ 1530

President Reagan stood as an example of a selfless, optimistic, humorous, and visionary leader in the crucible of Washington politics. He gave generously of himself and encouraged all of us not to give up on the American dream and to dare to believe in it again.

I, for one, have missed his leadership, his confidence not only in his own abilities but in the American people, and his genuine what-you-see-is-what-you-get style, no airs, no pretensions. I suspect that a great many of the American people miss these values as well.

This is most notably demonstrated in this year's presidential campaign, where we see almost every candidate attempting to take up President Reagan's mantle of conservative leadership in order to gain the support of those who find themselves so drawn to Ronald Reagan and his wish that every dawn be a great new beginning for America and every evening bring us closer to that shining city upon a hill.

Many will remember President Reagan for turning around the American economic machine and leading us like Moses out of the barren desert sands of inflation, gas shortages, and unemployment. Others will remember him for restoring America to the leadership of the free world and challenging former Soviet President Gorbachev to ''tear down this wall.'' But, in the end, President Reagan will be remembered and honored most for his moral courage and his never yielding dedication to the ideals that have made this country great.

If today's historians looking back at the end of the 20th century get it right, they will surely say that Ronald Reagan, more than any other person, helped to restore the American dream.

What was the American dream for Ronald Reagan? In 1992, he expressed this is his wish, that all Americans never forget their heroic origins, never fail to seek divine guidance, and never lose their natural God-given optimism.

I must also mention the great strength provided by former First Lady Nancy Reagan with her constant presence in helping, advising, and protecting the President. It was fitting that the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS), in introducing this bill, sought to honor both President Reagan and First Lady Nancy Reagan.

Mrs. Reagan became a leader in the antidrug movement and worked tirelessly to educate the Nation's youth about the drug use. She coined the phrase ''just say no,'' which became the guiding phrase of our Nation's drug preventive efforts. Mrs. Reagan understood that the bully pulpit was a powerful tool in the war on drugs, and our Nation experienced a steady decline in teen drug use throughout the 1980s and early 1990s.

Today, as she consoles and strengthens President Reagan in his struggle with Alzheimer's, she has become a symbol of hope for all those who care for a loved one battling disease and illness.

Mrs. Reagan is certainly a model of courage for my mother, who must deal daily in caring for my father during his own battle with Alzheimer's.

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

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

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, how much time is there remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) has 9½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to join my colleagues today in support of this resolution that calls for honoring President and Mrs. Reagan with a Gold Medal.

I first met Ronald Reagan in 1966. That is when I was working as a young person, I was in school at the time, in his first gubernatorial campaign. I then worked in both of his presidential campaigns as an assistant press secretary, traveling with then candidate Reagan throughout the United States both in 1976 and in 1980.

After Reagan won the 1980 presidential campaign, I went with him to the White House, where I served as a special assistant and speech writer to the President for 7 years.

Let me note, as someone who was this close to Ronald Reagan for many, many, many years, I will just have to testify today that Ronald Reagan never let me down.

Far too often, people who get to know their heroes are dismayed when they get to know their heroes. They get to know them as people. And all of us, of course, are only human; and we have our personal defects, our strong points, and our weak points. Ronald Reagan was a human being, but he was a wonderful human being; and he never, ever disappointed me with a lack of conviction or a mean spirit.

Throughout the time I knew him all of those years, I knew him as a man of strong conviction and principle and a man of benevolence, a loving person, and a man with a very positive character, always on the upbeat, always looking for the positive way to approach problems rather than just lamenting the problems that existed. And that was driven home to me, his character, the first time I met him.

In fact, I had worked on his first gubernatorial campaign in the primary. They were going to eliminate Youth for Reagan. I had a hundred young people in my area, walking precincts, in 1966, in Reagan's first campaign primary campaign for governor. But there had been turmoil in Youth for Reagan, and they were going to eliminate it. So I decided I would talk to Ronald Reagan myself in order to save Youth for Reagan.

At 2:30 in the morning, I walked up to his house in Pacific Palisades. There were no guards there, unlike today, we can imagine candidates today; and I camped out on his back lawn.

At about 7 o'clock in the morning, Nancy's head came out of the back door and said, Who are you? I had a little sign that said, ''Mr. Reagan, please speak to me.'' She said, Who are you? I said, well, I work in his youth campaign and they are going to eliminate Youth for Reagan, and I need to talk to him for 2 minutes.

She said, If my husband comes out here, he is going to be late for the rest of the day because I know he will spend more than 2 minutes with you. I have got to think about him as a man. He is going to skip his breakfast. I just cannot have it. If you go down to the campaign office, I will arrange that you meet the campaign manager.

So how can I argue with a wife when she is protecting her husband? I started walking down that long driveway. And a few minutes later running after me, I hear these footsteps and there is Ronald Reagan with shaving cream on his face and his shirt is half off and he is waving to me and saying, Wait a minute, wait a minute. If you can camp out on my back lawn all night just to speak to me, I can spend a few minutes with you. Now, what is the problem, young man?

Well, that was Ronald Reagan. That was the Ronald Reagan I met then. That was the Ronald Reagan I knew for 30 years after that, the very same Ronald Reagan. And it was the very same Ronald Reagan that was very often castigated as just an actor, well, he is up there just giving speeches.

Having worked with Ronald Reagan, I can tell my colleagues he is a great writer. He is such a talented writer we always used to say that if he was not the President, he could be the President's speech writer.

In fact, he was a man that was not just reading his speech. He was a man that was setting direction for his administration, setting the goals for the free world. And nowhere was that greater brought home to me than during the conflict over Ronald Reagan's visit to Berlin and whether or not he should say, Tear down this wall, Mr. Gorbachev.

I worked with several speech writers with the President preparing for that trip to Europe. During that time, I will report to my colleagues today that Ronald Reagan was advised by all of his senior staff, all of his foreign policy advisors, including and especially Secretary of State Shultz, but all of his top senior foreign policy advisors begging him not to say, Mr. Gorbachev, if you really believe in democracy, tear down this wall.

The night before that speech, Ronald Reagan was approached by his national security advisors, saying they wanted him to give this speech, all of his senior advisors wanted him to give this speech, not the one he had. And all it was was the same speech minus, Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall. Ronald Reagan looked at it and said, well, no. I think I will use the one I have. Thank you.

Ronald Reagan made up his mind. He was courageous. He made the decision, not his advisors. That courage, that strength of conviction is what ended the Cold War, brought the Soviet Government down to its knees and said, no, we cannot withstand principled democracy, principled capitalism as Ronald Reagan is presenting to the world, and ended the Cold War without the nuclear holocaust we feared.

Ronald Reagan was a hero of America and mankind, all of humankind.

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

Mr. Speaker, 20 years ago, the United States was mired in an economic malaise. As a Nation, we were experiencing the worst economic chaos since the Great Depression. Interest rates were as high as 21 percent, making owning a home an impossible dream for most Americans. Inflation rates were 12½ percent. They ate into savings. We had an unemployment rate of 7½ percent. Eight million Americans were out of work.

We had oil shortages, a stagnant economy. And we even had something that economists said could never happen, high inflation at the same time as low economic growth. A new term had to be coined by economists. That term ''stagflation.''

To restore the economic vitality, President Reagan championed a four-point solution: reduce tax rates across the board, regulatory reform, slow the growth of Federal spending, and focus monetary policy on price stability.

As a result of his economic program, we had 92 straight months of economic expansion, the second longest period of peacetime economic growth in the history of the country; and, indeed, this was the start of a period of economic growth which, with the exception of a 9-month recession during the early 1990s, has continued to this day.

Foreign policy. Most of us remember President Reagan and his successes there. He had an aggressive foreign policy record that was distinguished by the fight against international terrorism and communism in Africa, Asia, and Central America.

Ronald Reagan squarely faced Soviet Union, called it the Evil Empire, and faced it down. He even dared to call upon Mikhail Gorbachev to tear down the Berlin Wall, something that no one felt possible. And it fell, along with Soviet Communism. He ended the Cold War and made history.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD a letter that I have received from Mikhail Gorbachev saying ''The award of the Gold Medal of the United States Congress to Ronald Reagan is a fitting tribute to the 40th President of the United States, who will go down in history as a man profoundly dedicated to his people and committed to the values of democracy and freedom.''

THE INTERNATIONAL FOUNDATION FOR SOCIO-ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL STUDIES (THE GORBACHEV FOUNDATION),

Moscow, March 15, 2000.

The following is the text of Mikhail Gorbachev's tribute to Ronald Reagan on the occasion of the award of the Congressional Gold Medal:

The award of the Gold Medal of U.S. Congress to Ronald Reagan is a fitting tribute to the fortieth president of the United States, who will go down in history as a man profoundly dedicated to his people and committed to the values of democracy and freedom.

Together with Ronald Reagan, we took the first, the most important steps to end the cold war and start real nuclear disarmament. It was not easy to break the ice of mistrust that had been building up for decades. But at our very first meeting in Geneva I felt the president's readiness for dialogue. This honest and respectful dialogue eventually bore fruit. The human rapport between us and our families continued after we completed our duties in government.

On this important occasion I salute Ronald Reagan. My warmest greetings to Nancy Reagan and members of the Reagan family, whose care and support have been so important to Ronald during the past few years. I am confident that succeeding generations will duly appreciate the accomplishments of President Reagan.

MIKHAIL GORBACHEV.

Mr. Speaker, Ronald Reagan's presidential legacy as the great communicator has continued even in his twilight years. As a victim to Alzheimer's disease, he comforted a Nation by saying, I now begin the journey that will lead me into the sunset of my life. I know that, for America, there will always be a bright dawn ahead.

He brought to the presidency a sense of confidence in the American way, restored U.S. pride, and reenergized America's leadership on the international front. Under his leadership, an entire Nation reawakened confident, optimistic, bold, and proud.

As one historian wrote, ''Reagan does not argue for American ideals, for American values. He embodies them.''

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure and an honor for me to be involved in this worthwhile effort to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Ronald and Nancy Reagan. I want to thank my colleague, JIM GIBBONS, for his effort on this important legislation.

Together, the President and First Lady selflessly dedicated years of their lives to lifting the American spirit and bettering the quality of life for every single American. I continue to be inspired by President Reagan's ideals of lower taxes, stronger families, limited government, and peace through strength.

In 1989, I had the opportunity to personally thank President Reagan for his contributions to America. That was shortly after the Berlin Wall fell and the land he once declared an evil empire began to finally dissolve.

The fall of the Soviet Union would not have been achieved had it not been for Ronald Reagan's insistence on a strong military. During his tenure in office, he boosted the morale of our military personnel by providing them with the equipment, training, and support they needed to be successful. By restoring our national defense, he protected democracy and rebuilt national pride.

President Reagan's policies helped lift us out of the malaise of the late 70s, when interest rates were in the 20 percent range, unemployment was at record highs, and inflation reached the double digits. The economy recovered, and more Americans were working than ever before.

President Reagan believed that cutting tax rates would increase, not shrink, Federal tax revenues, and he was right. in 1981, he worked with Congress in a bipartisan manner to turn his belief into law.

The unprecedented economic prosperity America is now experiencing is due in no small part to the idealistic spirit and the anchored beliefs that Ronald Reagan brought to his agenda as our President. Today, that historic bipartisan effort continues to be recognized as a defining achievement that fostered economic growth and human ingenuity to raise the quality of life in America.

Though he has withdrawn from public life, we will never forget his great achievements. They are evident all around us, and now is the right time for America to say thank you.

Some people have thanked him by naming airports, schools, and buildings after him. I have a son who is proud to carry his name. And here in Congress, we can begin by awarding the Congressional Gold Medal to our former President and his loyal First Lady who shared his burdens and his joys, Ronald and Nancy Reagan.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, today we celebrate the extraordinary career and inspirational life of President Ronald Wilson Reagan of California.

When Reagan stood on the steps of this Capitol on January 20, 1981 and took his oath of office, he assumed leadership of a nation that was suffering the worst recession in a half-century. He recognized his greatest challenge, and he stood before America that day and articulated his redemptive mission—to return the reins of government to the people.

He knew that the best way to revive the American economy would be to get government out of the way of American creativity. ''It is time to reawaken this industrial giant, to get government back within its means, and to lighten our punitive tax burden,'' he said on that January morning at the Capitol. ''And these will be our first priorities, and on these principles, there will be no compromise.''

President Reagan was able to lead America through the murky waters of recession. He was a forceful champion for breaking down barriers to trade, because he knew that once we removed the shackles from American business, it could compete successfully anywhere in the world.

And when he was done, the American economy had embarked upon the largest peacetime expansion in history.

He pushed America to compete on the international stage as well. Ronald Reagan took the Presidency of a nation that was uncertain in foreign policy because it was unmoored in principle. The Soviet Army, then a greater power than our own, was occupying Afghanistan and training in Cuba. We were unwilling to provide the leadership necessary to galvanize our Western allies in response to the menace.

President Reagan identified the imminent threat communism posed to our democracy and those across the world, and used his leadership to initiate the policies that led to its demise. He understood that the United States should deal with the Soviet Union from a position of strength. He had the extraordinary vision to conceive of a national missile defense. He provided the leadership to know that we needed to risk war in order to achieve a more lasting peace. And within a few short years of his last year in office, the Berlin Wall crumbled and communism had begun its inevitable march into the dustbin of history.

Though it will be hard to bestow upon our former President any honor greater than the honor he restored to our nation, we today honor President Reagan, and his wife Nancy, for the enduring inspiration provided by their shining example.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to join in supporting this legislation which will grant well-deserved recognition and appreciation to former President Ronald Reagan and former First Lady Nancy Reagan. Both are outstanding American citizens who have contributed so honorably and selflessly to our country.

This legislation authorizes the President to present to both Ronald and Nancy Reagan the Congressional gold medal in recognition of their outstanding accomplishments as President and First Lady.

For most of our colleagues in this chamber, Ronald Reagan is a hero and a living legend. He was a dedicated leader who came to office in 1980 seeking to restore growth, optimism, and confidence to our nation. He survived an assassination attack and remained undaunted in his quest to lead this great nation into prosperity. Ronald Reagan is a man of unparalleled integrity and is truly one of our greatest presidents. Our nation is forever grateful. We are indebted to them.

President Reagan's efforts to strengthen national defense restored a sense of national security and directly contributed to the end of the Cold War. He effectively fostered relations with the Soviet Union during a very turbulent and volatile time in international history. Through his active communication and frequent talks with Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev, President Reagan was able to successfully negotiate the INF treaty in 1987 which reduced the threat of nuclear war. It was that treaty coupled with an extraordinary defense buildup that ended the Cold War and made the world once again safe for democracy.

Through cooperation with Congress, President Reagan was able to cut taxes, curb inflation, and increase employment. His policies stimulated our economy and initiated the largest peace-time economic expansion in history. He revolutionized the role in which government plays in the lives of individual citizens. The American people showed their support and appreciation for President Reagan by reelecting him in the largest electoral landslide in history.

Mr. Speaker, Nancy Reagan's role as First Lady was gracious and elegant. She fought to restore values and decency to our nation. She effectively and tirelessly promoted the ''Just Say No'' Anti-Drug campaign and brought that issue to the national forefront. In 1985 she held a conference at the White House for the first ladies of 17 different countries to focus international attention on the Drug problem. She continues to work on her campaign to teach children to ''say no to drugs.'' Through these and other worthy efforts, Nancy Reagan has established herself as a national icon and an outstanding American.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to support this legislation in recognition of their service to our nation, and to congratulate both President and Nancy Reagan as we wish them good health and happiness in the days ahead.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 3591. At the same time, I am very supportive of President Reagan's publicly stated view of limiting the federal government to it's proper and constitutional role. In fact, I was one of only four sitting members of the United States House of Representatives who endorsed Ronald Reagan's candidacy for President in 1976. The United States enjoyed sustained economic prosperity and employment growth during Ronald Reagan's presidency.

I must, however, oppose the Gold Medal for Ronald and Nancy Reagan because appropriating $30,000 of taxpayer money is neither constitutional nor, in the spirit of Ronald Reagan's notion of the proper, limited role for the federal government.

Because of my continuing and uncompromising opposition to appropriations not authorized within the enumerated powers of the Constitution, I would maintain my resolve and commitment to the Constitution—a Constitution, which only last year, each Member of Congress, swore to uphold. In each of these instances, I offered to do a little more than uphold my constitutional oath.

In fact, as a means of demonstrating my personal regard and enthusiasm for Ronald Reagan's advocacy for limited government, I invited each of these colleagues to match my private, personal contribution of $100 which, if accepted by the 435 Members of the House of Representatives, would more than satisfy the $30,000 cost necessary to mint and award a gold medal to Ronald and Nancy Reagan. To me, it seemed a particularly good opportunity to demonstrate one's genuine convictions by spending one's own money rather that of the taxpayers who remain free to contribute, at their own discretion, to commemorate the work of the Reagans. For the record, not a single Representative who solicited my support for spending taxpayer's money, was willing to contribute their own money to demonstrate their generosity and allegiance to the Reagan's stated convictions.

It is, of course, very easy to be generous with the people's money.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3591.

The question was taken.

Mr. BACHUS. 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.

□ 1545

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BACHUS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 3591.

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

There was no objection.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE BALKANS TRADE MISSION MEMORIAL

(Mr. FARR of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, on April 3, 1996, the Department of Commerce suffered the greatest tragedy in its history when 35 people perished in a plane crash while conducting a trade mission to the Balkans.

Ronald H. Brown, then Secretary of Commerce, was leading a delegation of private sector businessmen and government officials on a trade mission to seek ways to implement the civilian aspects of the Dayton peace accords through trade ties and investment opportunities. Secretary Brown and his staff were accompanied by a group of chief executive officers of major companies who agreed to help restore Bosnia's buildings, its water and energy systems, its tourism and its banking system. The goal of the trip was to start our U.S. commercial presence, to start economic reconstruction and to include U.S. companies in the development of the region. It was a mission of hope for the war torn region and an opportunity for American business. The members of the trade mission thought they would be able to use the power of the American economy to help peace take hold in the Balkans. Their quest was cut short on an unwelcoming mountain in Croatia.

Today, the families of all of those victims of that crash gathered here in Washington to unveil a memorial, a memorial that is a lasting testimonial written by the families of those loved ones who were lost on that fateful day. I took part in the dedication of that memorial at the U.S. Department of Commerce.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the names of the people that were on that memorial and hope everyone will take advantage of visiting it in our beautiful Department of Commerce.

''All of them were so full of possibility, even as we grieve for what their lives might have been, let us celebrate what their lives were.''

President William Clinton

TRADE MISSION PARTICIPANTS

Staff Sergeant Gerald V. Aldrich II, Flight Mechanic, United States Air Force.

Niksa Antonini, Photographer, Republic of Croatia.

Dragica Lendic Bebek, Interpreter, Republic of Croatia.

Ronald H. Brown, Secretary of Commerce.

Duane R. Christian, Security Officer, United States Department of Commerce.

Barry L. Conrad, President and CEO, Barrington International Hospitality, Inc.

Paul Cushman III, Executive Vice President, Riggs Bank/CEO, Riggs International.

Adam N. Darling, Confidential Assistant, United States Department of Commerce.

Captain Ashley J. Davis, Pilot, United States Air Force.

Gail E. Dobert, Deputy Director, Office of Business Liaison, United States Department of Commerce.

Robert E. Donovan, President, ABB, Incorporated.

Claudio Elia, President and CEO, Anjou International and Air and Water Technologies.

Staff Sergeant Robert Farrington, Jr., Steward, United States Air Force.

David L. Ford, President, InterGuard Corporation.

Carol L. Hamilton, Press Secretary, United States Department of Commerce.

Kathryn E. Hoffman, Senior Advisor for Strategic Schuduling and Special Initiatives, United States Department of Commerce.

Lee F. Jackson, Executive Director, European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, United States Department of Treasury,

Stephen C. Kaminski, Senior Commercial Officer in Austria, United States and Foreign Commercial Service, United States Department of Commerce.

Kathryn E. Kellogg, Confidential Assistant, Office of Business Liaison, United States Department of Commerce.

Technical Sergeant Shelly A. Kelly, Steward, United States Air Force.

James M. Lewek, Economic Analyst, Central Intelligence Agency.

Frank A. Maier, President, Ensearch International Corporation.

Charles F. Meissner, Assistant Secretary for International Economic Policy, United States Department of Commerce.

William E. Morton, Deputy Assistant Secretary for International Economic Development, United States Department of Commerce.

Walter J. Murphy, Senior Vice President of Sales/Marketing, AT&T Submarine Systems, Inc.

Nathaniel C. Nash, New York Times, Frankfurt Bureau Chief.

Lawrence M. Payne, Special Assistant, United States and Foreign Commercial Service, United States Department of Commerce.

Leonard J. Pieroni, Jr., Chairman and CEO, Parsons Corporation.

John A. Scoville, Chairman, Harza Engineering Company.

Captain Timothy W. Shafer, Pilot, United States Air Force.

I. Donald Terner, President, Bridge Housing Corporation.

P. Stuart Tholan, President, Bechtel-Europe, Africa, Middle East, Southwest Asia.

Technical Sergeant Cheryl A. Turnage, Steward, United States Air Force.

Naomi P. Warbasse, Deputy Director, Central and Eastern Europe Business Information Center, United States Department of Commerce.

Robert A. Whittaker, Chairman and CEO, Foster Wheeler Energy International.

ADAM NOEL DARLING

Adam was born on December 20, 1966, in Livermore, California . . . As my universe grows infinitely larger, may my loyalty to beloved friends grow dearer. As the world becomes exponentially complex, may my passion for the truth fathom its extremities. As the pursuit of peace grows costly and elusive, steel my resolve . . . Temper my candor with kindness, my directness with humor. Guard me from the temptation to substitute personal devotion for the simple truth, and save me from sacrificing the life of one friend or foe for abstract principle or selfish ambition. Make me at home with prime ministers and farm workers alike in order that power may be less arrogant and the humble may know the power of their true worth . . . May I take no notice of another's deliberate smallness, nor make one decision from fear, nor withhold my resources in stinginess. In defeat liberate me in expansive faithfulness and in victory delivery me from devaluing large principles by personal meanness . . . Let me spurn accolades that I may be truly honorable. Let me aspire to the vision of youth that I may be always young. Let me respect and receive the patience of my grandfather that I may be wise, the tenacity of my grandmother that I may endure, the love of my parents that I may be at home at the heart of the universe, the devotion of my sister and my niece that I may have a future, the joy of my brother that I may dance with him forever . . . And in the end may I be swept away in the infinite fierce tenderness of true love . . . Adam was serving as Confidential Assistant to Secretary Ron Brown while on this trade mission to Bosnia. In 1994, Adam was appointed Speech Writer and Confidential Assistant to David Barram, Deputy Secretary of Commerce, traveling throughout Asia, Australia, Canada, and the U.S. Previously, he was International Trade Administration Deputy Public Affairs Director. In 1991–92, Adam worked in the German Bundestag as a Carl Duisberg Fellow . . . ''I want to renovate the homes, refurbish the schools, retool the factories, and rededicate the churches of American cities. I now know that rebuilding America's cities will be my life's passion and my life's work. I have a special talent for this work and therefore a responsibility to do it.''

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). 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 47 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6 p.m.

□ 1800

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT) at 6 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.

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. 1089, by the yeas and nays; and

H.R. 3591, 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.

MUTUAL FUND TAX AWARENESS ACT OF 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 1089, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GILLMOR) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1089, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 358, nays 2, not voting 74, as follows:

[Roll No. 96]

YEAS—358

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth-Hage
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Combest
Condit
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Morella
Nadler
Napolitano
Nethercutt
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Sununu
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)

NAYS—2

Paul
Sanford

NOT VOTING—74

Barton
Berman
Borski
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Callahan
Campbell
Cannon
Carson
Coburn
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Coyne
Crane
Davis (FL)
Diaz-Balart
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Eshoo
Fattah
Fowler
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Gonzalez
Goodling
Graham
Greenwood
Hansen
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hobson
Hunter
Kilpatrick
Klink
Lampson
Lofgren
Manzullo
Martinez
McCollum
McIntosh
Miller, George
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Myrick
Neal
Northup
Ortiz
Owens
Payne
Pelosi
Pickering
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Rahall
Rangel

Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Scarborough
Shows
Shuster
Souder
Stupak
Sweeney
Taylor (NC)
Thurman
Vento
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (PA)
Weygand
Wise
Young (FL)

□ 1826

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

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on the additional motion to suspend the rules on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

AWARDING GOLD MEDAL TO FORMER PRESIDENT AND MRS. RONALD REAGAN IN RECOGNITION OF THEIR SERVICE TO THE NATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is on the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 3591.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BACHUS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3591, 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 350, nays 8, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 75, as follows:

[Roll No. 97]

YEAS—350

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth-Hage
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Combest
Condit
Costello
Cox
Cramer
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E.B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
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
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Morella
Napolitano
Nethercutt
Ney
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Sununu
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)

NAYS—8

Clay
Hastings (FL)
Lee
Meeks (NY)
Nadler
Paul
Stark
Waters

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Gutierrez

NOT VOTING—75

Barton
Berman
Borski
Brady (PA)
Brown (OH)
Callahan
Campbell
Cannon
Carson
Coburn
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Coyne
Crane
Davis (FL)
Diaz-Balart
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Eshoo
Fattah
Fowler
Franks (NJ)
Frost
Gonzalez
Goodling
Graham
Greenwood
Hansen
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hobson
Hunter
Kilpatrick
Klink
Lampson
Lofgren
Manzullo
Martinez
McCollum
McIntosh
Miller, George
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Myrick
Neal
Northup
Ortiz
Owens
Payne
Pelosi
Pickering
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Rahall
Rangel
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Scarborough
Shows
Shuster
Souder
Stupak
Sweeney
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thurman
Vento
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (PA)
Weygand
Wise
Young (FL)

□ 1835

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.

Stated for:

Mr. THOMAS. Madam Speaker, on rollcall No. 97. I was inadvertently detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. KILPATRICK. Madam Speaker, due to official business in the 15th Congressional District of Michigan, I was unable to record my vote for several measures considered today in the U.S. House of Representatives. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye'' on roll call no. 96, H.R. 1089, the Mutual Fund Tax Awareness Act; and ''aye'' on roll call no. 97, H.R. 3591, to Award the Congressional Gold Medal to Former President Ronald Reagan And Nancy Reagan In Recognition Of Their Service To The Nation.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, again due to a USAIR flight cancellation, I was unavoidably detained in North Carolina and unable to cast a vote on rollcall votes 96 and 97. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea'' on rollcall vote 96, On the Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, As Amended, H.R. 1089, the Mutual Fund Tax Awareness Act. I would have voted ''yea'' on roll call vote 97, On the Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass H.R. 3591, to award the Congressional gold medal to former President Ronald Reagan and his wife Nancy Reagan. I ask unanimous consent that the permanent record reflect these intended votes.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2418

Mr. HINCHEY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor from the bill, H.R. 2418.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. MCNULTY. Madam Speaker, due to a prior commitment back in my congressional district March 30, I missed rollcall votes 94 and 95. Had I been present and voting, I would have voted ''yes'' on rollcall vote 94, the motion to recommit on H.R. 3908, and ''no'' on rollcall vote 95, the vote on final passage for H.R. 3908.

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.

CONGRATULATING UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT WOMEN'S BASKETBALL TEAM ON WINNING 2000 NCAA NATIONAL CHAMPIONSHIP

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

Mr. GEJDENSON. Madam Speaker, this is a spectacular day for all of us from Connecticut, but I am fortunate enough to have the University of Connecticut stars in my district. I think as almost everybody saw last night, winning the 2000 NCAA national championship and beating the Tennessee Lady Volunteers 71 to 52, another great team with a spectacular record; but our team last night clearly controlled every aspect of the game, dominated both offense and defense. The margin of victory was the second largest in women's tournament history, a total team effort and really an astounding season with 36 wins and only 1 loss.

There were outstanding contributions by all of the players: Shea Ralph, Svetlana Abrosimova, Sue Bird, Swin Cash, Kelley Schumacher, Asjha Jones, and Tamika Williams.

Congratulations also to our great coach, Gino Auriemma, head coach; Chris Daily, associate head coach; Tony Cardoza, assistant coach; and Jamelle Elliott, another assistant coach.

UConn Huskies have done really an outstanding job through the 1990s. National championships include an undefeated season 1994 to 1995, eight Big East championships, including seven straight NCAA tournament appearances every year, 313 victories, second only to Tennessee that we were lucky enough and able enough to beat last night.

Husky fans really are the best fans in the Nation. We have had a spectacular time.

To Coach Gino and all the women there, really an outstanding season and a great lift to the State.

SACAJAWEA GOLDEN DOLLAR

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

Mr. METCALF. Madam Speaker, in 1997, Congress passed long overdue legislation to place in circulation a new $1 coin. Congress required that the new coin have a different edge, design, and color than the unsuccessful Susan B. Anthony $1 coin. The Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with Congress, was required to select the design for the new $1 coin.

The U.S. Mint conducted an extensive public outreach program in selecting the final coin design. This included public hearings, broadcast on C-SPAN, focus groups, public coin design exhibits, extensive print media requests for comments, and over 130,000 letters, faxes, and e-mails.

The result is simply outstanding. The new coin is golden in color with a smooth edge, and on the face of the coin is a picture of Sacajawea, the Native American woman who aided the Lewis and Clark expedition.

The public's demand for the new Sacajawea golden dollar is unprecedented. Since its release January 26, 300 million golden dollars have been purchased. In 14 weeks, there will be 500 million golden dollars in circulation. It took the Susan B. Anthony dollar 14 years to create the demand for 500 million coins.

I commend the U.S. Mint for this incredible success in proving that the public truly does want a dollar coin. To meet this enormous demand for the new coin, the United States Mint has done a terrific job of accelerating their production and shipment.

Recently, I had the honor of visiting the Philadelphia Mint, which employs 800 men and women who make this all happen. We watched the dollar coins coming through the stamping process. The Mint has doubled their production to 5.25, that is 5¼, million golden dollars a day by running 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. Because of their hard work, the U.S. Mint will be able to produce 1 billion coins by the end of the year.

Now, that is good news for taxpayers. But most people do not realize how good the news really is. It only costs the Mint 12 cents to make a Sacajawea golden dollar. Then the U.S. Mint sells the coins to the banks for full value, one full dollar. The result is a direct profit to the U.S. Treasury of 88 cents on every coin issued. At the end of this year, when 1 billion golden dollars are in circulation, the United States Treasury will have made a profit of $880 million.

This profit will be eligible to reduce our $5.7 trillion national debt. That is right. The Treasury makes a profit from issuing coins which helps lower the debt of our Nation. Yes, my colleagues heard correctly, a government department that makes a profit.

IN SUPPORT OF H.R. 4081, EDTEC

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

Mr. KIND. Madam Speaker, as this Nation forges ahead into the 21st century, our children's education must keep pace with the rigors and demands of the information age and the new economy.

In recent years, our Nation's schools have been doing a good job of acquiring technology like computers, information technology networks, and the Internet access. Now as schools continue their efforts in acquiring and updating technology this allows time to focus on the result of these efforts, student education and achievement.

□ 1845

To help schools teach with technology, I, along with the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY) and 17 other members of the new Democratic coalition, have introduced H.R. 4081, the Education Technology Enhances Classrooms Act, or EdTEC for short. EdTEC updates and reauthorizes the very successful and popular Technology Literacy Challenge Fund contained in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. EdTEC maintains the core elements of the Technology Literacy Challenge Fund but focuses new attention on integrating technology and classroom curriculum and also addresses a growing and troublesome trend: the digital divide.

EdTEC provides valuable framework for States and school districts to create and update their plans for education technology purchases, selftraining and development, and, now, student learning. Teachers will be given more tools and guidance to actually use technology to teach core academic subjects.

Computers, networks, and Internet connections will not be used merely as research tools or for demonstrations. In the 21st century, students must learn with technology and do homework with technology just as they have always used encyclopedias, dictionaries, periodicals, and textbooks. Access and use of technology today is as important as the blackboard and chalk were to teaching in the past.

EdTEC also works toward closing the digital divide by targeting Federal dollars to schools most in need. For example, even with Federal and State resources dedicated to technology acquisition, in 1998, only 39 percent of classrooms in high poverty schools had Internet access. In contrast, 62 percent of classrooms in low poverty schools had Internet access. EdTEC focuses funds first on disadvantaged schools in cities, small towns, and rural communities according to poverty and high need.

Our Nation's schools have been working hard to provide their students with access to technology. The Federal Government, through the Technology Literacy Challenge Fund, has been instrumental in leveraging the resources of local communities to acquire that

technology. In fact, since the inception of the Fund, the computer-to-student ratio has been reduced from 27 to 1 down to 14 to 1.

Nevertheless, we are at a point where most teachers report that they do not feel sufficiently trained on the use of technology in the classroom, and they do not have enough knowledge about what is available to them for teaching with technology. According to recent studies, only 20 percent of teachers report feeling very well prepared to use technology education as part of their teaching method. That is just way too low.

Students, in many instances, are more comfortable with the use of technology than their teachers and parents, but they do not always have access to technology resources at school which will actually capture their attention and enhance their learning. According to a recent survey conducted by the National School Boards Foundation and Children's Television Workshop, 53 percent of parents in households connected to the Internet report their children primarily use their home Net connection for school work. Forty-three percent of kids between the ages of 9 and 17 say their outlook about school has improved with access to the Internet.

This is important because education experts and children alike tell us that we must continue to find ways to challenge our children, to engage their creativity, to expand their interests, and, frankly, to simply fight off boredom in the classroom. The use of technology helps do that.

Our bill, EdTEC, will continue the important Federal investment in education technology. It provides States and schools with important funds and guidance in formulating technology education plans while focusing on the integration of technology and curriculum and closing the digital divide. This new century and our new economy demands our children are experienced and equipped to use the technology that is all around us. EdTEC will help our schools continue to move in that direction and ensure that our children can learn at the speed of change in the 21st century.

Madam Speaker, I want to call upon my colleagues to take a close and serious look at this legislation as we move forward with the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in this session of Congress.

INCREASING THE MINIMUM WAGE

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

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, several weeks ago the House debated, and passed, a bill to increase the minimum wage. Unfortunately, I was unable to get to the floor to participate in the debate. But I want to revisit the issue today, so that I can share with you a constituent letter I received from a small business owner in Kinston, North Carolina.

Madam Speaker, Ken Moore is an example of an entrepreneur who, without interference from the government, started a business with a single restaurant in 1991, and now has 39 locations throughout Eastern North Carolina. And along the way, he has shared his success by extending opportunities to his employees.

When Mr. Moore learned that the House would be debating a minimum wage increase, he sent me a letter to share how the mandate would affect his small business and communities throughout Eastern North Carolina. I wanted to share part of his letter with the Congress.

Madam Speaker, Mr. Moore wrote, and I quote:

Congressman Jones:

I started Andy's in March of 1991 in Goldsboro, North Carolina. As of today, we have grown to 39 locations throughout Eastern North Carolina and have another six locations under construction.

The reason for our success has always been because we give our hourly associates the opportunity to own an Andy's restaurant. We have never looked for outside investors, preferring to train our people and give them the opportunity to operate and eventually own their business. We call this ''starting at the minimum and earning the maximum.'' We now have many success stories throughout our company achieved through this philosophy.

The unfunded mandate of minimum wage put in place by Washington will hurt our business, associates, and neighbors in Eastern North Carolina.

We conducted a survey of nearly 700 employees and found only two earning minimum wage that were the primary wage earners for their family. These happen to be single moms who already receive some government assistance.

Two out of the 700 makes a mockery out of the political line that families can't exist on minimum wage. The much-touted family of four making minimum wage and trying to subsist doesn't exist, at least not within Andy's.

We don't believe that America is about handouts, but is based on hard work and persistence. These are the values we strive to teach our associates.

An increase in the minimum wage will mean an increase in prices, something which I don't want to do. Minimum wage increases invariably cause us to lay some people off and delay hiring new folks. This is sad, but simply the truth.

I would like all politicians in favor of increasing the minimum wage to simply tell the truth. Increasing the minimum wage is a tax increase, period.

Madam Speaker, I will include the entire text of the letter in the RECORD.

Madam Speaker, Ken Moore is just one of thousands of small business owners across this country, who recognize the effects an increase in the minimum wage will have on their businesses, and their communities. I appreciate the opportunity to share Mr. Moore's story. Because I believe that his concerns are shared by many small business owners across the country.

THE LITTLE MINT, INC.,
Kinston, NC, March 7, 2000.

Re Minimum wage increase.

To: Walter B. Jones, Jr.
From: Kenneth K. Moore

I started Andy's in March of 1991 in Goldsboro, NC. As of today we have grown to 39 locations throughout Eastern NC and have another 6 locations under construction. The reason for our success has always been because we give our hourly associates the opportunity to own an Andy's restaurant. We have never looked for outside investors, preferring to train our people and give them the opportunity to operate and eventually own their business. We call this ''starting at the minimum and earning the maximum.'' We now have many success stories throughout our company achieved through this philosophy.

Eastern NC is a rural area that has been through much during the past year. We have been rocked by hurricanes and floods during their aftermath. Our home is not a wealthy area. However, our people are the salt of the earth and work very hard to pay taxes and raise good children.

Eastern NC economy is predominately agriculturally based and with tobacco taking a beating in the press and in Washington many farmers have turned to pork production. Our state government has now placed a moratorium on that. At Andy's, we understand our neighbor's plight and have only raised prices in our stores twice in 9 years. Both times have been due to minimum wage increases. As you can tell, we are trying to do our part.

The unfunded mandate of minimum wage put in place by Washington will hurt our businesses, associates, and neighbors in Eastern NC. We conducted a survey of nearly our 700 employees and found only 2 earning minimum wage that were the primary wage earners for their family. These happen to be single moms who already receive some government assistance. Two out of the 700 makes a mockery out of the political line that families can't exist on minimum wage. The much-touted family of four making minimum wage and trying to subsist doesn't exist, at least not within Andy's.

Andy's has had very little employee turnover because we give people the opportunity to grow. Even the teenagers who comprise the vast amount of our minimum wage earners don't leave us. We have a yearly banquet at which we strive to inspire and motivate them to grow into solid citizens. We give scholarships and awards. We also continued to pay our minimum wage earners after the restaurants were flooded in the wake of Hurricane Floyd. All we asked them to do was to volunteer to help out in their local shelters. We teach our young people that there is already an increase in the minimum wage. It is called doing a good job!

We don't believe that America is about handouts but is based on hard work and persistence. These are the values we strive to teach our associates. An increase in the minimum wage will mean an increase in prices, something which I don't want to do. Minimum wage increases invariably cause us to lay some people off and delay hiring new folks. This is sad, but simply the truth.

I would like all politicians in favor of increasing the minimum wage to simply tell the truth. Increasing the minimum wage is a tax increase, period. The increase is simply another way for the government to make 15.6 cents on every dollar. If you truly want to help teenagers make more money, then waive the playoff taxes on the increase. If the truth be told the increase makes for great reelection material, doesn't it?

I remember a young lady who worked for me when I first started my business some years ago. She is now an elementary school teacher and a wonderful person. I saw her not long ago and we reminisced about a Chrismas Party we had in my original location in 1993. I didn't have the money for Christmas gifts for my small crew, so I gave each one a card with a personal note. As I was reminding her of this she stopped me

and reached for her purse, opening her wallet and produced the note from that night (6 years later). I wonder if she would have saved a pay stub with a minimum wage increase?

Folks, there is more to running a business than a lot of you may think. With an increase in wages, hiring will cease, and perhaps we will not be able to touch the life of some young person as I did years ago. I live and work in Eastern NC and I am proud to do business here. Please let me do it my way. Our friends, neighbors, and associates live in towns with names such as Beulaville, Kenansville, Mt. Olive, Kinston and Grifton, not Camelot.

Thanks,

KENNETH K. MOORE,
President/Founder.

THE CENSUS

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

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Madam Speaker, tonight is a very important evening because the University of Florida Gators will become the national champions in basketball. It is very exciting for someone who graduated from the University of Florida many years ago to see an exciting young team of freshmen and sophomores that are going to be successful against the supposedly more experienced team from Michigan State. So it will be an exciting evening, and I am looking forward to it.

But I am actually rising tonight, Madam Speaker, to speak about the census. We are in the middle of the Census 2000. Officially, this past Saturday, April 1, was Census Day, and that was the day we wanted to have everyone counted where they are. It is a chance to get a snapshot of America that is taken every 10 years going back to 1790, when Thomas Jefferson conducted the first one. This is a chance to not only count people, and that is the constitutional purpose, to count people where they are so we can do apportionment and redistricting in this country, but it is also important to get that snapshot because the Federal government has grown so large over the past decades that it is in need of information to help fund those programs.

Today, over $180 billion a year of Federal dollars will flow out of Washington to States and local communities based on census information. In addition, we have the money that flows out of State capitals, whether it is in Tallahassee or wherever in the United States. The money will flow to the communities based on census data. So it is so critical to our own communities to get the most accurate count and not get undercounted, because the money will flow; and it is not right if a community gets underfunded.

There is money for education, there is money for health care, there is money for highways. And if we have people there using those services, communities want to get their fair share of the money. So that is why this is so critical, so I encourage everybody to complete the forms if they have not. If a census worker comes knocking on the door over the next few months, please cooperate and get those forms completed.

The projected goal is a 61 percent response rate in the mail. Hopefully, we will do better. I am confident that we will do better than 61 percent. Somewhere between 65, 66 percent, I think, would be a great accomplishment. I would be very pleased if we can get that high. Because the higher the percentage we get in response, the fewer people we have to send out knocking on doors to get that information. So if the forms do not get completed, what will happen is that community runs the risk of not getting an accurate count, and second of all, the Federal Government just has to spend money going out and knocking on the door to collect that information. And that is a waste of actual tax dollars.

The Census Bureau this year has done a good job in a number of areas. Paid advertising. For the first time in history, they have used paid advertising. And the advertising does more than just make people aware of the census. It is designed to help motivate people to complete the census forms. It shows this is important. It shows classrooms being affected, or emergency, or fire protection that is needed, and that is all related to it.

The outreach efforts have been very successful. Census in the Schools. I have been going into schools to promote the census, and I think that is very useful. A lot of Members have gone to public service announcements. I know many of my colleagues have developed them. I know I have in my area, and they have played often on the cable television. I know my ratings in Sarasota County is above the area in the State of Florida because of the response rate. So I am excited about the response rate so far, and we will know more by the end of this week.

There has been a lot of controversy about this long form. And I know there is a lot of concern about privacy. We are always debating privacy concerning medical issues and for financial institutions, so the privacy issue will continue to be a problem faced by the Federal Government. But first of all, the questions, beyond the first core questions, which on the short form are the first six questions, are really needed for the constitutional purposes of redistricting and reapportionment. They really are important questions and they really will be kept confidential. There are very strict laws within the Census Bureau to not let any of that information out.

Last week the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) and myself were out actually helping with the homeless count the other night. Before we went out with census workers, we had them raise our right hands and take an oath that we would not disclose that information. As Members of Congress we get all these other clearances for confidential information, but not with the Census Bureau. But there are very strict laws that have been enforced and will be enforced for anyone in the Census Bureau that discloses any information. So I feel confident this information will be kept confidential.

Now, I know this area of distrust. I know a lot of people do not trust this administration because of many things, but there are a lot of things contributing to it. My neighbor across the street was complaining because she had the long form, and my wife was helping her fill it out last week. One question she refused to fill out was her telephone number. Well, the State of Florida sold drivers licenses with photographs a couple of years ago, and so there is that suspicion that government will disclose that information. It will not happen here.

This information is not shared with the IRS; it is not shared with the FBI, the Secret Service. They cannot get the information. INS, Immigration and Naturalization, cannot get the information. So it will be kept confidential. So I ask everyone to please complete their forms.

THE MICROSOFT CASE

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

Mr. INSLEE. Madam Speaker, I am compelled to address the House tonight about the decision by the Federal District Court in the Microsoft case, and I rise today on behalf of two groups of people that I think deserve a voice in this debate. The first group is the American consumers and the second group are the people who work and dedicate their lives to the products they create for American consumers at Microsoft.

I would like to address the beliefs of the American consumers first, because I will warrant that if we go out and we ask our constituents, Should the Federal Government break up Microsoft?, the answer will be a resounding no. From the State of Maine to the State of Washington, people do not believe that the Federal Government will help their lives, will advance the Internet, will advance software one inch by breaking up this engine of creative growth.

And the Americans are right when it comes to this belief. American consumers are right in having the belief that this industry is healthy. This is not a sick industry that demands the physician of the Federal Government to come rescue it. And the evidence is clear: American consumers know that they are getting better products, faster products, less expensive products every day with Microsoft as it is currently configured.

Look at the evidence. This industry has grown from 290,000 workers in 1990

to 860,000 productive workers today. It has grown from 24,000 companies in 1990 to 57,000 companies today. Where is the stranglehold on creativity when we have doubled the number of companies in the software business in the last decade? This industry today has contributed $20 billion, $20 billion, to our trade balance. The reason is creative people are doing creative work.

And I will tell my colleagues one thing, Madam Speaker, when I talk to people across this country, they tell me they know they are getting better products, and they do not trust the American government to try to define through judicial fiat what products these software engineers, who are geniuses, should give to the American consumers. Products should be defined by what the American consumers want, not what the Federal Government wants.

I want to touch now on a message from the folks who work at Microsoft, Madam Speaker. I represent thousands of people who get up in the morning and work commonly 12 to 14 hour days to try to bring their creative talents to bear to create new products for the American people.

They have done a good job and they are doing a good job and they are going to continue to do a good job creating new products for America. The reason is that the people at Microsoft in Redmond, Washington, are not going to be distracted, they are not going to be deterred, they are not going to stop their efforts to continue that creative growth by the fact that this case will go to the appellate court because they realize this is the first step in a long process. They trust the American appellate courts and trust that ultimately the will of the American consumers will prevail in this case.

Microsoft should continue to be creative and should not be broken up.

THE CENSUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Madam Speaker, this is Census Day plus three. My message to the American people is that if they have not already filled out and returned their census questionnaire, do it today. Do it this very minute. It is everyone's civic responsibility. I am very pleased that the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER), the Chair of the Subcommittee on Census, joins me in this message.

□ 1900

As of today, over 53 percent of Americans have responded to the census, with 47 percent to go. To the remaining 47 percent, I say please do their civic responsibility and fill out the form.

This was going to be our main message tonight here on the floor. But instead, regretfully, and with some disbelief, we must also stand here and ask what is going through the minds of some of our colleagues both here in the House of Representatives, in the Senate, and on the campaign trail.

With 47 percent of the American people still not being heard from, 2 days before census day, we have Members of Congress, who should all know better, standing up, holding press conferences and telling the American people that the census is optional.

Is it that some in the majority are undercount-aholics, they cannot help themselves but they want an inaccurate census? We have Members of Congress saying that they ''believe in voluntarily cooperating'' with the Government; but, beyond that, they will not follow the law. Since when did following the law in this country become a voluntary thing? Do they want participation, or do they want to make participation in the census optional?

What is really disingenuous is the fact that most of the questions on the long form have been around for decades. What is really amazing with this newfound concern about the census is that, over 2 years ago, really 3 years ago also, the content of the long and short forms and while it was being finalized, every single Member of the House of Representatives and the United States Senate received a detailed list of the questions to be asked, including a description of the need for asking it, along with the specific legal requirement supporting it.

Notification of Congress is required by Title 13, for a very good reason. That is to prevent the very situation that we face today, major leaders in our country literally telling the American people that the census is optional.

Members of Congress, every single Member of Congress, received this book ''Preparing for the Census: Questions Planned for Census 2000, Federal Legislative and Program Uses.'' They received this book in 1997, and they received it in 1998. I know that all of the Members who are complaining about this census received it. Do they not read their mail?

The time for input and to ask questions was when we were formulating the census, not now, not during the census, not days before census day. The questions asked by the census represent a balance between the needs of our Nation's communities and the needs to keep the time and effort required to complete the form to a minimum.

Only information required by Congress, not the Census Bureau, but required by Congress to manage and evaluate Federal programs is collected by the census. Federal and State funds for schools, employment services, housing assistance, road construction, daycare, hospitals, emergency services, programs for seniors, and much more are distributed based on these census figures. We must all work to make them as correct as possible.

We should remember that the Census Bureau has gone to great effort to make both the short and long forms as brief as possible. The 2000 Census short form contains eight questions, down from nine in 1990, and it takes about 10 minutes to fill it out. Ten minutes every 10 years to perform our civic duty on the needs in our community, is that too much to ask? It is shorter than 1990.

Also, the 2000 Census long-term contains 53 questions, down from 57 in 1990. We have the shortest long form in decades. It is four questions less than the 1990 Census.

The only new questions in the census were added to really evaluate welfare reform, and the question that was added is asking grandparents how many of them are caregivers. Does the Senator from Mississippi think that this question should be optional?

I am a little bit confused, because the same people who today are making such a fuss over the long form just 6 months ago literally tried to add a question to the short form, which everyone has to complete. Some of the Senators raising questions also cosponsored an amendment offered by Senator HELMS which would have asked every American what their marriage status was and add it to the short form.

Come on Senator, the head of the Senate, he cannot have it both ways. He cannot be lobbying for additional questions and then turn around and say that it is too long, that answering them should be optional.

Some of my friends who have been with me fighting for an accurate census, and many of them are on the floor with me tonight, they know because they were there when opponents of an accurate census threatened to shut down the Government twice over the census and the budget and a flood relief bill was held hostage, and we had to have the anti-modern count language removed.

Listen, believe me, these people who have fought to get the census forward to this point, they believe that the actions that are taking place now are intentional sabotage, the equivalent of a statistical shutdown of the Government by a small fraction of the GOP.

I really do not believe that, and I do not want to believe it. I think the answer is much simpler. I think the people criticizing the long form either do not know or maybe do not care how essential this information is to solving the problems of the people of our country. If they do not know what the problems are, then they do not have to spend the resources and the time and effort to correct the problems.

Let us look at the plumbing question that some of the Senators have raised. Well, it may shock some Senators but there are places in this country where Americans do not have plumbing, in the Colonias in Texas, on Indian reservations. And I really do say that in rural communities, even in Mississippi, what some elected officials are essentially saying is that they do not care

and that they do not want to know about the problems. If they do not know about the substandard housing in America, then we will not direct the resources to correct it.

But maybe some of these Members who have raised questions should talk to some of the Alaskan representatives and hear what Alaskans have to say or had to say when the census removed a question on sanitation from the long form. They want it added again because they have plumbing problems and a lack of adequate plumbing in many places in Alaska.

Or let us look at question 17 concerning a person's physical, mental, or emotional condition in the last 6 months. Are some Members saying they do not want to know how big a problem it is, how many disabled Americans there are in this country?

I would like to remind the House that these questions are essentially the same questions approved by Ronald Reagan and former President Bush except that there are fewer questions than the questions in 1990.

In the information age, we need reliable information in order to make good decisions for this Nation. Some Members of Congress must be stuck in the 18th century. They do not seem to want to know how America is doing. Without good data, we cannot administer the laws of this country fairly. Their comments are rash, appropriate, and just plain wrong.

I want to take the time to read excerpts from some of the editorials that have appeared since Governor Bush joined with some of his colleagues and declared the census optional.

From the Sacramento Bee on April 1: ''Trashing the Census. Irresponsible Bush Comments Could Sabotage the Count.'' That was the headline. From the New York Times, April 1, and I quote from the headlines: ''Civic Duty and the Census. Some Congressional Republicans are Seriously Undermining the 2000 Census.'' From today's Atlanta Constitution: ''Keep the Census From Becoming Political Fodder and Participate'' is the headline.

I further quote: ''Participation in the census may also be harmed by political grandstanding. Presidential candidate George W. Bush and Senate Majority Leader TRENT LOTT have criticized the long form. The alternative as urged by Bush, LOTT, and company would be to operate the government informally . . .''

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHERWOOD). The Chair will remind all Members that it is not in order in debate to refer to individual Members of the Senate.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was reading from an editorial headline.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The same rule applies whether it is the Members' own words or quotations from another person.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Same rule from an editorial headline.

I thank the Chair for making that point.

Mr. Speaker, from Friday's Journal Sentennial in Milwaukee, ''Census too Important to Ignore'' is the headline, ''There are also plenty of members of Congress who are now in a huff, saying they sympathize with citizens threatening to fill out their forms. One wonders what these guardians of the public good were doing when they reviewed and apparently approved of the same questions they are now complaining about.''

A certain Senator from the other body who ran for President and lost said and did yesterday what a lot of Members of Congress should do. This particular Senator urged all Americans to fill out the entire census form and to follow the law. I agree with him. And he was a Republican. He says, please fill it out.

The good news is that the Census Bureau will follow the law. It will try to get the long form questions answered, because the professionals at the bureau do what the law says, the law Congress passes. They will go out and try to get an accurate photo of this country and report back to Congress.

I guess we now know why the 2000 Census was designated an emergency in last year's budget. We just did not know that some Members of Congress were the ones who would be creating the emergency.

On average, the long form takes a little over half an hour to complete. Only information needed to manage or evaluate government programs is collected by the census. $180 billion a year in Federal money depends on census data. That is close to $2 trillion over the decade. Clearly, that is reason enough to fill out the form.

I urge every American, every resident in America, to fill out the form. Do not leave it blank. Do not leave their future and their community be blank. Be part of the civic responsibility of this country. Please fill out the form.

I have with me many members of the Census Task Force who have diligently worked for an active census, one that includes all of the residents of America.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RODRIGUEZ), who has been a great leader on this issue.

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) for yielding. I want to congratulate her on her efforts, and I want to thank her for allowing me to say a few words on this important topic.

First of all, I want to commend all Americans who have already taken the initiative and sent their census forms in. Congratulations. I thank them for their efforts. They have shown that people across this country know the value of the census and know their obligation and responsibility. I thank them for doing their part in making everyone count in this country.

The last update shows, as of tonight, that 53 percent nationally has been the response. While that is more than half that have responded, we are hoping and we will continue to work at a 70 percent response rate. So we still have a long way to go.

In Texas, we had a 48 percent response. We are hoping for 66 percent. We still have a long way to go.

I represent 13 counties in South Texas. My district's response rate per county has been as low as 29 percent in Zapata County and as high as 52 and 53 percent in both Bexar County and Comal and Guadalupe counties.

Especially where the initial rate is low, we must work hard to make sure that everyone gets counted. This week I spent the Census Day on Saturday at a particular restaurant in San Antonio at the Pico de Gallo Restaurant. The business community came forward providing both a little coffee and pastry for individuals to help fill out those forms.

We are going to continue to work on the communities. I am going to ask the leaderships throughout the 13 counties that I represent to reach out and do everything they can to make sure that everyone gets counted. This was a great example on some of our activities that we have had the private sector participating as well as the public sector.

I want to take also this opportunity to congratulate the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) and indicate in terms of the difficulty that we are having especially with elected officials of all people that should be responsible and not be making irresponsible comments.

I want to highlight the fact that there has been some criticism about the report and about the census this year, when, in actuality, as indicated by the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) the 2000 Census form is virtually the same census form as 1990, with the exception that it has got fewer questions.

□ 1915

So when we look in terms of the criticism, especially from a lot of the Republicans, you need to acknowledge the fact that under Bush and in the previous decade we had even more questions. The 2000 census short form contains eight questions. In 1990, it had nine questions. In the year 2000 census form, the large form has 53 questions, down from 57 questions. So it is important that we bring those questions down.

Once again I want to also highlight as the gentlewoman from New York did a beautiful job of pinpointing the importance of those questions and the long form that goes to one out of every six individuals. That long form allows us an opportunity to be able to identify a lot of the things that are critical in our country.

For one, in terms of family needs and community needs. I head the task force

on health care for the Hispanic Caucus. One of the things that we are real conscious about is community health centers. This data will help identify the need for and/or the lack of services in community mental health.

And so it becomes real critical that these questionnaires are sent back. When we talk about veterans and the disabled, those individuals that receive SSI, those individuals that are elderly, that are looking forward in terms of Social Security, that data is extremely helpful for this country to be able to identify how many expected over 65 are we going to be having, how many people are disabled, how many veterans we have out there in the country that are in need and disabled, in need of services.

All those types of questions that are there are there for a purpose. The question that sometimes comes to light is the question regarding plumbing. We all assume that we all have plumbing, but I am here to tell you that that is not the case in every community. We still have colonias, I have them in Bexar County, in South Bexar County, in the metropolitan areas and I have them in Starr and a lot of the other counties in the rural areas.

Those types of questions are critical to make sure we identify those areas that are in need and especially when it comes to zeroing in on identifying resources that are needed. In fact, some of the counties that have not responded are some of the counties that are most in need, that need to be worked on; and we need to look at a little more closely. I am going to encourage you once again to please look at your form right now, and I would ask that you seriously look at filling that out as quickly as possible so that we do not have to send people out there to make sure that we help.

If you need help, I would also ask that you call my congressional offices, both in Roma in Starr County in Texas and San Diego in Duval County in Texas and San Antonio. I would ask you to call our offices if you need any help and assistance in doing those forms.

In closing, I just want to thank the gentlewoman from New York for allowing us the opportunity to mention how critical this is. I also want to submit for the RECORD a letter that we will be sending to one of the governors in our State that has made some comments that we feel are very irresponsible.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, April 4, 2000.

Hon. GEORGE W. BUSH,
Governor, State of Texas, State Capitol, Austin, TX.

DEAR GOVERNOR BUSH: We are writing to express our deep concern over recent statements you reportedly made regarding the conduct of the 2000 census. As you know, the Republican leadership in the Congress has criticized the information sought in the census forms and has even encouraged Americans to leave some of the information blank if they find the questions objectionable. You joined congressional Republicans in that criticism last week by agreeing that if Americans are uncomfortable with the information they requested, they should leave those questions blank. Collectively, these statements have the effect, intended or not, of depressing the census count.

We believe your criticism of the information sought in the census forms is seriously misinformed. The 2000 census forms are virtually the same as the census forms used in 1990, with one exception: They ask fewer questions. The 2000 census short form contains 8 questions, down from 9 in 1990. The 2000 census long form contains fifty-three questions, down from fifty-seven in 1990. The 2000 long form is the shortest long form in decades. Moreover, the Census Bureau sent the forms to the Republican-controlled Congress for approval in both 1997 and 1998, and not a single privacy concern was raised.

You have opposed the Census Bureau's plan to use modern statistical methods to correct the 2000 census. Those methods were developed by the Census Bureau professionals at the direction of Congress in conjunction with the National Academy of Sciences, and have been found to be the best way to correct the undercount and overcount of the population that has plagued prior censuses. The correction to the census is about fairness. The 1990 census undercounted a disproportionate percentage of minority populations (e.g., Hispanics, African Americans, Native Americans, Asian Americans), resulting in Texas being short-changed $1 billion in federal funds that went elsewhere. Despite the best efforts of the Census Bureau, it is projected that even a greater number of Americans will be missed in the 2000 census.

Tenuous support of the census will hurt our home State of Texas. A recent study showed that Texas stands to lose around $2 billion over the next decade if the correction to the census is not made. Those funds go to the very heart of family values: schools, employment services, housing assistance, road construction, day care facilities, hospitals, emergency services, programs for seniors, and much more.

In opposing the use of modern statistical methods to correct the census, you have consistently said that you favor a full and accurate count. However, a full and accurate count has proven unachievable under the best circumstances, and becomes impossible when leading public officials denigrate the census itself. Your recent statements suggesting that Americans need not complete the census are counterproductive. Thus far, the State of Texas has the fourth lowest response rate to the census of any State. We still have a chance to urge Texans (and all Americans) to fill out their forms.

We strongly urge you to clarify your position regarding the census and stop encouraging Americans to leave census forms blank. Furthermore, given the numerous public statements questioning the need to complete census forms, in the event of an undercount, we urge you to reconsider your opposition to a statistical correction to the census so that all Americans are counted.

Sincerely,

CAROLYN B. MALONEY,
EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON,
GENE GREEN,
SILVESTRE REYES,
MAX SANDLIN,
CIRO D. RODRIGUEZ,
RUBEN HINOJOSA.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. I thank the gentleman for his comments and his hard work.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HINOJOSA) represents a great State which unfortunately was undercounted in 1990. He has worked hard over the past several years with many innovative programs and ideas to make people aware of the census and to improve the count in his State and in the country. I thank him for his leadership.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, I am here not to point fingers; rather, to encourage all Americans to complete and return their census forms. When I hear people saying, ''Don't bother to fill out your long form,'' and we seem to be hearing a lot of that lately, I am incredulous. What am I missing here? To not do so would be like driving down the road and throwing $100 bills out the window. I just cannot afford to do this, and I have yet to meet anybody in the circles I travel in who can.

If I want to talk in broad strokes, I can say that nationwide the Commerce Department estimates that 4 million people were overlooked in the 1990 count. This figure represents a shocking disempowerment of 1.6 percent of the American population and the figures for minorities were significantly worse. A full 5 percent of Hispanics were simply overlooked, 4.4 percent of blacks were never counted, and 4.5 percent of Native Americans were ignored.

Quite clearly far too many minority Americans were denied the representation that is their birthright. If I want to talk about the State of Texas, the 1990 census resulted in the second highest undercount of any State. Not only in 1990 but for a full 20 years, almost half a million Texans were inadequately represented in their government and received only a fraction of the Federal funds that they were due.

The undercount meant that Texas alone was deprived of $1 billion of Federal funds. An equally inaccurate census in the year 2000 could result in a loss of $2 billion to our great State of Texas. If I were to narrow my focus even more to the area that I represent, South Texas and the Rio Grande Valley communities stand to lose far more this go-around than the last. The 15th Congressional District was the 23rd most undercounted district in the Nation. The miscount in 1990 meant that 25 schools in my district were not built, and over 850 teachers were not hired through the course of that decade. Over the course of the past 10 years, our school districts have lost well over $78 billion in Federal funding that would have otherwise been allocated to educate our children in South Texas.

Mr. Speaker, the 1990 undercount also resulted in missed opportunities for health care and senior programs as each individual in my district lost $2,037, or a total of $46 million over the course of the decade in Federal resources. In short, what we do not receive as our fair share has real implications for our congressional district. My constituents lose too much if they are not counted.

Why would we choose to do that? I think we have learned from the past

about why we need an accurate census count. Again, let me ask, what am I missing when I hear people essentially saying, Don't bother to ask for what is yours? If a bank misallocated someone's hard-earned funds, I am certain no one would act so passively.

Representation in American government cannot be contingent on the affluence of your neighborhood or the color of your skin. This is a sanctioned disempowerment of American minorities and cannot be allowed to continue. We must have a census that not only attempts to count Americans but one that makes the people count.

In closing, I want to say, Mr. Speaker, by not completing the form thoroughly and completely, we are allowing ourselves to become third-class citizens without a voice in our government. The census is in our hands. It is simple. Abide by the law, fill out the form, and make yourself count.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD an editorial from the Atlanta Journal Constitution that says, ''To find fault with those queries at this late date is a cheap shot. The alternative would be to operate government uninformed of its people's needs.''

[From the Atlanta Journal Constitution, April 3, 2000]

CONSTITUTION: KEEP THE CENSUS FROM BECOMING POLITICAL FODDER AND PARTICIPATE

Roughly half of America's households did their civic duty and answered the U.S. Census Bureau's Year 2000 postal survey by its April 1 deadline. That level of participation is not nearly good enough if America is to get the accurate picture of itself essential to governing fairly and efficiently at local, state and federal levels.

Fortunately, the bureau still has a ''final, final deadline'' for mail and e-mail replies. It's April 11, the day it will send out its enumerators to count Americans who didn't respond. So if you have yet to fill out your census form, please do so and mail it this week.

Participation in the census may also be harmed by the political grandstanding it continues to inspire. Presidential candidate George W. Bush and Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott (R–Miss.) have criticized the long census—sent to one in six American households—as some sort of government intrusion on privacy.

However, the Census Bureau takes very seriously its responsibility to keep individual census responses confidential. Leakers inside will be sought out and prosecuted, as will hackers on the outside. In fact, the bureau is working with leading computer-security experts to make sure its data remain untapped.

Is this year's census survey exceptionally burdensome or intrusive, as its critics suggest? No, the questions on the long form are almost all similar to those asked in previous censuses, including the 1990 census conducted when Bush's father was president. And every question on this year's long form was presented to members of Congress for their comments two years ago. To find fault with those queries at this late date is a cheap shot.

The information being gathered will be used to redraw political districts, calculate how government benefits like Medicare are to be shared equitably, and predict public needs such as mass transit, roads, libraries, schools, fire and police protection. Census figures from 1990 helped federal emergency officials determine quickly where shelters were most needed after Hurricane Andrew smashed south Florida in 1993.

The alternative, as urged by Bush, Lott & Co., would be to operate government uninformed of its people's needs.

Mr. Speaker, I would now like to call upon a great leader on the census and many other areas, the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK). She helped organize a bipartisan hearing on the census and has worked very hard for an accurate count.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. I want to thank the gentlewoman from New York who has unselfishly led our initiatives here in the Congress along with the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) on the census, and while she has, she has kept up with it, she has monitored it.

Mr. Speaker, all Americans should have their eyes focused on us here tonight. We are here begging the American public to return their census forms. I say begging, Mr. Speaker, because it is the most important thing that we will work on in 10 years' time. This is our opportunity to be counted. If we miss this opportunity, then we should not complain about the status of things in these good old United States.

I want to thank all those people who have taken the time to return their forms and to say to them, Good for you. You have come forward to be counted.

Those who did not, I want to say to you, continue to work on it, fill them out and return it. Do not let anyone discourage you from returning your census forms. Do not let anyone convince you that you need not fill out the forms completely. They are underestimating your intelligence when someone tells you, Fill out what you want to, it is not important, or it is invasive, or it is invading your privacy.

Do not let anyone underestimate your intellectual ability and say that to you. The ball is in your court. Each one of you, one by one. One by one you must make a difference in your community, and you must make a difference in this Nation by setting us on a new path for the new century.

Our message to the American people is if you have not already filled it out and returned it, do it today. Do not wait any longer. Another minute might be too late. So do it today.

As of last night, I am told that over 53 percent of Americans had completed and sent in their census form. This is pretty good news, Mr. Speaker, but it is not good enough. We have to continue until we get as much as 100 percent would not be too much. We want everyone to be counted. The Constitution says that anyone who is in this country should be counted.

Now, there are people in this country, Mr. Speaker, that should think of it historically. They were not counted as a full person. African Americans like myself were not counted as a full person. They were counted as three-fifths of a man. Now they must go forward with all deliberate speed, with all urgency to be sure that they are counted, so that we will not leave anyone behind.

If they have not completed their questionnaire, if they need help, they should get it right away. There is too much at stake, Mr. Speaker. Too much at stake. For example, in my district, we have a need for housing. So many people in my district are without adequate housing. So many people in my district, Mr. Speaker, are without adequate transportation. So many people in my district need better health care. The mortality rate is high in certain segments of my community. The morbidity rate is very high in certain areas of my community. They should understand that unless they stand up and be counted, it will continue.

So many people complain, we do not have good marketing here, we do not have anywhere to go and purchase our products, we have to go all the way out of our district to find a store. We have to go all the way to another county to find a good place to shop. I am saying they must take the bull by the horns, because all of these market studies, Mr. Speaker, are made from census numbers. Population does count. It is so important.

Last week, we had people to say just before census day, April 1, I think they utilized, Mr. Speaker, they thought everybody was a fool, that it was almost April Fool's Day.

□ 1930

They figured that people should not return their forms. It was foolhardy, and they are unwise, Mr. Speaker, for anyone in government or out of government, especially people with high status in our government, to say, do not fill out all of the census. After all, this very Congress allocated millions of dollars to be spent for the census. They thought it was important. They were not just doing this for show, but to be sure that everyone is counted. Now they come back and say, do not take the time to fill out these forms. It is unconscionable, Mr. Speaker, for any of us who represent government or who represent the people to say to the people, do not fill out the form. Shame on those who say it. It should not be repeated. They should go back and say to people, I am ashamed to have taken a constitutional oath and to say, do not follow the Constitution of this country. The Constitution of this country says everyone should be counted. They even made it against the law not to be counted. They even made it against the law for people to take confidential information that is on the census form and betray the public trust by giving it away. It cannot be done.

So Congress has worked very hard on this. The gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) has spent a great deal of her time, and we have all spent a great deal of time in all of the caucuses

to ask the people to fill out the form. The Census Bureau has worked very, very hard. They have done so much.

I have been following the census, Mr. Speaker, for many years. I have seen the census in its good times and in its bad times. I have seen it when the Government was sued because of an inaccurate account. We do not want that to happen anymore. The 2000 Census is not a hard form to fill out. It only has 8 questions; there were 9 in 1990. My colleagues have heard us talk about it this evening. We are just saying to anyone, to anyone who is a governor, who is a legislator, who is a Senator or Congress person, shut up, if you are telling the American public the census should not be filled out. Anyone's position should be to support the census.

So let us encourage everyone, because there is so much at stake with the census.

So we say, well, why should we advise the American public again? We are constantly advising them. They are going to come to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY). Her people are going to come and knock on her door and say look, we did not get what we needed this year. We lost money that the Federal Government should be sending us. They will be going to her. My constituents are coming to me; my colleagues' constituents are coming to them.

They want to know, why is it that some other city, why is it that the State of New York received another representative? Why? Why did we not receive one here in Georgia or Alabama or Florida? Do my colleagues know why? Because people were not counted, because the census count tells us whether or not we will have another representative in Congress. It will even say to the Government, maybe we will not have another representative from Florida, or we might have another one, or maybe New York will lose another one. Why? Because the people were not there to be counted.

Then look at the State legislature. We look to see that we have a good State representative in the State legislature. We turn around and look, they are not there. Why are they not there? Because people did not come out and be counted. The Government cannot just go around and make people. We have to be counted and we must return the forms; and if we return the forms, we can get the numbers that we want.

We cannot ask too many personal questions. There are not any personal questions when it comes down to the expending of Federal money, because they just cannot give money on a whim. That money comes from population counts; it comes from need. So if one's district in one's community, in one's neighborhood does not get what it is supposed to get, then it is all our fault. The ball is in our court; it is in our court. So we may as well get out there and hastily return the forms.

We are so very glad to be here tonight, I say to my colleague from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), to say to the people back home, if we keep talking about good schools, we need better schools, we need more teachers; then if that is the case, education is the key, if we need that, then we must return our census forms. How can they count children who were missed in the last census? The Subcommittee on the Census has worked very hard to be sure that children are counted. So many people neglect to list the children in their homes, so when it is time to build schools, they are left out. Then the next thing they do is they call the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY). Look, our schools are crowded, we do not have enough teachers, we do not have enough supplies.

I want to end this by saying that if we return our census forms, we will be better served by our government, because there is an old saying which is that whatever we do, we should stand up and be counted, because as an individual or as a community, we will benefit from that count.

I want to thank the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) for this Special Order tonight so that we can help America understand the importance of the census. Those of us who did not return our forms, do it now, and we say, good for you.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to place in the RECORD an editorial from March 29 from the Seattle Times Company, and they write:

> The questions provide a telling snapshot of America and help determine how large pots of tax dollars are spent on social programs.

Further, they say,

> Smile. A big family portrait is being painted with census numbers. Nothing scary about that.

They go on to encourage everyone to fill out their form.

[From the Seattle Times, Mar. 29, 2000]

OVERLY OVERWROUGHT ABOUT THE 2000 CENSUS

On any given day, citizens are bombarded with dozens of legitimate, stress-producing worries. The U.S. Census Bureau, even its much-maligned long-form questionnaire, ought not be one of them.

Census questionnaires have been mailed to 120 million American households. The seven-question short form was sent to most households; a longer, more-detailed, 52-question form was delivered to one in six households.

Then the yowling began—The Snoops! The invasion of privacy!

The complaints are nine parts hype, one part hooey.

Two important developments have occurred since the last census was taken in 1990. The long form got shorter by four questions, and talk radio got louder.

In fairness to those with census jitters, more people nowadays are concerned about personal privacy. Frequent calls by solicitors and marketing companies wear down a person's patience and goodwill.

Remember, though, the census is the head count prescribed by the Constitution.

The people who make money by whipping up fear—and those who buy into it—substitute paranoia for logic.

The loudest concerns focus on question 31 on the long form, which asks people to report wages, salaries, commissions, bonuses or tips from jobs. This is not a scary question. The federal government, the Internal Revenue Service, already knows the answer for individuals. The Census Bureau is looking for data to report in the aggregate.

Before people allow themselves to be whipped into an unnecessary froth, remember the manner in which the data is reported. It is much like a series of USA Today headlines, ''We're older,'' ''We're more mobile, more diverse'' and so on. The census doesn't announce that Joe Dokes at 123 Pine Street does or says anything. Nor does the Census Bureau share personal information with other agencies.

The questions provide a telling snapshot of America and help determine how large pots of tax dollars are spent on social programs, highways and mass transit, and how congressional seats are distributed among the states.

Smile. A big family portrait is being painted with numbers. Nothing scary about that.

Mr. Speaker, my next speaker is a very diligent and outstanding member of the Subcommittee on the Census, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), who has been a great leader on getting an accurate count.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as I begin, let me just first of all indicate how delightful it has been to work under the leadership of two dynamic ladies on this issue, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), who is the ranking member on the Subcommittee on the Census, and the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK), who is the chairperson of the Congressional Black Caucus's Task Force on the Census.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join with my colleagues in urging the America people to fill out their census forms. Do something very simple: fill the forms out and send them in. Nothing more, nothing less.

Now, I know that the governor of Texas and others have suggested in recent days that if you have the long form, then maybe you should not answer all of the questions. Now, there are some people who might hear these comments and decide that they should not bother to fill out the long form. My response to those individuals is that there is too much at stake for you not to fill them out.

The census, as we all know, is about determining what communities will revenue schools, new nursing homes, job training centers, help with transportation infrastructure, and much more. It is about determining representation and whether or not a State will even gain or perhaps lose a congressional seat, a seat in the State legislature, city council, or on the county board. There is simply too much at stake to risk not filling out the form. Those who would suggest that the questions are too intrusive already know that this information cannot be sold or shared with INS or any other investigatory agency.

For example, the question regarding in-home plumbing is asked to determine how many homes actually have modern plumbing, yet there are those

who would suggest that it is too intrusive. Well, it is not too intrusive if one lives in a community where there are no sewer lines, where there is no running water, where there is no in-home plumbing. Plus, they already know that the responses are protected by law.

I would also suggest to people that perhaps the slogan often used by the Panthers several years ago would be appropriate when they said that you are either part of the solution or you are part of the problem. If you do not fill out the form, then I can assure you that you are part of the problem.

We can ill afford to allow forces opposed to an accurate census count to suppress the number of people returning their forms. In my own city, the city of Chicago, we lost millions of dollars in Federal funds as a result of the 1990 undercount. According to the Census Bureau, at least 10 million people, including at least 113,831, were undercounted in the State of Illinois, 81,000 in Cook County alone; and 68,000 in the City of Chicago were not counted. Many of those missed were women and children who live in minority communities. Because of the undercount, every Chicago and Cook County citizen was shortchanged, shortchanged on money to prepare roads, fix bridges; for schools, parks, and job training. Perhaps the most egregious shortchanging would be that of political representation.

So when people in powerful positions encourage people to give up their most basic of all rights, then all of America loses.

So again, I commend the gentlewoman from New York for arranging for this Special Order. I also want to thank all of my neighbors who are volunteers, people who are taking it upon themselves to go to the streets and encourage their neighbors and other people in their community, to simply fill out the form, send them in, because the reality is if you are not counted, then you really do not count.

Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to be with my colleagues this evening on this Special Order.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I would like to put into the RECORD the editorial from the Sacramento Bee in California. They are very critical of leaders who have come out against filling out the long census. They state, and I quote: ''How harmful to this important civic exercise. How irresponsible and unpatriotic.'' They go on to say, ''With their thoughtless comments, they feed mindless anti-government sentiment. Do they really think they can govern better by knowing less about America? They have done a disservice to the census and to the country.'' I would include that in the RECORD at this time.

[From the Sacramento Bee, April 1, 2000]

TRASHING THE CENSUS: IRRESPONSIBLE BUSH COMMENTS COULD SABOTAGE COUNT

Just two days ago before Census Day, as U.S. Census Bureau officials were urging Americans to cooperate in the crucial once-in-a-decade national count, Texas Gov. George Bush made their job harder. If he had the long census form, Bush told a campaign crowd, he's not sure he'd want to fill it out either. How harmful to this important civic exercise; how irresponsible and unpatriotic.

Bush's remarks come on the heels of Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott's advice to his fellow Americans not to answer any questions on the census long form that they believe invade their privacy. Taken together, those remarks by the leading Republican in Congress and the likely Republican presidential nominee can easily be interpreted as a deliberate attempt to sabotage the 2000 census. They raise questions about the integrity of the census that are unwarranted, unfair and irresponsible.

One in six households receives the census long form. Beyond the basic eight questions about the number, age, gender and race or ethnicity of people living in the household, the long form asks other questions designed to measure the well-being of Americans, to help government agencies to plan where to put schools or highways or health funding. Included in the long forms are 53 questions such as: How many bedrooms in the house? Has anyone been disabled by health problems in the last six months? Is there a telephone? What is the income of the household? Is there indoor plumbing?

By law the responses are strictly confidential. The U.S. Census cannot share individual household answers with the IRS, FBI, INS or any other government agency or private entity.

Moreover, every single question on the long and short forms is there because of a specific statutory requirement. Most of these questions have been on the form for decades. The only new question added since 1990 was put there at the behest of Republicans in Congress, including Lott. It asks grandparents whether they are caregivers for their grandchildren. The wording of each question was reviewed by Congress in 1997 and 1998. Lott, who now raises objections, pushed a resolution urging the Census Bureau to return to the short form a question about marital status that it had moved to the long form.

The census is the law of the land, enacted by the first Congress. When Bush says he wouldn't fill out the form, he's saying he's prepared to break the law. When Lott advises Americans not to answer questions they don't want to answer, he's telling them to break the law. And although both Lott and Bush limit their specific objections to the long form, the impact will inevitably reverberate more widely—to those who only receive the short form.

In Sacramento, census officials report that the response to the census is already lagging. Only 39 percent of Sacramento households have returned the form so far. Every man, woman or child not counted costs $1,600 in lost federal funds. That's money that would go to our schools and highways and mental health and police protection.

Participating in the census is a civic duty, like voting, serving on juries and defending the country. As duties go, it's not burdensome; for most people, filing out the long form is a once-in-a-lifetime chore. With their thoughtless comments that feed mindless anti-government sentiment—do they really think they can govern better by knowing less about America?—Bush and Lott have done a disservice to the census and the country.

Mr. Speaker, our next speaker is the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA), who is a new Member, but already a great leader on the census and other issues.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to thank the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) for the outstanding job she has done in leading us, in leading the Nation on what is so important to all of us and the effect it is going to have on this Nation over the next decade. It is important for someone to take that leadership role, and she has taken that role. She has gone out to the various States telling all of us of the importance of the count. I commend her for her efforts.

Now, the responsibility is up to us. The responsibility is up to all Americans. This is not about political wedges, this is about improving the quality of life.

Some of us like myself who are veterans have to remember that we serve this country; and veterans have fought so we would enjoy those freedoms, those freedoms that we have today; and those freedoms meant the ability to participate in a process. We have a responsibility to participate in that process. It is our American duty, it is our American responsibility, it is our civic duty to participate in this process.

Right now, Mr. Speaker, 53 percent to 56 percent have responded. That is not enough. I ask the rest of the American people to please respond to what is important, what will guide this Nation not only now, but in the future. It is the responsibility of churches, our community organizations; it is a partnership between business and ourselves to make sure that everyone counts. If we hear anyone that states not to turn in the form, not to fill it out, then they are being irresponsible. They are not doing their civic duties.

We have heard that from former governors that have indicated that, from other Members that have indicated that. We have to remember what the real responsibility is. I know, because in California alone, we have 52 Members that represent us. I have heard most of the constituents in California talk about the lack of money going back to the State of California.

□ 1945

We are all going to fight for monies coming back to the State of California, and this is another vehicle of getting monies back to California by ensuring that an accurate count is done, that the Federal dollars are returned appropriately. If we do an accurate count, then the monies will be returned back to California.

We lost or have the potential of losing $2.2 billion if we do not get an accurate count. In my district alone, we lost $50 million over the last 10 years because an accurate count did not occur.

What does that mean to us? That means that we did not do good data-gathering, we did not participate in the process. We should have participated in the process. What does that mean? We did not get the educational services that we needed, we did not get the health care that was needed, we did not

get the special ed that everybody talks about getting, and monies for construction and education, for our seniors and health centers that is so important to a lot of us.

It is important that we do that count to make sure that we take care of every aspect, including transportation and monies in the infrastructure. If we do not get monies in, what do we look at in California and the Inland Empire, which has the largest growth in the area? If we do not do an accurate count, how are we going to get the money back to our area?

We are asking for funds now. I am fighting and advocating for funds in that area. If we do an accurate count, at least there will be a pool of money so we can go back and put it into our area. It is important that we do that. It is important that we count everyone.

If we look at statistics that were done, African-Americans were undercounted in our communities. Latinos were undercounted. Asians, American Indians were undercounted. We have the responsibility that every American is counted. If we do not, California and the Nation loses.

I ask everyone to please complete that form. I know that it is easy to talk about the form being long and extensive, and the questions that are there. I had the long form. I completed the long form. It is important for others to do that.

For those who feel they do not know how to fill it out, please call the Census. Call your congressional office. We know what it means to the State of California and what it means to the rest of the Nation when it comes to not only the congressional seats, State senate seats, assembly seats, local elected positions in our area.

It is not just about that, but it is about what is our civic responsibility. I want to remind all Americans, and I want Americans to remember those veterans who have fought for this country to assure that we enjoy those freedoms; who said, I fought for you to enjoy the freedoms that you have today. Exercise those rights. If we fail to exercise those rights, we fail to serve America.

I commend our leader, who has done an excellent job in this endeavor, to make sure that everybody in the Nation knows how important it is to all of us. It does not matter whether we are white, whether we are black, Asian, Native American Indians or Latinos, it is about Americans and our civic responsibility. It is about this Nation and what we stand to gain as a whole.

United we will conquer and do what is important for all of us. It is not about political wedges, it is about inclusion. This is about including everybody in that process. This is what we stand for, inclusion of everyone. I ask everyone to be included in this process and to participate.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I refer Members to an editorial from the New York Times on April 1. In it they criticize the congressional Republicans for undermining an accurate 2000 Census.

They state, and I quote, ''These comments are irresponsible. Completing the Census form fully and accurately is not optional; it is a civic duty that is required by law.''

I include this article for the RECORD.

The article referred to is as follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 1, 2000]

CIVIC DUTY AND THE CENSUS

Some Congressional Republicans are seriously undermining the 200 census by suggesting that the national head count, which officially takes place today, is an invasion of privacy. That bizarre complaint could discourage the public from participating in a project that is crucial to the functioning of state and federal government. The question's on this year's long census form—including questions on household income, plumbing facilities and physical disabilities—have been part of the census for decades. The only new question asks for information on grandparents who are caregivers for children. In fact, this year's long form is the shortest one in 60 years. All answers on census forms are kept confidential. Yet Senator Chuck Hagel of Nebraska has suggested in recent days that people can simply ignore questions on the long form—which goes to one out of six American households—that they find intrusive. A spokesman for Senator Trent Lott, the majority leader, has made similarly inappropriate suggestions. Gov. George W. Bush of Texas has said that people should fill out the forms, but that if he received a long form, he was not sure he would want to fill it out either. These comments are irresponsible. Completing the census form fully and accurately is not optional; it is a civic duty that is required by law. Senator Hagel now says that he does not want to encourage people to break the law, but will introduce legislation to make most of the questions on the long form voluntary.

The federal government has spent billions of dollars trying to produce an accurate count as response rates have continued to decline with each decennial count. Accuracy is critical because the census is used to apportion seats in Congress, draw legislative districts within the states and distribute more than $185 billion in federal funds. The government uses information from the long form of the census to allocate money to communities for housing, school aid, transportation, services for the elderly and the disabled and scores of other programs. The data are also necessary to calculate the consumer price index and cost of living increases in government benefits.

When individuals fail to give complete information about their households, they risk shortchanging their communities of government aid that they may be entitled to. That is why many state and local government officials are working hard to increase census response rates in their communities. The mindless complaints of some politicians could well sabotage those efforts.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD), who is here representing the Asian Pacific American Caucus. Asians were terribly undercounted in the 1990 Census. The gentleman has been a leader on this issue.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for yielding to me. I also take the time to honor her and recognize her tireless efforts on the Census. She has been a force for accurate counting. She has been a force for inclusion in the most basic American sense when Americans, all Americans, are counted.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my thanks to all Americans who have completed their forms so far. All who have performed their civic duty have been making a difference for their community and setting our Nation on the the best path for this new century.

For those who have not returned the form and returned the Census questionnaires, I urge that they do so today.

As reported yesterday, more than 53 percent of all Americans have completed and sent in their Census forms. This is exciting news, and we must continue to work together with the Census Bureau, all elected officials working closely with the Census Bureau, and all elected officials at all levels of government working closely with the Census Bureau and with communities and neighborhoods across the Nation to reach out to the 47 percent of Americans who have yet to complete their Census questionnaire.

As reported, I represent the Asian Pacific American Caucus. I am chair of the Caucus for this Congress, and we have certainly been interested in this issue because we recognize that Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders were undercounted.

I am pleased to report that in my own home area of Guam, in the 1990 Census, Guam's response rate was over 70 percent in the initial outreach, and I would have to say that it was one of the highest response rates in the Nation.

Regrettably, just last week, just days before Census day, we had Members of Congress and prominent leaders of the Republican party, people who ought to know better, tell the American public that somehow or other the Census or parts of the Census were optional. Over 2 years ago, every Member of Congress received a detailed list of the questions to be asked on the long form, including a description of the need for asking these questions and specific legal requirements supporting it, which Congress itself had passed supporting these questions.

The time for input on the questions was then. The time to achieve an accurate count is now. The Census Bureau has gone to great effort within the mandates of Congress to make the forms as brief as possible. The 2000 Census form, as has already been reported, contains eight questions, down from nine in 1990. The long form contains 53 questions, down from 57 in 1990, and is the shortest long form in history.

In this, the Information Age, we need reliable information in order to make good decisions for this Nation. Without good data, we cannot administer the laws of this country fairly. Yet, the Governor of Texas, along with prominent members of the other body, seems to imply that the Census is optional; that somehow or other people should not have to answer all of the questions,

that people only have to obey those parts of the law which requires all Americans to fill out the Census which they are comfortable with.

Mr. Speaker, that a member of the other body said that he advised people not to answer questions they do not like, while the Governor of Texas said that he was not sure that he would fill out the entire Census form if he had received the long form, these actions are entirely irresponsible. Instead, Mr. Speaker, we should encourage all Americans to fill out their forms and to participate in the Census. It is important to have complete and accurate information about all Americans.

Even the question on plumbing has been derisively referred to in a number of media reports, but I want to tell the Members that if they come from a home without plumbing, it is no joke. We want government officials to know that there is a pattern of plumbing in our area, and when we are not hooked to the sewer line, or if we use an outhouse quite regularly, we want people to know that so government policymakers will respond to that reality in a responsible way.

I also want to take the time to thank the Census for the language assistance, particularly in communities where English is not the normal language of some people.

Some people say that we do not need to know everything, but I do think that demographic data is the raw material for making public policy, and I would rather that we craft a policy based upon knowledge of our population, rather than one that is based on incomplete knowledge.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would mention to Members a Washington Post March 31 editorial.

In this editorial, they call upon all Americans to fill out their Census form. I quote, ''All kinds of harm will be done if the count is defective. A politician not seeking to score cheap political points at public expense might resist the temptation to demagogue, and instead urge citizens to turn in their forms. But in an election year such as this, that apparently is too high a standard for some.''

So they are critical of all elected officials that are urging people not to fill out their forms, that doing so is optional.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD this editorial from the Washington Post:

The editorial referred to is as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 31, 2000]

CENSUS BASHING

THE CENSUS always produces complaints that an intrusive government is asking for more information than it has a right to know. Usually the complaints are scattered and come from the fringe. But this year some radio talk show hosts have taken up the issue, and now some national politicians who otherwise yield to none in insisting on law and order are telling constituents not to answer questions they feel invade their privacy.

The Senate majority leader, Trent Lott, is one such. He believes that people ought to provide ''the basic census information'' but that if they ''feel their privacy is being invaded by [some] questions, they can choose not to answer,'' his spokesman says. Likewise Sen. Chuck Hagel, whose ''advice to everybody is just fill out what you need to fill out, and [not] anything you don't feel comfortable with.'' Yesterday, George W. Bush said that, if sent the so-called long form, he isn't sure he would fill it out, either.

And which are the questions that offend these statesmen? One that has been mocked seeks to determine how many people are disabled as defined by law, in part by asking whether any have ''difficulty . . . dressing, bathing, or getting around inside the home.'' when it mailed the proposed census questions to members of Congress for comment two years ago—and got almost no response—the bureau explained that this one would be used in part to distribute housing funds for the disabled, funds to the disabled elderly and funds to help retrain disabled veterans. Are those sinister enterprises? A much-derided question about plumbing facilities is used in part ''to locate areas in danger of ground water contamination and waterborne diseases''; one about how people get to work is used in transportation planning. All have been asked for years.

Earlier this year, Mr. Lott's Senate complained 94 to 0 that a question about marital status had been removed from the basic census form. That was said to be a sign of disrespect for marriage. Come on. This is a critical period for the census. All kinds of harm will be done if the count is defective. A politician not seeking to score cheap political points at public expense might resist the temptation to demagogue and instead urge citizens to turn in their forms. But in an election year such as this, that's apparently too high a standard for some.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), who has been a great leader on this issue.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from New York has devoted tireless energy well beyond the call of duty to this extraordinarily important issue, and every American is indebted to her.

Mr. Speaker, I want to devote the few minutes I have to clarifying some issues.

April 1 has caused some confusion. It was not the deadline for getting people's form in, of course, it was the target date. The Census Bureau is still receiving mail. It costs twice as much to send people out to get the forms, and that is about to happen on April 15.

I had a Census job fair that drew thousands of people here last week, just so we could get a fair count. The way to save the government money, however, is, of course, to send it in so it will not cost us the tremendously extra money it does to send people out.

Irresponsible comments from the Republican majority or members of that majority may already have cost taxpayers more because it undermines millions of dollars that have been spent in advertisements and staff work to get people, to raise the count.

I include for the RECORD from the Washington Post the chart which informs people of why the questions are asked and why answering those questions is so important.

The chart referred to is as follows:

Questions on	Federal uses	Local impact
Income:		
Regarding wages and any other forms of income, including through public assistance programs..	Provides a measure of general economic health.	Identifies local areas eligible for grants for job training and other employment programs.
	Used to determine poverty status.	Guides funding for social services distributed to local agencies.
	Used to assess the need for various types of public assistance.	
Mortgage costs:		
Regarding mortgage costs, taxes and other expenses covered (fire, hazard and flood insurance), and amount of monthly payments..	Used by the Department of Health and Human Services to assess housing assistance for elderly, disabled and low-income homeowners..	Needed to evaluate an area's qualification for federal housing assistance.
	Needed by Department of Energy to help study energy supply and use.	Used as one of the selection criteria for local urban development grants.
Plumbing facilities:		
Regarding plumbing facilities, including hot and cold piped water, flush toilets and a bathtub or shower..	Needed by federal agencies to identify areas eligible for public assistance programs..	Used to allocate Section 8 and other federal housing subsidies to local governments.
	Used by public health officials to locate areas in danger of ground water contamination, waterborne diseases..	Used by state and local agencies to identify poor-quality housing.
Disabilities:		
Regarding long-lasting conditions such as blindness or a hearing impairment; difficulties with routine activities such as dressing or bathing; memory loss..	Used to distribute funds and develop programs for people with disabilities and the elderly..	Required under Housing and Urban Development Act to distribute funds for people with disabilities.
	Needed under the Americans With Disabilities Act to ensure comparable public transportation services..	Used by state and county agencies to determine eligible recipients under Medicare and Medicaid programs.

Mr. Speaker, public officials must perform as public officials, not as right-wing talk show hosts engaging in disinformation and conspiracy theories. Our job is to get an accurate Census. That is our constitutional duty.

I am pleased that Senator LOTT seemed to back off from his spokesman, who appeared to indicate that people should not have to answer the forms. He was a responsible thing for a leader for the majority in the Senate to do.

Where is Governor Bush, who said he is not sure people should fill out their forms? Does he know what side his bread is buttered on? Is he saying the residents are not entitled to all the services and funds entitled to them?

What about the large Hispanic population, the highest undercount? What about his talk about children? Is that just talk, or does he not recognize that the greatest undercount was among children?

We should be advising the people that it is a violation of law. We have made it a felony, $5,000 or 5 years, or both. It has never been used, but it should be reserved for people who knowingly use their high positions to advocate violation of the law through selective response. It should be used for people who themselves have confused the American public, as some public officials have done. It should be used for those who sabotage the constitutional requirement of an accurate Census.

□ 2000

Our job is to help people understand why there is a long form; that they are not being asked these questions as individuals. It does not matter whether you yourself have indoor plumbing. It is being asked of you as a representative sample. Nobody can attach that answer to your name. If you are worried about people divulging information, do not worry about the census. Worry about the private sector. Worry about people on the Internet. It is no felony for them to give your name and address to everybody.

Nobody has ever heard of anybody giving your name, address or anything else from the census form.

It is cruel, it is cruel, to advise people not to fill in every answer in the long form. Sure, the government should not know your business, but your business is not by your name. It allows us to find essentially what the statistical basis is for the answers you provide. These answers are worth approximately $700 per person. That is not to be sneezed at.

A lot of folks have spent a lot of time and more than $6 billion trying to get an accurate census. It ill behooves Members of this body to undercut that very important constitutional effort.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2418, ORGAN PROCUREMENT AND TRANSPLANTATION NETWORK AMENDMENTS OF 1999

Mr. LINDER (during special order of Mrs. MALONEY of New York), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106–557) on the resolution (H. Res. 454) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2418) to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend programs relating to organ procurement and transplantation, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3671, WILDLIFE AND SPORT FISH RESTORATION PROGRAMS IMPROVEMENTS ACT OF 2000

Mr. LINDER (during special order of Mrs. MALONEY of New York), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106–558) on the resolution (H. Res. 455) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3671) to amend the Acts popularly known as the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act and the Dingell-Johnson Sport Fish Restoration Act to enhance the funds available for grants to States for fish and wildlife conservation projects and increase opportunities for recreational hunting, bow hunting, trapping, archery, and fishing by eliminating opportunities for waste, fraud, abuse, maladministration, and unauthorized expenditures for administration and execution of those Acts, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ALL COLORADANS SHOULD FILL OUT THEIR CENSUS FORM

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

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD), for yielding me this time, and I also want to thank my tireless colleague, the gentlewoman from the great State of New York (Mrs. MALONEY), for her work on the census.

Mr. Speaker, I have a short statement that I would like to share with my fellow Coloradans. I want to urge Coloradans to return their census forms. It is very important for our State and for the country.

Just last week, our State demographer, Jim Westkott, was saying Colorado may have as many as 330,000 residents than the latest estimate by the Census Bureau, an 8 percent difference between the State's estimate and the Census Bureau's latest extrapolation from the 1990 census returns.

Of course, it is the Census Bureau's numbers that are used for Federal purposes, for apportioning House seats amongst the States to allocating Federal funds for schools, transportation and other purposes. That is why it should concern everyone in our State, our State of Colorado, that the Census Bureau itself says its 1999 count of Coloradans missed some 66,000 people. That is why it is so important that this year's count be as accurate as possible, and that is why it is unfortunate that some members of the other body and other political figures have been making statements that could discourage people from being counted.

So, Mr. Speaker, I hope everyone in Colorado, from Arboles and Antonito in the south to Virginia Dale and Peetz in the north and from Dinosaur and Dove Creek in the west to Wray and Holly in the east, plus everybody in between, will send back the census form and help make this the most complete and most accurate census in the history of our State and our country.

Mr. Speaker, as I conclude, on my plane ride today, I got out my census form and I know it was supposed to be in a few days ago but there is still time. Please, if you have the form, long or short, pull it out, take the short period of time it takes to fill it out. It is simple. It is well structured. Fill it out. Send it in so we can count every American so that we can proceed in the ways that we want to proceed in this next 10 years and continue to build on the great work that we are doing in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I again thank my colleague, the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD), for this time.

NAVY'S PRIVATIZATION PRACTICE IN GUAM

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, this evening I want to take the time to discuss an item of military policy which has directly and negatively affected my home community of Guam, but which will inevitably find its way into other communities. That is the process of privatization, outsourcing, contracting out what are currently civil service jobs, particularly on Department of Defense installations.

Many Members of this body every year argue for an increase in the amount of money that this country spends on defense. They cite shortfalls in procurement and spare parts, declining recruitment numbers, crumbling infrastructure and aging equipment. There are also those Members who chastise these efforts and demand that the Pentagon do more with less and find a better way to conduct business in order to save money and meet these shortfalls. In a way, they are both right and both wrong. Congress does need to do more for the troops in terms of housing and salaries; time on deployment or in training; education benefits and health care. In most cases, this will require an increased level of funding from this body.

Congress also needs to ensure that officials in the Pentagon are spending these funds in the most prudent and efficient manner possible. This responsibility requires that Congress certify the Pentagon's fiscal decisions with the utmost consideration to the Nation's long-term strategic goals.

Unfortunately, this has not always been the case. Today I am going to focus on the conduct of the Navy's outsourcing study on Guam.

Mr. Speaker, this is one case of outsourcing that every military community around the country should pay attention to, because it serves as an example of poor, long-term planning by the Pentagon that will have grave security implications for our presence in the western Pacific.

The Department of Defense and each of the military services, since the early 1990s, have been aggressively implementing their version of, quote, a better way to do business. Their solution

is to outsource, to downsize and to privatize. The Navy announced in the fall of 1999 that Raytheon Technical Services was the winner amongst the private contractors that would be pitted to compete against the in-house civil service workers, the so-called most efficient organization. Under the A–76, or commercial study rules which are set up for this purpose, the victor in this winner-take-all competition would have the right to perform the Navy's base operating systems contract, or more commonly known as the BOS contract. This past January, the Navy announced that the BOS contract, the BOS support functions, were to be sent out to the private sector for performance. The in-house civil servants bid some $607 million against Raytheon, which won the competition at $321 million. The huge disparity in these bids is testament to the Navy's disenchanted efforts in assisting the local workforce and the inherent weakness in the A–76 process in situations where there is little or inadequate union input.

The study on Guam analyzed some 1,200 positions, 950 alone at the Works Public Center. Many of these workers eventually pursued the Navy's priority placement program which enables alternative Federal employment worldwide. Others chose early retirement. Those who were left, who face involuntary separation, earned the right of first refusal, the so-called right of first refusal, the jobs that the contractor provides they have the right to refuse the job first. Any way you look at it, it is an inglorious way to end one's civil service career.

Now, let us take a look at the broader look at the A76 process. To be sure, A–76 is not the best of methods to mete out savings. However, in some respects it affords the civil service an opportunity to fight it out and sometimes even beat the private sector through this competition. Appreciating its procedural imperfections, A–76 is criticized by the public workforce, the unions and the private sector contractors. Each player views the rules of the process with some degree of accuracy as favoring their opponents throughout the competition. The Department of Defense has placed a very high stake in the process of outsourcing and privatization. In 1999, the Department of Defense announced that by the year 2005 over 230,000 current civil service positions will have been studied for possible outsourcing. The department estimates that they will have saved some $11.2 billion and achieved a steady savings rate beginning in fiscal year 2005 of approximately $3.4 billion annually. These estimates are sheer mathematical conjuring. The Pentagon is assuming these savings. Indeed, the individual services often do not even account for the cost of performing this study, which in most cases comes from operation and maintenance accounts. These costs can include the paying of the cost comparison study itself as well as associated costs for voluntary separation, incentive pay, early retirement benefits and general reductions in force or RIFs. The military often risks savings at the expense of long-term readiness and I make this statement based on several notions. In the world of the Pentagon, those of us who are on the House Committee on Armed Services and who have the responsibility of overseeing the activities of the Department of Defense, there is on one side the warfighters and there is on the other side the force builders. The warfighters are the folks that will have to put their neck on the line and fight our Nation's battles and win. The force builders are the folks that provide the tools to the warfighters. Congress has oversight over both.

The problems that we have generally lie with the force builders. These people are the facilities and infrastructure specialists. More and more of these cadre have MBAs or are CPAs. They get promoted based on how much money they can save in a given cycle. In some instances, military officers are rated for promotion based on achieving certain fiscal goals or in exceeding outsourcing benchmarks. Let me be clear, I am not opposed to savings or more efficiency. I recognize that there are times there is colossal waste in the Pentagon and opportunities to improve the methods of operating and maintaining our infrastructure need improvement. What I am opposed to is when readiness and strategic forethought takes a back seat to fiscal aggressiveness. We need to think hard when many of our people in uniform, the military's rising stars, earn meritorious service medals or legions of merits because they were able to save $300 million by laying off a thousand employees. And that is the state to which much of the activity inside the Department of Defense is now occurring. They are so focused on this strategy to save money and to conduct their business in what they call a more businesslike way, that they are actually getting rewarded, not because they are a more effective fighting force or not because they have done something in the warfighting, they have not improved methods, but they are getting awarded because they are able to save money by laying off people.

I will remind my colleagues over in the Pentagon that their first duty is to plan and to prepare and to fight and to win our Nation's wars. The military is not a business, and thus you will not always have a balanced spread sheet. The department's accountants cannot place a dollar figure on readiness. That is a political and strategic decision which I know every Member of Congress is willing to pay for.

Congress recognized that outsourcing may have a dramatic impact on our communities. This is why they require the Pentagon, in law, to report to Congress on the potential impact that an outsourcing process will have on the community's economy. Sadly for my home island of Guam, this requirement was introduced after the Navy commenced its study. If the Department of Defense was required to submit an economic impact study for Guam, it would show that Guam was really a poor model for the DOD to conduct the study on a big base/small base comparison, which was their original rationale.

Indeed, even the Navy abandoned this so-called comparison study model in favor of just continuing forward with Guam's solitary A–76 commercial study. Guam will face job losses of a unique proportion. Essentially, it is an erosion of its middle class. It is important to understand that Guam is a small place, 150,000 people with a workforce of about 60,000. Any kind of movement in one sector of the economy has enormous ramifications in the other sectors.

For those workers, civil service workers, who will choose the priority placement program, they will have to leave the island. Unlike other jurisdictions, there are not Federal jobs over in the next county. The next county is 3,500 miles away. In fact, in this whole process already almost 60 people have been placed in Utah, and some of the most tragic circumstances I have had to deal with in terms of my constituents is to deal with young men who looked forward to having a successful career in the civil service doing important work for the defense of the nation and its forward presence in Guam now having to face the possibility of working here in Virginia or in the State of Washington or some other community where they are now divorced from their family network, where their kids are now not going to see their grandparents, where they are not going to be able to attend the family functions which are such a critical and sensitive part of our island way of life.

An island has a unique economy in that it is very sensitive to slight movements in the labor market. The Navy completely disregarded this consideration because there is no legal mandate for them to do so. The exodus of these skilled workers from Guam represents a serious brain drain. It can also depress real estate markets as hundreds of homes are sold off.

□ 2015

Finally, the local tax base suffers as there is a decline in the local working population.

For those workers who choose to stay on island and leave the Federal service for a contractor job, they are offered meager salaries. This is the right of first refusal. These wages are calculated by a so-called prevailing wage calculator. This measures a wage rate for a particular job common in the community, but does not account for the price of consumer goods that are available on island.

When one works for the Federal Government, one has a tension on the local economy, but one also has what is

called a COLA, cost of living allowance. Usually that makes up the difference. The private contractor is not required to pay this.

So as a consequence, the contract on Guam, which is scheduled to commence next Monday morning, has a number of serious differences in the wages that the people used to make and the wages that they are now being offered in terms of the right of first refusal.

In most cases, a Federal worker of the Public Work Center Guam will be paid a decent wage this Friday. But on Monday, he will be paid a dismal wage to do the same work. For example, an air conditioning mechanic making $18.37 an hour this week will be offered $8.05 next week. An industrial equipment mechanic making $18.37 this week will be offered $12.13 next week. An electrician making $18.37 an hour this week will be offered $10.78 next week. An office clerk who is making $12 an hour this week will be offered $8.36 next week. A general clerk who is making $11.60 an hour this week will be offered $5.87 an hour next week, no matter how many years of service you have.

Furthermore, to add insult to injury to this offer, these salaries are being offered, not on a 40-hour workweek, but Raytheon is offering the workers a 32-hour workweek. They are considering that full time. So on top of these salary cuts, there is an additional cut of 20 percent by offering a 32-hour workweek. This rubric will be devastating for these wage earners. Even at the previous base salary, the cola was everything.

As a small isolated community, the prices on Guam for food stuffs and dry goods and clothing and mortgages and utilities and loans are usually very high. We all know how important health care is to America's families these days, and we equally recognize all the quality of Federal health insurance programs. The civil service employees were part of this system and were able to support their families with it.

The health benefits rate that is going to be paid under this contract, under the RFP issued by the Navy, is $1.63 an hour. This is going to be too little to support even the wage earner. How is the worker going to take care of his or her family?

As a result of these dismal salaries and the 32-hour workweek, many of Guam's workers are simply not taking the jobs, preferring unemployment insurance, which will pay higher benefit, or simply will choose to leave the island.

The island has a limited population that cannot accommodate a war time surge in work if most of its skilled labor force leaves. This has grave implications for readiness, because in the case of a national emergency or something happening in Korea or Taiwan or some part of Asia, Guam is the major logistical node. Where are they going to find the workers then? Well, they are going to have to bring them in from off island at great cost.

An adequate economic study would have flushed out this. A realistic look at the readiness requirements and the war time requirements of our defense forces, and an objective look at the world situation in East Asia would have flushed all of this out.

The employees who choose to stay on island and leave the civil service are permitted a right of first refusal for the private sector jobs. But how meaningful can this right be when the positions being offered are far below what they were previously earning.

The A–76 rules and procedures were applied haphazardly by Navy's PACDIV in Hawaii with little regard to the human toll or the impact on Guam's economy. PACDIV's desire to save money was so egregious that they misinterpreted what should be the tradeoff between military security, forward presence, strength in Asia, and bottom line savings. I believe we could have had both, but it would have taken a great deal more planning and thought than PACDIV apparently gave to this project.

Mr. Speaker, in light of these fallacies and problems that have occurred on Guam in the Navy's A–76 study, I am calling for several things. First of all, I am calling for the Navy to explore halting the implementation of this contract until many of these grievances and miscalculations can be redressed.

Last Friday, I sent a letter to Secretary De Leon, a joint letter from 28 Members of Congress, calling for a halt to the implementation of this contract until the Congress and the Inspector General of the Department of Defense can audit the way the outsourcing study was dealt with on Guam balanced against strategic circumstances.

Secondly, I am calling for the U.S. General Accounting Office to conduct an audit into the way the Navy organized, planned, and conducted this outsourcing study on Guam with seeming little regard to the impact on the small isolated community that, relative to its population, has a significant role had the readiness and the strength of the U.S. military in the Western Pacific.

Third, I am calling on the House Subcommittee on Military Readiness to conduct a hearing on the methods of the Department of Defense privatization efforts on Guam as well as the Pentagon's aggressive plans towards outright privatization without using the A–76 rules.

Finally, I am going to introduce into the defense authorization bill for fiscal year 2001 an amendment to extend COLA benefits for those civil service employees who exercised the right of first refusal on Guam. This will, I believe, assist these families financially and perhaps stem the flight of skilled workers from Guam.

Another aspect of this amendment is to provide a mortgage assistance program for all affected civil service workers. For all their years of dedicated Federal civil service, this is the least that the government can do.

Mr. Speaker, I have said it before and I will say it again, outsourcing from a small island economy does not make any sense. There is no readiness benefit to do it. In fact, there is more likely the case that this privatization endeavor will jeopardize both long-term and short-term readiness.

Of course there is no benefit to the local economy. Since Guam's firms are not large enough to be the prime contractor, most of the contract's profits will be sent off island or remain in the hands of big corporations.

There is no benefit to the laborer. Their salaries have been sliced and diced, so they will not even be able to able to afford the costly consumables that are sold locally. Whatever happened to an honest day's wage for honest skilled labor.

All in all, the Navy's conduct in this commercial study appears to have been a rather shallow display of gratitude and neighborliness for all of Guam's years of service as the Nation's most strategic forward located area. Furthermore, their decisions represent an utter lack of forethought with regard to the future defense needs in the region.

It is my hope to bring some relief to these dedicated civil service employees and alert other communities to the pitfalls that were encountered by my island community of Guam during the Navy's outsourcing.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. GONZALEZ (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business.

Mr. STUPAK (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of family matters.

Mr. ORTIZ (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business in the district.

Ms. CARSON (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business.

Ms. KILPATRICK (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business in the district.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of official business.

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of family medical reasons.

Mr. SCARBOROUGH (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of delayed arrival due to bad weather.

Mr. MANZULLO (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of illness in the family.

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. GEJDENSON) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GEJDENSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KIND, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. INSLEE, 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. METCALF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MILLER of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 4, 2000, at 9:30 a.m., for morning hour debates.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

6875. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Services, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Importation of Pork and Pork Products [Docket No. 95–027–2] received January 10, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6876. A letter from the Administrator, Food and Nutrition Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations: Disqualification Penalties for Intentional Program Violations (RIN: 0584–AC65) received January 7, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6877. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Glufosinate ammonium; Extension of Tolerance for Emergency Exemptions [OPP–300953; FRL–6394–5] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received January 5, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

6878. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting amendments to the FY 2001 budget requests for the Departments of Agriculture, Commerce, Defense, Energy, Health and Human Services, State, Transportation, and the Treasury; the Corps of Engineers; the Office of the United States Trade Representative, International Assistance Programs; the Small Business Administration; and, the Coporation for National and Community Service, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1107; (H. Doc. No. 106–222); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

6879. A letter from the Chief, Programs and Legislation Division, Office of Legislative Liasison, Department of Defense, transmitting notification that the Air Force has initiated an independent business analysis to determine whether significant savings can be achieved or significant performance improvements are likely by waving the Office of Management and Budget A–76 procedures for the acquisition of Aircraft Maintenance and Supply functions at Andrews Air Force Base (AFB), Maryland, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2461; to the Committee on Armed Services.

6880. A letter from the Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting the Incentive-Based Crime Reporting Program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

6881. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the certification pertaining to destruction of Russia's chemical weapons and the report on proposed obligations for chemical weapons destruction activities in Russia; to the Committee on Armed Services.

6882. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Assessments (RIN: 3064–AC31) received January 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

6883. A letter from the Managing Director, Federal Housing Finance Board, transmitting the Board's final rule—Devolution of Corporate Goverance Responsibilities [No. 99–62] (RIN: 3069–AA–89) received January 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

6884. A letter from the Managing Director, Federal Housing Finance Board, transmitting the Board's final rule—Amendment of Affordable Housing Program Regulation [No. 99–68] (RIN: 3069–AA82) received January 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

6885. A letter from the General Counsel, Central Office, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Loans in Areas Having Special Flood Hazards—received January 12, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

6886. A letter from the Director,, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the reports, as required by the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended; to the Committee on the Budget.

6887. A letter from the Administrator, Food and Nutrition Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Summer Food Service Program; Implementation of Legislative Reforms (RIN: 0584–AC23) received January 7, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6888. A letter from the Administrator, Food and Nutrition Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Summer Food Service Program: Program Meal Service During the School Year, Paperwork Reduction, and Targeted State Monitoring (RIN: 0584–AC06) received January 5, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6889. A letter from the Administrator, Food and Nutrition Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Child and Adult Care Food Program: Overclaim Authority and Technical Changes to the Meal Pattern Requirements (RIN: 0584–AB19) received January 3, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6890. A letter from the Administrator, Food and Nutrition Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Direct Certification of Eligibility for Free and Reduced Price Meals and Free Milk in Schools (RIN: 0584–AB35) received January 7, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

6891. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management, Department of Energy, transmitting the report on the Identification of Preferred Alternatives for the Department of Energy's Waste Management Program: Low-Level Waste and Mixed Low-Level Waste Disposal Sites; to the Committee on Commerce.

6892. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; and Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; Indiana [IN116–1a, FRL–6522–1] received January 13, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

6893. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—#35 Grants and Agreements with Institutions of Higher Education, hospitals, and other non-profits organizations—received January 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

6894. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—#36 How to Complete your Application for Federal Assistance—received January 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

6895. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans: Alaska [AK–21–1709-a; FRL–6515–3] received January 5, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

6896. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plan for Louisiana: Transportation Conformity Rule [LA–26–1–6965a; FRL–6514–6] received January 5, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

6897. A letter from the Special Assistant to the Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202.(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Farmington, Grass Valley, Jackson, Lindon, Placerville, and Fair Oaks, California, and Carson City and Sun Valley, Nevada) [MM Docket No. 90–189, RM–6904, RM–7114, RM–7186, RM–7415, RM–7298] received January 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

6898. A letter from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Whitewright and Van Alstyne, Texas) [MM Docket No. 98–196, RM–9325, RM–9476] received January 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

6899. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser for Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Copies of international agreements, other than treaties, entered into by the United States, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

6900. A letter from the Director, Bureau of Economic Analysis, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule—Direct Investment Surveys: BE–10, Benchmark Survey of U.S. Direct Investment Abroad—1999 [Docket No. 9908102129310–

02] (RIN: 0691–AA36) received January 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

6901. A letter from the Bureau of Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revisions to Encryption Items [Docket No. 000110010–0010–01] (RIN: 0694–AC11) received January 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

6902. A letter from the Chairman, Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board, transmitting the consolidated report for the year ending September 30, 1999, on the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act and the status of our internal audit and investigative activities; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6903. A letter from the Acting Deputy Associate Administrator for Acquisition Policy, Office of Governmentwide Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Federal Acquisition Regulation; Deobligation Authority [FAC 97–15; FAR Case 99–015; Item IV] (RIN: 9000–AI56) received January 24, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6904. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—#34 Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements to State and Local Governments—received January 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6905. A letter from the Inspector General, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the semiannual report of the Office of Inspector General covering the period April 1, 1999 through September 30, 1999, and the semiannual Management Report on Audits, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6906. A letter from the Chair, Federal Labor Relations Authority, transmitting the Fiscal Year 1999 Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act (FMFIA) Report for the Federal Labor Relations Authority (FLRA); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6907. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting the annual report in compliance with the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act (''FMFIA''); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6908. A letter from the Deputy Director, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, transmitting the FY 1999 report pursuant to the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3512(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6909. A letter from the Acting Deputy Associate Administrator for Acquisition Policy, Office of Governmentwide Policy, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Federal Acquisition Regulation; Pollution Control and Clean Air and Water [FAC 97–15; FAR Case 97–033; Item I] (RIN: 9000–AI19) received January 24, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6910. A letter from the Acting Deputy Associate Administrator for Acquisition Policy, Office of Governmentwide Policy, National Air and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Federal Acquisition Regulation; Contract Bundling [FAC 97–15; FAR Case 1997–306 (97–306); Item III] (RIN: 9000–AI55) received January 24, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6911. A letter from the Director, Workforce Compensation and Performance Service, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule—Miscellaneous Changes in Compensation Regulations (RIN: 3206–AH11) received January 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6912. A letter from the Director, Workforce Compensation and Performance Service, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule—Retention Allowances (RIN: 3206–AI31) received January 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

6913. A letter from the Special Counsel, Office of Special Counsel, transmitting the fiscal year 1999 reports required by the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6914. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting the Annual Program Performance Report for fiscal year (FY) 1999; to the Committee on Government Reform.

6915. 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—Pacific Tuna Fisheries; Closure of Purse Seine Fishery for Bigeye Tuna [Docket No. 991207319–9319–01; I.D. 113099A] received January 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6916. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Marine Fisherie's Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Gulf of Alaska; Interim 2000 Harvest Specifications [Docket No. 991223348–9348–01; I.D. 122199B] received January 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6917. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Emergency Interim Rule to Implement Major Provisions of the American Fisheries Act [Docket No. 991228352–0012–02; I.D. 011100D] (RIN: 0648–AM83) received January 31, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6918. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Marine Fisherie's Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Permit Requirements for Vessels, Processors, and Cooperatives Wishing to Participate in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Pollock Fishery Under the American Fisheries Act [Docket No. 991228352–9352–01; I.D. 121099C] (RIN: 0648–AM83) received January 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6919. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Foreign Fishing; Fisheries off West Coast States and in the Western Pacific; Pacific Coast Groundfish Fishery; Annual Specifications and Management Measures [Docket No. 991223347–9347–01; I.D. 120299C] (RIN: 0648–AM21) received January 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

6920. A letter from the Independent Counsel, transmitting the annual report for the Office of Independent Counsel-Barrett, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 595(a)(2); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6921. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Branch, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Boarding of Vessels in the United States [T.D. 00–4] (RIN: 1515–AC29) received January 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6922. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Fiscal Service, Bureau of the Public Debt, Department of Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Notice of Call for Redemption: 8¼ Percent Treasury BONDs of 2000–05—received January 20, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6923. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Binding Arbitration [Announcement 2000–4, 2000–3] received January 5, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6924. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Equity Options With Flexible Terms; Special Rules and Definitions [TD 8866] (RIN: 1545–AV48) received January 24, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6925. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Safe Harbor Explanation-Certain Qualified Plan Ditributions [Notice 2000–1] received January 24, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6926. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Definitions relating to coporate reoganizations [Rev. Rul. 2000–5, 2000–5 I.R.B.] received January 24, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6927. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Disclosure of Return Information to Officers and Employees of the Department of Agriculture for Certain Statistical Purposes and Related Activities [TD 8854] (RIN: 1545–AX70) received January 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6928. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Treatment of Income and Expense From Certain Hyperinflationary, Nonfunctional Currency Transactions and Certain Notional Principal Contracts [TD 8860] (RIN: 1545–AP78) received January 12, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6929. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—EP/EO Technical Advice Procedures [Rev. Proc. 2000–5] received January 5, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6930. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Purchase Price Allocations in Deemed and Actual Asset Acquisitions [TD 8858] (RIN: 1545–AV58) received January 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 4052. A bill to preserve certain reporting requirements

under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives, and for other purposes (Rept. 106–555). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BURTON: Committee on Government Reform. The Department of Defense Anthrax Vaccine Immunization Program: Unproven Force Protection (Rept. 106–556). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. LINDER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 454. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2418) to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend programs relating to organ procurement and transplantation (Rept. 106–557). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 455. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3671) to amend the Acts popularly known as the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act and the Dingell-Johnson Sport Fish Restoration Act to enhance the funds available for grants to States for fish and wildlife conservation projects and increase opportunities for recreational hunting, bow hunting, trapping, archery, and fishing, by eliminating opportunities for waste, fraud, abuse, maladministration, and unauthorized expenditures for administration and execution of those Acts, and for other purposes (Rept. 106–558). Referred to the House Calendar.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

[The following action occurred on March 31, 2000]

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X, the Committee on the Budget discharged. H.R. 701 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X, the Committee on the Judiciary discharged from further consideration of H.R. 3615.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker:

[The following action occurred on March 31, 2000]

H.R. 3615. Referral to the Committee on Commerce extended for a period ending not later than April 4, 2000.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself, Mr. SHAW, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. LAZIO, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. BRYANT, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, and Mr. TOWNS):

H.R. 4149. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to preserve coverage of drugs and biologicals under part B of the Medicare Program; 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. BECERRA:

H.R. 4150. A bill to require ballistics testing of the firearms manufactured in or imported into the United States that are most commonly used in crime, and to provide for the compilation, use, and availability of ballistics information for the purpose of curbing the use of firearms in crime; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BECERRA:

H.R. 4151. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals a refundable credit against income tax for the fair market value of firearms turned in to local law enforcement agencies; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAMP (for himself, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. MOORE):

H.R. 4152. A bill to amend title XI of the Social Security Act to revise the performance standards and certification process for organ procurement organizations; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. EDWARDS:

H.R. 4153. A bill to prohibit certain abortions; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HUNTER:

H.R. 4154. A bill to amend title 13, United States Code, to provide that the penalty for refusing or neglecting to answer decennial census questions shall apply only to the extent necessary to allow the Government to obtain the information needed for its enumeration of the population, as required by the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. ISAKSON:

H.R. 4155. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit advanced refunding of private activity bonds with general obligation bonds if the governmental issuer takes over the private activity bond due to failure of the private entity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN (for himself, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. WISE):

H.R. 4156. A bill to establish the Wheeling National Heritage Area in the State of West Virginia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. ROGAN (for himself, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. DIXON, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD):

H.R. 4157. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 600 Lincoln Avenue in Pasadena, California, as the ''Matthew 'Mack' Robinson Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan:

H.R. 4158. A bill to limit the penalty that may be assessed under section 221 of title 13, United States Code, for not answering decennial census questions beyond those necessary for an enumeration of the population; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Ms. STABENOW:

H.R. 4159. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a refundable credit for long-term care and to offset the revenue cost of the credit by revising the rules on expatriation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TRAFICANT:

H.R. 4160. A bill to authorize appropriations to the Department of Energy for oil shale research; to the Committee on Science.

By Mr. PALLONE (for himself and Mr. ISTOOK):

H. Con. Res. 297. Concurrent resolution congratulating the Republic of Hungary on the millennium of its foundation as a state; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. SENSENBRENNER:

H. Res. 453. A resolution providing for the consideration of the bill H.R. 1753 and the Senate amendments thereto; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. TANCREDO:

H. Res. 456. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives to acknowledge and highlight the efforts of the Arapahoe Rescue Patrol of Littleton, Colorado; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 148: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD and Mr. GORDON.

H.R. 218: Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. LAMPSON, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 329: Mr. HOYER.

H.R. 371: Mr. BACHUS.

H.R. 515: Mrs. MEEK of Florida.

H.R. 632: Mr. COBLE.

H.R. 664: Mr. KLINK.

H.R. 919: Mr. HINCHEY and Mr. WATT of North Carolina.

H.R. 1021: Mr. BACA.

H.R. 1041: Mr. HASTERT and Mr. ISAKSON.

H.R. 1053: Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 1055: Mr. GILMAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BEREUTER, and Mrs. MINK of Hawaii.

H.R. 1063: Mr. CAMPBELL.

H.R. 1095: Mrs. CLAYTON.

H.R. 1168: Mr. HYDE, Mr. PITTS, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. VENTO, and Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN.

H.R. 1237: Mrs. TAUSCHER.

H.R. 1275: Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. COYNE, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. KIND, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. CLAY, and Mr. BURR of North Carolina.

H.R. 1300: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 1323: Mr. KLINK.

H.R. 1325: Mr. FOLEY and Mr. MCINNIS.

H.R. 1413: Mr. MASCARA and Mr. KIND.

H.R. 1495: Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 1577: Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 1620: Mr. GARY MILLER of California.

H.R. 1850: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. HOBSON.

H.R. 1870: Mr. OWENS and Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1967: Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 2059: Mr. BILBRAY.

H.R. 2149: Ms. DELAURO and Mr. DOOLEY of California.

H.R. 2298: Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H.R. 2301: Mr. BRADY of Texas.

H.R. 2511: Mr. HERGER.

H.R. 2512: Mr. GEJDENSON.

H.R. 2571: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 2594: Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 2720: Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. STUPAK, and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 2736: Mr. CROWLEY.

H.R. 2741: Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 2780: Mr. FROST, Mr. CLEMENT, Ms. CARSON, and Mr. DIXON.

H.R. 2814: Mr. SUNUNU.

H.R. 2883: Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 2911: Mr. BRYANT, Mr. GORDON, and Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi.

H.R. 2929: Mr. HOLT and Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 2934: Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 2973: Mr. GILLMOR.

H.R. 3000: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. CARSON, and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 3100: Mr. ROTHMAN.

H.R. 3180: Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 3193: Mr. MASCARA and Mr. BISHOP.

H.R. 3212: Mr. NEY.

H.R. 3293: Mr. UPTON, Mr. GORDON, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. COBLE, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. MEEKS of New York, and Mr. POMEROY.

H.R. 3295: Ms. KILPATRICK, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 3320: Mr. GUTIERREZ and Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 3396: Mr. CONDIT, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 3439: Mrs NORTHUP, Mr. ETHERIDGE, and Mr. OLVER.

H.R. 3463: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

H.R. 3485: Mr. CROWLEY and Mr. CANNON.

H.R. 3525: Mr. NUSSLE.

H.R. 3540: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GEJDENSON, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 3544: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania and Mr. WEYGAND.

H.R. 3573: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, and Mr. WU.

H.R. 3575: Mr. RILEY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. SKELTON, and Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 3593: Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. EVANS, Mr. CANADY of Florida, and Mr. GORDON.

H.R. 3631: Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 3633: Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. FORBES, Mr. FILNER, Mr. WEYGAND, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. FROST, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. OWENS, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, and Mr. REYES.

H.R. 3660: Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. SALMON, Mr. SANFORD, and Mr. RYUN of Kansas.

H.R. 3710: Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. SHAYS, and Mr. SKELTON.

H.R. 3766: Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. GEJDENSON, and Mr. HOEFFEL.

H.R. 3767: Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 3768: Mr. DIXON.

H.R. 3836: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 3842: Mrs. KELLY, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. MASCARA.

H.R. 3981: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 4007: Ms. DANNER, Mr. PALLONE, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. GEJDENSON.

H.R. 4030: Mr. STUPAK.

H.R. 4033: Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. WELLER, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, and Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 4035: Mr. BAKER.

H.R. 4051: Mr. BEREUTER and Mr. BUYER.

H.R. 4066: Mr. DIXON, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. MEEKS of New York, and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 4069: Mr. PETRI, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. OSE, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. BILBRAY, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 4102: Mr. TIAHRT and Mr. GILLMOR.

H.R. 4118: Mr. SHADEGG.

H.J. Res. 60: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

H. Con. Res. 8: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H. Con. Res. 58: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

H. Con. Res. 133: Mr. SANDERS, Mr. UPTON, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. HALL of Texas.

H. Con. Res. 192: Mr. WELLER, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. UNDERWOOD.

H. Con. Res. 238: Ms. NORTON.

H. Con. Res. 259: Mr. WEXLER and Mr. OLVER.

H. Con. Res. 443: Mr. UNDERWOOD.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 146 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, APRIL 3, 2000 No. 39

Senate

The Senate met at 12 noon and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. THURMOND).

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Lloyd John Ogilvie, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray:

Almighty and eternal God, there is no limit to what You are able to do through people who are unreservedly dedicated to You, who humbly trust You, who are open to Your guidance, and who give You all the glory for what they accomplish. We begin this new week asking You so to draw our hearts to You, so to guide our minds, so to fill our imaginations, so to control our wills that we will truly belong to You and become responsive to Your Spirit. We spread out before You the challenges of this day and ask that You will use us for Your plans and Your purpose.

Bless the Senators. Replenish their strength, renew their sense of calling to serve You here, and rekindle their enthusiasm for doing Your will in all the issues of public policy. May they, and all of us who work with them, abandon ourselves to You. We place our lives in Your strong, capable hands for You are our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable CHUCK HAGEL, a Senator from the State of Nebraska, led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, today the Senate will be in a period of morning business throughout the day with time under the control of Senator BOB SMITH, Senator BROWNBACK or his designee, Senator CRAIG or his designee, and Senator DURBIN or his designee. As previously announced, no votes will occur during today's session of the Senate. However, the Senate will begin consideration of the budget resolution at 9:30 a.m. tomorrow, Tuesday morning, and votes can be expected during each day and evening throughout the week.

The budget resolution is allowed up to 50 hours of debate, and quite often we have a series of votes at the end of that time. I hope we will not get into a long list of amendments that will require votes right at the very end. It is not a very good way to do business. Last year, after a lot of hard work by Senator REID and others, we were able to reduce that list to at least a reasonable number. But Senators should be on notice that we will have to spend a good bit of time in session on Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, probably going into the night at least Wednesday and Thursday, and that there is a very good chance we will be in on Friday with votes.

If we can complete the budget resolution Thursday night, even if it means going late into the night, we will do that; otherwise, we will go into Friday. But we will complete the budget resolution this week so we can move forward with appropriations bills in the appropriations subcommittees beginning next week.

Members should also be aware there are a number of important committee markups that will be occurring this week. So we are going to have a very busy time.

THE FIRST TARTAN DAY

Mr. President, I should note this is also the first week in history that we will recognize those of us with Scottish heritage: Thursday, April 6, will be the first Tartan Day. I understand the head of the Church of Scotland will be here, as well as a number of visiting members of the Scottish Parliament.

I look forward to the opportunity to wear my kilt and wear a bit of the tartan on Tartan Day. I ask all my colleagues to look through their Scottish ancestry and find their tartan tie or something with which they can mark their appreciation for the impact that Scotland has had on our history. In fact, about half, maybe a little more than half of the signers of the Declaration of Independence actually had Scottish ancestry. So I am glad we will have this day to recognize that, and I look forward to joining our Chaplain, Lloyd John Ogilvie, as we celebrate this occasion.

A NATIONAL ENERGY POLICY

Mr. President, I hope the Senate will spend some time this week giving serious thought to how we should proceed on the development of a national energy policy and what we could do on a short-term basis to deal with the price of gasoline. We are not sure exactly what is going to happen. There is some indication there will be an increase of production by the OPEC countries. It is not clear exactly how much that will be or what impact it will have. If prices stay high or go higher, I think the American people are going to expect us to look at some alternatives, some short-term relief, and then also have a full debate about what we can do for the future, in terms of more production, alternative fuels, conservation—a whole package of things that are long overdue.

I think we are being given a second warning. We were given a warning in the late 1970s and 1980s when we had high gasoline prices, a shortage of supply, and gasoline lines. We knew there was a problem and that we should do something about it. We made some efforts, but it has not produced the results that we need. We are now dependent on foreign oil for 55 percent of our

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

oil needs. I think that is totally unacceptable and a threat to our national security. During the week, I hope we can engage in some discussion and thought about this. We should be prepared to have some votes in this area next week, after the budget resolution is completed.

THE MARRIAGE PENALTY TAX

Mr. President, the week of April 10, voting not later than April 14, the Senate will have a chance to indicate whether or not it believes we should eliminate the marriage penalty tax. The House has voted overwhelmingly to eliminate that tax. The President has indicated he thinks we should phase it out. Now the Senate Finance Committee has acted on a package that will be available and will be acted on in the Senate that week of April 10. Like the Social Security earnings test, are we finally going to do what we have been talking about for years? The Social Security earnings penalty was in place for 30 years but finally, last week, the Congress did something about it.

We have been talking about how we were going to eliminate the marriage penalty tax for 10 years. Are we going to do it? Are we finally going to do something about it? Also, this one takes on particular significance to me because our daughter was married last May. She and her husband both work. She is a young professional woman. She has discovered this applies to her and that they are going to pay more taxes this year than they did last year, even though they make about the same amount of money. She says: Dad, you must do something. So we did something in the Finance Committee. Will we do it in the Senate? Will we rise to this challenge?

Would anybody like to try to explain this tax to the married couples in America, particularly newly married couples who are first confronted with this marriage penalty tax? Would anybody like to defend it? Would anybody like to explain that it is fair and should be in place? No.

I have asked that question in all kinds of groups with all kinds of backgrounds and philosophies, and not a single hand goes up to defend it. So the Senate has a chance to act affirmatively in this area the week of April 10. I look forward to that.

THE GONZALEZ MATTER

Mr. President, finally, and not least, obviously there is a lot in the news media about the Gonzalez matter. I am not sure this is something that Congress should step into. I would like it to be handled in an appropriate forum, such as a family court, but the Government seems to be involved. The Government seems to be determined to send this young boy back to Cuba. I think that is a mistake, without full opportunity for appeals and an appropriate court consideration of what is best for the young boy.

We may have some opportunity to consider this issue in the Senate. We will be careful about how we proceed. But I do not think we can stand by as if we did not know what was going on. So I hope my colleagues will join me in giving thought to an appropriate way to proceed on this matter.

Mr. President, I yield the floor. If no Senator is seeking recognition at this point, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HAGEL). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The Senator from Nevada.

BUDGET

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the leader is right, this is a historic time. It is historic because this is the week we are going to begin deliberations on the budget that will guide all of our spending for this year. We have 13 appropriations bills and as soon as the budget is adopted, we can start appropriating.

I hope my friends on the majority side of the Senate will understand that we really are doing quite well as a country. This all began in 1993 when we voted on the deficit reduction plan. I am sorry to report it was not done in a bipartisan fashion. Every vote for that deficit reduction plan was cast by a Democrat. It passed the House of Representatives by one vote. In the Senate, it resulted in a tie that was broken by the Vice President of the United States, AL GORE. As a result of that action, the United States has seen on an unprecedented amount of economic expansion.

In April, we reached 107 months of consecutive economic growth, the longest period of economic growth in the history of this country. We are now 2 months beyond that and still growing. We have created about 21 million new jobs. The majority of these jobs are high-wage jobs, high-paying jobs. We have had the lowest unemployment and the lowest inflation in 30 years.

We talk about the size of Government. Well, we have actually done something about the size of Government as a result of the program President Clinton initiated and which was supported in the Senate in 1993 by a tie-breaking vote of Vice President GORE and in the House by one vote. We have cut the size of Government. We have talked about the Government continually getting smaller. Now it is about the same size as when President Eisenhower was President. We talked for a year or two about it being the size when President Kennedy was President. We have gone even beyond that.

Home ownership is the highest in the history of this country. The country is doing very well. I hope we continue the record economic expansion because it does give us a historic opportunity.

We need to save Social Security. We need to make sure it is strengthened. Now that it is going to be OK until about the year 2035, the President wants to move forward and make sure it is OK for another 20 to 30 years. We should do that as soon as we can.

We should do something to expand Medicare so that prescription drugs are part of the program. It is no longer adequate that we have hospitalization and some doctor care for senior citizens. It is important we realize they also need help with prescription drugs.

People over the age of 65 get an average of 18 prescriptions filled every year. We need to do something about that. Sixty percent of senior citizens have trouble paying for prescription drugs. Some do not get the prescription drugs they need. Some, because they do not have enough money, take half a pill a day when they should take one pill a day. They split the pills. People are actually going without food for medicine. We need to make sure that we, in this richest country in the history of the world, the only superpower in the world, have some program for prescription drugs. I hope we do not squander this opportunity.

This already is a Presidential campaign issue. I think we should take a look at what the Republicans are saying about Governor George W. Bush's budget which there is going to be a tremendous tendency to adopt on behalf of the majority.

Senator JOHN MCCAIN says:

> But, more importantly, there is a fundamental difference here. I believe we must save Social Security. We must pay down the debt. We have to make an investment in Medicare. For us to put all the tax cuts—all of the surplus into tax cuts I think is not a conservative effort—I think it's a mistake.

Senator MCCAIN is right. This country has a debt of over $5 trillion. We should address that in this budget. We should not be going on speculative tax cuts. It seems the only thing the Governor of Texas understands as a solution to a problem is a tax cut. We have an energy crisis. What does he recommend? A tax cut, about which I am sure the oil barons, the oil moguls in the Middle East, are jumping for joy. I guess George W. Bush thinks anytime the price of gas goes up, all the Government has to do is lower the tax and continue producing as much oil as before, and it makes the Middle Eastern oil producers very happy.

He also suggested an income tax cut, even though a week ago it was reported in the press all over the country that income tax rates are at their lowest in the majority of categories. Our taxes are lower than they have been for 40 to 50 years, depending on which category one is in. Yet George W. Bush wants an income tax cut. Again, what Senator MCCAIN says about that is:

> Thirty-eight percent of Governor Bush's tax cut goes to the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans.

We have Members in the House who disagree with the budget of George W. Bush. LINDSEY GRAHAM says:

> It is a large tax cut that's going to eat up all the surpluses if they come about. It does nothing, in my opinion, fiscally responsible to reduce the national debt. It doesn't address the Social Security issue. Here's what Governor Bush said: ''There's plenty of money to take care of the debt, take care of Social Security and give you a big tax cut. The truth is this money is a projection 10 years in the future and Congress' spending plan is going to destroy the projection. If the economy goes south, he—

Meaning George W. Bush—

> has dedicated all the surpluses to a tax cut. The $5.8 trillion debt needs to be addressed quickly.

I could not agree more with Representative LINDSEY GRAHAM. We have to address the debt. If we address the debt, we reduce the debt and it is a tax cut for everybody. We pay hundreds of billions of dollars on interest on the debt. If we did not do that, it would be money in everyone's pocket, not just the 38 percent that goes to the wealthiest 1 percent of people in this country.

We are going to debate the budget this week to find out if we are going to adequately take care of the needs of this country. Can we meet the demands we have? What demands do we have? One can look at all the appropriations bills and, at random pick, for example, the Interior appropriations bill. Our national parks are the envy of the world, but our national parks have a backlog of renovations and repairs of almost $10 billion. We are closing national parks. The national parks deserve some attention. In the State of Nevada, we only have one national park and it too has a backlog of needed repairs. The people who work for the National Park System live in quarters that are unbelievable. They are bad.

In Grand Canyon National Park, in the sister State of Arizona, they live in facilities that are difficult to describe. They look like big tin cans. People who work to preserve or national parks should not have to live in facilities such as that.

We need to help our National Park System, not only with the living quarters of the people who work in the parks, but also simply to make it so that when tourists visit them, they can visit all the parks, and that the roads are OK, the trails are OK, and, in fact, that we do a better job of preserving our parks.

We can look at every appropriations bill we have to consider this year and there are things that need to be dealt with.

The point I am trying to make is, the American people recognize that there are things we need to do other than cutting taxes. We need to make sure we take care of Social Security, we address education, and, as I have already talked about, we need to do something about Medicare. There are priorities the American people have that are more important than reducing Federal income taxes, which are the lowest they have been in 40 to 50 years.

I hope, as this debate unfolds this week, we will be able to seize upon this opportunity to continue the record economic expansion that was started in the 1993 Budget Deficit Reduction Act. I hope we can meet this historic opportunity, on a bipartisan basis, and vote on amendments that come before us on this budget bill not on strictly a partisan basis but on what is best for this country.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, we are in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct.

THE BUDGET

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, it is my understanding our focus this week will be on the budget, as it should be. One of the things, of course, that is very necessary is to address the budget each year, and one of the things we haven't done that we should do, and are doing this year, is to address the budget early so we don't find ourselves at the end of the session being sort of at the mercy of the President, who can kind of put the leverage on us to do what he wants us to do or else suspend Government operations and, of course, blame the Congress, which has happened before.

In any event, when we are talking about budgets, it is easy to get off into the detail. That is what we will have to do. My friend from Nevada talked about the plans for spending, and that we will have the budget come up, and that we have fortunately, for the third time in 40 years, some extra money—a surplus—in the operating budget. So many, particularly on the other side of the aisle, are searching for ways to spend the money, which is fine. But it seems to me that the responsible approach we ought to take and the approach I believe most Americans want us to take is to evaluate where we are with respect to Government, what the role of the Federal Government is in these various policies, and to make a determination as to what expenditures ought to be made that are consistent with what we believe to be the legitimate role of the Federal Government.

We need to talk about an analysis of that because what happens for the rest of the year is pretty much guided by what you do in terms of the budget—unless, of course, you simply ignore the budget later on. I hope that is not the case. So we ought to be talking in the areas that will be under consideration. What is the role of the Federal Government with respect to the private sector? What is the role of the Federal Government with respect to local and State government? What role should be played there? It seems to me that that is basically where we ought to begin having made that decision, of course, which won't be unanimous because there is a good deal of philosophical difference as to where we ought to go.

There are those who believe the more money you can spend on behalf of the people by the Federal Government, the better off you are. There are those of us who don't agree with that. Some believe the role of the Federal Government should be limited, that we ought to do the things that encourage people to do things, give them the ability to do things for themselves, and leave many decisions with the people in local and State governments. I agree with that.

We ought to be doing something specifically for Social Security. The President has been talking for several years about ''let's save Social Security.'' But he doesn't have a program at all to do that. Just to say ''let's save Social Security'' isn't the proper approach. Indeed, we have ideas on this side of the aisle as to what we ought to do. Clearly, there are three options as to what you do to make sure the young people now paying in from their first paycheck 12.5 percent will be able to have benefits when the time comes to do that. One is to raise taxes. Very few people are for that. Another, of course, is to reduce benefits. Very few are for that. The third option is to take that account and make it a personal account for the person who has paid in the money, and allow, on their behalf, for this money to be invested in the private sector in equities or bonds or stocks so that the return on that trust fund will be much higher than it is now and the benefits will be there.

We talk about paying down the debt. It is a great idea. We have done very little of that over time. We have a $5 trillion debt. This generation and preceding generations have spent it, and we are going to leave it up to others to pay for it. We have paid down the debt some with respect to taking Social Security money and putting it over there in place of publicly held debt, which is a positive thing to do; the costs are less. Really, to pay it down, we ought to be taking some of the surplus out of the general fund and putting it over there. Frankly, we don't do that unless we have a plan to do it—something like a mortgage in which we say over 15

years, or whatever, we are going to pay that off. Then we can take so much every year to do that, and we are dedicated to doing it. That is not the approach taken by the administration.

There is great concern about tax reduction. I certainly believe we ought to take care of adequate spending, protecting Social Security, paying down the debt, but then what is wrong with tax reduction? That is where the money came from. Just because there is more money coming in as a result of a stronger economy doesn't mean we necessarily have an obligation to spend it, which is what the other side often says we ought to do. Much of the tax reduction is just a fairness issue. For instance, the marriage tax. Why is it that two people who are making a certain amount of money as two single persons get married and they have to pay more taxes on the same amount of earnings? That is very unfair. Part of what we talk about in tax reduction is a matter of fairness. Part of it is also incentives to do other things.

So we will be talking about the Republican budget that will be coming before this Congress, in which we safeguard Social Security, shield Medicare, pay down the national debt, and at the same time work on the fairness issue. We will be protecting that surplus by not spending it, which is unique, only happening in the last several years. It strengthens Medicare by increasing—as we did last year and again this year—some of the reductions that were made in the balanced budget amendment. We will reduce the national debt, hopefully, by using operational funds to do that, as well as Social Security dollars. We will provide tax fairness for families. We need to do that. We need to balance the budget again, as we have for about the third time in 40 years. So that is a very good thing.

This budget, over time, reduces the debt by $177 billion, wipes it out over 13 years—if we stay with this budget. That is the kind of commitment we ought to make. We talked about tax reduction. Think about what it is. This budget would provide about $150 billion in 5 years in tax relief to American families—over $13 billion next year alone in the form of marriage penalty relief which, again, is a fairness tax. In the form of educational assistance now, is reducing taxes a bad thing if we are going to—increase the health care deductibility? I don't believe so. We are seeking to provide more coverage for people—without making a total government program out of it—by giving some kind of tax relief to do that.

I think this is going to be a very important debate and an important discussion. I understand there will be differences of view. That is what this body is all about, talking about different philosophies. There will be different philosophies, such as saying the more spending we have, the better government is and the better off everyone is. That is a point of view. I don't happen to share it. I think there ought to be limitations on the size and role of government. We ought to be building opportunity instead of doing those sorts of things.

I think we have a great opportunity to do some of the things we have talked about for years; that is, to reduce the debt, to secure Social Security, and to provide some incentives for people to do things for themselves.

We have the opportunity, and we will be doing it this week. I think we ought to take into account not only the dollars that are there, and not only the specific expenditures, but how we envision the role of government over time. How does that fit into the idea of freedom and opportunity for all? What is the role of a government in that?

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

Mr. WYDEN. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG AFFORDABILITY

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I come to the floor today to talk about a very encouraging development and solution with respect to prescription drugs.

I have come to the floor on more than 20 separate occasions over the last several months to talk particularly about how America can no longer afford to deny this critical coverage. Again and again, I cited examples on the floor of this Senate about how our country cannot afford to deny seniors the opportunity to get prescription drug coverage. I have talked, for example, about the exciting anticoagulant drugs. These drugs allow a senior citizen, for example, for perhaps $1,000 or $1,500, to prevent a stroke which might end up costing more than $100,000.

What is so exciting about these prescription medicines is that they don't just help older people when they are very ill, but they are absolutely key to keeping older people healthy by lowering blood pressure and cholesterol. They will help senior citizens stay in the community and will keep them from racking up those much larger health care expenses under what is known as Part A of the Medicare Hospital Insurance Trust Fund.

Again and again, we have seen examples of how cholesterol-lowering drugs can reduce death and expenses for senior citizens.

For example, heart disease is the leading cause of death for persons 65 and older. Beta blockers can reduce long-term mortality by 25 percent, and they cost about $360 a year, or $30 a month.

One in five older women has osteoporosis. About 15 percent have suffered fractures as a result this disease. This disease is the leading risk factor for hip fractures. Estrogen replacement can reduce the risk of osteoporosis as well as cardiovascular disease. One commonly used drug costs $20 a month. This is an investment that can help avoid those hip fractures and help avoid the extraordinary medical expenses.

I must say that my own mother, who will be 80 years of age very shortly, had a hip fracture recently, and this drove home to me how these prescription medicines can help avoid the kinds of health problems that my mother and scores of others seniors have seen, and how providing coverage now is an investment this Senate cannot afford to pass up.

What was exciting about the developments in the budget resolution was, first, that the Budget Committee committed $40 billion would be committed for this important program. For example, on the other side of the Capitol, the House of Representatives talked about $40 billion, but they could spend it on just about anything in the health care arena. The Senate Budget Committee said we are going to make $40 billion available for prescription drugs because it is high time we set in place this important coverage.

Second, we provided a date certain to get this job done. Our colleague from Louisiana, Senator BREAUX, has been correct to say repeatedly that the Senate Finance Committee has now held 14 hearings on this issue. Clearly there is great interest in that committee in moving forward.

The budget resolution says on this point that if the Senate Finance Committee does not come forward with a prescription drug benefit on or before September 1st of this year, any Member of the Senate can come to the floor of this body and bring this issue before the Senate.

The Presiding Officer of the Senate, who serves with me on the Senate Committee on Aging, could come to the floor if he had a plan to deal with prescription drugs. Senator SNOWE and I have teamed up on a bipartisan basis. We are particularly grateful for the help of Senator GORDON SMITH last week in the Budget Committee. The resolution allows any group of Senators to come forward with legislation if the Senate Finance Committee does not report a prescription drug measure on or before September 1st of this year.

I think it is critical to note that many Senators in the leadership of both political parties were involved in this effort.

Senator DASCHLE has talked to me almost daily about the importance of the Senate dealing with this issue, and dealing with it this year. He has worked very hard to try to reconcile the various approaches Senators have on this issue. He also has been steadfast in saying how important it is that the Senate not put this off until after another election.

There may be some colleagues on the Republican side and some on the Democratic side who will say: Let's just talk about this in the political campaign.

I believe we can't afford to deny this coverage to the Nation's senior citizens.

Senator DASCHLE has been resolute in saying we ought to go forward and deal with this issue, and deal with it in this session of Congress.

I also want to commend several of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle: Senator DOMENICI, for example, in the Budget Committee, when this issue got to a flash point; it would have been very difficult even to go forward. Senator DOMENICI worked with several of us, particularly Senator SNOWE and Senator SMITH, in order to bring the committee together on this point. We had some bipartisan support last week in the Budget Committee for taking tangible action on this issue.

What is really important is that every Senator understands that I and others are going to stay at this issue again and again and again so the Senate does not miss this historic opportunity.

Too often, whether dating back to catastrophic health care legislation or the failed efforts in 1993 and 1994 to pass comprehensive health care reform, we have muffed. The Congress has muffed the opportunity to put in place a historic breakthrough in terms of health care in our country. I think we have another such opportunity as a result of the work that was done in the Budget Committee last week.

Only about one in four of our senior citizens has prescription drug coverage. Many of them take up to 20 medicines a year. Something like 20 percent of the Nation's senior citizens spend over $1,000 out of pocket now on their prescription medicines. As a result of these and other factors, there is not a single specialist in the health care field and not a Democrat or a Republican who would create a Medicare program today without including prescription drug coverage.

That is why the breakthrough we saw in the Budget Committee last week is so important. I think it is absolutely critical that we keep what was done in the Budget Committee throughout this process. It may be challenged on the floor of the Senate this week. My understanding is that there will be Senators opposed to it, but I think we can build on the work that was done last week in the Budget Committee. Again, I commend Chairman DOMENICI, Senator SNOWE, and Senator GORDON SMITH, my colleague from Oregon, for working with us on it—we can get this done; we can ensure that action on prescription drugs is tied to reform of the Medicare program.

Many of my colleagues have stressed this. I think they are right. I, too, happen to believe it would be better to have comprehensive Medicare reform that includes prescription drug coverage.

I think it is also clear—and I stress this because it is so important to this Senator and many on this side of the aisle—that we cannot afford to wait. We want to use competitive purchasing principles for prescription drug benefit. We will use the kind of principles that make sense in private sector health care. We will ensure the benefit is voluntary. No senior would have to choose this particular benefit if they preferred their existing coverage. However, we do want to put in place a universal coverage program. We want to get it done before this Congress adjourns.

We are going to fight with all our strength to protect what was done in the Budget Committee last week on the floor of the Senate this week and when it goes to conference and throughout the process so that if the Senate Finance Committee does not act to provide this benefit on or before September 1 of this year, that any Member of this body will be able, without facing points of order, come to the floor of the Senate and force the Senate to deal with this critical issue.

I am sure when my colleagues go home and talk to constituents they will find what I have found; that is, the question of prescription drug coverage is one of the two or three most pressing issues our constituents care about.

We have families and older people all across this country who are walking on an economic tightrope balancing their food bills against their fuel bills and their fuel bills against their medical costs.

I have been bringing to the floor of the Senate cases of older people who are supposed to take three pills and they take only two. They are breaking their lipid-lowering capsules in half—the drugs that help to deal with cholesterol and heart problems—because they cannot afford to take the full pill.

I spoke recently about a case from Hillsboro, OR, my home State. A physician actually put an elder person in a hospital for 6 weeks because that elderly man could not afford the medicine on an outpatient basis. Allowing outpatient coverage of medicine is what we are trying to accomplish in the Senate. Seniors could get their medicine without going into the hospital. That older gentleman in Hillsboro, OR, had to be hospitalized for 6 weeks so he could get his medicine paid for under what is known as Part A of the Medicare program. That is a classic example of how, under today's health care system, dollars are wasted by having a person hospitalized rather than getting help in the community and, at the same time, facing the predicament of taking longer to get healthy than if these benefits have been available more promptly on an outpatient basis for the elderly.

Last week's developments in the Budget Committee were encouraging. Many predicted the Budget Committee would not adopt binding language with respect to prescription drugs that would allow the Senate to get this program enacted, and get it enacted this year. However, the Budget Committee came together. I commend my colleagues, Senator SNOWE and Senator GORDON SMITH. They have worked with me for 15 months. We now have funding available in the budget resolution. We have a date certain when it can actually come before the Senate. If the Finance Committee doesn't act on or before September 1, any Senator could bring this issue to the floor of the Senate and it would be tied to the question of Medicare reform.

There is a long way to go. We have to get through the discussion this week. Then we will have a conference committee. Then many Members will work closely with the Finance Committee where there are many interested Senators who have devoted time to this prescription drug issue.

What was done in the Budget Committee last week was something of a breakthrough. It was a very encouraging development for the millions of seniors and families who are watching how Congress deals with this issue, watching to make sure we do it this year, do it on a bipartisan basis, and not just send it out to be another topic and cannon fodder for the political campaign this fall.

As I have made clear, I intend to keep coming back to the floor again and again raising examples of why this Nation cannot afford to deny prescription drug coverage for the elderly. More than 4,000 seniors from Oregon have written me since I have begun this effort. The cases illustrate in a dramatic way how important it is that Congress deal with this issue now.

I intend, with my colleagues, to come back again and again and again until we get this coverage for the Nation's older people. This country can no longer afford to have the Congress deny this coverage. With the work done in the Budget Committee, we have an opportunity now to deal with this issue promptly. The seniors who come to our town hall meetings with their prescription drug bills tell how their private insurance doesn't cover their prescriptions. Because they cannot afford prescription medicine, very often they get sicker. They are the ones who have a right to expect this Congress to act.

The developments last week for the first time give me a tangible sense that we are going to be able to get this done. It was concrete evidence that the Congress understands how important this issue is. Many of my colleagues have said this is one of their top two priorities for this session of Congress. Certainly it is for this Senator. We are going to keep coming back to this floor, stressing the need for action on their prescriptions until the Senate moves to do what should have been done years ago.

When Medicare was enacted in 1965, it did not cover prescription drugs. Now the big buyers, the health maintenance organizations and the health plans, are able to negotiate discounts. That means senior citizens in Alabama, Oregon, and across the country pay more for their medicine because they are not able to get the benefits of the big buyers. Seniors are going to have the power of the big buyers if we can act this session. A number of the key

bills before the Senate give older people bargaining power in the marketplace in order to be able to afford their medicine. That is key—affordability—the ability of senior citizens to afford their prescription medicine so they don't have to give up food, rent, and heat.

Making drugs affordable for seniors has been important to all Members who have focused on this issue. Yet there are many seniors who struggle to make ends meet because they cannot get medicine in an affordable way. The budget resolution provides the opportunity now for those seniors to get relief. I will do everything in my power, and there are many of my colleagues who will, as well, to defend what was done in the Budget Committee last week on prescription drugs throughout this process. If we have a floor fight on this measure, those who try to knock out what the Budget Committee did ought to understand how strong Members feel who worked to get that prescription drug coverage in the budget resolution. I hope we will not see that kind of fight.

I hope the work done by Senator SNOWE and Senator SMITH, along with Senator DASCHLE, Senator CONRAD, and myself, the group of Members who worked with the Budget Committee, can be preserved.

It ought to be preserved for the Nation's senior citizens. Those are the people who are counting on us to deliver on this critical issue. I intend to keep coming back to this floor again and again and again until we have achieved this major health care reform that the older people of this country richly deserve.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SESSIONS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Idaho is recognized.

Mr. CRAIG. I inquire of the Chair, what is the business on the floor at this moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I will then proceed for the next few moments in morning business.

I believe that when I am done, I will also conclude the Senate for the day and take us out, as others who had been planning morning business comments for the day are not going to be with us.

ENERGY PRICES AND GAS TAXES

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I thought I would come to the floor today to speak again about energy and the current energy cost crisis in which this Nation finds itself.

Many of us have been to the floor numerous times over the last several weeks comparing our current situation and the tremendous runup in gas prices with this administration's lack of an energy policy and how they correlate—or if they relate.

I have said, most critically, over the last several weeks, the only policy in town is the ''tin cup'' policy: Give our Secretary of Energy a tin cup, and send him to foreign oil-producing nations to beg for a little crude.

He has been begging. He wanted a lot more. He begged for 2 million barrels a day in additional production. He got considerably less than that. I think it is now a wait-and-see: How does this level out? What do the markets say? What is the consumer going to pay at the gas pump in July? My guess is, the consumer is going to be paying near $2 a gallon for regular gasoline, depending on where they are in the country.

The reason for this situation is what I would like to talk about this afternoon. Congress can respond in some ways. But we cannot increase oil production in the short term because, largely, we have had a policy of reducing oil production in this country for the last two decades, and it takes time to bring that production back on line. A great many people out there are opposed to increasing domestic production—all in the name of the environment or all in opposition to using hydrocarbons or some other issue that has helped shape the Clinton/Gore energy policy over the last 8 years.

When the Clinton-Gore administration came to town in 1993, its announced intention was to drastically alter the way the Nation used energy, especially fossil fuels. The President and the Vice President determined that a broad-based Btu tax would force us away from coal and oil and natural gas to renewable energies, such as solar and wind and biomass. That objective has remained the hallmark of this administration's energy policy—until now; that is, until the day before yesterday, when the President was blaming the Congress, saying we had failed to reauthorize the Strategic Petroleum Reserve—the salt domes in the Gulf of Mexico, where we have stored about 570 million barrels of crude oil.

The President promised his Btu tax would raise nearly $72 billion over 5 years, from 1994 to 1998, and marketed it as fair, helpful to the environment, that it would force down our dependence on foreign oil, and that it would have trivial impacts on consumers.

Congress did not pass the Btu tax because we thought it would be damaging to the consumer. And over the years we have become increasingly more dependent upon foreign oil. I doubt the President can declare a victory because he was unable to suck $72 billion out of the back pockets of Americans while at the same time he advanced policies that slowed down crude oil production in our country.

In fact, the Btu tax would have unfairly punished energy-intensive States and industries. Estimates by the American Petroleum Institute and the National Association of Manufacturers predicted the tax would hurt exports, reduce GDP by $38 billion, and destroy 700,000 American jobs.

That is why the Congress finally refused to pass the tax, over the President's and the Vice President's objection. Vice President GORE and President Clinton claimed the tax was needed to balance the budget and fund large new spending programs to offset the negative impact of the tax. They also claimed that use of crude oil imports would be reduced by 400,000 barrels a day.

At that time, DOE's own projections predicted—this is the President's own Department of Energy—that the tax would shave oil import growth by less than one-tenth in 10 years. DOE also predicted that by the year 2000, Americans would depend on foreign oil for three-fifths of their total crude oil requirements.

So quite the opposite was going on inside the administration. The President was talking politics, and his own Department of Energy was analyzing the matter and coming up with some very interesting facts.

The American Petroleum Institute, in testimony, said:

> . . . even if imports were to fall by the full 400,000 barrels a day claimed by the Administration, the cost of $34 billion in lost GDP is excessive relative to other alternatives for improving energy security. Using the Administration's optimistic predictions, the cost of the Btu tax works out to about $230 per barrel.

Of course, that would have been devastating to an economy that is highly dependent upon fossil fuels that not only make our cars and trucks go, but feed the whole petrochemical industry which manufactures carpeting, herbicides, pesticides, insecticides, and plastics, all of those things that make up our very large, integrated economy—therefore, the 700,000 estimated jobs lost if we were to raise the price of crude oil to $230 a barrel.

In the end, Congress did the right thing; we refused the President's and the Vice President's policy and said it would simply create havoc in our economy. Congress did agree to raise taxes on transportation fuels by 4.3 cents—the first time the Congress has actually put a tax on fuel—and then put it into the general fund of the Treasury. Of course, it was argued to be a deficit reduction tax.

A couple of years ago, we finally pulled that tax out of the general fund and put it back in the surface transportation fund, where all highway fuels taxes have gone historically, to fund the construction of roads, highways, and bridges.

The Clinton-Gore administration's obsession with fossil fuel use reduction has actually put us in the position we find ourselves today. The President, on March 7, 2000, at the White House said:

Americans should not want them [oil prices] to drop to $12 or $10 a barrel again because that. . .takes our mind off our business, which should be alternative fuels, energy conservation, reducing the impact of all this on global warming.

He is referring again to the cost of fuel. He simply said it would move us away from a desire for alternative fuels if we were to see low gasoline and fuel prices. Isn't that terrible? The alternative fuels were synthetics, highly subsidized by as much as $25 to $30 a barrel by tax money and, of course, alternative energy and electricity by solar voltaic cells and by wind machines.

The only problem is, I have not yet seen a car, or a truck for that matter, going down the road with a solar cell on the top of it. I don't think they run very well that way. Somehow the President and the Vice President, in their hatred of fossil fuels, have forgotten that point.

That is kind of an overview of 1993 to the present. What has happened during this administration? Domestic oil production is down 17 percent, and our crude oil consumption is up 14 percent. Dependence on foreign sources of crude oil has risen to 56 percent of our total crude requirements. In 1973, during the Arab oil embargo, our dependency was only 36 percent. I can remember that time.

I am sure some listening this afternoon will remember the gas lines, the frustration and even the violence that occurred when Americans found out for the first time there wasn't an abundance of energy. There was a shortage. They couldn't get what they needed for their commuting or the running of their businesses.

Since that time, while this country has struggled to put a policy together, other policies of our Government, largely environmental policies—some for the right reason—have progressively reduced our overall ability to produce and use domestic energy sources. That, coupled with the fixation of this administration on eliminating fossil fuels, now brings us to that point where we are now over 56-percent dependent.

We all remember in the early 1990s we were fighting a war in the Middle East. Why? Well, to help some of our allies. Those allies were large producers of crude oil, Saudi Arabia and Kuwait. We were fighting Iraq because the Iraqis had crossed the border and started the war. In the end, as they retreated and we were victorious, they set fire to many oil wells in Kuwait. We remember that phenomenal picture from the Middle East of black clouds of smoke as those oil wells burned. Many of our oil field workers went in and put the fires out for our neighbors.

Now, what is the irony of that? Today, the very enemy we fought is selling over 700,000 barrels of crude oil each day to the United States. Something is wrong about that. Something is wrong about an absence of foreign policy that has allowed that to happen. That is the reality of where we are.

Americans grow angry when they understand this administration only has excuses and solar cells and windmills for an energy policy. They understand that the Clinton/Gore foreign policy, working hand in glove with its non-energy policy, now tolerates that we buy Iraqi oil.

Of course, we are not sure where that money goes and what it is used for. Is Saddam Hussein being allowed to build another war machine with the millions of dollars a day that pour out of the pockets of our consumers into the treasury of Iraq? The Clinton-Gore administration, while making much of increased appliance efficiency, greater use of renewables from biomass and other ideas, ignores a very fundamental fact. A large part of our energy use cannot be addressed by these measures.

I am not suggesting we not pursue new technologies and alternatives. Where a solar cell fits, put one up; where wind farms work, we ought to have them. We ought to be striving to build the efficiencies of the new wind turbines. At the same time, those will not fuel a nation that produces the kind of growth we produce and builds its efficiencies based on flexible transportation and the ability to send our people and our products in an integrated way around the Nation and around the world.

The administration's failure to encourage domestic oil production and production of coal and natural gas has led us to this point of near crisis. This Congress will engage in the very near future in debating the issue to see what we can do in the short term to help solve the pressure being placed on our consumers, but we also will be looking at long-term policy to see if we can't begin to produce more of our own resources again.

For example, if we have the right tax incentives and if we were able and willing to build a floor for the small 15-barrel-or-less producer, we are not talking about the major oil companies. We are talking farmers and ranchers and private property owners spread all across the mid to lower south central part of our country and southwest that are known as stripper well producers. Their break even is about $17 a barrel. When gas oil crude prices went to $10 a barrel last year, many of those wells were shut in. If we would help encourage that production once again, we could produce well over a million barrels of oil back into our economy that is not producing today.

I think that is tremendously good policy, if the tradeoff is putting money in Saddam Hussein's hand to build a new war machine versus helping subsidize or provide incentives for the small producer across this country to bring back on line a million barrels a day of domestic crude oil.

The administration has refused to acknowledge the vast oil reserves and gas reserves we have offshore and in ANWR, the Alaska National Wildlife Refuge. We know we can explore and produce in these areas in an environmentally sound way. ANWR is an area about the size of Dulles Airport relative to the whole State of Virginia. Those opposed to exploring ANWR would have you believe that if we drilled inside Dulles Airport that it would pollute the whole State of Virginia.

How foolish can some of these people get who make those kinds of arguments? The President listened. The Vice President listened. They have refused to promote a policy that would allow safe and sound drilling to provide the energy for our country.

The Clinton-Gore administration recently announced a ban on future exploration for most of the Federal Outer Continental Shelf through the year 2012. That is where the real big oil reserves are left in this country, offshore. I know we all remember the oil spills of 20 years ago on the coast of California. What no one is talking about is the tremendous new technology that has been applied to the gulf and other areas where drilling goes on, where wells don't leak today and blowouts don't happen. If they do occur accidentally, they are immediately shut down. All of those technologies are in existence. I think anyone who has looked at the record of drilling in the Gulf of Mexico recognizes that it is clean and it is sound. It is extracting the resource and is having almost a zero impact on the environment of the gulf area and its coast lines.

In 1996, the administration resorted to the little used 1906 Antiquities Act. The President argued it was a major emergency and he had to lock up these millions of acres in Utah. What he was really locking up, for fear that it might be mined, was 23 billion tons of low-sulfur, high-value coal that could have been used to generate electricity in our country today and well into the future.

All of these areas that would have been mined—and they were a very small part of the over 1 million acres that the President locked up in the Grand Starcase/Escalante National Monument—would have been reclaimed in a natural way because that is part of the environmental policy of our country today. If you are going to disturb the land, once you have done so, you must put it back in as near a natural way as is possible.

The Clinton-Gore administration has vetoed legislation that would have opened the Coastal Plain of the remote Alaskan national wildlife reserve. It is estimated that there are 15 billion barrels of domestic crude oil up there.

The administration also has ignored a report prepared by the National Petroleum Council, requested by the Energy Secretary, explaining how the Nation can increase production and use of domestic natural gas resources from about 22 trillion cubic feet per year to more than 30 trillion cubic feet per

year over the next 10 to 12 years. In other words, we could add nearly 10 trillion cubic feet of new domestic gas to our energy mix.

That would allow the Northeast, which is tremendously dependent upon oil for space heat, to convert to a much cleaner fuel, a much more efficient fuel, a fuel of natural gas, and bring down their dependency on oil fuel for home heat and space heat.

The Clinton-Gore administration has shown little interest in solving our domestic energy problems until now, as the foreign oil producers have forced crude up to over $30 a barrel last month. Gasoline prices, last week, were $2 a gallon in San Francisco.

Mr. President, I argue that the Clinton-Gore administration has acted in other ways designed to force us away from the use of a reliable, available, relatively inexpensive fossil fuel, and the only argument the President had this weekend during his radio address was: Congress, you are to blame.

Yet I have listed numerous vetoes or efforts to block our administrative and rulemaking processes that have actually blocked production in our country. That is why many of us have suggested to this President that he needs to step back and work with Congress to define a national energy policy that promotes increased domestic crude oil and natural gas production, while looking at all of the other alternatives we have and the new technologies, especially clean coal technology. Nothing should be done in isolation of the other. It ought to well be a total package that we would want to work on.

My distinguished friend from West Virginia, Senator ROBERT BYRD, spoke eloquently last week on the subject. I want to add a few thoughts to his comments. The U.S. has the world's largest demonstrated coal reserve base and more than 90 percent of our total fossil fuel energy reserves are in coal. Yet this administration has downplayed new coal-burning and clean coal technologies—the very kind of thing we ought to want to bring online as much of our electricity is generated by coal, and as we define and refine the science of global warming and attempt to understand the cause or causes and how to respond. At present rates of consumption our coal will last for up to 270 years. In other words, we blessed with huge coal reserves. Yet this administration's lack of policy has forced us into near crisis. Coal is used to generate 56 percent of our electrical supply and about 88 percent of the Midwest's electrical needs. Coal use for electrical power has risen more than 250 percent since 1970, while sulfur dioxide emissions has decreased by 21 percent due to technology and, in part, due to some of the money we put into research sponsored here that has moved that kind of technology.

Now, as my colleagues think about all of this, here is a quote I found by the President over the weekend. Remember, I was talking about coal. I was talking about our tremendous need for production of electricity. Here is what the President was saying over the weekend:

> I think to a much greater degree, then, we have a commitment to the notion that we can improve the environment while we grow the economy—

None of us disagrees with that. But he goes on,

> . . . that is what the whole global warming issue is about. All over the world, there are people who just don't believe that you can get rich unless you put more stuff in the air that heats up the earth. They think you have got to burn more coal and oil in the digital economy. That is not true.

Mr. President, what you have said isn't true. What runs the digital economy of our country? What turns on the computer? What fires up the Internet? A solar cell? A wind mill? I don't think so, Mr. President. It is the abundance of electrical power.

Let me repeat: Coal use for electrical power has risen more than 250 percent since 1970, and the sulfur dioxide emissions during that time have actually decreased by 21 percent. Furthermore, the gas the Clinton/Gore administration blames for global warming, carbon dioxide, isn't a poisonous gas and isn't regulated under the Clean Air Act.

The point I am making is simply this: An abundant economy—the kind we are experiencing today that has us at or near full employment—is a direct result of an abundance of relatively inexpensive energy. The history of our country has been based on the availability of energy. That is why we are the wealthy Nation we are today. Look at the rest of the countries of the world; as they strive to grow and provide an economy for their people, they develop their energy base.

My wife and I and a group of business people from Idaho were in China in December. The skies were so dark there in Beijing that you could hardly see because they don't have the clean coal technology we have. Yet they are growing very rapidly and they need an abundant source of energy. They are building dams and nuclear reactors, and they are searching for a cleaner way to burn their coal because they know if they are to grow and provide their country and their citizens with opportunity, they are going to have to use coal to generate electric energy. President Clinton, I don't think you really get it. Do you think this new hi-tech, digital economy happens out there on its own? It is, in fact, a product of a nation who has an abundant energy base. In November of 1999, the EPA sued several coal-burning utilities, claiming they had made major modifications in their facilities without applying for new resource review permits. Utilities maintained that these were modifications made during routine maintenance. They were still providing high-quality energy with less emissions. Why is EPA out there suing at this moment, at a time when there is a deficiency of energy in this country and we ought to be promoting more? Certainly, we ought to be promoting it with all of the newest technology. But you don't do that by suing; you do that with policies that encourage people to do the right thing.

Lastly—and this is the irony of this administration which likes to think it has an energy policy—this morning, Secretary of Interior Bruce Babbitt is out looking for a dam to tear down. Eight years ago, he said he would like to knock down a really big dam while he is Secretary of Interior. Really big dams produce a lot of big power, Mr. Secretary, or haven't you figured that out? Big renewable power, hydropower. It doesn't have emissions; it is very clean. Yes, our fathers and forefathers chose to dam some rivers to generate electricity. Those were efficient ways to do it then, and they are finding out they are environmentally sound ways to do it now. Yet Mr. Babbitt wants to tear down one, two, or three dams, or I guess as many as he can get his hands on, or find a policies that make it difficult to keep these dams running.

Why don't we simply work to improve those dams? Why don't we make them more efficient by adding new technology to the dams, putting new turbines in them that are friendly and more efficient. It is beginning to happen nationwide. Why should we deny our country 20 percent of its energy base, or bad mouth that energy source, or attempt to tear it down? No, what I am trying to say this afternoon in this collection of thoughts is, Mr. President, I don't think you get away by just pointing a finger at a single action of the Congress and saying you didn't give me emergency authority over the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, so therefore our energy crisis is your fault, Congress.

I think I have named 15 or 20 issues on which this administration has taken a strong anti-energy, anti-production approach toward dealing with energy policy in this country. Mr. President, we can solve our energy problems. We are a marvelously creative Nation. But we don't do it by simply saying no. We do it by producing where we can produce, by creating less dependency on foreign sources, while at the same time building the kind of science and technology that allows us ever increasing energy efficiency and environmental improvement. I think in the coming years we are going to debate the global climate change issue. Getting rid of hydrocarbons isn't the answer. Getting rid of fossil fuels isn't the answer. It is finding better and more efficient ways to use them, and then allowing our technology to be sold and transferred to the world at large. If our clean coal technology were at use in China today, China would be a healthier, more environmentally clean place to live.

Someday they will be able to afford that technology, and they will want it. It is our businesses and our companies that develop it that ought to be encouraged to sell it to them. That is

called leadership. It simply isn't crawling into a cave and getting a candle to light your way and heat your space. It is building an efficient system recognizing that all sources of energy ought to be at play at this moment so that we can truly develop an abundant energy package for ourselves and our Nation's future. Thank you Mr. President.

TRIBUTE TO BRIGADIER GENERAL WEBSTER, UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I wish to take this opportunity to recognize and say farewell to an outstanding Air Force officer and former Marine, Brigadier General Ernest R. Webster, upon his retirement from the Air Force after more than thirty-two years of commissioned service. Throughout his career, Brigadier General Webster has served with distinction, and it is my privilege to recognize his many accomplishments and to commend him for the superb service he has provided the Air Force and our Nation.

General Webster is a native of my home State, having been born in Anguilla, Mississippi. He entered the United States Marine Corps Officer Candidate School Quantico, Virginia in 1967. After successfully qualifying as a Marine aviator, he served as a pilot and intelligence officer for the Naval Special Landing Forces in the Caribbean region. He served his nation as an aviator in Southeast Asia while stationed with the 1st Marine Air Wing in the Republic of Vietnam. General Webster was an aircraft maintenance officer and test pilot at New River, North Carolina prior to his transfer into the United States Air Force in January 1972. After attending Maintenance Officer School at Chanute Air Force Base, Illinois, he was assigned to Homestead Air Force Base, Florida, where he was chief of maintenance, flight examiner, chief of safety, and operations officer for the 301st Aerospace Rescue and Recovery Squadron.

As a major, he was assigned to Sheppard and Little Rock Air Force Bases for flight training where he mastered the C–130 Hercules weapon system. His next assignment was chief of safety for the 920th Weather Reconnaissance Group at Keesler Air Force Base in Biloxi, Mississippi. He then moved to March Air Force Base, California, serving as deputy commander for operations at the 303rd Aerospace Rescue and Recovery Squadron. He was promoted to colonel in 1985.

During that same year, Colonel Webster took command of the 907th Tactical Airlift Group, Rickenbacker Air National Guard Base, in Ohio. He was promoted to deputy chief of staff for operations, Headquarters 14th Air Force, Dobbins Air Force Base, Headquarters Air Force Reserve, to serve as assistant deputy chief of staff for operations where he played a critical role in the call-up of thousands of Air Force reserve members to Southwest Asia during Operations Desert Shield/Desert Storm. He then moved to Duke Field, Florida, to assume command of the 919th Special Operations Wing where he directed critical tactical operations. In 1994 he assumed command of the 403rd Wing at Keesler Air Force Base, Mississippi. Colonel Webster was promoted to Brigadier General in 1995.

General Webster's accomplishments are many. Units under his command received the Outstanding Unit Award in three of the five years he was in command. His ''Flying Jennies'' of the 815th Airlift Squadron accomplished Denton Amendment humanitarian missions in Honduras, Argentina, Ecuador, Nicaragua, Mexico, the Dominican Republic, Russia, and many other areas struck by disaster. His ''Hurricane Hunters'' of the 53rd Weather Reconnaissance Squadron were world-famous for providing critical hurricane information to residents of coastal areas in the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.

During his stellar career, General Webster has served the United States Marine Corps, the United States Air Force, and our great Nation with excellence and distinction. He provided exemplary leadership to the best-trained, best-equipped, and best-prepared citizen-airmen force in the history of our Nation. General Webster is a model of leadership and is a living example of our military's dedication to the core values of service before self, integrity first, and excellence in all endeavors.

General Webster will retire from the United States Air Force on April 3, 2000 after thirty-two years and six months of dedicated commissioned service. On behalf of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, I wish General Webster blue skies and safe landings. Congratulations on completion of an outstanding and successful career.

ESTUARY PARTNERSHIP RESTORATION ACT OF 1999

Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, I would like to say just a few words about the Estuary Partnership Restoration Act of 1999, which was passed by unanimous consent on Thursday March 30th. This bill contains language that reauthorizes the Chesapeake Bay Program. The success of the Bay program, and the partnerships that have been established as a result of that program, have led to improved water quality in the Bay, enhanced the lives of those of us lucky enough to live in the Chesapeake watershed, and added to the body of scientific knowledge that we have about estuaries, fisheries, and watersheds in general.

As Governor of Virginia I negotiated the original Chesapeake Bay Agreement. Last week, I had the opportunity to see that the Senate recognizes all the successes that have come from that program. The fact that the Chesapeake Bay program has enough support to be passed by unanimous consent is gratifying indeed. I am also excited at the prospect of expanding the oyster restoration program, which will enhance Bay water quality in a number of ways, and will continue to work for that expansion.

My only regret is that John Chafee, the original architect of the Estuary Habitat Restoration Partnership Act, was not here with us. His leadership on these issues was steadfast, his ability to convince us all to take right action remarkable. I was thinking of John Chafee, last week, wishing he could have joined in the happy moment that he helped make possible. I was happy to have the opportunity to contribute to his legacy, and know that his work will be with us for years to come.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE LIEUTENANT COLONEL, UNITED STATES ARMY RETIRED MARGARET L. ELLERMAN

• Mr. ROBB. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize and honor the late Lieutenant Colonel Margaret L. Ellerman, United States Army Retired.

A native of Michigan, Lieutenant Colonel Ellerman entered the Army as a private in 1964, after seven years of teaching in parochial schools. Following attendance at basic training and advanced individual training, she was selected for Officer Candidate School, from which she graduated in 1966.

Lieutenant Colonel Ellerman served as a Finance Officer for most of her career in a variety of command and staff positions. In 1968, she was selected for overseas duty in Germany, in an era when military women were virtually hand-picked for duty outside the United States. Other overseas assignments followed in Thailand and Turkey. Lieutenant Colonel Ellerman received numerous military honors, awards and decorations. Among these were three awards of the Meritorious Service Medal, the Army Commendation Medal and the Good Conduct Medal.

While on active duty, Lieutenant Colonel Ellerman, received her Bachelor of Science Degree in 1972 from Eastern Michigan University, and her Masters in Business Administration from Northwest Missouri State University. In addition, she was a graduate of numerous professional military finance and resource management courses. In 1977, Lieutenant Colonel Ellerman was a graduate of the United States Army Command and General Staff College.

After retirement from the United States Army in 1986, Lieutenant Colonel Ellerman entered civilian employment at the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, from which she retired in 1998. Upon this retirement, she founded her own corporation, Partners In Success, which assisted individuals establish their own businesses.

From 1991 until her death in March 2000, Lieutenant Colonel Ellerman continued to serve her country and the women who had, are, and will serve in the military forces of the United

States. She lent her considerable energy and economic knowledge to the Women In Military Service For America Memorial Foundation on the Board of Directors. Joining the cause in 1991, Lieutenant Colonel Ellerman worked tirelessly to see that this Memorial, housing and showcasing the achievements of all women who serve our nation in military service, was funded, erected and dedicated in October 1997. Through her ''behind the scenes'' efforts, this Memorial stands as a monument to our countrywomen who freely choose to dedicate their lives in military service to the United States.

Lieutenant Colonel Ellerman never stopped sharing the part of her that made her a dedicated teacher, career Army Officer, and philanthropic entrepreneur. Her charismatic character continues to inspire the men and women who knew and worked with her. The Department of Defense and the American people were well served by this selfless and dedicated Army soldier and civilian citizen.●

TRIBUTE TO ROBERT TAYLOR

● Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I rise today to congratulate Bob Taylor on his accomplishments at the University of Louisville Business School and in the Louisville business community.

From the moment Bob took over the reigns at UofL's business school in 1984, good things started to happen. Bob is a man of vision and incredible instincts about what works in the business world. He brought those talents to UofL to improve the quality of the program and strengthen the students' capabilities in a real-life business environment. Bob succeeded at both of those goals and brought UofL's rankings among U.S. business schools up to an honorable level and continues to rise in national recognition.

Numerous academic achievements mark Bob's tenure at UofL, including Success magazine's recent naming of UofL as one of the best in the nation for training entrepreneurs. Also, the business school has begun offering master's level programs overseas and now offers varied advanced degrees.

Several personal achievements are evidence of Bob's knowledge of and influence in the business world. He became the president of the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business last year, which serves as the accrediting body for business schools nationwide. Bob also serves the community on the board of directors for the Rawlings Company, Logan Aluminum Inc., the Louisville Police Administration Advisory Commission, and the Metro United Way.

Many of Bob's colleagues and members of the Louisville business community have noted his extraordinary leadership skills. Bob took on a huge responsibility when he came to UofL, and he continues to press on to reach higher goals for the school. For this, I commend Bob and thank him for his dedication to UofL. His hard work has paid off and students from across the state and even the nation are reaping the benefits of Bob's success. His experience in business and success at Louisville is a sign of more good things to come for the school and the great State of Kentucky.

Bob, on behalf of my colleagues and myself, thank you for your commitment to the students and faculty at UofL's College of Business and Public Administration. I have every confidence in your ability to lead the school to even greater heights with more accomplishments and successes in the years to come.

Mr. President, I also ask that an article which ran in the Louisville Courier-Journal on Sunday, March 19, 2000, appear in the RECORD following my remarks.

[From the Louisville Courier-Journal, Mar. 19, 2000]

U OF L DEAN DOUBLES AS CIVIC LEADER—LOW-KEY LEADER GUIDES A SCHOOL AND A COMMUNITY

(By David McGinty)

When he arrived in Louisville in 1984 to become dean of the University of Louisville's business school, Robert Taylor did not expect to hang around.

''I was going to stay here three years and move on,'' he recalled.

For perhaps one of the few times in his life, Taylor's expectation for the future was faulty. At the time, he thought his job would be fairly simple: To help a small business school win accreditation.

Tayor did not foresee the complications and twists that life would throw in his path, or where they would lead.

The business school now has master's-level programs in three overseas locations, offers several advanced degrees and is becoming known in academic circles.

In a recent U.S. News and World Report survey its undergraduate programs ranked 93rd among more than 327 programs—not in the top ranks, but a big step up from the bottom levels the program once inhabited.

Success magazine has ranked the school's program for training entrepreneurs among the best in the nation. And last year Taylor became president of the American Assembly of Collegiate Schools of Business, the accrediting body for business schools.

Apart from his academic accomplishments, Taylor may also be one of the most influential civic figures you never hear of.

He serves on a number of boards, charities and advisory bodies, including the boards of directors of the Rawlings Co. and Logan Aluminum Inc. and the Louisville Police Administration Advisory Commission. He is most proud, he said, of his service on the board of Metro United Way—but his greatest influence may be through less visible activities.

Although his style is low-key and his name rarely surfaces publicly, behind-the-scenes business and political leaders have learned he is a prescient adviser, and they seek him out. His contacts are widespread and so, although it is subtle and anonymous, is his contribution to Louisville's economic well-being.

''You've got to put him among the top five'' civic leaders whose contributions are not publicly known, said Bill Samuels, president of Maker's Mark distillery.

Samuels, a longtime friend, said Taylor ''is as bright as anybody I've ever met. . . . I've never had a dull conversation with him, and I've had several thousand. In a sense he's been a mentor to me.''

Former Louisville Mayor Jerry Abramson said that while he was in office he often worked with Taylor, particularly in urban workshops on visits to other cities to observe their accomplishments. After a visit Taylor would lead group discussions on what lessons could be learned, and he proved to be an adroit moderator with a gift for shaping a plan of action.

''Whenever we needed someone who could think outside the box and be a visionary and push the envelope a little bit, we always looked to the dean,'' Abramson said.

''There have been times when we worked on issues that I wasn't ready for a public discussion on, that I would take him into my confidence. He's a tremendous listener, and he can frame a consensus out of disparate views.''

''He's probably one of the biggest assets to the community,'' said David Wilkins, chairman of Doe-Anderson Advertising and Public Relations. ''He moves in and out of virtually every circle and level of the community with ease. He's trusted and respected by everybody.''

Wilkins' relationship with Taylor is a close one, with an unusual twist. In 1994, in what Taylor said was a pivotal moment for him, he took a six-month sabbatical to work at Wilkins' agency and learn firsthand how the business world works.

At the time, Taylor was winding up a decade of busy and often frustrating activity. He took charge of the business school just as it was entering an unforeseen period of problems and change.

At Doe-Anderson, Taylor made an abrupt eye-opening transition from academia to the business world. He quickly learned ''that the environment business people were facing was changing daily.''

''Everything was getting much faster,'' Taylor said. ''The turnaround time on work was faster, the demands were faster. In order to be successful, they had to be completely flexible.''

Taylor's own background is a mix of academic and military, with no private business experience. A native of Pittsburgh, he graduated from Allegheny College in 1961 with a U.S. Air Force commission through the ROTC. Later he received advanced business degrees from Ohio State University and Indiana University.

He had a eight-year stint at the U.S. Air Force Academy in Colorado, rising to head the Department of Economics, Geography and Management. After retiring from the Air Force in 1981 he joined the faculty of the University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point, where he headed the division of business and economics. From that job he came to U of L.

After his stint at Doe-Anderson, Taylor returned to U of L convinced that the business school was not keeping up with the world outside, so he set up teams of faculty to reorganize the school.

''I said, 'Look, gang, we are not adapting quickly enough. We've got to do something different so that we have the same sense of urgency, the same flexibility that our students must have if they're going to be successful in business.' ''

The response, Taylor acknowledged, was not overwhelming. One faculty member said he'd left the business world because ''I didn't want that kind of frenzy.''

And some of the results weren't successful. But such stumbles are part of progress, Taylor believes, and the school has made progress. When he came back from his sabbatical, he set long-range goals for the school.

He wanted it to achieve national recognition for its public administration programs. That recognition is coming, and the school's overseas programs are gaining an international reputation and alumni base.

He wanted the schools entrepreneurial program to start new, student-run businesses. That effort is beginning to get off the ground through a venture-capital fund, a telecommunications research center intended to incubate new businesses and the aid of former business executives on the faculty.

He wanted the school's endowment to top $25 million. It has topped $21 million and is growing.

In Louisville's business community the school's reputation is increasingly solid, in no small part because of Taylor's own credibility. Civic figures who have worked with him say he has been a prescient advocate—sometimes the first—for coming economic trends.

He was one of the first voices in the community to preach the importance of new technology and the Internet.

Doug Cobb, who was until recently president of Greater Louisville Inc., said Taylor ''is the original champion of the idea that Louisville needs to be more entrepreneurial.''

Cobb, himself one of the city's foremost advocates of entrepreneurial activity, said he feels like ''I walk in his steps a little bit.''

To Taylor, this kind of trailblazing is part of the job. ''I feel like my responsibility to this community is that we have to be on the leading edge, and somebody has to be telling people what is happening.''

It has not always been rewarding work, and by his own account Taylor has not always been successful. In the early 1990s, he foresaw a coming shortage of workers in the community and began urging measures to attract immigrants to Louisville.

But when he proposed such steps to a committee planning economic-development strategies for the community, the reception was hostile. ''I'll never forget. A couple of aldermen and other people just berated me, saying we've got unemployed in this community we've got to help first.''

Without rancor, Taylor characterized that period as his ''biggest failure'' to direct the community's attention to an important issue.

Now, of course, employers are straining to find qualified workers. Civic leaders are pondering how to ensure that the community will have enough workers in the future to support economic growth—and one of the strategies is to attract immigrants.

''I think if we had been prepared, we wouldn't have had the pressure on our work force that we have today, and we could be bringing in more people than we bring in now,'' he said.

That's an opportunity missed. Taylor now is pushing the community's business leaders not to miss other opportunities that he sees, particularly in rapidly evolving technologies.

Traditionally, Taylor said, Louisville has been content to follow economic trends. That's got to stop, he said. ''I'm saying the trends are occurring so quickly we can't afford a time lag. We have to go and grab it.''

Taylor is already pushing his faculty to what he sees as emerging possibilities for global education—a degree program that involves courses in two countries, two universities, two languages, two cultures.

''That's my new vision,'' he said, and he admits that when he espouses it ''some people are looking at me like I've gone off the deep end.''

To his friends, that's just vintage Bob Taylor.

''He's such an individualist,'' Samuels said. ''He enjoys ideas that are in the unconventional vein. And I've got so much respect for his judgment. I think he'd make a wonderful CEO.''●

NATIONAL COUNTY GOVERNMENT WEEK

● Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I rise today to salute the work of the 3,072 county governments nationwide, and in particular the work of the 87 counties in my home State of Minnesota. Counties are often an invisible, but extremely important part of our intergovernmental system. As we enter the new millennium, it is important to review our past as we look to the future.

County governments began as a response to the needs of the early settlers of our country, tracing their beginnings to the roots of the Anglo-Saxon local government 1,000 years ago. Counties first appeared in colonial America, making them older than the Republic itself.

Traditionally, counties performed state-mandated duties which included assessment of property, record-keeping, such as property and vital statistics, maintenance of rural roads, and administration of election and judicial functions. Today, counties are moving rapidly into other areas, undertaking programs relating to consumer protection, economic development, employment training, planning and zoning, and water quality, to name just a few.

During the week of April 9–15, counties across the country are celebrating National County Government Week. This celebration is an annual event for counties. First held in 1991, the goal of National County Government Week is to raise public awareness and understanding about the roles and responsibilities of the Nation's counties.

More than 1,000 counties annually participate in National County Government Week by holding a variety of programs and events at the national, State and local levels. These include tours of county facilities, presentations in schools, meetings with business and community leaders, recognition programs for volunteers, briefings on environmental projects, and the adoption of proclamations.

There is a theme each year for National County Government Week. This year, the theme is ''Honoring Volunteers.'' The National Association of Counties will recognize the top county volunteer programs in the country at a ceremony April 13 in Washington, D.C. Counties will receive awards for their ''Acts of Caring'' efforts that they undertook using volunteers to improve their country's quality of life.

I know that NACo has encouraged counties to hold a town meeting this week during National County Government Week or launch a series of community-wide dialogues to solicit citizen participation in identifying the community's most pressing issues and establishing a comprehensive vision for the future. I hope many Minnesota counties will participate in these activities.

NACo has also suggested that, as we enter the new millennium, counties reflect on the past and prepare for the future. As part of that process, counties may want to apply for the designation of Millennium Community. This designation, presented by the White House Millennium Council, is given to counties and cities that have established programs that ''Honor the Past—Imagine the Future.''

One of NACo's priorities for this year is economic development. The organization is encouraging counties to create and expand businesses, noting the fact that businesses not only provide jobs, but also keep taxes in check. Therefore, counties have been encouraged to promote economic development programs.

Mr. President, I am pleased to rise today to support the efforts of our county governments not only in Minnesota, but throughout the country. National County Government Week will again be successful in raising pubic awareness of the good work of our nation's county governments and how they help improve the lives of their residents.●

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, which were referred as indicated:

EC–8297. A communication from the Commissioner, Public Buildings Service, General Services Administration transmitting a report relative to the new Byron G. Rogers Federal Building-Courthouse in Denver, CO; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–8298. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; California State Implementation Plan Revision; Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District, San Diego County, San Joaquin Valley Unified, and Ventura County Air Pollution Control Districts'' (FRL #6569–9), received March 29, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–8299. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Hazardous Waste Management System; Identification and Listing of Hazardous Waste; Final Exclusion'' (FRL #6570–2), received March 29, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–8300. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revision to the California State Implementation Plan, Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District'' (FRL #6569–5), received March 29, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–8301. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Revision to the Water Quality Planning and Management Regulation Listing Requirements'' (FRL #6569–7),

received March 29, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–8302. A communication from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Office of Policy, Planning and Evaluation, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Technical Corrections to: Standards of Performance for New Stationary Sources and Guidelines for Control of Existing Sources: Municipal Solid Waste Landfills'' (FRL #6570–4), received March 29, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–8303. A communication from the Secretary of Labor and Chairman of the Board, and the Executive Director, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report for fiscal year 1999; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–8304. A communication from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Strategy and Threat Reduction, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to the elimination of Russian SS–18 ICBMs; to the Committee on Armed Services.

EC–8305. A communication from the Regulatory Policy Officer, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Increase in Tax on Tobacco Products and Cigarette Papers and Tubes (64 FR 71937)'' (RIN 1512–AB88), received March 28, 2000; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–8306. A communication from the Chief Counsel, Office of Foreign Assets Control, Department of the Treasury transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Blocked Persons, Specially Designated Nationals, Specially Designated Terrorists, Foreign Terrorist Organizations, and Specially Designated Narcotics Traffickers: Additional Designations and Removal and Supplementary Information on Specially Designated Narcotics Traffickers'' (Appendix A to 31 CFR Chapter V), received March 29, 2000; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE SUBMITTED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Pursuant to the order of the Senate of March 30, 2000, the following report was submitted on March 31, 2000, during the adjournment of the Senate:

By Mr. DOMENICI, from the Committee on the Budget, without amendment:

S. Con. Res. 101: An original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal years 2001 through 2005 and revising the budgetary levels for fiscal year 2000 (Rept. No. 106–251).

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. HELMS:

S. 2339. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to issue a certificate of documentation with appropriate endorsements for employment in the coastwise trade for the vessel EAGLE; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MCCAIN (for himself, Mr. BROWNBACK, and Mr. LEAHY):

S. 2340. A bill to direct the National Institute of Standards and Technology to establish a program to support research and training in methods of detecting the use of performance-enhancing substances by athletes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 1364

At the request of Mr. BAYH, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. COVERDELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1364, a bill to amend title IV of the Social Security Act to increase public awareness regarding the benefits of lasting and stable marriages and community involvement in the promotion of marriage and fatherhood issues, to provide greater flexibility in the Welfare-to-Work grant program for long-term welfare recipients and low income custodial and noncustodial parents, and for other purposes.

S. 2060

At the request of Mrs. FEINSTEIN, the names of the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. GRAMS), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. DASCHLE), the Senator from Louisiana (Ms. LANDRIEU), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. WELLSTONE), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. KERREY), the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL), the Senator from Florida (Mr. GRAHAM), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CLELAND), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI), the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH), the Senator from Washington (Mr. GORTON), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. FITZGERALD), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. ROBB), the Senator from Florida (Mr. MACK), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS), the Senator from Alaska (Mr. STEVENS), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAIG), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE), the Senator from Georgia (Mr. COVERDELL), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from Colorado (Mr. CAMPBELL), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. ROTH), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. TORRICELLI), the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SANTORUM), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. FEINGOLD), the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VOINOVICH), the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. BREAUX), the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. INHOFE), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING), the Senator from New Mexico (Mr. BINGAMAN), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED), the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROCKEFELLER), the Senator from New York (Mr. SCHUMER), the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. AKAKA), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. HARKIN), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. BRYAN), the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. KOHL), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY), the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN), the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY), the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD), the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CONRAD), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KERRY), the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), the Senator from Arkansas (Mrs. LINCOLN), the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS), the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. EDWARDS), the Senator from Oregon (Mr. SMITH), the Senator from Montana (Mr. BURNS), the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND), the Senator from Kansas (Mr. BROWNBACK), the Senator from Maine (Ms. SNOWE), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. SMITH) were added as cosponsors of S. 2060, a bill to authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to Charles M. Schulz in recognition of his lasting artistic contributions to the Nation and the world, and for other purposes.

S. 2235

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2235, a bill to amend the Public Health Act to revise the performance standards and certification process for organ procurement organizations.

S. 2284

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. LEAHY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2284, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide for an increase in the Federal minimum wage.

S. 2308

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the name of the Senator from Virginia (Mr. ROBB) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2308, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to assure preservation of safety net hospitals through maintenance of the Medicaid disproportionate share hospital program.

S. 2314

At the request of Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. TORRICELLI), and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR) were added as cosponsors of S. 2314, a bill for the relief of Elian Gonzalez and other family members.

S. RES. 279

At the request of Mrs. BOXER, the name of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. REID) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 279, a resolution expressing the sense of the Senate that the United States Senate Committee on Foreign Relations should hold hearings and the Senate should act on the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women (CEDAW).

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 101—SETTING FORTH THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET FOR THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT FOR FISCAL YEARS 2001 THROUGH 2005 AND REVISING THE BUDGETARY LEVELS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2000

Mr. DOMENICI, from the Committee on the Budget, reported under authority of the order of the Senate of March 30, 2000, the following original concurrent resolution; which was placed on the Calendar on March 31, 2000:

S. CON. RES. 101

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

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001.

(a) DECLARATION.—Congress determines and declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2001 including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2002, 2003, 2004, and 2005 as authorized by section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and the revised budgetary levels for fiscal year 2000 as authorized by section 304 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

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

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2001.

TITLE I—LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.
Sec. 102. Social Security.
Sec. 103. Major functional categories.
Sec. 104. Reconciliation of revenue reductions in the Senate.

TITLE II—BUDGETARY RESTRAINTS AND RULEMAKING

Sec. 201. Congressional lock box for Social Security surpluses.
Sec. 202. Reserve fund for Medicare.
Sec. 203. Reserve fund for stabilization of payments to counties in support of education.
Sec. 204. Reserve fund for agriculture.
Sec. 205. Tax reduction reserve fund in the Senate.
Sec. 206. Reserve fund for additional surpluses.
Sec. 207. Mechanism for additional debt reduction.
Sec. 208. Emergency designation point of order in the Senate.
Sec. 209. Reserve fund pending increase of fiscal year 2001 discretionary spending limits.
Sec. 210. Congressional firewall for defense and non-defense spending.
Sec. 211. Mechanisms for strengthening budgetary integrity.
Sec. 212. Prohibition on use of Federal Reserve surpluses.
Sec. 213. Reaffirming the prohibition on the use of revenue offsets for discretionary spending.
Sec. 214. Application and effect of changes in allocations and aggregates.
Sec. 215. Reserve fund to foster the health of children with disabilities and the employment and independence of their families.
Sec. 216. Exercise of rulemaking powers.

TITLE III—SENSE OF THE SENATE PROVISIONS

Sec. 301. Sense of the Senate on controlling and eliminating the growing international problem of tuberculosis.
Sec. 302. Sense of the Senate on increased funding for the Child Care and Development Block Grant.
Sec. 303. Sense of the Senate on tax relief for college tuition paid and for interest paid on student loans.
Sec. 304. Sense of the Senate on increased funding for the National Institutes of Health.
Sec. 305. Sense of the Senate supporting funding levels in Educational Opportunities Act.
Sec. 306. Sense of the Senate on additional budgetary resources.
Sec. 307. Sense of the Senate on regarding the inadequacy of the payments for skilled nursing care.
Sec. 308. Sense of the Senate on the CARA programs.
Sec. 309. Sense of the Senate on veteran's medical care.
Sec. 310. Sense of the Senate on Impact Aid.
Sec. 311. Sense of the Senate on funding for increased acreage under the Conservation Reserve Program and the Wetlands Reserve Program.
Sec. 312. Sense of the Senate on tax simplification.
Sec. 313. Sense of the Senate on antitrust enforcement by the Department of Justice and Federal Trade Commission regarding agriculture mergers and anti-competitive activity.
Sec. 314. Sense of the Senate regarding fair markets for American farmers.
Sec. 315. Sense of the Senate on women and Social Security reform.
Sec. 316. Protection of battered women and children.
Sec. 317. Use of False Claims Act in combatting medicare fraud.
Sec. 318. Sense of the Senate regarding the National Guard.
Sec. 319. Sense of the Senate regarding military readiness.
Sec. 320. Sense of the Senate on compensation for the Chinese Embassy bombing in Belgrade.
Sec. 321. Sense of the Senate supporting funding of digital opportunity initiatives.
Sec. 322. Sense of the Senate regarding immunization funding.
Sec. 323. Sense of the Senate regarding tax credits for small businesses providing health insurance to low-income employees.
Sec. 324. Sense of the Senate on funding for criminal justice.
Sec. 325. Sense of the Senate regarding the Pell Grant.
Sec. 326. Sense of the Senate regarding comprehensive public education reform.
Sec. 327. Sense of the Senate on providing adequate funding for United States international leadership.
Sec. 328. Sense of the Senate concerning the HIV/AIDS crisis.
Sec. 329. Sense of the Senate regarding tribal colleges.

TITLE I—LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are the revised levels for fiscal year 2000 and the appropriate levels for the fiscal years 2001 through 2005:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution—

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $1,464,604,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,501,658,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,546,533,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,598,771,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,655,093,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,720,654,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: −$877,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: −$13,157,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: −$24,854,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: −$30,752,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: −$37,550,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: −$43,448,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $1,467,257,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,471,817,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,502,777,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,614,195,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,670,329,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,730,514,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution and the revised fiscal year 2000 resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $1,441,459,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,447,795,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,469,962,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,589,699,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,644,120,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,705,698,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $23,145,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $53,863,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $76,571,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $9,072,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $10,973,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $14,956,000,000.

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $5,625,962,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $5,667,144,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $5,681,983,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $5,768,762,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $5,849,465,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $5,923,674,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of the debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $3,455,362,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $3,248,659,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $2,995,663,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $2,802,939,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $2,594,260,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $2,364,124,000,000.

SEC. 102. SOCIAL SECURITY.

(a) SOCIAL SECURITY REVENUES.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the amounts of revenues of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $479,648,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $501,533,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $524,854,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $547,179,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $569,907,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $597,326,000,000.

(b) SOCIAL SECURITY OUTLAYS.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the amounts of outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $322,545,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $331,869,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $339,068,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $347,733,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $357,737,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $368,976,000,000.

(c) SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—In the Senate, the amounts of new budget authority and budget outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance

Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund for administrative expenses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $3,160,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,187,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $3,429,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,378,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $3,471,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3.438,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $3,505,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,473,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $3,541,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,507,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $3,576,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,543,000,000.

SEC. 103. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority, budget outlays, new direct loan obligations, and new primary loan guarantee commitments for fiscal year 2000 (as revised) and fiscal years 2001 through 2005 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $291,583,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $288,112,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $305,833,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $294,064,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $309,085,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $302,272,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $315,485,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $309,362,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $323,191,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $317,461,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $331,532,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $327,948,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $21,967,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,019,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $20,139,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,625,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $20,868,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,932,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $21,420,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,573,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $21,907,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,741,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $22,645,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,892,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $19,267,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,418,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $19,703,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,245,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $19,877,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,593,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $19,806,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,515,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $20,069,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,655,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $20,337,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,900,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $1,081,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$607,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $1,475,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $172,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, −$264,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$1,366,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $1,202,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$43,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $1,238,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$124,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $1,210,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$85,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $24,487,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,245,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $24,936,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,905,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $25,023,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,045,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $25,019,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,203,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $25,066,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,065,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $25,059,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,876,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $35,257,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,916,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $20,894,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,779,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $18,950,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,235,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $17,965,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,366,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $17,354,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,910,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $16,092,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,593,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $7,594,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,141,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $6,117,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,977,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $8,608,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,864,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $9,356,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,677,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $13,413,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,391,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $13,368,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,331,000,000.

(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $54,352,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,656,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $59,247,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,822,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $57,536,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $53,486,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $59,101,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $55,516,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $59,135,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $56,138,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $59,174,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $56,418,000,000.

(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $11,336,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,725,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $9,021,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,386,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $8,822,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,815,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $8,665,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,749,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $8,657,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,255,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $8,744,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,886,000,000.

(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $57,688,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $61,904,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $74,977,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $68,648,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $75,744,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $72,570,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $76,636,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $75,430,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $77,751,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $76,766,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $79,128,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $78,033,000,000.

(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $159,224,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $153,473,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $169,215,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $165,836,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $178,911,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $177,766,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $190,951,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $190,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $205,181,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $204,835,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $221,484,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $220,329,000,000.

(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $199,601,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $199,507,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $218,751,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $219,005,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $228,635,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $228,604,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $249,762,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $249,520,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $265,318,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $265,546,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $288,730,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $288,681,000,000.

(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2000:

(A) New budget authority, $238,891,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $248,071,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $253,236,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $255,424,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $264,844,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $267,252,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $274,789,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $278,452,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $284,929,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $288,367,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $297,669,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $301,202,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $11,532,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,533,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $9,728,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,727,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $11,572,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,572,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $12,271,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,271,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $13,020,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,020,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $13,841,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,841,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $46,010,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,130,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $47,568,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,141,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $48,823,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,704,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $50,838,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,513,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $52,119,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $51,842,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $55,517,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $55,194,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $27,370,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,013,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $27,927,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,224,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $28,520,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,698,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $29,157,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,123,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $31,283,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,012,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $32,124,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,863,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $13,670,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,727,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $14,427,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,291,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $13,605,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,883,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $13,578,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,768,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $13,570,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,882,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $13,595,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,604,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $284,491,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $284,493,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $286,920,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $286,920,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $285,291,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $285,290,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $279,465,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $279,465,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $275,502,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $275,502,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $270,951,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $270,951,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, −$3,829,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$11,702,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, −$59,931,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$48,031,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, −$59,729,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$71,311,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, −$790,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, −$6,770,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, −$6,072,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, −$34,315,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$34,315,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, −$38,366,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$38,366,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, −$41,943,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$41,943,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, −$41,270,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$41,270,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, −$38,374,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$38,374,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, −$40,686,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$40,686,000,000.

SEC. 104. RECONCILIATION OF REVENUE REDUCTIONS IN THE SENATE.

Not later than September 22, 2000, the Senate Committee on Finance shall report to the Senate a reconciliation bill proposing changes in laws within its jurisdiction necessary to reduce revenues by not more than $13,157,000,000 in fiscal year 2001 and $149,761,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005.

TITLE II—BUDGETARY RESTRAINTS AND RULEMAKING

SEC. 201. CONGRESSIONAL LOCK BOX FOR SOCIAL SECURITY SURPLUSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) under the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, the Social Security trust funds are off-budget for purposes of the President's budget submission and the concurrent resolution on the budget;

(2) the Social Security trust funds have been running surpluses for 18 years;

(3) these surpluses have been used to implicitly finance the general operations of the Federal Government;

(4) in fiscal year 2001, the Social Security surplus will reach $166,000,000,000;

(5) in fiscal year 1999, the Federal budget was balanced without using Social Security;

(6) the only way to ensure that Social Security surpluses are not diverted for other purposes is to balance the budget exclusive of such surpluses; and

(7) Congress and the President should take such steps as are necessary to ensure that future budgets continue to be balanced excluding the surpluses generated by the Social Security trust funds.

(b) POINT OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any revision to this concurrent resolution, or any other concurrent resolution on the budget, or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that sets forth a deficit for any fiscal year.

(2) DEFICIT LEVELS.—For purposes of this subsection, a deficit shall be the level (if any) set forth in the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget for that fiscal year pursuant to section 301(a)(3) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(c) BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.—For purposes of this section, the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for a fiscal year shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives or the Senate, as applicable.

(d) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (b) shall not apply if—

(1) the most recent of the Department of Commerce's advance, preliminary, or final reports of actual real economic growth indicate that the rate of real economic growth for each of the most recently reported quarter and the immediately preceding quarter is less than 1 percent; or

(2) a declaration of war is in effect.

(e) SOCIAL SECURITY LOOK-BACK.—If in any fiscal year the social security surplus is used to finance general operations of the Federal Government, an amount equal to the amount used shall be deducted from the available amount of discretionary spending for the following fiscal year for purposes of any concurrent resolution on the budget.

(f) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (b) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required in the Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

SEC. 202. RESERVE FUND FOR PRESCRIPTION DRUGS.

(a) ALLOCATION.—In the Senate, spending aggregates and other appropriate budgetary levels and limits may be adjusted and allocations may be revised for legislation reported by the Committee on Finance to provide a prescription drug benefit for fiscal years 2001, 2002, and 2003, provided that this legislation will not reduce the on-budget surplus by more than $20,000,000,000 total during these 3 fiscal years, and provided that the enactment of this legislation will not cause an on-budget deficit in any of these 3 fiscal years.

(b) EXCEPTION.—The adjustments provided in subsection (a) shall be made for a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment that is offered (in the Senate), that provides coverage for prescription drugs, if the Senate Committee on Finance has not reported such legislation on or before September 1, 2000.

(c) ADJUSTMENT.—If legislation is reported by the Senate Committee on Finance that extends the solvency of the Medicare Hospital Insurance Trust Fund without the use

of transfers of new subsidies from the general fund, without decreasing beneficiaries' access to health care, and excluding the cost of extending and modifying the prescription drug benefit crafted purusuant to section (a) or (b), then the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget may change committee allocations and spending aggregates by no more than $20,000,000,000 total for fiscal years 2004 and 2005 to fund the prescription drug benefit if such legislation will not cause an on-budget deficit in either of these 2 fiscal years.

(d) BUDGETARY ENFORCEMENT.—The revision of allocations and aggregates made under this section shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

SEC. 203. RESERVE FUND FOR STABILIZATION OF PAYMENTS TO COUNTIES IN SUPPORT OF EDUCATION.

(a) ADJUSTMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Whenever the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate reports a bill, or an amendment thereto is offered, or a conference report thereon is submitted, that provides additional resources for counties and complies with paragraph (2), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may increase the allocation of budget authority and outlays to that committee by the amount of budget authority (and the outlays resulting therefrom) provided by that legislation for such purpose in accordance with subsection (b).

(2) CONDITION.—Legislation complies with this paragraph if it provides for the stabilization of receipt-based payments to counties that support school and road systems and also provides that a portion of those payments would be dedicated toward local investments in Federal lands within the counties.

(b) LIMITATIONS.—The adjustments to the allocations required by subsection (a) shall not exceed $200,000,000 in budget authority (and the outlays resulting therefrom) for fiscal year 2001 and shall not exceed $1,100,000,000 in budget authority (and the outlays resulting therefrom) for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005.

SEC. 204. RESERVE FUND FOR AGRICULTURE.

(a) ADJUSTMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate reports a bill on or before June 29, 2000, or an amendment thereto is offered, or a conference report thereon is submitted that provides assistance for producers of program crops and specialty crops, and enhancements for agriculture conservation programs that complies with paragraph (2), the appropriate chairman of the Committee on the Budget may increase the allocation of budget authority and outlays to that committee by the amount of budget authority (and the outlays resulting therefrom) provided by that legislation for such purpose in accordance with subsection (b).

(2) CONDITIONS.—Legislation complies with this paragraph if it does not cause a net increase in budget authority and outlays of greater than $1,640,000,000 for fiscal year 2001.

(b) LIMITATIONS.—The adjustments to the allocations required by subsection (a) shall not exceed $5,500,000,000 in budget authority and outlays for fiscal year 2000, and $3,000,000,000 in budget authority (and the outlays resulting therefrom) for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005.

SEC. 205. TAX REDUCTION RESERVE FUND IN THE SENATE.

In the Senate, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may reduce the spending and revenue aggregates and may revise committee allocations for legislation that reduces revenues if such legislation will not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for—

(1) fiscal year 2001; or

(2) the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005.

SEC. 206. RESERVE FUND FOR ADDITIONAL SURPLUSES.

(a) CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE UPDATED BUDGET FORECAST.—Pursuant to section 202(e)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Congressional Budget Office shall update its economic and budget outlook for fiscal years 2001 through 2010 by July 1, 2000.

(b) REPORTING A SURPLUS.—If the report provided pursuant to subsection (a) estimates an on-budget surplus for any fiscal year that exceeds the on-budget surplus set forth in the Congressional Budget Office's March 2000 economic and budget outlook, the appropriate chairman of the Committee on the Budget may make the adjustments as provided in subsection (c).

(c) ADJUSTMENTS.—The appropriate chairman of the Committee on the Budget may make the following adjustments in an amount equal to the difference between the on-budget surpluses set forth in the March report and the on-budget surplus contained in the July report:

(1) Reduce the on-budget revenue aggregate by that amount for such fiscal year.

(2) Increase the on-budget surplus levels used for determining compliance with the pay-as-you-go requirements of section 207 of H. Con. Res. 68 (106th Cong., 1st Sess.).

(3) Adjust the instruction in section 104 to—

(A) increase the reduction in revenues by that amount for fiscal year 2001; and

(B) increase the reduction in revenues by the sum of the amounts for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005.

SEC. 207. MECHANISM FOR ADDITIONAL DEBT REDUCTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—If any of the legislation described in subsection (b) does not become law on or before October 1, 2000, then the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate shall adjust the levels in this concurrent resolution as provided in subsection (c).

(b) LEGISLATION.—The adjustment required by subsection (a) shall be made with respect to—

(1) the reconciliation legislation required by section 104; or

(2) the Medicare legislation provided for in section 202.

(c) ADJUSTMENTS TO BE MADE.—The adjustment required in subsection (a) shall be—

(1) with respect to the legislation required by section 104, to decrease the balance displayed on the Senate's pay-as-you-go scorecard and increase the revenue aggregate by the amount set forth in section 104 (as adjusted, if adjusted, pursuant to section 205) and to decrease the level of debt held by the public as set forth in section 101(6) by that same amount; or

(2) with respect to the legislation provided for in section 202, to decrease the balance displayed on the Senate's pay-as-you-go scorecard by the amount set forth in section 202 and to decrease the level of debt held by the public as set forth in section 101(6) by that same amount and make the corresponding adjustments to the revenue and spending aggregates and allocations (as adjusted by section 202).

SEC. 208. EMERGENCY DESIGNATION POINT OF ORDER IN THE SENATE.

(a) DESIGNATIONS.—

(1) GUIDANCE.—In making a designation of a provision of legislation as an emergency requirement under section 251(b)(2)(A) or 252(e) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the committee report and any statement of managers accompanying that legislation shall analyze whether a proposed emergency requirement meets all the criteria in paragraph (2).

(2) CRITERIA.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The criteria to be considered in determining whether a proposed expenditure or tax change is an emergency requirement are—

(i) necessary, essential, or vital (not merely useful or beneficial);

(ii) sudden, quickly coming into being, and not building up over time;

(iii) an urgent, pressing, and compelling need requiring immediate action;

(iv) subject to subparagraph (B), unforeseen, unpredictable, and unanticipated; and

(v) not permanent, temporary in nature.

(B) UNFORESEEN.—An emergency that is part of an aggregate level of anticipated emergencies, particularly when normally estimated in advance, is not unforeseen.

(3) JUSTIFICATION FOR FAILURE TO MEET CRITERIA.—If the proposed emergency requirement does not meet all the criteria set forth in paragraph (2), the committee report or the statement of managers, as the case may be, shall provide a written justification of why the requirement should be accorded emergency status.

(b) POINT OF ORDER.—When the Senate is considering a bill, resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report, a point of order may be made by a Senator against an emergency designation in that measure and if the Presiding Officer sustains that point of order, that provision making such a designation shall be stricken from the measure and may not be offered as an amendment from the floor.

(c) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required in the Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

(d) DEFINITION OF AN EMERGENCY REQUIREMENT.—A provision shall be considered an emergency designation if it designates any item an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) or 252(e) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(e) FORM OF THE POINT OF ORDER.—A point of order under this section may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(f) CONFERENCE REPORTS.—If a point of order is sustained under this section against a conference report the report shall be disposed of as provided in section 313(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

SEC. 209. RESERVE FUND PENDING INCREASE OF FISCAL YEAR 2001 DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.

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

(1) The functional totals with respect to discretionary spending set forth in this concurrent resolution, if implemented, would result in legislation which exceeds the limit on discretionary spending for fiscal year 2001 set out in section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985. Nonetheless, the allocation pursuant to section 302 of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 to the Committee on Appropriations is in compliance with current law spending limits.

(2) Consequently unless and until the discretionary spending limit for fiscal year 2001 is increased, aggregate appropriations which exceed the current law limits would still be out of order in the Senate and subject to a supermajority vote.

(3) The functional totals contained in this concurrent resolution envision a level of discretionary spending for fiscal year 2001 as follows:

(A) For the discretionary category: $596,579,000,000 in new budget authority and $590,326,000,000 in outlays.

(B) For the highway category: $26,920,000,000 in outlays.

(C) For the mass transit category: $4,639,000,000 in outlays.

(4) To facilitate the Senate completing its legislative responsibilities for the 106th Congress in a timely fashion, it is imperative that the Senate consider legislation which increases the discretionary spending limit for fiscal year 2001 as soon as possible.

(b) ADJUSTMENT TO ALLOCATIONS.—Whenever a bill or joint resolution becomes law that increases the discretionary spending limit for fiscal year 2001 set out in section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the appropriate chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall increase the allocation called for in section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the appropriate Committee on Appropriations.

(c) LIMITATION ON ADJUSTMENT.—An adjustment made pursuant to subsection (b) shall not result in an allocation under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 that exceeds the total budget authority and outlays set forth in subsection (a)(3).

SEC. 210. CONGRESSIONAL FIREWALL FOR DEFENSE AND NON-DEFENSE SPENDING.

(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, for fiscal year 2001 the term ''discretionary spending limit'' means—

(1) for the defense category, $306,819,000,000 in new budget authority and $295,050,000,000 in outlays; and

(2) for the nondefense category, $289,760,000,000 in new budget authority and $327,583,000,000 in outlays.

(b) POINT OF ORDER IN THE SENATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—After the adjustment to the section 302(a) allocation to the Appropriations Committee is made pursuant to section 208 and except as provided in paragraph (2), it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that exceeds any discretionary spending limit set forth in this section.

(2) EXCEPTION.—This subsection shall not apply if a declaration of war by Congress is in effect.

(c) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required in the Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

SEC. 211. MECHANISMS FOR STRENGTHENING BUDGETARY INTEGRITY.

(a) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term ''budget year'' means with respect to a session of Congress, the fiscal year of the Government that starts on October 1 of the calendar year in which that session begins.

(b) POINT OF ORDER WITH RESPECT TO ADVANCED APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, resolution, amendment, motion or conference report that—

(A) provides an appropriation of new budget authority for any fiscal year after the budget year that is in excess of the amounts provided in paragraph (2); and

(B) provides an appropriation of new budget authority for any fiscal year subsequent to the year after the budget year.

(2) LIMITATION ON AMOUNTS.—The total amount, provided in appropriations legislation for the budget year, of appropriations for the subsequent fiscal year shall not exceed $14,200,000,000.

(c) POINT OF ORDER WITH RESPECT TO DELAYED OBLIGATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that contains an appropriation of new budget authority for any fiscal year which does not become available upon enactment of such legislation or on the first day of that fiscal year (whichever is later).

(2) EXCEPTION.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply with respect to appropriations for the following programs provided that such appropriation is not delayed beyond the specified date and does not exceed the specified amount:

(A) DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR.—Operation of Indian Programs School Operation Costs (Bureau of Indian Affairs Funded Schools and Other Education Programs): July 1 not to exceed $401,000,000.

(B) DEPARTMENT OF LABOR.—

(i) Training and Employment Service: July 1 not to exceed $1,650,000,000.

(ii) State Unemployment Insurance: July 1 not to exceed $902,000,000.

(C) DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION.—

(i) Education Reform: July 1 not to exceed $512,000,000.

(ii) Education for the Disadvantaged: July 1 not to exceed $2,462,000,000.

(iii) School Improvement Program: July 1 not to exceed $975,000,000.

(iv) Special Education: July 1 not to exceed $2,048,000,000.

(v) Vocational Education: July 1 not to exceed $858,000,000.

(D) DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION.—Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation: September 30 not to exceed $343,000,000.

(E) DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—Medical Care (equipment-land-structures): August 1 not to exceed $900,000,000.

(F) ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY.—Hazardous Substance Superfund: September 1 not to exceed $100,000,000.

(d) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsections (b) and (c) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required in the Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

(e) FORM OF THE POINT OF ORDER.—A point of order under this section may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974.

(f) CONFERENCE REPORTS.—If a point of order is sustained under this section against a conference report, the report shall be disposed of as provided in section 313(d) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974.

(g) PRECATORY AMENDMENTS.—For purposes of interpreting section 305(b)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, an amendment is not germane if it contains only precatory language.

(h) SUNSET.—Except for subsection (g), this section shall expire effective October 1, 2002.

SEC. 212. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FEDERAL RESERVE SURPLUSES.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to ensure that transfers from nonbudgetary governmental entities such as the Federal reserve banks shall not be used to offset increased on-budget spending when such transfers produce no real budgetary or economic effects.

(b) BUDGETARY RULE.—For purposes of points of order under this resolution and the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, provisions contained in any bill, resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that affects any surplus funds of the Federal reserve banks shall not be scored with respect to the level of budget authority, outlays, or revenues contained in such legislation.

SEC. 213. REAFFIRMING THE PROHIBITION ON THE USE OF REVENUE OFFSETS FOR DISCRETIONARY SPENDING.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to reaffirm Congress' belief that the discretionary spending limits should be adhered to and not circumvented by increasing taxes.

(b) RESTATEMENT OF BUDGETARY RULE.—For purposes of points of order under this resolution and the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, provisions contained in an appropriations bill (or an amendment thereto or a conference report thereon) resulting in increased revenues shall continue not to be scored with respect to the level of budget authority or outlays contained in such legislation.

SEC. 214. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this concurrent resolution for any measure shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this concurrent resolution.

SEC. 215. RESERVE FUND TO FOSTER THE HEALTH OF CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES AND THE EMPLOYMENT AND INDEPENDENCE OF THEIR FAMILIES.

(a) ADJUSTMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Whenever the Committee on Finance of the Senate reports a bill, or an amendment thereto is offered, or a conference report thereon is submitted, that facilitates children with disabilities receiving needed health care at home and complies with paragraph (2), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may increase the spending aggregate and allocation of budget authority and outlays to that committee by the amount of budget authority (and the outlays resulting therefrom) provided by that legislation for such purpose in accordance with subsection (b).

(2) CONDITION.—Legislation complies with this paragraph if it finances health programs designed to allow children with disabilities to access the health services they need to remain at home with their families while allowing their families to become or remain employed.

(b) LIMITATIONS.—The adjustments to the spending aggregates and allocations required by subsection (a) shall not exceed $50,000,000 in budget authority (and the outlays resulting therefrom) for fiscal year 2001 and shall not exceed $300,000,000 in budget authority (and the outlays resulting therefrom) for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005.

SEC. 216. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

Congress adopts the provisions of this title—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such they shall be

considered as part of the rules of each House, or of that House to which they specifically apply, and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change those rules (so far as they relate to that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

TITLE III—SENSE OF THE SENATE PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON CONTROLLING AND ELIMINATING THE GROWING INTERNATIONAL PROBLEM OF TUBERCULOSIS.

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

(1) According to the World Health Organization—

(A) nearly 2,000,000 people worldwide die each year of tuberculosis-related illnesses;

(B) one-third of the world's total population is infected with tuberculosis; and

(C) tuberculosis is the world's leading killer of women between 15- and 44-years old and is a leading cause of children becoming orphans.

(2) Because of the ease of transmission of tuberculosis, its international persistence and growth pose a direct public health threat to those nations that had previously largely controlled the disease. This is complicated in the United States by the growth of the homeless population, the rate of incarceration, international travel, immigration, and HIV/AIDS.

(3) With nearly 40 percent of the tuberculosis cases in the United States attributable to foreign-born persons, tuberculosis will never be eliminated in the United States until it is controlled abroad.

(4) The means exist to control tuberculosis through screening, diagnosis, treatment, patient compliance, monitoring, and ongoing review of outcomes.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assumes that additional resources should be provided to fund international tuberculosis control efforts at $60,000,000 in fiscal year 2001, consistent with authorizing legislation approved by the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

SEC. 302. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON INCREASED FUNDING FOR THE CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) in 1998, 33.2 percent of women in the labor force have children under 14;

(2) in 1998, 65.2 percent of women with children younger than age 6, and 78.4 percent of women with children ages 6 through 17 were in the labor force, and 41.6 percent of women with children younger than 3 were employed full-time;

(3) 1,920,000 couples both working and with children under 18 had family incomes of under $30,000 (10.3 percent);

(4)(A) in 1998, 11,700,000 children out of 21,300,000 (55.1 percent) under the age of 5 have employed mothers;

(B) 18.4 percent of children under 6 are cared for by their fathers at home;

(C) another 5.5 percent (562,000) are looked after by their mother either at home or away from home; and

(D) in other words, less than a quarter (23.9 percent) of these children are taken care of by 1 parent;

(5) a 1997 General Accounting Office study found that the increased work participation requirement of the welfare reform law will cause the need for child care to exceed the known supply;

(6) a 1995 study by the Urban Institute of child care prices in 6 cities found that the average cost of daycare for a 2-year-old in a child care center ranged from $3,100 to $8,100;

(7) for an entry-level worker, the family's child care costs at the average price of care for an infant in a child care center would be at least 50 percent of family income in 5 of the 6 cities examined;

(8) a large number of low- and middle-income families sacrifice a second full-time income so that a parent may be at home with the child;

(9) the average income of 2-parent families with a single income (a family with children, wife does not work) is $13,566 less than the average income of 2-parent families with 2 incomes;

(10) a recent National Institute for Child Health and Development study found that the greatest factor in the development of a young child is ''what is happening at home and in families''; and

(11) increased tax relief directed at making child care more affordable, and increased funding for the Child Care and Development Block Grant, would take significant steps toward bringing quality child care within the reach of many parents, and would increase the options available to parents in deciding how best to care for their children.

(b) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution and legislation enacted pursuant to this resolution assume—

(1) that tax relief should be directed to parents who are struggling to afford quality child care, including those who wish to stay home to care for a child, and should be included in any tax cut package; and

(2) a total of $4,567,000,000 in funding for the Child Care and Development Block Grant in fiscal year 2001.

SEC. 303. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON TAX RELIEF FOR COLLEGE TUITION PAID AND FOR INTEREST PAID ON STUDENT LOANS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) in our increasingly competitive global economy, the attainment of a higher education is critical to the economic success of an individual, as evidenced by the fact that, in 1975, college graduates earned an average of 57 percent more than those who just finished high school, compared to 76 percent more today;

(2) the cost of attaining a higher education has outpaced both inflation and median family incomes;

(3) specifically, over the past 20 years, the cost of college tuition has quadrupled (growing faster than any consumer item, including health care and nearly twice as fast as inflation) and 8 times as fast as median household incomes;

(4) despite recent increases passed by Congress, the value of the maximum Pell Grant has declined 23 percent since 1975 in inflation-adjusted terms, forcing more students to rely on student loans to finance the cost of a higher education;

(5) from 1992 to 1998, the demand for student loans soared 82 percent and the average student loan increased 367 percent;

(6) according to the Department of Education, there is approximately $150,000,000,000 in outstanding student loan debt, and students borrowed more during the 1990's than during the 1960's, 1970's, and 1980's combined; and

(7) in Congress, proposals have been made to address the rising cost of tuition and mounting student debt, including a bipartisan proposal to provide a deduction for tuition paid and a credit for interest paid on student loans.

(b) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution and legislation enacted pursuant to this resolution assume that any tax cut package reported by the Finance Committee and passed by Congress during the fiscal year 2001 budget reconciliation process include tax relief for college tuition paid and for interest paid on student loans.

SEC. 304. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON INCREASED FUNDING FOR THE NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) the National Institutes of Health is the Nation's foremost research center;

(2) the Nation's commitment to and investment in biomedical research has resulted in better health and an improved quality of life for all Americans;

(3) continued biomedical research funding must be ensured so that medical doctors and scientists have the security to commit to conducting long-term research studies;

(4) funding for the National Institutes of Health should continue to increase in order to prevent the cessation of biomedical research studies and the loss of medical doctors and research scientists to private research organizations; and

(5) the National Institutes of Health conducts research protocols without proprietary interests, thereby ensuring that the best health care is researched and made available to the Nation.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume increased funding in function 550 (Health) for the National Institutes of Health of $2,700,000,000, reflecting the commitment made in the fiscal year 1998 Senate Budget Resolution to double the National Institute of Health budget by 2003.

SEC. 305. SENSE OF THE SENATE SUPPORTING FUNDING LEVELS IN EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES ACT.

It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that of the amounts provided for elementary and secondary education within the Budget Function 500 of this resolution for fiscal years 2001 through 2005, such funds shall be appropriated in proportion to and in accordance with the levels authorized in the Educational Opportunities Act, S. 2.

SEC. 306. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON ADDITIONAL BUDGETARY RESOURCES.

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

(1) In its review of government operations, the General Accounting Office noted that it was unable to determine the extent of improper government payments, due to the poor quality of agency accounting practices. In particular, the General Accounting Office cited the Government's inability to—

(A) ''properly account for and report billions of dollars of property, equipment, materials, and supplies and certain stewardship assets''; and

(B) ''properly prepare the Federal Government's financial statements, including balancing the statements, accounting for billions of dollars of transactions between governmental entities, and properly and consistently compiling the information in the financial statements.''.

(2) Private economic forecasters are currently more optimistic than the Congressional Budget Office (CBO). Blue Chip expects 2000 real GDP growth of 4.1 percent, whereas the Congressional Budget Office expects 3.3 percent growth. From 1999 through 2005, Blue Chip expects real GDP to grow more than 0.3 percentage points faster per year than the Congressional Budget Office does. Using budgetary rules of thumb, this latter difference translates into more than $150,000,000,000 over the 5-year budget window.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels contained in this resolution assume that—

(1) there are billions of dollars in wasted expenditures in the Federal Government that should be eliminated; and

(2) higher projected budget surpluses arising from reductions in government waste and stronger revenue inflows could be used in the future for additional tax relief or debt reduction.

SEC. 307. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON REGARDING THE INADEQUACY OF THE PAYMENTS FOR SKILLED NURSING CARE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) Congress confronted and addressed the funding crisis for medicare beneficiaries requiring skilled nursing care through the Balanced Budget Refinement Act of 1999;

(2) Congress recognized the need to address the inadequacy of the prospective payment system for certain levels of care, as well as the need to end arbitrary limits on rehabilitative therapies. Congress restored $2,700,000,000 to reduce access threats to skilled care for medicare beneficiaries; and

(3) Currently, more than 1,600 skilled nursing facilities caring for more than 175,000 frail and elderly Americans have filed for bankruptcy protection.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that—

(1) the Administration should identify areas where they have the authority to make changes to improve quality, including analyzing and fixing the labor component of the skilled nursing facility market basket update factor; and

(2) while Congress deliberates funding structural medicare reform and the addition of a prescription drug benefit, it must maintain the continued viability of the current skilled nursing benefit. Therefore, the committees of jurisdiction should ensure that medicare beneficiaries requiring skilled nursing care have access to that care and that those providers have the resources to meet the expectation for high quality care.

SEC. 308. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON THE CARA PROGRAMS.

It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that, if the Congress and the President so choose, the following programs can be fully funded as discretionary programs in fiscal year 2001, including—

(1) the Land and Water Conservation Fund programs;

(2) the Federal aid to Wildlife Fund;

(3) the Urban Parks and Recreation Recovery Grants;

(4) the National Historic Preservation Fund;

(5) the Payment in Lieu of Taxes; and

(6) the North American Wetlands Conservation Act.

SEC. 309. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON VETERAN'S MEDICAL CARE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) this budget addresses concerns about Veteran's medical care;

(2) we successfully increased the appropriation for Veteran's medical care by $1,700,000,000 last year, although the President had proposed no increase in funding in his budget; and

(3) this year's budget proposes to increase the Veteran's medical care appropriation by $1,400,000,000, the level of funding in the President's budget.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume an increase of $1,400,000,000 in Veteran's medical care appropriations in fiscal year 2001.

SEC. 310. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON IMPACT AID.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) the Impact Aid, as created by Congress in 1950, fulfills a Federal obligation to local educational agencies impacted by a Federal presence;

(2) the Impact Aid provides funds to these local educational agencies to help them meet the basic educational needs of all their children, particularly the needs of transient military dependent students, Native American children, and students from low-income housing projects; and

(3) the Impact Aid is funded at a level less than what is required to fully fund ''all'' federally connected local educational agencies.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that the Impact Aid Program strive to reach the goal that all local educational agencies eligible for Impact Aid receive at a minimum, 40 percent of their maximum payment under sections 8002 and 8003.

SEC. 311. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON FUNDING FOR INCREASED ACREAGE UNDER THE CONSERVATION RESERVE PROGRAM AND THE WETLANDS RESERVE PROGRAM.

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

(1) The Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) and the Wetlands Reserve Program (WRP) have been successful, voluntary, incentive-based endeavors that over the last decade and a half have turned millions of acres of marginal cropland into reserves that protect wildlife in the United States, provide meaningful income to farmers and ranchers (especially in periods of collapsed commodity prices), and combat soil and water erosion. CRP and WRP also provide increased opportunities for hunting, fishing, and other recreational activities.

(2) CRP provides landowners with technical and financial assistance, including annual rental payments, in exchange for removing environmentally sensitive farmland from production and implementing conservation practices. Currently, CRP includes around 31,300,000 acres in the United States.

(3) Similarly, WRP offers technical and financial assistance to landowners who select to restore wetlands. Currently, WRP includes 785,000 acres nationwide.

(4) Furthermore, bipartisan legislation has been introduced in the 106th Congress to increase the acreage permitted under both CRP and WRP. The Administration also supports raising the acreage limitations in both programs.

(5) Unfortunately, both CRP and WRP may soon become victims of their own success and their respective statutory acreage limitations unless Congress acts. Given the popularity and demand for these conservation programs, the statutory acreage limitations will likely exhaust resources available to producers who want to participate in CRP or WRP. As currently authorized, CRP has an enrollment cap of 36,400,000 million acres and WRP is limited at 975,000 acres. As of October 1, 1999, enrollment in CRP stood at approximately 31,300,000 million acres and enrollment in WRP at just over 785,000 acres.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that Congress and the Administration should take steps to raise the acreage limits of the CRP and WRP in order to make these programs available to aid the preservation and conservation of sensitive natural soil and water resources without negatively effecting rural communities. Further, such actions should help improve farm income for agricultural producers and restore prosperity and growth to rural sectors of the United States.

SEC. 312. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON TAX SIMPLIFICATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the tax code has become increasingly complex, undermining confidence in the system, and often undermining the principles of simplicity, efficiency, and equity;

(2) some have estimated that the resources required to keep records and file returns already cost American families an additional 10 percent to 20 percent over what they actually pay in income taxes; and

(3) if it is to enact a greatly simplified tax code, Congress should have a thorough understanding of the problem as well as specific proposals to consider.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that the Joint Committee on Taxation shall develop a report and alternative proposals on tax simplification by the end of the year, and the Department of the Treasury is requested to develop a report and alternative proposals on tax simplification by the end of the year.

SEC. 313. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON ANTITRUST ENFORCEMENT BY THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE AND FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION REGARDING AGRICULTURE MERGERS AND ANTICOMPETITIVE ACTIVITY.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice is charged with the civil and criminal enforcement of the antitrust laws, including the review of corporate mergers likely to reduce competition in particular markets, with a goal of protecting the competitive process;

(2) the Bureau of Competition of the Federal Trade Commission is also charged with enforcement of the antitrust laws, including the review of corporate mergers likely to reduce competition;

(3) the Antitrust Division and the Bureau of Competition are also responsible for the prosecution of companies and individuals who engage in anti-competitive behavior and unfair trade practices;

(4) the number of merger filings under the Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act of 1976, which the Department of Justice, in conjunction with the Federal Trade Commission, is required to review, has increased significantly in fiscal years 1998 and 1999;

(5) large agri-businesses have constituted part of this trend in mergers and acquisitions;

(6) farmers and small agricultural producers are experiencing one of the worst periods of economic downturn in years;

(7) farmers currently get less than a quarter of every retail food dollar, down from nearly half of every retail food dollar in 1952;

(8) the top 4 beef packers presently control 80 percent of the market, the top 4 pork producers control 57 percent of the market, and the largest sheep processors and poultry processors control 73 percent and 55 percent of the market, respectively;

(9) the 4 largest grain processing companies presently account for approximately 62 percent of the Nation's flour milling, and the 4 largest firms control approximately 75 percent of the wet corn milling and soybean crushing industry;

(10) farmers and small, independent producers are concerned about the substantial increase in concentration in the agriculture industry and significantly diminished opportunities in the marketplace; and

(11) farmers and small, independent producers are also concerned about possible anticompetitive behavior and unfair business practices in the agriculture industry.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that—

(1) the Antitrust Division and the Bureau of Competition will have adequate resources to enable them to meet their statutory requirements, including those related to reviewing increasingly numerous and complex

mergers and investigating and prosecuting anticompetitive business activity; and

(2) these departments will—

(A) dedicate considerable resources to matters and transactions dealing with agri-business antitrust and competition; and

(B) ensure that all vertical and horizontal mergers implicating agriculture and all complaints regarding possible anticompetitive business practices in the agriculture industry will receive extraordinary scrutiny.

SEC. 314. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING FAIR MARKETS FOR AMERICAN FARMERS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) United States agricultural producers are the most efficient and competitive in the world;

(2) United States agricultural producers are at a competitive disadvantage in the world market because the European Union outspends the United States (on a dollar/acre basis) by a ratio of 10:1 on domestic support and by a ratio of 60:1 on export subsidies;

(3) the support the European Union gives their producers results in more prosperous rural communities in Europe than in the United States;

(4) the European Union blocked consensus at the World Trade Organization ministerial meeting in Seattle because Europe does not want to surrender its current advantage in world markets;

(5) despite the competitiveness of American farmers, the European advantage has led to a declining United States share of the world market for agricultural products;

(6) the United States Department of Agriculture reports that United States export growth has lagged behind that of our major competitors, resulting in a loss of United States market share, from 24 percent in 1981 to its current level of 18 percent;

(7) the United States Department of Agriculture also reports that United States market share of global agricultural trade has eroded steadily over the past 2 decades, which could culminate in the United States losing out to the European Union as the world's top agricultural exporter sometime in 2000;

(8) prices of agricultural commodities in the United States are at 50-year lows in real terms, creating a serious economic crisis in rural America; and

(9) fundamental fairness requires that the playing field be leveled so that United States farmers are no longer at a competitive disadvantage.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that—

(1) the United States should take steps to increase support for American farmers in order to level the playing field for United States agricultural producers and increase the leverage of the United States in World Trade Organization negotiations on agriculture as long as such support is not trade distorting, and does not otherwise exceed or impair existing Uruguay Round obligations; and

(2) such actions should improve United States farm income and restore the prosperity of rural communities.

SEC. 315. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON WOMEN AND SOCIAL SECURITY REFORM.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) without Social Security benefits, the elderly poverty rate among women would have been 52.2 percent, and among widows would have been 60.6 percent;

(2) women tend to live longer and tend to have lower lifetime earnings than men do;

(3) during their working years, women earn an average of 70 cents for every dollar men earn; and

(4) women spend an average of 11.5 years out of their careers to care for their families, and are more likely to work part-time than full-time.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that—

(1) women face unique obstacles in ensuring retirement security and survivor and disability stability;

(2) Social Security plays an essential role in guaranteeing inflation-protected financial stability for women throughout their old age;

(3) the Congress and the Administration should act, as part of Social Security reform, to ensure that widows and other poor elderly women receive more adequate benefits that reduce their poverty rates and that women, under whatever approach is taken to reform Social Security, should receive no lesser a share of overall federally funded retirement benefits than they receive today; and

(4) the sacrifice that women make to care for their family should be recognized during reform of Social Security and that women should not be penalized by taking an average of 11.5 years out of their careers to care for their family.

SEC. 316. PROTECTION OF BATTERED WOMEN AND CHILDREN.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) Each year an estimated 1,000,000 women suffer nonfatal violence by an intimate partner.

(2) Nearly 1 out of 3 adult women can expect to experience at least 1 physical assault by a partner during adulthood.

(3) Domestic violence is statistically consistent across racial and ethnic lines. It does not discriminate based on race or economic status.

(4) The chance of being victimized by an intimate partner is 10 times greater for a woman than a man.

(5) Past and current victims of domestic violence are over-represented in the welfare population. It is estimated that at least 60 percent of current welfare beneficiaries have experienced some form of domestic violence.

(6) Abused women who do seek employment face barriers as a result of domestic violence. Welfare studies show that 15 to 50 percent of abused women report interference from their partner with education, training, or employment.

(7) The programs established by the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 have empowered communities to address the threat caused by domestic violence.

(8) Since 1995, Congress has appropriated close to $1,800,000,000 to fund programs established by the Violence Against Women Act of 1994, including the STOP program, shelters for battered women and children, the domestic violence hotline, and Centers for Disease Control and Prevention injury control programs.

(9) The programs established by the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 have been and continue to comprise a successful national strategy for addressing the needs of battered women and the public health threat caused by this violence.

(10) The Supreme Court could act during this session to overturn a major protection and course of action provided for in the Violence Against Women Act of 1994. In United States v. Morrison/Brzonkala, the Supreme Court will address the issue of the constitutionality of the Federal civil rights remedy under the Violence Against Women Act of 1994, and may overturn congressional intent to elevate violence against women to a category protected under Federal civil rights law.

(11) The actions taken by the courts and the failure to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 has generated a great deal of concern in communities nationwide.

(12) Funding for the programs established by the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 is the only lifeline for battered women and Congress has a moral obligation to continue funding and to strengthen key components of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994.

(13) Congress and the Administration should work to ensure the continued funding of programs established by the Violence Against Women Act of 1994.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that, in light of the pending litigation challenging the constitutionality of the Federal civil rights remedy in the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 and the lack of action on legislation reauthorizing and strengthening the provisions of that Act—

(1) Congress, through reauthorization of the programs established by the Violence Against Women Act of 1994, should work to eliminate economic barriers that trap women and children in violent homes and relationships; and

(2) full funding for the programs established by the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 will be provided from the Violent Crime Reduction Fund.

SEC. 317. USE OF FALSE CLAIMS ACT IN COMBATTING MEDICARE FRAUD.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) the solvency of the medicare trust funds is of vital importance to the well-being of the Nation's seniors and other vulnerable people in need of quality health care;

(2) fraud against the medicare trust funds is a major problem resulting in the depletion of the trust funds; and

(3) chapter 37 of title 31, United States Code (commonly referred to as the False Claims Act) and the qui tam provisions of that chapter are vital tools in combatting fraud against the medicare program.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that chapter 37 of title 31, United States Code (commonly referred to as the False Claims Act) and the qui tam provisions of that chapter are essential tools in combatting medicare fraud and should not be weakened in any way.

SEC. 318. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE NATIONAL GUARD.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) the Army National Guard relies heavily upon thousands of full-time employees, Military Technicians and Active Guard/Reserves, to ensure unit readiness throughout the Army National Guard;

(2) these employees perform vital day-to-day functions, ranging from equipment maintenance to leadership and staff roles, that allow the drill weekends and annual active duty training of the traditional Guardsmen to be dedicated to preparation for the National Guard's warfighting and peacetime missions;

(3) when the ability to provide sufficient Active Guard/Reserves and Technicians end strength is reduced, unit readiness, as well as quality of life for soldiers and families is degraded;

(4) the Army National Guard, with agreement from the Department of Defense, requires a minimum essential requirement of 23,500 Active Guard/Reserves and 25,500 Technicians; and

(5) the fiscal year 2001 budget request for the Army National Guard provides resources sufficient for approximately 22,430 Active Guard/Reserves and 23,957 Technicians, end

strength shortfalls of 1,052 and 1,543, respectively.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.— It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in the resolution assume that the Department of Defense will give priority to funding the Active Guard/Reserves and Military Technicians at levels authorized by Congress in the fiscal year 2000 Department of Defense authorization bill.

SEC. 319. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING MILITARY READINESS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) the Secretary of the Air Force stated that the United States Air Force's top unfunded readiness priority for fiscal year 2000 was its aircraft spares and repair parts account and top Air Force officers have said that getting more spares is a top priority to improve readiness rates;

(2) the Chief of Naval Operations stated that the aircraft spares and repair parts account for a top readiness priority important to the long-term health of the Navy;

(3) the General Accounting Office's study of personnel retention problems in the armed services cited shortages of spares and repair parts as a major reason why people are leaving the services;

(4) the fiscal year 2001 budget request decreases the Air Force's spares and repair parts account by 13 percent from fiscal year 2000 expected levels; and

(5) the fiscal year 2001 budget request decreases the Navy's spares and repair parts account by 6 percent from the fiscal year 2000 expected levels.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the functional totals in the budget resolution assume that Congress will protect the Department of Defense's readiness accounts, including spares and repair parts, and operations and maintenance, and use the requested levels as the minimum baseline for fiscal year 2001 authorization and appropriations.

SEC. 320. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON COMPENSATION FOR THE CHINESE EMBASSY BOMBING IN BELGRADE.

It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume funds designated to compensate the People's Republic of China for the damage inadvertently done to their embassy in Belgrade by NATO forces in May 1999, should not be appropriated from the international affairs budget.

SEC. 321. SENSE OF THE SENATE SUPPORTING FUNDING OF DIGITAL OPPORTUNITY INITIATIVES.

(a) The Senate finds that—

(1) computers, the Internet, and information networks are not luxury items but basic tools largely responsible for driving the current economic expansions;

(2) information technology utility relies on software applications and online content;

(3) access to computers and the Internet and the ability to use this technology effectively is becoming increasingly important for full participation in America's economic, political, and social life; and

(4) unequal access to technology and high-tech skills by income, educational level, race, and geography could deepen and reinforce the divisions that exist within American society.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that the Committees on Appropriations and Finance should support efforts that address the digital divide, including tax incentives and funding to—

(1) broaden access to information technologies;

(2) provide workers and teachers with information technology training;

(3) promote innovative online content and software applications that will improve commerce, education, and quality of life; and

(4) help provide information and communications technology to underserved communities.

SEC. 322. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING IMMUNIZATION FUNDING.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) vaccines protect children and adults against serious and potentially fatal diseases;

(2) society saves up to $24 in medical and societal costs for every dollar spent on vaccines;

(3) every day, 11,000 babies are born—4,000,000 each year—and each child needs up to 19 doses of vaccine by age 2;

(4) approximately 1,000,000 2-year-olds have not received all of the recommended vaccine doses;

(5) the immunization program under section 317(j)(1) under the Public Health Service Act, administered by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, provides grants to States and localities for critical activities including immunization registries, outbreak control, provider education, outreach efforts, and linkages with other public health and welfare services;

(6) Federal grants to States and localities for these activities have declined from $271,000,000 in 1995 to $139,000,000 in 2000;

(7) because of these funding reductions States are struggling to maintain immunization rates and have implemented severe cuts to immunization delivery activities;

(8) even with significant gains in national immunization rates, underimmunized children still exist and there are a number of subpopulations where coverage rates remain low and are actually declining;

(9) rates in many of the Nation's urban areas, including Chicago and Houston, are unacceptably low; and

(10) these pockets of need create pools of susceptible children and increase the risk of dangerous disease outbreaks.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in the resolution assume that Congress should enact legislation that provides $214,000,000 in funding for immunization grants under section 317 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247b) for infrastructure and delivery activities, including targeted support for immunization project areas with low or declining immunization rates or who have subpopulations with special needs.

SEC. 323. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING TAX CREDITS FOR SMALL BUSINESSES PROVIDING HEALTH INSURANCE TO LOW-INCOME EMPLOYEES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) 25,000,000 workers in the United States were uninsured in 1997 and more than two-thirds of the uninsured workers earn less than $20,000 annually, according to a Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation report;

(2) the percentage of employees of small businesses who have employer-sponsored health insurance coverage decreased from 52 percent in 1996 to 47 percent in 1998; for the smallest employers, those with 3 to 9 workers, the percentage of employees covered by employer-sponsored health insurance fell from 36 percent in 1996 to 31 percent in 1998;

(3) between 1996 and 1998, health premiums for small businesses increased 5.2 percent; premiums increased by 8 percent for the smallest employers, the highest increase among all small businesses;

(4) monthly family coverage for workers at firms with 3 to 9 employees cost $520 in 1998, compared to $462 for family coverage for workers at large firms; and

(5) only 39 percent of small businesses with a significant percentage of low-income employees offer employer-provided health insurance and such companies are half as likely to offer health benefits to such employees as are companies that have only a small percentage of low-income employees.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that Congress should enact legislation that allows small businesses to claim a tax credit when they provide health insurance to low-income employees.

SEC. 324. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON FUNDING FOR CRIMINAL JUSTICE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) our success in the fight against crime and improvements in the administration of justice are the result of a bipartisan effort; and

(2) since 1993 the Congress and the President have increased justice funding by 92 percent, and a strong commitment to law enforcement and the administration of justice remains appropriate.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that funds to improve the justice system will be available as follows:

(1) $665,000,000 for the expanded support of direct Federal enforcement, adjudicative, and correctional-detention activities.

(2) $50,000,000 in additional funds to combat terrorism, including cyber crime.

(3) $41,000,000 in additional funds for construction costs for the Federal Bureau of Prisons and the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center.

(4) $200,000,000 in support of Customs and Immigration and Nationalization Service port of entry officers for the development and implementation of the ACE computer system designed to meet critical trade and border security needs.

(5) Funding is available for the continuation of such programs as: the Byrne Grant Program, Violence Against Women, Juvenile Accountability Block Grants, First Responder Training, Local Law Enforcement Block Grants, Weed and Seed, Violent Offender Incarceration and Truth in Sentencing, State Criminal Alien Assistance Program, Drug Courts, Residential Substance Abuse Treatment, Crime Identification Technologies, Bulletproof Vests, Counterterrorism, Interagency Law Enforcement Coordination.

SEC. 325. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE PELL GRANT.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) public investment in higher education yields a return of several dollars for each dollar invested;

(2) higher education promotes economic opportunity for individuals; for example recipients of bachelor's degrees earn an average of 75 percent per year more than those with high school diplomas and experience half as much unemployment as high school graduates;

(3) access to a college education has become a hallmark of American society, and is vital to upholding our belief in equality of opportunity;

(4) for a generation, the Federal Pell Grant has served as an established and effective means of providing access to higher education;

(5) over the past decade, Pell Grant has failed to keep up with inflation. Over the past 25 years, the value of the average Pell Grant has decreased by 23 percent—it is now worth only 77 percent of what Pell Grants were worth in 1975;

(6) grant aid as a portion of student aid has fallen significantly over the past 5 years. Grant aid used to comprise 55 percent of total aid awarded and loans comprised just over 40 percent. Now that trend has been reversed so that loans comprise nearly 60 percent of total aid awarded and grants only comprise 40 percent of total aid awarded;

(7) the percentage of freshmen attending public and private 4-year institutions from families whose income is below the national median has fallen since 1981.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that within the discretionary allocation provided to the Committee on Appropriations, the funding for the maximum Pell Grant award should be at or above the level requested by the President.

SEC. 326. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING COMPREHENSIVE PUBLIC EDUCATION REFORM.

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

(1) Recent scientific evidence demonstrates that enhancing children's physical, social, emotional, and intellectual development before the age of 6 results in tremendous benefits throughout life.

(2) Successful schools are led by well-trained, highly qualified principals, but many principals do not get the training in management skills that the principals need to ensure their school provides an excellent education for every child.

(3) Good teachers are a crucial catalyst to quality education, but 1 in 4 new teachers do not meet State certification requirements; each year more than 50,000 underprepared teachers enter the classroom; and 12 percent of new teachers have had no teacher training at all.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that the Federal Government should support State and local educational agencies engaged in comprehensive reform of their public education system and that any public education reform should include at least the following principles:

(1) Every child should begin school ready to learn.

(2) Training and development for principals and teachers should be a priority.

SEC. 327. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON PROVIDING ADEQUATE FUNDING FOR UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL LEADERSHIP.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) United States international leadership is essential to maintaining security and peace for all Americans;

(2) such leadership depends on effective diplomacy as well as a strong military;

(3) effective diplomacy requires adequate resources both for operations and security of United States embassies and for international programs;

(4) in addition to building peace, prosperity, and democracy around the world, programs in the International Affairs (150) budget serve United States interests by ensuring better jobs and a higher standard of living, promoting the health of our citizens and preserving our natural environment, and protecting the rights and safety of those who travel or do business overseas;

(5) real spending for International Affairs has declined more than 40 percent since the mid-1980's, at the same time that major new challenges and opportunities have arisen from the disintegration of the Soviet Union and the worldwide trends toward democracy and free markets;

(6) current ceilings on discretionary spending will impose severe additional cuts in funding for International Affairs;

(7) improved security for United States diplomatic missions and personnel will place further strain on the International Affairs budget absent significant additional resources;

(8) the United States cannot reduce efforts to safeguard nuclear materials in the former Soviet States or shortchange initiatives aimed at maintaining stability on the Korean peninsula, where 37,000 United States forces are deployed. We cannot reduce support for peace in the Middle East or in Northern Ireland or in the Balkans. We cannot stop fighting terror or simply surrender to the spread of HIV/AIDS. We must continue to support all of these things, which are difficult to achieve without adequate and realistic funding levels; and

(9) the President's request for funds for fiscal year 2001 would adequately finance our International Affairs programs without detracting from our defense and domestic needs. It would help keep America prosperous and secure. It would enable us to leverage the contributions of allies and friends on behalf of democracy and peace. It would allow us to protect the interests of Americans who travel, study, or do business overseas. It would do all these things and more for about 1 penny of every dollar the Federal Government spends.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that additional budgetary resources should be identified for function 150 to enable successful United States international leadership.

SEC. 328. SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING THE HIV/AIDS CRISIS.

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

(1) More than 16,000,000 people have been killed by Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome (AIDS) since the epidemic began.

(2) 14,000,000 Africans have died as a result of the AIDS epidemic. Eighty-four percent of the worldwide deaths from AIDS have occurred in sub-Saharan Africa.

(3) Each day, AIDS kills 5,500 Africans, and infects 11,000 more.

(4) By the end of 2000, 10,400,000 children in sub-Saharan Africa will have lost one or both parents, to AIDS.

(5) Over 85 percent of the world's HIV-positive children live in Africa.

(6) Fewer than 5 percent of those living with AIDS in Africa have access to even the most basic care.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the functional totals underlying this resolution on the budget assume that Congress has recognized the catastrophic effects of the HIV/AIDS epidemic, particularly in Sub-Saharan Africa, and seeks to maximize the effectiveness of the United States' efforts to combat the disease through any necessary authorization or appropriations;

(2) Congress should strengthen ongoing programs which address education and prevention, testing, the care of AIDS orphans, and improving home and community-based care options for those living with AIDS; and

(3) Congress should seek additional or new tools to combat the epidemic, including initiatives to encourage vaccine development and programs aimed at preventing mother-to-child transmission of the disease.

SEC. 329. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING TRIBAL COLLEGES.

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

(1) More than 26,500 students from 250 tribes nationwide attend tribal colleges. The colleges serve students of all ages, many of whom are moving from welfare to work. The vast majority of tribal college students are first-generation college students.

(2) While annual appropriations for tribal colleges have increased modestly in recent years, core operation funding levels are still about half of the $6,000 per Indian student level authorized by the Tribally Controlled College or University Act.

(3) Although tribal colleges received a $3,000,000 increase in funding in fiscal year 2000, because of rising student populations and other factors, these institutions may face an actual per-student decrease in funding over fiscal year 1999.

(4) Per-student funding for tribal colleges is roughly half the amount given to mainstream community colleges.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that—

(1) the Senate recognizes the funding difficulties faced by tribal colleges and assumes that priority consideration will be provided to them through funding for the Tribally Controlled College and University Act, the 1994 Land Grant Institutions, and title III of the Higher Education Act; and

(2) such priority consideration reflects Congress' intent to continue work toward current statutory Federal funding goals for the tribal colleges.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Committee on Aging be permitted to meet on April 3, 2000, from 1 p.m.–4 p.m. in Dirksen 562 for the purpose of conducting a hearing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

JOHN K. RAFFERTY HAMILTON POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 474, H.R. 1374.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1374) to designate the United States Post Office Building located at 680 U.S. Highway 130 in Hamilton, New Jersey, as the ''John K. Rafferty Hamilton Post Office Building.''

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 1374) was read a third time and passed.

JOSEPH ILETO POST OFFICE

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 475, H.R. 3189.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3189) to designate the United States Post Office located at 14071 Peyton Drive in Chino Hills, California, as the ''Joseph Ileto Post Office.''

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be

read a third time and passed, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and any statements relating to the bill be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 3189) was read a third time and passed.

APPOINTMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair announces that pursuant to P.L. 105–134, the Amtrak Reform and Accountability Act of 1997, the appointment of the following individual, appointed by the Minority Leader of the United States Senate, to the Amtrak Reform Council: James E. Coston of Illinois, vice Donald R. Sweitzer of Virginia.

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, APRIL 4, 2000

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until the hour of 9:30 a.m. on Tuesday, April 4. I further ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday immediately following the prayer, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate then begin consideration of the Senate Concurrent Resolution 101, the budget resolution. I further ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess from the hours of 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. for the weekly policy conferences to meet.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, for the information of all Senators, the Senate will begin debate on the budget resolution at 9:30 tomorrow. Amendments are expected to be offered, debated, and voted on throughout the day and into the evening. Senators who have amendments are encouraged to work with the Budget Committee on a time to offer and debate those amendments. As previously announced, votes will occur throughout the week so that action on the budget resolution can be completed no later than Friday's session of the Senate.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30. A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 2:04 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, April 4, 2000, at 9:30 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

MARICOPA COUNTY, ARIZONA, LAUDED FOR TECHNOLOGICAL ADVANCES IN VOTE–BY–MAIL

HON. BOB STUMP

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 2000

Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, today, April 3, 2000, the 2000 Information Technology Innovation Collection will be formally presented to the Smithsonian's National Museum of American History. I am proud to let my colleagues know that the Maricopa County (Arizona) Election Department's Vote–By–Mail technology program will become part of the Permanent Research Collection on Information Technology at the Smithsonian in recognition of how Maricopa County is utilizing new information age tools to extend the benefits of technology to voters.

Maricopa County is the fifth largest county in the United States, and is more than 1.4 million voters. In an effort to provide alternative methods of voting to increase voter participation, reduce voter apathy and thwart the stereotype that government is antiquated and inflexible, the Elections Department has devised and implemented a Vote–By–Mail program in which voters are encouraged to request mail-in ballots by phone, mail, Internet, or walk-in. Overall voter participation has increased since 1992 when Vote–By–Mail was first available for all voters, and mail-in ballots have grown to account for a third of the total ballots cast in the last election.

The benefits of the Vote–By–Mail process include ease and convenience, more time to study issues or candidates appearing on the ballot, and relief from time constraint problems on election day such as conflicting job hours or transportation issues. The most evident benefit in past election statistics is the overwhelming increase in voter turnout.

Through the implementation of several new hardware and software technologies, the Maricopa County Elections Department has created a system which allows for the timely, reliable and secure storage and access to voter affidavits, efficient yet stringent and accurate tracking, processing and return of voters' ballots, systematic record-keeping, and a verification system for ballot security which checks the voter's signature as well as insuring that a voter meets the criteria that they maintain their registration throughout the 33-day early voting period which insures confidence in a fraudulent-free voting method.

Nominated by Michael Dell, Chairman and Chief Executive Office of Dell Computer Corporation, in the Government & Non-Profit Organizations category, Maricopa County Election Department's work is part of a collection that includes over 440 of the year's most innovative applications of technology from 38 states and 21 countries.

Karen Osborne, Maricopa County Elections Director; Reynaldo Valenzuela and John Stewart of the staff from the Maricopa County Elections Department will be attending today's Presentation Ceremony, returning to Phoenix to present the Medal to the Maricopa County Recorder, Helen Purcell, in a special ceremony at the Recorder's Office on Thursday, April 6, 2000.

Mr. Speaker, I bring this special recognition to the attention of my colleagues as a tried and true technological means to increase voter participation, and congratulate Maricopa County Recorder Helen Purcell, Elections Director Karen Osborne and their staff for their outstanding work and well-deserved recognition for conducting Vote-By-Mail efficiently, accurately and safely.

OPPOSITION TO MINIMUM WAGE INCREASES

HON. SUE WILKINS MYRICK

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 2000

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, today I state my opposition to recent efforts to raise the government-mandated minimum wage. I am convinced that a higher mandated minimum wage would dramatically reduce job opportunities for those who truly need them and stifle the growth of our economy.

Congress raised the minimum wage twice in recent years. It is my belief that employers should have the right to choose when to give employees raises. Several economists have stated that mandating a higher minimum wage will encourage employers to replace people with machines, or move their businesses to countries that do not have a mandated minimum wage. Either way, this will result in fewer jobs for Americans.

If we truly support increased opportunities for teens to get work experience, and for poor men and women to escape unemployment, we must not legislate an even higher minimum wage that prices them out of the job market. Instead, Congress needs to focus our efforts on achieving regulatory reform tax relief and legal reform which will increase the capital available to the business sector for wage increases. Congress must also focus on reducing individual income taxes so that citizens can keep more of their hard-earned money.

TRIBUTE TO DR. HENRY BRADFORD, JR. OF HUNTSVILLE, ALABAMA

HON. ROBERT E. (BUD) CRAMER, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 2000

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the outstanding contributions of Dr. Henry Bradford, Jr., to Church Street Cumberland Presbyterian Church and the spiritual community at large in northern Alabama. His list of credentials fills many a page. Dr. Bradford has been a moral mentor for Church Street Presbyterian for 36 years.

For almost four decades Dr. Bradford has imparted his wisdom from the pulpit. The community refers to Dr. Bradford as ''everybody's pastor'' which reflects his selfless service to our entire city.

I believe this is a fitting tribute for one who has given so much of himself for the betterment of others. Aside from his pastoral duties, Dr. Bradford has served as chairman of the board of directors of the Harris Home for six years in addition to numerous other board positions. Bradford's vocal talents have been enjoyed by our community as he has been a narrator for Huntsville museums and the orchestra. He has graciously shared his musical talents also as Chairman of the Department of Music Education at Alabama A&M University and as a music professor at Oakwood College.

I want to offer my best wishes to Dr. Bradford, his wife Mrs. Nell Lane Bradford, their children Dr. Henry Lane Bradford and Andrea Bradford and their grandson, Henry Lane. He has inspired so many to seek truth and to use their talents to serve the community. I congratulate Dr. Bradford on his retirement and wish him a well-deserved rest.

LEHIGH VALLEY HEROES—LEHIGH VALLEY HOSPICE VOLUNTEERS

HON. PATRICK J. TOOMEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 2000

Mr. TOOMEY. Mr. Speaker, today I pay tribute to a group of my constituents who do volunteer work helping others in my district. Over 100 volunteers for the Lehigh Valley Hospice will soon receive awards for their service. These volunteers, who come from all areas of eastern Pennsylvania, help to improve the lives of thousands of terminally ill patients in the community.

From assisting with chores to providing respite for patients' families, the acts of these volunteers show the depth of their generosity and compassion. Hospice volunteers provide much needed emotional support during a time of tremendous distress. The volunteers provided care for patients as well as caregivers, and represent a light of hope to the entire community.

This year marks the 20th anniversary of Lehigh Valley Hospice, and I applaud the organization's wonderful volunteers for providing a service that aids so many members of the community. Mr. Speaker, all the hospice volunteers are Lehigh Valley Heroes.

HONOREES—LEHIGH VALLEY HOSPICE VOLUNTEERS

Marilyn Ackerman, Robert Allwein, Jennifer Baldwin, Edna Balmat, Debbie Barr, Susan Baxter, Jean Behler, Shirley Beiseigel, Irene Bell, Roy Bertelsen, Rosemary Bobersky, Al Braido, Florence Brown,

Lisa Brown, Lois Brown, Diane Buchner, Nadenka Butko.

Penn Clissold, Mary Therese Collins, Karen Conners, Jean Cooper, Dorine Cope, Betsy Cunningham, Alice D'Amore, Rosie Deitrick, Marilyn Demaree, Lou Ditro, Jean Dolan, Chester Dombrowski, Helene Dombrowski, Betty Dorwart, Elizabeth Dorwart, Margaret Duell, Doug Dykhouse.

Mary Earley, Adrienne Ehle, Jean Everett, Gerry Filemyr, Gertrude Flicker, Kathleen Foglia, Dorothy Folk, Helen Fox, Susan Fritz.

Lar Garman, Gail Geist, Steve Gendall, Marion Gewartowski, Joyce Gobrecht, Connie Graaf, Lorraine Gyauch, Mary Haas, Jeanne Hagemes, Susan Hamill, David Hankard, Lori Henninger, Jack Helt, Dorothy Hoffman, Jane Holland, Barbara Hydro.

Karen Jacob, Marymae Jansson, Ann Karas, Pat Keinert, Barbara Kelly, Mary Lou Kenney, Becky Korman, Gina Kramer, Sarah Kutz, Shirley Lafaver, Roberta Lambert, Helen Lamparella, Joan Laudenslager, Margaret Liebl, Martha Lopez, Anne Lynch, Wendy Lynn.

Ed Magocs, Jean Magocs, Kathryn Major, Ken Mangano, Helen Maron, Yvette Martinez, Linette Martino, Joan May, Donnal Mayotte, Suzanne McCready, Anne McCullough, Tracey McGee, Susan McGrath, Jean McNamara, Lettie Mearhoff, Kristy Parks Mesh, Sue Micek, Rodney Miller, Carolyn Momm, Joan Moran, Elsie Mory, Valerie Moyer.

Ruth Nigro, Pat Pluchinsky, Angie Pontician, Sylvia Prorok, Frederika Rhodes, Nancy Rich, Elizabeth Rodriguez, Kim Roth, Lillian Rozenburgh.

Laurette Sabolick, Jean Sauder, Carol Saxman, Marion Schaffer, Ann Schuck, Mary Sechler, Jan Seem, Eileen Serow, Elaine Sheninger, Brenda Smith, Sherri Smith, Brenda Stahley, Kathy Sterner, Justine Stoudt, Arlan Strubeck.

Fran Tapper, Mary Thompson, Karen Toole, Dorothy Tramontano, Beverly Van Kuren, Jeaninne Wagner, Frank Walsh, Eleanor Wetherhold, Janet Whitehill, Ann Wilhelm, Anne Yori, Rita Zanders, Susan Zern, Bill Zoshak.

In memoriam—Michael McNamara and Ethel Strubeck.

SALUTE TO THE 1999 LOS ANGELES POLICE RESERVE OFFICER OF THE YEAR, SPECIALIST RESERVE OFFICER ERICA DESMITH

HON. HOWARD P. "BUCK" McKEON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 2000

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, today I salute my constituent, a resident of North Hills, who truly embodies the spirit of national service.

Erica DeSmith, who is assigned to the LAPD Devonshire Area, was selected as the Los Angeles Police Department's Reserve Officer of the Year for 1999 at the annual Reserve Award's Banquet on March 25th. As a Specialist Reserve Police Officer, Erica DeSmith volunteers her time to the Devonshire Area community-policing program four days a week, seven hours a day, and has amassed over 13,000 hours over the past 6 years.

Officer DeSmith is the mainstay of the community-policing program who takes calls from community members who have problems ranging from graffiti to noisy neighbors to speeding on their streets. She handles the inquiries that do not need direct police response, thus saving countless valuable hours for police officers to focus on other duties and responsibilities.

Officer DeSmith has established a solid reputation with the sworn officers, civilian employees of Devonshire Area, and the community; and is a person who can be relied on to get the job done. Her commitment to the self-excellence, her leadership qualities, and her ability to motivate her fellow officers and all add up to making her an outstanding public servant. Her tireless efforts and personal interest have contributed significantly toward ensuring the success of community based policing in the Devonshire Area.

I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the unbridled commitment and dedication of Los Angeles Police Specialist Reserve Officer Erica DeSmith. I also recognize thousands of her fellow officers, both sworn and reserve, who give so much of themselves to ensure the safety of our citizens and community, many times at the expense of their own families. Thank you for a job well done.

2000 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. J.C. WATTS, JR.

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 2000

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3908) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes:

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, last night in my district in McClain County, Oklahoma, a home was completely destroyed in a methamphetamine lab explosion. The explosion was so intense the toxic waste disposal team could not clean the area for several hours. Every day in Oklahoma, families are exposed to toxic fumes that are disbursed in meth lab explosions. Earlier this month, in Grove, Oklahoma, 26 people were rushed to the emergency room as a result of another meth lab explosion. The Oklahoma State Bureau of Investigation estimates that there are 900 meth labs in Oklahoma, and thousands upon thousands of these illegal meth labs across the country.

The DEA, which funds the clean up of these illegal meth labs, has already run out of funds for this year.

Today, this body has the opportunity to help the people of Oklahoma and thousands of other communities across this country. Representative HUTCHINSON's amendment will use existing Justice Department funds to supply the Drug Enforcement Administration with 15 million dollars to clean up meth labs across the nation.

I urge my colleagues to stand with Representative HUTCHINSON and myself to provide our communities with protection from these dangerous illegal meth labs. Vote ''yes'' on the Hutchinson amendment.

CONGRATULATING CHARLES AND BERNICE COVELLI UPON THEIR FIFTIETH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY

HON. DAVID D. PHELPS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 2000

Mr. PHELPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute and honor the fiftieth wedding anniversary of Charles and Bernice Covelli. They were married fifty years ago last Friday, on March 31, 1950 at the First Christian Church in West Frankfort, Illinois. Charles and Bernice Covelli were both born in West Frankfort, Illinois, which is in my district, and still reside there today. Charles was born to Steve and Mary Covelli and Bernice was born Bernice Stephens to Jack and Lydia Stephens. Together they have one daughter named Debbie Ricci, who is married to Tim Ricci. Debbie and Tim gave Charlie and Bernice two wonderful granddaughters named Chelcee and Lacee.

Charles was the self-employed owner and operator of Covelli's Steve's Place and Italian Restaurant in Royalton, Illinois for fifty years. Charlie also served in the United States Army and now is retired. Bernice was a employee of the Illinois State Board of Education for thirty years and is also now retired. In their retirements, Charlie and Bernice both enjoy spending time with their grandchildren. Charlie, a sports fan, also like attending sporting events and Bernice enjoys reading and discussing politics.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to encourage all my colleagues in the House of Representatives in wishing a happy anniversary to Charles and Bernice Covelli. I know that this is a very special time for the Covellis, their family and friends, and I am honored to have this opportunity to commemorate their fiftieth wedding anniversary in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SUE WILKINS MYRICK

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 2000

Mrs. MYRICK. Mr. Speaker, on March 9, I voted incorrectly on rollcall vote No. 45, the final passage vote for H.R. 3846. My intention was to vote ''nay.''

TRIBUTE TO MRS. DOROTHY MIREE OF HUNTSVILLE, ALABAMA

HON. ROBERT E. BUD CRAMER, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 2000

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the outstanding contributions of Mrs. Dorothy (Dot) Miree to the Huntsville-Madison County Chamber of Commerce. Every year about this time. Mrs. Miree has made an appearance here in Washington with the annual Chamber trip. This year will be her last trip as she is retiring shortly. Over her twelve year career with the Chamber, she has led hundreds of Chamber members to Washington,

D.C. and Montgomery for annual trips. She has also planned and organized the Chamber's Washington and Alabama updates, Armed Forces Celebrations, annual outings and more than 100 other events. All of these have been very professionally administered with a careful eye for detail and a very personalized touch.

We have a very open and warm working relationship with Mrs. Miree. Working together to bridge the connection between the Tennessee Valley and the federal government, we have taken giant steps towards generating more economic development in North Alabama. As a resident of Huntsville since 1952 and a long time member of First Presbyterian Church, Mrs. Miree cares about her community and it shows.

I want to offer my best wishes and congratulations to Mrs. Miree and her family: her husband Reggie, her three children, Lucia, Marian and Trey and her three grandchildren, Jessica, Brandon and Alexandra.

For her dedication, hard work and loyalty, I feel that this is an appropriate honor. Over her twelve year career, she has become a role model for her work ethic and competence. On behalf of the U.S. Congress, I pay homage to Mrs. Miree and thank her for a job well done. I wish her a well-deserved rest and I wish the Chamber the best of luck in coping without her.

2000 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. STENY H. HOYER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 2000

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3908) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes:

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, in 1973, the National Commission on Fire Prevention and Control issued its ''America Burining'' report. For the fire service this was a turning point in its 350 year history and led to the creation of the United States Fire Administration.

Today is another such turning point because this afternoon we will see a renewed Federal commitment to the fire service. I will get into the details in a moment but first I would like to thank a few of my colleagues for their leadership.

First, is my good friend from Pennsylvania CURT WELDON. As all of you know, Representative WELDON is the founder of the Fire Caucus and has done more to advance the cause of first responders than any other Member in Congress.

Secondly, I would like to thank my friend from New Jersey Representative BILL PASCRELL. Congressman PASCRELL is the sponsor of the FIRE Act, H.R. 1168. The FIRE Act has energized the fire service and the grant provisions to our first responders included in the amendment today are largely derived from his legislation.

Finally, are my Fire Caucus Co-chairs. Representative ROB ANDREWS and Representative SHERRY BOEHLERT, and Representatives NICK SMITH who serves as Chairman of the Basic Research Subcommittee of the Science Committee. All of them have worked very hard to get us here today.

Mr. Chairman, as I said before this is a watershed moment for the fire service. The proposed amendment does four very important things for the fire service. First, it makes available $10 million for the Volunteer Fire Assistance program. This program helps fire departments in rural and suburban areas prepare for and fight wildfires.

The second component is $10 million for a competitive grant program administered by FEMA for burn prevention, research, and treatment. This money will be used by groups like Safe Kid, AARP, and NFPA to prevent fires before they start.

Groups like the International Association of Fire Fighters will be able to apply for the money to augment their very successful burn camp. Unlike other accident victims, burn survivors are often permanently disfigured and require extensive physical therapy, job re-training and counseling.

The fourth item is the $80 million that will be made available to fire fighter health and safety. Sadly, every year roughly 100 fire fighters are killed in the line of duty. This money will be used to purchase turnout gear, communications equipment, promote fire fighter fitness, increase training, and enforce the fire codes.

Mr. Chairman, I want to urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment.

IN HONOR OF ABBY SNAY

HON. NANCY PELOSI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 2000

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, April 6, 2000, Abby Snay will be honored at a luncheon in San Francisco for her 25 years of service to the Jewish Vocational and Career Counseling Service (JVS).

Abby Snay first joined JVS in 1975 as a part-time counselor for high school students. In 1981, she became Assistant Director of JVS and in 1984 assumed her current position as the Executive Director. It is truly remarkable that for more than two decades she has remained with JVS benefitting that organization and the larger San Francisco community with her insight, wisdom, and hard work.

For twenty-five years, Abby has worked closely with leaders of business and government to provide employment-related services for people with diverse backgrounds and from diverse communities in San Francisco. She is well known for her ability to develop innovative partnerships with local educational institutions, private companies and other community-based organizations to train adults and youth and place them into jobs. Abby has possessed the ability to anticipate trends before they happen and to reinvent JVS as the community's needs change. Her many accomplishments include: rehabilitation programs for people with disabilities, including two current programs for individuals living with HIV/AIDS; occupational training programs in computer assisted drafting and design, nursing and related medical skills, computer literacy, and vocational English as a second language (VESL); school to work programs for students with disabilities; and job search and placement programs for welfare recipients and homeless men and women.

Under Abby's leadership, JVS has grown from a small organization with four employees and a $300,000 budget to an influential community-based organization with more than 70 full time employees and a budget of over $4 million. Abby was named the Jewish Community Federation's Professional of the Year in 1993, and since she became Executive Director in 1984, JVS has received numerous awards for its innovative programs.

Mr. Speaker, I join with Abby's many friends in San Francisco in celebrating her career. She is a remarkable person and San Francisco has benefitted greatly from her contributions.

IN HONOR OF CELINE MARCUS ON THE OCCASION OF HER NINETIETH BIRTHDAY

HON. CAROLYN B. MALONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 2000

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay special tribute to Celine Marcus. Mrs. Marcus is well known and broadly respected as a leading advocate for tenants' rights, seniors, and the poor. She is a role model and an inspiration to countless residents in New York City. I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating Mrs. Marcus's 90th birthday by expressing our Nation's deep appreciation and gratitude for her life and work.

A civic activist for more than 30 years, Mrs. Marcus has devoted herself to helping the poor, the elderly, and the homeless in her community on the Upper East Side of Manhattan. As an advocate for tenant rights and rent protections, Mrs. Marcus was a founder of the Neighborhood for Shelter, the Stanley M. Isaacs Neighborhood Center, and Interfaith Neighbors.

Serving first as Associate and then as Executive Director of the Lenox Hill Neighborhood House, Mrs. Marcus created such innovative programs as the Lenox Hill Senior Center and Project SCOPE, which provides home care services for housebound older adults in the community. As Executive Director, Mrs. Marcus has thoroughly advanced the mission of The Lenox Hill Neighborhood House, to help those in need on Manhattan's East Side while improving the quality of life for all the individuals and families in its community.

In recognition of her leadership and great commitment to those in need, the City Council of New York has declared March 30, 2000, ''Celine Marcus Day.'' For more than 30 years, Mrs. Marcus has devoted herself to the underserved residents of her community. She created numerous tenant and block associations and organized neighbors to fight for fair housing protections. In her every endeavor Mrs. Marcus has brought health and happiness to others and touched the lives of countless New Yorkers.

Mr. Speaker, I salute the life and work of Celine Marcus, and I ask my fellow Members of Congress to join me in recognizing her significant contributions to the Lenox Hill community, to the city of New York, and to our great Nation.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CORRINE BROWN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 2000

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 95, on March 30, I was detained and unable to make this vote. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes.''

HONORING JACK BRADY

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 2000

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, the House has lost a good friend. Jack Brady, who passed away last week, worked for the House Foreign Affairs Committee for 26 years, including 17 as chief of staff.

Jack's personality suffused every activity of the Foreign Affairs Committee, from markups and hearings to study missions abroad. A Committee Member could not walk into the hearing room without running into Jack, usually with a cigar in hand, running down the day's agenda. He earned great respect from Members and staff for his vision and indefatigable tenacity.

Mr. Speaker, it is no exaggeration to say that Jack Brady was essential to the operations of our Foreign Affairs Committee—now known as the International Relations Committee—from the drafting of legislation to the filling of the water pitchers. From 1976 to 1993, he was the personification of our Committee.

Jack was extraordinarily highly qualified for his job. He had a doctorate in international relations from the London School of Economics and a master's degree from Notre Dame. He was a combat veteran of World War II, having served as an enlisted soldier in Europe. He retired after 21 years of active duty in the U.S. Army as a Lt. Colonel. His awards and decorations included the Bronze Star and the Purple Heart.

Mr. Speaker, Jack Brady was a man who took great pride in serving his country, which he did with distinction in a number of arenas. His service to this body was extraordinary, and I invite my colleagues to join me in honoring him and expressing our condolences to his family.

DEDICATION OF THE LATE JEREMIAH F. REGAN LIBRARY, OCEANPORT, NJ

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 2000

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow evening, Tuesday, April 4, 2000, a most fitting tribute will be made in honor of a man whose passing, a little more than one year ago, is still acutely felt in our community. The Jeremiah F. Regan Library/Media Center will be dedicated in honor of the late Jeremiah F. Regan at the Maple Place School Library in Oceanport, NJ. Given his decades-long devotion to educational excellence, and providing better opportunities for our young people to get access to an education, naming this facility in Mr. Regan's honor is indeed very appropriate, a well-deserved recognition.

Jerry Regan, a resident of Oceanport who passed away on March 9, 1999, was one of those rare people who could always be relied upon to be involved in a wide array of professional, community, political and religious activities. And yet, more importantly, Jerry always maintained as his top priority his devotion to his family and friends.

His involvement in education issues was both wide and deep. He served as New Jersey delegate to the National School Boards Association and represented school boards in New Jersey's Sixth Congressional District on the Federal Relations Network, a public school advocacy effort. He was a member of the Oceanport Board of Education, an adjunct professor at Monmouth College, and an active leader in the Monmouth County and New Jersey school boards associations. He was President of the Executive Board of the New Jersey School Boards Association from 1988 to 1990, and held other senior posts with the Association.

Jerry was also deeply involved in the political, religious and civic life of our community. He served as campaign director and comptroller for my predecessor, the late Representative James J. Howard, a Member of Congress for nearly a quarter of a century. He also served on the Diocesan Educational Advisory Council of the Diocese of Trenton. He was a communicant of St. Michael's Roman Catholic Church in Long Branch, NJ, and was active in the St. Vincent DePaul Society. He was a Scoutmaster for Boy Scout Troop 58 in Oceanport for 12 years. Jerry was also a member of the Oceanport Senior Citizens, and he served on the Public Employees Relations Commission.

Jerry Regan was a proud patriot who served our country in time of war, and contributed to our national defense throughout his life. An Army veteran of World War II, Jerry had a long and highly decorated career at Fort Monmouth. He was promoted to the highest civilian level in the Department of Defense. He also served with me and several of my Congressional colleagues, past and present, on the Save Our Fort Committee. He was a member of the Oceanport Division of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

A great American, Jerry Regan was also a proud son of Ireland. Born in Skibbereen in County Cork, Ireland, Jerry came to the U.S. in 1932. He became an American citizen while serving in Germany with the Army. Throughout his life, Jerry maintained a strong devotion to both his native and his adopted homelands.

On this occasion, I also would like to pay tribute to Jerry's wife Marilyn (Pinky) Regan, who has for many years done an absolutely superb job in my campaign office, and to their two sons and three daughters, all the grandchildren, and to Jerry's other relatives on both sides of the Atlantic. They have much to be proud of.

Mr. Speaker, as Members of Congress, we are often called upon to pay tribute to outstanding citizens who are honored for their many achievements, and it is one of the most rewarding parts of our jobs as elected officials. It is even more rewarding when the person being honored was a respected colleague and a valued friend, like Jerry Regan.

The dedication of the Jeremiah F. Regan Library/Media Center will stand for years to come as a tribute to the public service of an outstanding citizen and community leader. For those of us who were privileged to know him, the memories of Jerry Regan's warmth, humor and genuine decency will be equally enduring.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. HELEN CHENOWETH-HAGE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 2000

Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE. Mr. Speaker, on March 30, 2000, I missed several rollcall votes on the account that I had unavoidable obligations elsewhere. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea'' on rollcall vote 89 (Mr. KASICH's amendment to H.R. 3908), ''nay'' on rollcall vote 90 (Mr. WELDON's amendment to H.R. 3908), ''yea'' on rollcall vote 91 (Mr. STEARNS' amendment to H.R. 3908), ''yea'' on rollcall vote 92 (Mr. PAUL's amendment to H.R. 3908), ''yea'' on rollcall vote 93 (Mr. TANCREDO's amendment to H.R. 3908), ''nay'' on rollcall vote 94 (on motion to recommit with instructions), and ''nay'' on rollcall vote 95 (on passage of H.R. 3908).

ORGAN PROCUREMENT ORGANIZATION CERTIFICATION ACT

HON. DAVE CAMP

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 2000

Mr. CAMP. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on behalf of myself and my colleagues, Representatives JOHNSON of Connecticut, PORTMAN, MATSUI, and PALLONE to introduce the Organ Procurement Organization Certification Act. This important legislation will improve the process that the Health Care Financing Administration (HCFA) uses to certify organ procurement organizations (OPOs).

Each day about 57 people receive an organ transplant, but another 13 people on the waiting list die because not enough organs are available. According to the United Network for Organ Sharing, there are now 68,220 patients in the United States on the waiting list for a transplant. April 16 through 22 is National Organ and Tissue Donor Awareness Week. Communities nationwide will be celebrating the critical importance of organ and tissue donation. First designated by Congress in 1983, this week is used to raise awareness of the critical need for organ and tissue donation and to encourage all Americans to share their decision to donate with their families so their wishes can be honored. This is especially important as the gap between the supply of organs and the growing number of transplant candidates continues to widen.

Next week, it is expected that the House will consider legislation dealing with organ allocation—this issue has been very controversial and certainly deserves our attention. But one of the most critical aspects of the organ transplant system gets very little attention. Organ Procurement Organizations—or OPOs—play a

critical role in procuring and placing organs and are therefore key to our efforts to increase the number and quality organs available for transplant. The OPOs' job is to provide all of the services, within a geographic region, for coordinating the identification of potential donors, requests for donation, and recovery and transplant of organs. The professionals in the OPOs evaluate potential donors, discuss donation with family members, and arrange for the surgical removal of donated organs. They are the people that are responsible for preserving the organs and making arrangements for distribution within the national organ sharing policies. Finally, the OPOs provide information and education to medical professionals and the general public to encourage organ and tissue donation to increase the availability for organs for transplantation.

I don't think that most people are aware of how significant these organizations are, or the impact they have on these recipients' lives. There are currently 60 organ procurement organizations in the United States. Unfortunately, OPOs are suffering from what many other health care providers deal with on a regular basis—excessive regulations from HCFA.

Under current regulations, OPOs are subject to a recertification process every two years. Within that process, HCFA's current measures for certification are based on invalid assumptions. First, they assume that potential donors are equivalent per capita in each OPO service area. Harvard University and industry studies have demonstrated otherwise. Demographic and epidemiologic data have shown wide variations across the country in suicides, homicides, and gunshot wounds; in motor vehicle fatalities; and in HIV incidence and frequency. HCFA also assumes that potential donors die where they live. Recent data examining donors recovered with a home address outside of the OPO service area, however, show wide variations. None of these variations are adjusted by HCFA. HCFA also assumes that populations are accurately determined and assigned. We know, however, that there exist differential growth rates across the country with lags in reporting, and we know that census undercounts vary across the nation. HCFA frequently splits populations arbitrarily across counties as part of OPO service area assignments. None of these variations are adjusted for in the current measures. These are just a few of the problems. I'm not a statistician, but even I can see the inefficiencies in these measures.

For example, while Michigan ranks below the national average in its rate of recovery of vital organs, it is the single largest supplier in the country of human bone for transplantation. The processes for identifying potential donors and obtaining consent is virtually identical for human organs and for bone. Therefore, it cannot be an organization performance issue that causes Michigan to appear to be a poor performer in recovering vital organs.

To compound matters, every two years, these OPOs face decertification, and unlike other HCFA certification programs, there is no provision for corrective action plans to remedy a deficient performance and there is no appeals process for resolving conflicts. The current system forces OPOs to compete on the basis of an imperfect grading system, with no guarantee of an opportunity for a fair hearing based on their actual performance. This situation pressures many OPOs to focus on the certification process itself rather than on activities and methods to increase donation, undermining what should be the ultimate goal of the program. In addition, the two year cycle—which is shorter than any other certification program administered by HCFA—provides little opportunity to examine trends and even less incentive for OPOs to mount long term interventions.

The General Accounting Office, the Institute of Medicine, the Harvard School of Public Health and a host of others have criticized HCFA's use of the population based standard. HCFA has updated certification processes and increased the cycle of accreditation for Medicare Hospitals, Home Health Services, Ambulatory Surgery Centers, Long Term Care Organizations and Methadone Clinics—but they have done nothing to change the certification process for OPOs, despite Congressional urging these changes.

We are introducing legislation that will accomplish three major objectives. First of all, it will impose a moratorium on the current recertification process for OPOs and the use of the population-based performance measurements. Under this bill, the certification of qualified OPOs will remain in place through January 1, 2000, for those OPOs that are certified as of January 1, 2000. Second, the bill requires the Secretary of Health and Human Services to promulgate new rules governing OPO recertification by January 1, 2002. These new rules are to rely on outcome and process performance measures based on evidence of organ donor potential. Finally, the bill provides for the filing and approval of a corrective action plan by an OPO that fails to meet the standards, a grace period to permit corrective action, an opportunity to appeal a decertification to the Secretary on substantive and procedural grounds and a four-year certification cycle.

It is my hope that through enacting this legislation, we can improve a system that touches hundreds of thousands of lives every year. I urge all of my colleagues to join us as cosponsors.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MARK GREEN

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 2000

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, my vote on final passage of H.R. 3908, the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Act, was mistakenly recorded Thursday, March 30. I intended to vote ''nay'', as I had indicated throughout debate on the bill. An ''aye'' vote was recorded.

MOURNING THE PASSING OF ROBERTO L.G. LIZAMA

HON. ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 2000

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, today I pay tribute and mourn the passing of Roberto L.G. Lizama. Tun Bob or Uncle Bob as he was affectionately known in the Chamorro community of the Washington, DC area had a distinguished military career and was a leader of the local Guam community. Eager to assist with any function, reliable for anyone in need of help, a winning smile and a kind word were all part of Uncle Bob's character. He was beloved by his family, the local Guam community and the thousands of Chamorrors who have passed through Washington, DC over the past several decades.

Uncle Bob was born on April 21, 1927 in the prewar Guam village of Sumady. He had a typical upbringing on the ranch and he was willing to share many stories of his young life as a helper to his family on the ranch. His adolescence was marked by a cruel enemy occupation of his homeland, but the experience only strengthened his character and did not alter his positive outlook on life. Almost immediately after the liberation of Guam by American forces and when he still was not a citizen of the United States, he joined the Navy.

As was the practice by the Navy in those days, he and other young men from Guam were not allowed access to all of the military rates. They were limited to service as mess attendants and stewards as were many African-Americans and Filipinos. This discriminatory practice was offensive and limited the upward mobility of many young men from Guam. But this did not diminish Uncle Bob's optimistic outlook on life and his own life chances. Last year, he and several other Chamorro men who served as stewards visited a memorial dedicated to the stewards who served during World War II. I accompanied them and I listened intently to their discussions and they recounted for me the nature of their experiences. Typical of Chamorro men, they endured the insulting treatment they sometimes received, but they continued to work loyally and proved themselves to be better men than many others through their hard work and labor.

Uncle Bob recounted some of his experiences, but not in a bitter manner. He simply told me about the times he had to defend his honor as a Chief, as a sailor and as a native of Guam. And he did so successfully as many others did. His 30 years naval career spanned three wars. He was a veteran of World War II, the Korean War and the Vietnam War. He served aboard ship and ashore in a number of capacities. The crowning glory of his carrier was his service to three Presidents as a cook at the White House. He served Presidents John Kennedy, Lyndon Johnson and Richard Nixon. It is hard to imagine that he prepared kelaguen and lumpia in the White House for the President, but he did. And all of Guam is proud of him for doing so.

He raised his family in Maryland. He and his wife for 51 years, Brigida Guzman Lizama, raised six sons: George, Robert, Stan, Jeff, Wayne, Eric. Together, they have five grandsons. The Lizama name will certainly survive. In his capacity as a community elder, Uncle Bob attended all of the social events and helped members of the community by lending a helping hand when needed and by cooking when necessary. We will all miss him. We extend our sincerest condolences to Auntie Bea and the Lizama men.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. TERRY EVERETT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 2000

Mr. EVERETT. Mr. Speaker, on March 28th and 29th, I was with my wife Barbara who underwent major surgery at John Hopkins University Hospital, and was unable to vote in favor of the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations bill for fiscal year 2000. I am pleased that this legislation was adopted by the House to provide needed funds to restore critical national security readiness items that must be replenished, due to the military's high operating tempo in Kosovo and other contingency operations around the world.

Had I been present, I would have cast my vote accordingly: Roll 81—(Rule)—yes; roll 82—(Sanford Amendment)—no; roll 83—(Toomey Amendment)—yes; roll 84—(Obey Amendment)—no; roll 85—(Lewis Amendment)—yes; roll 86—(Ramstad Amendment)—no; roll 87—(Gilman Amendment)—yes; roll 88—(Fowler Amendment)—yes; roll 89—(Kasich Amendment)—yes; roll 90—(Weldon Amendment)—yes; roll 91—(Stearns Amendment)—yes; roll 92—(Paul Amendment)—no; roll 93—(Tancredo Amendment)—yes; roll 94—(Motion to Recommit)—no; and roll 95—(Final Passage)—yes.

TRIBUTE TO MACON-BIBB COUNTY LEGISLATOR FRANK CHAPMAN PINKSTON, SR.

HON. SAXBY CHAMBLISS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 2000

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, I want to pay tribute to a great American and Georgian, Frank Chapman Pinkston, Sr., who died Monday, March 27, 2000.

Mr. Pinkston was an inspiration to all of us. As a leader and public servant, he believed strongly in the citizens of Georgia and the meaning of loyalty. He worked hard every day to improve our communities and enhance the lives of our neighbors. He served the people of Georgia by giving 100 percent in every endeavor, placing his faith in God, his family, and his country. He will be greatly missed by the people of Georgia and his accomplishments will long be remembered.

Mr. Pinkston was born on February 9, 1923 in Ludowici, GA. He was married to the former Lucille Park Finney for 52 years and graduated from Mercer University and the Walter F. George School of Law, Mercer University in 1947. He was a veteran of the U.S. Army, serving from 1943–1946, serving in the European Theater and participating in the Allied Invasion of Normandy. Mr. Pinkston received five battle stars and was a retired Lieutenant Colonel, Judge Advocate General Corps. Since 1947, Mr. Pinkston had been an attorney, specializing in wills, trust and probate.

Elected to the Georgia House of Representatives in 1968, Mr. Pinkston served continuously in that body until 1992. He was Chairman of the Banks and Banking Committee from 1974 to 1992 and a member of the Rules, and Appropriations Committees. He rewrote Georgia's banking laws and shaped Southern regional banking. He was elected in 1992 as the Eighth Congressional District representative on the State Transportation Board and was re-elected to that position in 1995 and in January 2000. He served as Vice Chairman of the Board from April 1998 until April 1999 at which time he was elected as Chairman, a position he held until his death.

Mr. Pinkston was a member of Ingleside Baptist Church, serving on the Board of Directors of the Macon Rescue Mission, New Town Macon, and the Executive Committee of the Macon-Bibb County Road Improvement Program. He also served three terms on the Board of Trustees of Mercer University, The President's Council of Mercer University, the Boy Scouts of America, and the Middle Georgia Council on Drugs.

Mr. Pinkston received the Algernon Sydney Sullivan Award from Mercer University in 1987 and an honorary Doctor of Law Degree from Mercer University in 1997.

Mr. Speaker, I had the distinct pleasure of serving with Mr. Pinkston on many projects over the years. During his 24 years in public service, he helped lead the development of the Tom Hill Sr. Boulevard/Arkwright Road area, and several of Macon's museums. Mr. Pinkston's proudest achievement was establishment of the medical school at his alma mater, Mercer University. One of his many projects that, unfortunately, he was not able to see through to completion was the Fall Line Freeway.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that in honor of Mr. Pinkston and his many accomplishments in Georgia, local, State, and Federal legislators working on this project will name a portion of the Fall Line Freeway the Frank Pinkston Freeway. I believe this tribute would be a further reminder of his legacy.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. KAY GRANGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 2000

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, due to the severe weather which struck Fort Worth, Texas, last week, I was unable to be present for rollcall votes 81 through 95.

Had I been present, I would have voted: ''Aye'' on rollcall vote 81; ''no'' on rollcall vote 82; ''aye'' on rollcall vote 83; ''no'' on rollcall vote 84; ''aye'' on rollcall vote 85; ''no'' on rollcall vote 86; ''aye'' on rollcall vote 87; ''aye'' on rollcall vote 88; ''no'' on rollcall vote 89; ''aye'' on rollcall vote 90; ''no'' on rollcall vote 91; ''no'' on rollcall vote 92; ''no'' on rollcall vote 93; ''no'' on rollcall vote 94; and ''aye'' on rollcall vote 95.

MICROSOFT ANTITRUST VERDICT

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 2000

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, America and the world are reacting to today's decision by U.S. District Judge Thomas Penfield Jackson that Microsoft, among other things, violated federal antitrust laws when it bundled its Internet browser and its Windows operating system. In particular, a lot of focus is being placed on the way the financial markets are reacting to this decision and its impact on consumers of technological goods and services.

I am not in a position at this point to comment on the Judge's decision or on who is to blame for the settlement discussions failing to achieve a solution acceptable to the parties. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ensure that we do not overlook many of the tremendous benefits that Microsoft has given to America, and African Americans in particular.

No one can seriously dispute that the Microsoft phenomenon has had a profound impact on the way every American lives today. When Microsoft and IBM led the personal computer revolution in the early 1980s, helping to make this powerful tool affordable to many American families, no one could have dreamed that we would be where we are today. The Internet and the potential of e-commerce simply could not have been imagined.

Today, the personal computer with the user-friendly Windows operating system is a way of life for many of us. We are just beginning to fully realize the great improvements in our educational achievement, our economy growth and our personal enjoyment that we owe to the personal computer and Microsoft. I hope that we never forget the tremendous contribution Microsoft has made to our way of life, no matter the outcome of this proceeding.

I also want to point out that Microsoft and its Chairman, Bill Gates, are outstanding corporate citizens whose record of charitable giving should not be ignored. Together, Bill Gates and Microsoft have donated over $20 million to the United Negro College Fund and other organizations helping to educate future generations of Americans. They also have taken great steps to help bridge the ''digital divide,'' the gap between those with access to the Internet and information technologies and those without it. They have donated over $200 million in software to public libraries, Boys & Girls Clubs, and made ''Connected Learning Community'' grants to community-based nonprofit organizations in cities across the United States.

Mr. Chairman, our antitrust laws are creatures of the early 20th century, designed to address ''robber barons'' and railroads. As the lessons learned from the AT&T litigation showed us, these laws were not easily adapted to the economic realities of telecommunications in the 1970s. The Microsoft litigation shows the problems inherent in applying these old laws to the electronic marketplace of the third millennium. Microsoft was a pioneer in an industry that did not exist twenty years ago, and it may ultimately pay a penalty as our legal system attempts to grasp this new, dynamic industry.

What happens to Microsoft in the coming months will have an important impact on other technology companies, and will frame the shape of 21st century commerce. Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the right form of regulation, if any, should be and how the antitrust laws should apply in this new age. I encourage Congress to begin to look at this issue, as well as addressing the growing digital divide, to ensure that the great revolution that Microsoft helped begin does not falter.

2000 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. JOHN W. OLVER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 30, 2000

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3908) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes:

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I am in strong opposition to the Kasich/Shays/Condit amendment, which threatens unilateral withdrawal of U.S. forces and resources from Kosova.

One year ago, Kosova was a rump province and ethnic cleansing project of Slobodan Milosevic's Greater Serbia. The world watched the systematic campaign of killing, rape, and forced displacement of ethnic Albanians, whose only crime was their religion.

We and NATO were right to intervene, and we still have a job to do. The need in Kosova for peacekeeping, reconstruction and development of civil and judicial administration is greater than all of the promises by NATO and the U.S. together.

The authors of this amendment are right in one respect. Every diplomatic effort to hold NATO allies to their agreement is entirely appropriate. But threatening to unilaterally withdraw from our freely given commitment just makes the peacekeeping job, so ably done by our deployed men and women—and the reconstruction job—a great deal harder. And if the threat were acted upon, God forbid, it will only lead to giving the final initiative back to Milosevic.

Mr. Chairman, Secretary of State Albright has said that our challenge is to ''secure the peace'' in Kosova. This amendment would assure no peace.

I urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment.

2000 EMERGENCY SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. FLOYD SPENCE

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 29, 2000

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3908) making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes:

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Lewis-Spence-Murtha-Skelton amendment.

I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS), the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) for making this amendment a bipartisan amendment. We could not do it without them.

There are not many people here on this floor this evening, but, frankly, the folks that are here, are not the people that I am trying to reach. I am trying to reach the people who are in the offices listening and the American people on C–Span that might see this.

I am going to say what I said at our Republican conference this morning. And, I will say it to everyone now. We are considering emergency supplemental legislation. In prior years, we have talked about supplementals, emergency supplementals, real emergency supplementals. This is a real, real emergency supplemental from the standpoint of defense.

I know we all have different priorities. We have talked about them a lot today. We are going to continue to talk about them—all the things that are in this supplemental bill, drugs and all the rest.

But, I want to remind everyone, we would not be here as a free society, secure and prosperous, if it had not been made possible by our military, starting with the revolution when we gained our independence. Since that time, we have had World War I and World War II, big threats. Our forefathers, our fathers, our grandfathers, and their families sacrificed their lives and their health to make sure that we are free and secure, and to create this environment that permits us to discuss these matters as they come along.

There is a poem that is often attributed to General MacArthur, and also to a priest that served with the General, Father Denis Edward O'Brien, U.S. Marine Corps, that I believe sums up just how much we owe the freedom and liberty that we so often take for granted, to the military. It goes like this:

It is the soldier, not the reporter, Who has given us freedom of the press.
It is the soldier, not the poet, Who has given us freedom of speech.
It is the soldier, not the campus organizer. Who has given us the freedom to demonstrate.
It is the soldier, who salutes the flag, Who serves beneath the flag, And whose coffin is draped by the flag, Who allows the protester to burn the flag.

Some people these days talk about the arms race. Many people say we spend money on defense than all the rest of the world put together. We have to. Who else is able to do it? We are the only ones. To save ourselves, we have to save the rest of the world along with it.

The Cold War is over, yes. I agree. But, President Reagan, with a Democrat Congress, helped to restore the military and that is what brought about the end of the Cold War—we beat the Soviet Union in the arms race. They could not keep up. They could not do it any longer. That is what ended the Cold War. Today, we face a similar situation. We have more threats today than ever before. We still have the nuclear threat from now Russia, but now we have China and North Korea and all the rest of them, and we are not prepared to defend against those threats.

We also have other threats now—weapons of mass destruction other than nuclear—chemical, biological, from these same countries and lesser countries. This threat is out there, and we are unprepared to deal with it.

Finally, today we are no longer strong enough to fight one conventional war. Kosovo was a wakeup call. We devoted all of our air assets, just about everything, to that air war. And what would have happened if something big had broken out somewhere else in the world? We could not have handled it, certainly not without a large loss of life.

Now it is our turn. We have to step up to the plate. We have to make sure that our country is free, first of all, and allows us the environment to consider these other priorities, which I can sympathize with. The administration, I will give them credit, has come a long way, but not nearly enough. This amendment is going to help a whole lot, but still not enough.

I will conclude with a personal note: Twelve years ago, God gave me a second chance at life when I received a double lung transplant. God has clearly seen fit to leave me here on earth for some reason. I have dedicated this extension of my life to doing the best I can to preserve our freedom. But, I cannot do it alone. Our military cannot do it alone. We need your help. We need everyone's help. When the time comes, I want to be able to say, ''I've done my best.'' I want you to be able to say the same.

A TRIBUTE TO REPRESENTATIVE STEVEN CHEN

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 3, 2000

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of my colleagues an article regarding Representative Steven Chen, who serves as the head of the Taipei Cultural and Economic Representative Office in Washington. The article, which ran in today's New York Times, is a fitting tribute to Taiwan's unofficial Ambassador, who has worked diligently to promote and expand relations between the United States and the 22 million citizens of Taiwan.

Mr. Speaker, Ambassador Chen is a thorough professional who has enjoyed a long and distinguished life as a career diplomat. He has represented his government all over the world, including postings in the Philippines, Brazil, Argentina, and Bolivia. His experience in the United States also is extensive. During the past 25 years, Ambassador Chen served in Atlanta, Chicago, Los Angeles, and he has spent the last three years as the Representative in Washington, DC.

Mr. Speaker, I am certain my colleagues would agree that Steven Chen's charm and quiet demeanor have served Taiwan well. Whether meeting Members of Congress in their offices or Executive Branch officials in a more neutral setting, Ambassador Chen has always worked to make certain the United States and Taiwan remain strong friends.

Mr. Speaker, as the article notes, Ambassador Chen is planning to retire shortly. I am certain all of my colleagues join me in congratulating Steven Chen on a distinguished diplomatic career. We in the Congress are indeed fortunate to know him, and we wish him well in the years ahead.

[From the New York Times, April 3, 2000]

A DIPLOMATIC OUTSIDER WHO LOBBIES INSIDE WASHINGTON

(By Philip Shenon)

WASHINGTON.—At an embassy that is not an embassy, the ambassador who is not an ambassador can only imagine what it is like to be a full-fledged member of Washington's diplomatic corps.

''In the evenings, you attend cocktail parties, champagne dances,'' Stephen Chen said wistfully of the black-tie world from which he is largely excluded. ''This is the very routine, beautiful picture of the diplomat in a textbook.''

Mr. Chen, the director of the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative Office, the de facto embassy here for the government of Taiwan, is a charming pariah.

While he represents the interests of 22 million of the freest and richest people in Asia, the 66-year-old diplomat might as well be invisible, at least as far as many of the State Department's China experts are concerned.

The snubs, Mr. Chen suggested, are an obvious effort to appease Beijing, and they are more than a little unfair to a government that is only weeks away from a peaceful transfer of power from one democratically elected leader to another, the first time that has happened in almost 5,000 years of Chinese history.

''There is a kind of unfairness,'' Mr. Chen tells a visitor, the wall behind his desk decorated with a painting of the delicate blossoms of the winter plum, Taiwan's national flower. ''We have been a model student for freedom, democracy and a market economy.''

''We don't mind if the United States has rapprochement with mainland China—we think it's good to bring the P.R.C. into the family of civilizations,'' he says of the People's Republic of China, which considers Taiwan to be a renegade province. ''What we ask is that the interests of Taiwan not be sacrificed.''

Because the United States has no diplomatic relations with Taiwan and has recognized the Communist government in Beijing as the sole representative of the people of China, Mr. Chen and his staff of nearly 200 are barred from the premises of the State Department.

They are not invited to diplomatic receptions at the White House, or to most of the dinner parties and glittery balls held at the embassies of nations that recognize Beijing.

When Taiwanese diplomats want to talk with Clinton administration officials, the meetings are often held in hotel coffee shops.

''We must meet in a neutral setting, that is the rule,'' says Mr. Chen, explaining the awkward logistics of the job.

Relations with China have been especially jittery since Taiwan's election last month of the new president, Chen Shui-bian, a former democracy activist who long advocated Taiwan's independence and whose victory ended half a century of Nationalist rule.

On the eve of the election, Chinese leaders all but warned of an invasion if Mr. Chen and his party were victorious. Since the election, both Mr. Chen and Beijing have softened their rhetoric, and Mr. Chen has recently insisted that he sees no need for an independence declaration.

Stephen Chen, who is not related to the new president, welcomes the moderated rhetoric from Taiwan's new government. The Communist leaders in Beijing, he says, would strike only ''if they should be unnecessarily provoked.''

''We have been dealing with them for more than 60 years,'' he said. ''We know when they are bluffing, when they are not bluffing. If we don't give them an excuse, I don't think they're going to attack.''

Mr. Chen, who was born in the Chinese city of Nanjing, last saw the mainland in 1949, when his family was on the run from the victorious Communist forces of Mao Zedong. They fled to Taiwan, his father a diplomat in the service of the Nationalist leader, Chiang Kai-shek.

His father was assigned to the embassy in the Philippines when Mr. Chen was 15, and he remained there for more than a decade, attending college in Manila, marrying his Chinese-Filipino high school sweetheart and becoming fluent in English.

In 1960, he returned to Taiwan and passed the foreign service exam. He was first sent to Rio de Janeiro, and then to Argentina and Bolivia. In 1973, he was named consul general to Atlanta, where he remained until the United States severed relations with Taiwan and recognized Beijing six years later.

Mr. Chen said he can remember sitting in his living room in Atlanta, watching the televised announcement by President Carter that the United States would recognize the Communist government. ''I felt that I was being clobbered,'' he recalled. ''A baseball bat on the head.''

''It seemed very unfair,'' he continued. ''It was as if the United States wanted to reward a bad guy, the lousy student, and to punish the good student. That was my feeling.''

In the years since, he said, Taiwanese diplomats have learned how to innovate, especially in Washington, where they employ some of the city's most powerful lobbyists and retain close ties to many prominent conservative members of Congress.

Mr. Chen says his office has an annual budget for lobbying of about $1.2 million and contracts with 15 firms. ''They help open doors, they make appointments for us,'' he said. ''But we make the presentations.''

Under a 1979 law, Taiwan can continue to buy American weapons.

And Mr. Chen has been a frequent visitor to Capitol Hill in recent weeks as his government seeks Congressional approval for the sale of a wish list of sophisticated weapons. ''If we are deprived of basic defensive weapons, then of course we are thrown to the wolves,'' he said.

Mr. Chen is considering a visit to the lair of the wolves. After 40 years in the diplomatic service, he is nearing retirement, and he is planning a vacation on the mainland, which is now permitted.

''I tell you very frankly, I would like to see the Great Wall,'' he said. ''This belongs to the legacy of China. It has nothing to do with Communism.''

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, April 4, 2000 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

APRIL 5

Time to be announced
Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings to examine the energy potential of the 1002 area of the Arctic Coastal Plain; the role this energy could play in National security; the role this energy could play in reducing U.S. dependency on imported oil; and the legislative provisions of S. 2214, to establish and implement a competitive oil and gas leasing program that will result in an environmentally sound and job creating program for the exploration, development, and production of the oil and gas resources of the Coastal Plain. (Immediately following Full Committee Business Meeting).
SD–366

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2001 for the Department of the Interior.
SD–124

Indian Affairs
Business meeting to consider pending calendar business;to be followed by a hearings on S. 612, to provide for periodic Indian needs assessments, to require Federal Indian program evaluations.
SR–485

Energy and Natural Resources
Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.
SD–366

Foreign Relations
International Operations Subcommittee
To hold hearings on United Nations peace keeping missions and their proliferation.
SD–419

Judiciary
Administrative Oversight and the Courts Subcommittee
To resume oversight hearings on the handling of the investigation of Peter Lee, focusing on the plea-bargain agreement reached in the case.
SH–216

Rules and Administration
To hold hearings to examine political parties in America.
SR–301

10 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2001 for the Department of Defense, focusing on Army programs.
SD–192

Finance
To hold hearings on the pattern of improper payments in the school Medicaid program.
SD–215

2 p.m.
Foreign Relations
To hold hearings on legacies of the Holocaust.
SD–419

APRIL 6

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2001 for the Department of Veterans Affairs.
SD–138

Appropriations
Treasury and General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2001 for the Office of Drug Control Policy.
SD–124

Energy and Natural Resources
Forests and Public Land Management Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the proposed five-year strategic plan of the U.S. Forest Service in compliance with Government Results and Performance Act.
SD–366

Environment and Public Works
To hold hearings on the March 30, 2000, United States Army Civil Works Management Reforms.
SD–406

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To hold hearings on interstate shipments of state inspected meat.
SR–328A

Armed Services
To hold hearings to examnine procedures and standards for the granting of security clearances at the Department of Defense.
SR–222

Appropriations
Commerce, Justice, State, and the Judiciary Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2001 for the Federal Trade Commission.
S–146, Capitol

10 a.m.
Commerce, Science, and Transportation
Aviation Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine issues dealing with aviation security.
SR–253

Judiciary
Business meeting to consider the nomination of Richard C. Tallman, of Washington, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Ninth Circuit; the nomination of John Antoon II, of Florida, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Florida; the nomination of Marianne O. Battani, of Michigan, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Michigan vice Anna Diggs Taylor, retired; the nomination of David M. Lawson, of Michigan, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District of Michigan vice Avern Cohn, retired; H.R. 2260, to amend the Controlled Substances Act to promote pain management and palliative care without permitting assisted suicide and euthanasia; S. 1854, to reform the Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act of 1976; and H.J. Res. 86, recognizing the 50th anniversary of the Korean War and the service by members of the Armed Forces during such war.
SD–226

Foreign Relations
East Asian and Pacific Affairs Subcommittee
International Economic Policy, Export and Trade Promotion Subcommittee
To hold joint hearings on China in the World Trade Organization, focusing on United States high technology sector.
SD–419

Finance
To hold hearings to examine China's accession to the World Trade Organization.
SD–215

10:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Foreign Operations Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2001 for the International Financial Institutions.
SD–192

2:15 p.m.
Intelligence
To hold closed hearings on pending intelligence matters.
SH–219

2:30 p.m.
Judiciary
Criminal Justice Oversight Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings to examine the Federal Bureau of Prisons.
SD–226

APRIL 11

9:30 a.m.
Appropriations
Interior Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2001 for the Department of Energy.
SD–138

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings to examine the effects of permanent, normalized trade relations with China on the U.S. economy.
SR–253

Armed Services
To hold hearings on the nominations of Bernard Daniel Rostker, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness; Gregory Robert Dahlberg, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of the Army; and Madelyn R. Creedon, of Indiana, to be Deputy Administrator for Defense Programs, National Nuclear Security Administration.
SR–222

10 a.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
To hold hearings on S. 282, to provide that no electric utility shall be required to enter into a new contract or obligation to purchase or to sell electricity or capacity under section 210 of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978; S. 516, to benefit consumers by promoting competition in the electric power industry; S. 1047, to provide for a more competitive electric power industry; S. 1284, to amend the Federal Power Act to ensure that no State may establish, maintain, or enforce on behalf of any electric utility an exclusive right to sell electric energy or otherwise unduly discriminate against any

consumer who seeks to purchase electric energy in interstate commerce from any supplier; S. 1273, to amend the Federal Power Act, to facilitate the transition to more competitive and efficient electric power markets; S. 1369, to enhance the benefits of the national electric system by encouraging and supporting State programs for renewable energy sources, universal electric service, affordable electric service, and energy conservation and efficiency; S. 2071, to benefit electricity consumers by promoting the reliability of the bulk-power system; and S. 2098, to facilitate the transition to more competitive and efficient electric power markets, and to ensure electric reliability.

SH–216

APRIL 12

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2001 for the Corporation for National and Community Service, Community Development Financial Institutions, and Chemical Safety Board.

SD–138

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings on S. 2255, to amend the Internet Tax Freedom Act to extend the moratorium through calendar year 2006.

SR–253

Indian Affairs

To hold oversight hearings on the report of the Academy for Public Administration on Bureau of Indian Affairs management reform.

SR–485

10 a.m.

Appropriations

Defense Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2001 for the Department of Defense, focusing on missile defense programs.

SD–192

Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examnie the Wassenaar arrangement and the future of multilateral export control.

SD–342

2:30 p.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Water and Power Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings to examine federal actions affecting hydropower operations on the Columbia River system.

SD–366

APRIL 13

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2001 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

SD–138

Energy and Natural Resources

To resume hearings on S. 282, to provide that no electric utility shall be required to enter into a new contract or obligation to purchase or to sell electricity or capacity under section 210 of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978; S. 516, to benefit consumers by promoting competition in the electric power industry; S. 1047, to provide for a more competitive electric power industry; S. 1284, to amend the Federal Power Act to ensure that no State may establish, maintain, or enforce on behalf of any electric utility an exclusive right to sell electric energy or otherwise unduly discriminate against any consumer who seeks to purchase electric energy in interstate commerce from any supplier; S. 1273, to amend the Federal Power Act, to facilitate the transition to more competitive and efficient electric power markets; S. 1369, to enhance the benefits of the national electric system by encouraging and supporting State programs for renewable energy sources, universal electric service, affordable electric service, and energy conservation and efficiency; S. 2071, to benefit electricity consumers by promoting the reliability of the bulk-power system; and S. 2098, to facilitate the transition to more competitive and efficient electric power markets, and to ensure electric reliability.

SH–216

2:30 p.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Forests and Public Land Management Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 2034, to establish the Canyons of the Ancients National Conservation Area.

SD–366

APRIL 25

2:30 p.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Water and Power Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 2239, to authorize the Bureau of Reclamation to provide cost sharing for the endangered fish recovery implementation programs for the Upper Colorado River and San Juan River basins.

SD–366

APRIL 26

10 a.m.

Appropriations

Defense Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2001 for the Department of Defense.

SD–192

SEPTEMBER 26

9:30 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs on the Legislative recommendation of the American Legion.

345 Cannon Building

CANCELLATIONS

APRIL 6

2:30 p.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

National Parks, Historic Preservation, and Recreation Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on the incinerator component at the proposed Advanced Waste Treatment Facility at the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory and its potential impact on the adjacent Yellowstone and Grand Teton National Parks.

SD–366

POSTPONEMENTS

APRIL 19

9:30 a.m.

Indian Affairs

Business meeting to consider pending calendar business; to be followed by hearings on S. 611, to provide for administrative procedures to extend Federal recognition to certain Indian groups.

SR–485

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

See Résumé of Congressional Activity.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S2029–S2051

Measures Introduced: Two bills were introduced, as follows: S. 2339–2340. **Page S2040**

Measures Reported: Reports were made as follows:

Reported on Friday, March 31, 2000, during the adjournment:

S. Con. Res. 101, setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal years 2001 through 2005 and revising the budgetary levels for fiscal year 2000. (S. Rept. No. 106–251) **Page S2040**

Measures Passed:

John K. Rafferty Hamilton Post Office Building: Senate passed H.R. 1374, to designate the United States Post Office building located at 680 U.S. Highway 130 in Hamilton, New Jersey, as the "John K. Rafferty Hamilton Post Office Building", clearing the measure for the President. **Page S2050**

Joseph Ileto Post Office: Senate passed H.R. 3189, to designate the United States post office located at 14071 Peyton Drive in Chino Hills, California, as the "Joseph Ileto Post Office", clearing the measure for the President. **Pages S2050–51**

Congressional Budget Resolution—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for the consideration of the Congressional Budget Resolution on Tuesday, April 4, 2000. **Page S2051**

Appointment:

Amtrak Reform Council: The Chair, announced that pursuant to P.L. 105–134, the Amtrak Reform and Accountability Act of 1997, the appointment of the following individual, appointed by the Minority Leader of the United States Senate, to the Amtrak Reform Council: James E. Coston of Illinois vice Donald R. Sweitzer of Virginia. **Page S2051**

Communications: **Pages S2039–40**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page S2040**

Authority for Committees: **Page S2040**

Additional Statements: **Pages S2037–39**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 12 noon, and adjourned at 2:04 p.m., until 9:30 a.m., on Tuesday, April 4, 2000. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S2051.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

DOE GASEOUS DIFFUSION PLANT

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: On Friday, March 31, Subcommittee on Energy Research, Development, Production and Regulation concluded oversight hearings to examine the Department of Energy's findings at the Gaseous Diffusion Plant in Paducah, Kentucky, and plans for cleanup at the site, after receiving testimony from Carolyn L. Huntoon, Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management, David Michaels, Assistant Secretary of Environment, Safety and Health, and William D. Magwood IV, Director of the Office of Nuclear Energy, Science and Technology, all of the Department of Energy; Keith H. Dinger, Somersworth, New Hampshire, on behalf of the Health Physics Society; and John M. Driskill, United Plant Guard Workers of America, Paducah, Kentucky.

OLDER WORKER EMPLOYMENT

Special Committee on Aging: Committee held hearings to examine employment demand for older workers, focusing on obstacles hindering participation in the labor market, flexibility in retirement programs, and phased retirement programs, receiving testimony from Representative Pomeroy; Joseph Perkins, American Association of Retired Persons, Scott A. Morris, Committee for Economic Development, both of Washington, D.C.; Stephen Meyer, Hy-Vee, Inc.,

West Des Moines, Iowa; September L. Dau, Iowa Lakes Rural Electric Cooperative, Esterville, Iowa, on behalf of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association; and Wilma K. Schopp, Monsanto/Pharmacia and Upjohn, St. Louis, Missouri, on behalf of the Association of Private Pension and Welfare Plans.

Hearings recessed subject to call.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Bills Introduced: 12 public bills, H.R. 4149–4160; and 3 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 297, H. Res 453, 456, were introduced. **Page H1673**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 4052, to preserve certain reporting requirements under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives (H. Rept. 106–555);

The Department of Defense Anthrax Vaccine Immunization Program: Unproven Force Protection (H. Rept. 106–556).

H. Res. 454, providing for consideration of H.R. 2418, to amend the Public Health Service Act to revise and extend programs relating to organ procurement and transplantation (H. Rept. 106–557) and

H. Res. 455, providing for consideration of H.R. 3671, to amend the Acts popularly known as the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act and the Dingell-Johnson Sport Fish Restoration Act to enhance the funds available for grants to States for fish and wildlife conservation projects and increase opportunities for recreational hunting, bow hunting, trapping, archery, and fishing, by eliminating opportunities for waste, fraud, abuse, maladministration, and unauthorized expenditures for administration and execution of those Acts (H. Rept. 106–558). **Page H1673**

Speaker Pro Tempore: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he designated Representative Ballenger to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H1631**

Recess: The House recessed at 12:42 p.m. and reconvened at 2:00 p.m. **Page H1632**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Agency Reporting Requirements to the Committee on Science: H.R. 3904, to prevent the elimination of certain reports; **Page H1634**

Methane Hydrate Research and Development: H. Res. 453, providing for the consideration of the bill H.R. 1753, Methane Hydrate Research and Development Act, and the Senate amendments thereto; **Pages H1634–36**

Use of Capitol Grounds for the John F. Kennedy Center: H. Con. Res. 281, authorizing the use of the East Front of the Capitol Grounds for performances sponsored by the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts; **Pages H1636–37**

Judge J. Smith Henley Federal Building, Harrison, Arkansas: H.R. 1605, amended, to designate the United States courthouse building located at 402 North Walnut Street and Prospect Avenue in Harrison, Arkansas, as the "Judge J. Smith Henley Federal Building." Agreed to amend the title; **Pages H1637–38**

Use of Capitol Grounds for the National Peace Officers Memorial Service: H. Con. Res. 278, authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the 19th annual National Peace Officers' Memorial Service; **Pages H1638–39**

Use of Capitol Grounds for the Library of Congress: H. Con. Res. 279, amended, authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the 200th birthday celebration of the Library of Congress; **Pages H1639–40**

Agency Reporting Requirements to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: H.R. 4052, to preserve certain reporting requirements under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure of the House of Representatives; **Pages H1640–42**

Frank J. Battisti and Nathaniel R. Jones Federal Building, Youngstown, Ohio: H.R. 1359, to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse to be constructed at 10 East Commerce Street in Youngstown, Ohio, as the "Frank J. Battisti and Nathaniel R. Jones Federal Building and United States Courthouse"; **Pages H1642–44**

C.B. King United States Courthouse, Albany Georgia: S. 1567, amended, to designate the United States courthouse located at 223 Broad Street in Albany, Georgia, as the "C.B. King United States Courthouse." Agreed to amend the title; **Pages H1644–45**

Participation of the Extremist FPO in Austrian Government: H. Res. 429, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives concerning the participation of the extremist FPO in the government of Austria; **Pages H1645–48**

Mutual Fund Tax Awareness Act: H.R. 1089, amended, to require the Securities and Exchange Commission to require the improved disclosure of after-tax returns regarding mutual fund performance (passed by a yea and nay vote of 358 yeas to 2 nays, Roll No. 96); and **Pages H1648–51, H1656–57**

Awarding the Congressional Gold Medal to President and Mrs. Ronald Reagan: H.R. 3591, to provide for the award of a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to former President Ronald Reagan and his wife Nancy Reagan in recognition of their service to the Nation (passed by a yea and nay vote of 350 yeas to 8 nays with 1 voting ''present'', Roll No. 97). **Pages H1651–55, H1657**

Recess: The House recessed at 3:47 p.m. and reconvened at 6:00 p.m. **Page H1656**

Senate Messages: Message received from the Senate today appears on page H1631.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Two yea and nay votes developed during the proceedings of the House today and appear on pages H1656–57 and H1657. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 12:30 a.m. and adjourned at p.m. 8:25 p.m.

Committee Meetings

''ARE THE FINANCIAL RECORDS OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT RELIABLE''

Committee on Government Reform: On March 31, the Subcommittee on Government Management, Information, and Technology held a hearing on ''Are the Financial Records of the Federal Government Reliable.'' Testimony was heard from David M. Walker, Comptroller General, GAO; Joshua Gotbaum, Controller, Office of Federal Financial Management, OMB; and Donald V. Hammond, Fiscal Assistant Secretary, Department of the Treasury.

WILDLIFE AND SPORT FISH RESTORATION PROGRAMS IMPROVEMENT ACT

Committee on Rules: Granted by voice vote, an open rule on H.R. 3671, Wildlife and Sport Fish Restoration Programs Improvement Act of 2000, providing one hour of general debate equally divided between the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Resources. The rule waives clause 4(a) of rule XIII (requiring a three-day layover of the committee report) against consideration of the bill. The rule makes in order the Committee on Resources amendment in the nature of a substitute, now printed in the bill, as an original bill for the purpose of amendment, which shall be open for amendment at any point. The rule waives clause 4 of rule XXI (prohibiting appropriations in a legislative bill) against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The rule provides that the amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying the resolution shall be considered as read, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. The rule waives all points of order against the amendment printed in the report. The rule authorizes the Chair to accord priority in recognition to Members who have pre-printed their amendment in the Congressional Record. The rule permits 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. Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. Testimony was heard from Chairman Young of Alaska.

ORGAN PROCUREMENT AND TRANSPLANTATION NETWORK AMENDMENTS

Committee on Rules: Granted, by voice vote, a structured rule on H.R. 2418, Organ Procurement and Transplantation Network Amendments of 1999, providing one hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Commerce. The rule makes in order the Committee on Commerce amendment in the nature of a substitute now printed in the bill as an original bill for the purpose of amendment. The rule makes in order only those amendments printed in the Rules Committee report which may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. The rule waives all points of order against the amendments printed in the report. The rule permits 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. Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit with or without instructions. Testimony

was heard from Chairman Bliley and Representatives LaHood, Peterson of Pennsylvania, Dingell, Rush, DeGette, Barrett of Wisconsin, Luther, and Moakley.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR TUESDAY, APRIL 4, 2000

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Interior, to hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2001 for the Bureau of Indian Affairs and Office of the Special Trustee, Department of the Interior, 9:30 a.m., SD–138.

Subcommittee on Transportation, to hold hearings to examine the implementation of the Driver's Privacy Protection Act, focusing on the positive notification requirement, 10 a.m., SD–192.

Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, to hold hearings on Chechnya, Russia and U.S. Policy and aid programs, 10:30 a.m., SR–301.

Subcommittee on Treasury and General Government, to hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2001 for the Department of the Treasury, 2:30 p.m., SD–138.

Committee on Armed Services: to hold hearings on United States support for counter-narcotics activities in the Andean Ridge and neighboring countries, and the impact of narco-trafficking on the stability of the region, 9:30 a.m., SH–216.

Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities, to hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for fiscal year 2001 for the Department of Defense and the Future Years Defense Program, focusing on joint requirements, capabilities, and experimentation, 2:30 p.m., SR–222.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: to hold hearings on S.1712, to provide authority to control exports, 2:30 p.m., SR–253.

Committee on Foreign Relations: to hold hearings on the nominations of Donald Arthur Mahley, of Virginia, for the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service as Special Negotiator for Chemical and Biological Arms Control Issues; and Gregory G. Govan, of Virginia, for the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service as Chief U.S. Delegate to the Joint Consultative Group, 10:30 a.m., SD–419.

Subcommittee on Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs, to hold hearings to examine the international trafficking of women and children, focusing on prosecution, testimonies, and prevention, 2 p.m., SD–419.

Select Committee on Intelligence: to hold closed hearings on pending intelligence matters, 3 p.m., SH–219.

House

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, on Bureau of Reclamation, 10 a.m., 2362–B Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, on Institute of Museum and Library Services and National Education Goals Panel, 10 a.m., and on public witnesses, 2 p.m., 2358 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government, oversight on Customs—Automated Commercial Environment, 10 a.m., and on U.S. Postal Service, 2 p.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on VA, HUD and Independent Agencies, on National Science Foundation, 9:30 a.m., H–143 Capitol.

Committee on Education and the Workforce, Subcommittee on Employer-Employee Relations, hearing on Modernizing ERISA to Promote Security, 10:30 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing on Fiscal Year 1999 Audit of the Corporation for National Service, 2 p.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Government Reform, Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources, hearing on Drug Treatment Options within the Criminal Justice System, 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Government Management, Information, and Technology, hearing on Reauthorization of the National Historical Publications and Records Commission for Fiscal Years 2002–2005, 3 p.m., 2247 Rayburn.

Committee on International Relations, Subcommittee on International Economic Policy and Trade, to continue hearings on the Future of the Export Administration Act, Part 2, 3 p.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on the Judiciary, to continue markup of H.R. 3767, Visa Waiver Permanent Program Act; and to mark up the following bills: H.R. 3244, Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 1999; and H.R. 3125, Internet Gambling Prohibition Act of 1999, 10 a.m., 2141 Rayburn.

Committee on Resources, hearing on the following bills: H.R. 3291, Shivwits Band of the Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah Water Rights Settlement Act; and H.R. 3468, Duchesne City Water Rights Conveyance Act, 2 p.m., 1324 Longworth.

Subcommittee on Forests and Forest Health, oversight hearing on the Effect of the New Forest Rules on National Recreation, 2 p.m., 1334 Longworth.

Subcommittee on National Parks, and Public Lands, hearing on the following bills: H.R. 2249, Corinth Battlefield Preservation Act of 1999; H.R. 2773, Wekiva Wild and Scenic River Act of 1999; and H.R. 2833, Yuma Crossing National Heritage Area Act of 1999, 10 a.m., 1324 Longworth.

Committee on Rules, to consider H.R. 3660, Partial-Birth Abortion Ban Act of 2000, 1 p.m., H–313 Capitol.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, executive, hearing on Unauthorized Disclosures of Classified Information: Possible Solutions, 2 p.m., H–405 Capitol.

Joint Meetings

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe: to hold hearings on the deteriorating freedom of media and speech in Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe, 1 p.m., 334, Cannon Building.

Résumé of Congressional Activity

SECOND SESSION OF THE ONE HUNDRED SIXTH CONGRESS

The first table gives a comprehensive résumé of all legislative business transacted by the Senate and House. The second table accounts for all nominations submitted to the Senate by the President for Senate confirmation.

DATA ON LEGISLATIVE ACTIVITY

January 24through March 31, 2000

	Senate	*House*	*Total*
Days in session	31	31	..
Time in session	206 hrs., 22′	172 hrs., 3′	..
Congressional Record:			
Pages of proceedings	2,027	1,630	..
Extensions of Remarks	..	471	..
Public bills enacted into law	4	6	10
Private bills enacted into law	..	..	..
Bills in conference	3	11	..
Measures passed, total	52	78	130
Senate bills	12	5	..
House bills	6	32	..
Senate joint resolutions	1	..	..
House joint resolutions	..	1	..
Senate concurrent resolutions	10	5	..
House concurrent resolutions	3	9	..
Simple resolutions	20	26	..
Measures reported, total	*37	*63	100
Senate bills	17	3	..
House bills	11	35	..
Senate joint resolutions	1	..	..
House joint resolutions	..	..	..
Senate concurrent resolutions	2	..	..
House concurrent resolutions	..	..7	..
Simple resolutions	6	18	..
Special reports	1	1	..
Conference reports	1	2	..
Measures pending on calendar	153	80	..
Measures introduced, total	409	746	1,155
Bills	340	631	..
Joint resolutions	6	6	..
Concurrent resolutions	24	57	..
Simple resolutions	39	52	..
Quorum calls	1	1	..
Yea-and-nay votes	51	57	..
Recorded votes	..	37	..
Bills vetoed	..	..	..
Vetoes overridden	..	..	..

*These figures include all measures reported, even if there was no accompanying report. A total of 22 reports have been filed in the Senate, a total of 66 reports have been filed in the House.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE NOMINATIONS

January 24 through March 31, 2000

Civilian nominations totaling 248 (including 142 nominations carried over from the First Session), disposed as follows:	
Confirmed	11
Unconfirmed	235
Withdrawn	2
Other Civilian nominations totaling 937 (including 778 nominations carried over from the First Session), disposed as follows:	
Confirmed	937
Air Force nominations, totaling 2,591 (including 15 nominations carried over from the First Session), disposed as follows:	
Confirmed	1,139
Unconfirmed	1,449
Returned to White House	3
Army nominations, totaling 1,733 (including 204 nominations carried over from the First Session), disposed as follows:	
Confirmed	1,219
Unconfirmed	512
Returned to White House	2
Navy nominations, totaling 572 (including 20 nominations carried over from the First Session), disposed as follows:	
Confirmed	261
Unconfirmed	309
Returned to White House	2
Marine Corps nominations, totaling 866 (including 1 nomination carried over from the First Session), disposed as follows:	
Confirmed	856
Unconfirmed	10

Summary

Total nominations carried over from First Session	1,150
Total Nominations received this session	5,797
Total Confirmed	3,486
Total Unconfirmed	3,452
Total Withdrawn	2
Total Returned to White House	7

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Tuesday, April 4

Senate Chamber

Program for Tuesday: Senate will begin consideration of S. Con. Res. 101, Congressional Budget.

(Senate will recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m. for their respective party conferences.)

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9:30 a.m., Tuesday, April 4

House Chamber

Program for Tuesday: Consideration of H.R. 2418, Organ Procurement and Transplantation Network Amendments (structured rule, one hour of general debate)

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Ackerman, Gary L., N.Y., E479
Brown, Corrine, Fla., E476
Camp, Dave, Mich., E476
Chambliss, Saxby, Ga., E478
Chenoweth, Helen, Idaho, E476
Cramer, Robert E. (Bud), Jr., Ala., E473, E474
Everett, Terry, Ala., E478
Gilman, Benjamin A., N.Y., E476
Granger, Kay, Tex., E478
Green, Mark, Wisc., E477
Hoyer, Steny H., Md., E475
McKeon, Howard P. ''Buck'', Calif., E474
Maloney, Carolyn B., N.Y., E475
Myrick, Sue Wilkins, N.C., E473, E474
Olver, John W., Mass., E479
Pallone, Frank, Jr., N.J., E476
Pelosi, Nancy, Calif., E475
Phelps, David D., Ill., E474
Spence, Floyd, S.C., E479
Stump, Bob, Ariz., E473
Toomey, Patrick J., Pa., E473
Towns, Edolphus, N.Y., E478
Underwood, Robert A., Guam, E477
Watts, J.C., Jr., Okla., E474

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.