United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 146 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MAY 2, 2000 No. 52

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 2, 2000.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JUDY BIGGERT 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 with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 150. An act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to convey National Forest System lands for use for educational purposes, and for other purposes.

H.R. 834. An act to extend the authorization for the National Historic Preservation Fund, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1444. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to plan, design, and construct fish screens, fish passage devices, and related features to mitigate adverse impacts associated with irrigation system water diversions by local governmental entities in the States of Oregon, Washington, Montana, Idaho, and California.

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

S. 397. An act to authorize the Secretary of Energy to establish a multiagency program to alleviate the problems caused by rapid economic development along the United States-Mexico border, particularly those associated with public health and environmental security, to support the Materials Corridor Partnership Initiative, and to promote energy efficient, environmentally sound economic development along that border through the development and use of new technology, particularly hazardous waste and materials technology.

S. 408. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey a former Bureau of Land Management administrative site to the city of Carson City, Nevada, for use as a senior center.

S. 503. An act designating certain land in the San Isabel National Forest in the State of Colorado as the ''Spanish Peaks Wilderness''.

S. 1167. An act to amend the Pacific Northwest Electric Power Planning and Conservation Act to provide for expanding the scope of the Independent Scientific Review Panel.

S. 1218. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to the Landusky School District, without consideration, a patent for the surface and mineral estates of certain lots, and for other purposes.

S. 1627. An act to extend the authority of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to collect fees through 2005, and for other purposes.

S. 1629. An act to provide for the exchange of certain land in the State of Oregon.

S. 1694. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study on the reclamation and reuse of water and wastewater in the State of Hawaii.

S. 1705. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to enter into land exchanges to acquire from the private owner and to convey to the State of Idaho approximately 1,240 acres of land near the City of Rocks National Reserve, Idaho, and for other purposes.

S. 1727. An act to authorize funding for the expansion annex of the historic Palace of the Governors, a public history museum located, and relating to the history of Hispanic and Native American culture, in the Southwest and for other purposes.

S. 1778. An act to provide for equal exchanges of land around the Cascade Reservoir.

S. 1797. An act to provide for a land conveyance to the city of Craig, Alaska, and for other purposes.

S. 1836. An act to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project in the State of Alabama.

S. 1849. An act to designate segments and tributaries of White Clay Creek, Delaware and Pennsylvania, as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

S. 1892. An act to authorize the acquisition of the Valles Caldera, to provide for an effective land and wildlife management program for this resource within the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes.

S. 1910. An act to amend the Act establishing Women's Rights National Historical Park to permit the Secretary of the Interior to acquire title in fee simple to the Hunt House located in Waterloo, New York.

S. 1946. An act to amend the National Environmental Education Act to redesignate that Act as the ''John H. Chafee Environmental Education Act'', to establish the John H. Chafee Memorial Fellowship Program, to extend the programs under that Act, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 106–170, the Chair, on behalf of the Democratic Leader, after consultation with the Ranking Member of the Senate Committee on Finance, announces the appointment of the following individuals to serve as members of the Ticket to Work and Work Incentives Advisory Panel—

Dr. Richard V. Burkhauser, of New York, for a term of two years; and

Ms. Christine M. Griffin, of Massachusetts, for a term of four years.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 106–170, the Chair, on behalf of the Majority Leader, after consultation with the Chairman of the Senate Committee on Finance, announces the appointment of the following individuals to serve as members of the Ticket to Work and Work Incentives Advisory Panel—

Larry D. Henderson, of Delaware, for a term of two years; and

Stephanie Smith Lee, of Virginia, for a term of four years.

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

Printed on recycled paper.

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 Ohio (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

LIVABLE COMMUNITIES

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Madam Speaker, my goal in Congress has been the promotion of livable communities, the Federal Government being a better partner with State and local governments than the private sector. In order to make our families safe, healthy, and economically secure transportation is clearly a central element of those deliberations and the bicycle is getting increasing attention as an indicator of livable communities.

At the turn of the century, bicycling was a critical mode of transportation. It was cheaper than a horse. It was faster than walking, and it was more convenient for most than street cars. The demand for new and safe bicycle routes led to a national ''good roads'' movement; a successful cyclist who led lobbying of Congress won a $10,000 grant to study the possibility of a paved highway system.

It is with some irony that this quest for quality biking led us down the path that ultimately led to the interstate freeway system; and now 100 years, we have come full circle, because the quest for relief from traffic congestion of automobiles is now having people look more attentively at the possibilities of cycling.

Americans still view biking as a very favorable mode of transportation. A study by the New York Department of Transportation showed that in communities with bike lanes and bike parking over 50 percent of the people living within 5 to 10 miles from work would, in fact, commute by bicycle.

Yet Americans are driving nearly 2½ trillion miles a year; they are spending the equivalent of over 50 workdays per year trapped behind the wheel of their car just going to and from work. Every day the average American adult drives close to 40 miles and spends over an hour in their car.

When considering traffic and parking, 40 percent of our trips would be faster on a bike. I certainly found that to be the case, since in the 4 years that I have been on Capitol Hill being able to routinely beat my colleagues in trips to the White House and back on a bike rather than a car.

Increasingly, communities are working to reintegrate cycling back into their transportation systems. Chicago; Philadelphia; Eugene, Oregon; Davis, California; Rockville, Maryland; Washington, D.C. are all actively promoting a more bicycle-friendly transportation system. My own hometown of Portland, Oregon, has been declared twice in the last 5 years as America's most bike-friendly community.

These pro-bike efforts in cities around the country, this progress is due, in no small part, to the national leadership provided by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR).

He was the champion of funding for bike paths in the 1991 ISTEA legislation and the T21 legislation last year for the surface transportation reauthorization. He continues to promote bike-friendly legislation as a ranking member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

Madam Speaker, I am especially proud of his membership in our bike-partisan Bike Caucus, perhaps the most avid cyclist in American public office. These pro-bike efforts across the country are not asking everyone to trade in their car for a bicycle, but instead to encourage small but meaningful changes in our everyday transportation decisions and to expand the choices available to Americans.

Biking, walking, or taking transit just a few short trips a week to school, to work, to the grocery store, other nearby errands can have a profound effect on the quality of life.

It is estimated that a 4-mile round trip that we do not take by car prevents nearly 15 pounds of air pollutant from contaminating the air; and in a time of skyrocketing gasoline prices and questions about availability of oil, it is important to note that biking to work just 2 days a week or telecommuting or transit by American workers just 2 days a week would completely eliminate our dependence on oil imports.

May is National Bike Safety Month, and in honor of this occasion and National Bike to Work Day, the Congressional Bicycle Caucus will be riding from Capitol Hill to Freedom Plaza this Friday, May 5. We are urging Members and staff to join us at 7:45 on the west side of Capitol Hill for this ride.

Madam Speaker, in addition, we urge people now to earn their pin and join the Bicycle Caucus.

CELEBRATING OUR ENVIRONMENTAL SUCCESSES

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

Mr. STEARNS. Madam Speaker, it is estimated that 500 million people around the world participated in Earth Day on April 22 this year. We should consider how the environment has changed since the first Earth Day was celebrated in 1970.

Although a celebration, Earth Day 1970 generated a large amount of dire predictions for the future. I think we should take a moment to look back at those. One Harvard biologist declared ''we are in an environmental crisis which threatens the survival of this Nation and of the world as a suitable place for human habitation.''

Another common premonition of devastation centered on population growth. Environmental doomsayers in 1970 estimated that the world population would exceed 7 billion people by the year 2000, prompting one Stanford biologist to state, ''At least 100 to 200 million people per year will be starving to death during the next 10 years.''

This picture of widespread starvation has not materialized, nor has the population projections. Instead of more than 7 billion people on the earth today, we have roughly just 6 billion.

Just as in 2000, environmentalists in 1970 saw a growing environmental catastrophe in the form of climate change. Unlike today, 30 years ago the alarm was sounded over global cooling. They talked about another ice age was in the works.

One ecologist, Kenneth Watt, proclaimed that, ''The world will be about 4 degrees colder . . . in 1990, but 11 degrees colder in the year 2000. This is about twice what it would take to put us into an ice age.''

Now, frankly, there are no ice sheets spreading across this continent; the threat of global cooling dissolved into the sea of misinformation. However, how can we rage against climatic change if the world is not getting colder? It, therefore, must be becoming warmer.

Evidence indicates that the world's average temperature has increased by 1 degree over the past 100 years. However, data from global satellites indicate that the earth actually has cooled by less than one-tenth of one degree Celsius over the past 18 years. The warnings of serious global warming today have as little basis in fact as those for global cooling 30 years ago.

Now, doomsayers in 1970 also warned of poisonous air ravaging the populations in our major cities. In that year, Life Magazine said, ''In a decade, urban dwellers will have to wear gas masks to survive air pollution.'' The same scientist that predicted that starvation would kill ''at least 100 to 200 million people per year'' also opined 3 decades ago that air pollution would take ''hundreds of thousands of lives in the next few years.''

How is our air quality now? The Environmental Protection Agency reports that between 1970 and 1997, emission of every major pollutant except nitrogen dioxide has decreased. From 1988 to 1997, the number of unhealthy air quality days decreased by an average of two-thirds for every major city in the United States of America.

The first Earth Day in 1970 was observed against a backdrop of dire environmental predictions. Unfortunately, Earth Day 2000 was accompanied with similar predictions of environmental calamities. Instead of providing a platform for the harbingers of ecological destruction, we should use Earth Day, I think, to acknowledge the progress we have made.

The environment is better today than it was 10 years ago and better

than it was 30 years ago. If we continue our present course, it will be even better 10 years from today. Thanks to the Heritage Foundation, I can share my reasons for this optimism.

Even though 16 billion cubic feet of timber are harvested each year in the United States, net tree growth exceeds tree cuttings by 37 percent. Today we have more forest area in America than we did in the 1920's and it is growing.

The loss of wetlands has been slowing over the past 45 years. From 1992 through 1996, 160,000 acres of wetlands were restored privately through voluntary arrangements each year. The United States is within 47,000 acres of achieving a ''no net loss'' of wetlands acreage.

Since 1945, the amount of land committed for parks wilderness and wildlife has expanded twice as fast as the growth in urban areas.

Unfortunately, our major media prefer to focus on the negative; they still rely on dire predictions based upon questionable scientific data and misinformation. The American people of today and of future generations deserve their rich natural heritage of clean air, pure water, and unspoiled land. Across the board over the last 3 decades, our water, land and air have gotten cleaner. They will be cleaner in years to come. That is a message we should be sharing on Earth Day 2001.

PERMANENT MOST FAVORED NATION STATUS FOR CHINA IS BAD IDEA

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Madam Speaker, 3 weeks from this week, the Republican leadership will ask this House to pass legislation granting Permanent Most Favored Nation status trading privileges to China. This is a very bad idea. Let me count the ways.

First of all, China is a nation that practices slave labor and practices child labor. Why should we give trade advantages to a nation that engages in that kind of behavior with no oversight from us, with no check on Chinese behavior?

China is a nation that allows forced abortions, a government that sometimes encourages forced abortions, again, a violation of any kind of behavior that we and most of the nations around the world find unacceptable.

The Chinese government, the Chinese Communist Party, is also a nation and a government that persecutes Christians and Muslims and Buddhists and also local religious sects such as the Falun Gong in a China that, again, has no respect for human rights.

The government of China also has repeatedly sold nuclear technology to countries that have no business having that kind of nuclear technology that can very easily turn into weapons of mass destruction.

1245

At the same time, in the last few weeks, we have seen the People's Republic of China threaten the Republic of Taiwan. Three or 4 years ago, during the last Taiwanese elections, the Chinese government, the People's Republic of China, the Communist Chinese Government sent missiles shooting into the Straits of Taiwan to threaten that Nation that was holding the first free elections ever in Chinese history.

Giving China Most Favored Nation status, giving China permanent trading privileges with the West simply makes no sense. China is a market that has been closed to us. We, 10 years ago, 11 years ago, when President Reagan and President Bush, now President Clinton, began this policy of engagement with China where we would trade freely back and forth with China, in those days, 11 years ago, we had $100 million, with an ''M,'' $100 million trade deficit with the People's Republic of China.

Today, after 11 years of this policy, we have a $70 billion, with a ''B,'' $70 billion trade deficit with the People's Republic of China. Why? Because of slave labor, because of child labor, because they have simply closed their markets to us.

Last year, we bought $85 billion worth of goods from the People's Republic of China. They only let us sell $15 billion of goods into their market. We sell more to Belgium than we do to China. We sell more to Singapore than we do to China. We sell more to Taiwan than we do to China, countries that have, at most, 1–50th the population of the People's Republic of China.

No issue in my 8 years in Congress has been debated as heavily or lobbied most importantly, lobbied as heavily by as many wealthy special interest groups as the annual MFN review for China and now permanent trade relations with China.

There are more corporate jets at National Airport when the China vote comes up. There are more CEOs individually, the CEOs of the largest corporations in America, walking the halls of Congress, stopping in every Member's office, lobbying them about supporting permanent trade privileges for the People's Republic of China.

Wei Jing-Sheng, a Chinese dissident who spent time in Chinese prison camps, said that the vanguard of the Chinese communist party in the United States is American CEOs. Think about that. CEOs of the largest companies in this country are doing the dirty work, doing the heavy lifting, doing the lobbying for, doing the support of the Communist leaders in the People's Republic of China.

This body would never even consider, would not even come close to supporting permanent trade relations with China, would not even come close to supporting any kind of tariff reductions, Most Favored Nation status, trading privileges for China, if these CEOs of America's largest corporations were not walking the halls and lobbying for the Communist leaders in the People's Republic of China.

These same CEOs say, well, the reason we need to knock down all barriers to China and ignore human rights violations, ignore the forced abortions, ignore the persecution of Christians and Muslims, the reason that we in the United States should ignore the nuclear sales to rogue nations, the reason we in the United States should ignore slave labor and child labor in China is because it will help the United States of America, and they say it will mean 1.2 billion consumers for American products. The fact is their excitement is not over 1.2 million consumers, it is over 1.2 million workers. We should defeat China MFN.

SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Madam Speaker, this chart is on Social Security. I have been very interested and concerned about Social Security for the last 5 years. I have introduced three Social Security bills that have been scored by the actuaries of the Social Security Administration that would keep Social Security solvent, would keep it going to the next 75 years. So three bills over the last 5 years.

I also chaired the bipartisan task force on Social Security where we were very successful. We have bipartisan agreement on 18 findings that moves us ahead.

Last night, I was listening to television, and I heard AL GORE talk about his proposal to fix Social Security and criticize Governor George W. Bush's suggestion that we allow some of that money to be kept and invested by individuals. I was so concerned that I took an earlier flight so I could speak this noon on Social Security.

I criticize Mr. GORE for suggesting that we do not have to do anything to fix Social Security. Chris Lehane, Mr. GORE's spokesman, says that one of the reasons Social Security has been so successful is that it depends on one generation to take care of another generation. When in fact there is no need to do anything right now, Mr. GORE suggests that we use the extra money coming in from Social Security. Look at this chart a minute. We have got a short-term, where there is more money coming in from Social Security taxes than is needed to pay out benefits. Mr. GORE suggests that we take some of this money, we borrow from this fund, and we use that money to pay down the debt, the so-called Wall Street debt.

It is also so disconcerting that ABC, NBC, CBS pick up those press releases out of the White House that says we are going to pay down $180 billion of debt this year, and that is good, we are

moving in the right direction, but what is happening is we are borrowing the money from Social Security to pay down the Wall Street debt so the $5.7 trillion that we now have as a national debt continues to go up.

Maybe an analogy is saying that Mr. GORE suggests that we take out one credit card and we use that credit card to pay off another credit card when there is no real money out there.

I think this is the time in this presidential election year to discuss and debate how we are going to fix Social Security, how we are going to keep it there, not only for the existing retirees and the near retirees, but for future generations. It is the most important program that probably we have in government. It is the largest program in this country. It is the largest program in the world.

What is happening is some people suggest, look, the United States is as good as its word. If it borrows the money, it is going to pay it back. Even if it paid it all back, it is only going to keep Social Security solvent until 2034. But will the Federal Government pay that money back? Where is it going to come from? We are going to have to increase borrowing, cut other government programs, or increase taxes. That is where it is going to come from.

As a demonstration of Federal Government's commitment, this Congress and the President, in 1977, when there was a problem of fewer dollars coming in than was needed to pay out benefits, what did they do? In 1977, they increased taxes and reduced benefits. In 1983, again, we ran out of enough money to pay benefits, so, again, they reduced benefits and increased taxes.

If we do nothing, I say to Mr. GORE, then taxes are going to increase up to 55 percent, increase in Social Security taxes for our kids. That is what the trustees of the Social Security Administration said. If we do not want to increase taxes, then we cut benefits by 33 percent.

This is an appropriate time to discuss where we are going to go on Social Security to keep it solvent. If my colleagues look at the red area, how much we are going into the red over the years, the Social Security actuaries project that we are short $120 trillion. Remember, our annual budget here is $1.7 trillion. Over the next 75 years, we are short $120 trillion of there being less money coming in from the Social Security tax than we need to pay out the benefits that are promised.

If we look at the possibility of getting real investment, then all we have got to do is beat a zero percent return. Some of the think tanks around town have projected that one is not even going to get back the money that one paid in. Some of the projections go as high as a 1.7 percent return on the Social Security money that one pays into Social Security.

Can the stock market do any better than that? The average for any 12-year period since 1926 has been 3.7. The average for a retiree's lifetime has been up to a 7.88 percent return. We can do better than Social Security. Let us move ahead. Let us debate it. Let us discuss it. Let us not hide the problem under the rug.

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 54 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

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:

Eternal God, in past days, we have celebrated with our brothers and sisters of faith the Passover of the Lord and the Paschal Mystery of Jesus Christ. With family customs and solemn traditions, we have participated in the annual rights of spring.

Shower on us Your waters of renewed life and penetrating freedom so that we may truly live as children born of Your Spirit.

May the profound suffering of others and the death of anyone, embraced with the utter abandonment of faith, create in us compassionate hearts ready to respond to those in most need of Your justice.

May the awakening of the heart or the birth of any of Your creatures produce in us a vibrant respect for all life. In this season of hope, we search for continuing signs of Your presence in our midst. For You live 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.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 14, 2000.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted to Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on April 14, 2000 at 10:20 a.m.

That the Senate agreed to House amendments, S. 1567.

That the Senate agreed to House amendments, S. 1769.

That the Senate passed without amendment, H.R. 1231.

That the Senate agreed to House amendments to Senate amendments, H.R. 1753.

That the Senate passed without amendment, H.R. 2368.

That the Senate passed without amendment, H.R. 2862.

That the Senate passed without amendment, H.R. 2863.

That the Senate passed without amendment, H.R. 3063.

That the Senate passed without amendment, H.R. 3090.

That the Senate passed without amendment, H. J. Res. 86.

That the Senate passed without amendment, H. Con. Res. 269.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

JEFF TRANDAHL,
Clerk of the House.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, Speaker pro tempore WOLF signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution on Wednesday, April 19, 2000:

H.R. 1231, to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain national forest lands to Elko County, Nevada, for continued use as a cemetery;

H.R. 1615, to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to extend the designation of a portion of the Lamprey River in New Hampshire as a recreational river to include an additional river segment;

H.R. 1753, to promote the research, identification, assessment, exploration, and development of gas hydrate resources, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2368, to assist in the resettlement and relocation of the people of Bikini Atoll by amending the terms of the trust fund established during the United States administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands;

H.R. 2862, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to release reversionary interests held by the United States in certain parcels of land in Washington County, Utah, to facilitate an anticipated land exchange;

H.R. 2863, to clarify the legal effect on the United States of the acquisition of a parcel of land in the Red Cliffs Desert Reserve in the State of Utah;

H.R. 3063, to amend the Mineral Leasing Act to increase the maximum acreage of Federal leases for sodium that may be held by an entity in any one State, and for other purposes;

H.R. 3090, to amend the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act to restore certain

lands to the Elim Native Corporation, and for other purposes;

J. Res. 86, recognizing the 50th anniversary of the Korean War and the service by members of the Armed Forces during such war, and for other purposes;

S. 1567, to designate the United States Courthouse located at 223 Broad Avenue in Albany, Georgia, as the ''C.B. King United States Courthouse;''

S. 1769, to exempt certain reports from automatic elimination and sunset pursuant to the Federal Reports Elimination and Sunset Act of 1995, and for other purposes.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first individual bill on the Private Calendar.

BELINDA MCGREGOR

The Clerk called the Senate bill (S. 452) for the relief of Belinda McGregor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

S. 452

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

SECTION 1. PERMANENT RESIDENCE.

(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, for purposes of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.), Belinda McGregor shall be held and considered to have been selected for a diversity immigrant visa for fiscal year 2000 as of the date of the enactment of this Act upon payment of the required visa fee.

(b) ADJUSTMENT OF STATUS.—If Belinda McGregor, or any child (as defined in section 101(b)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act) of Belinda McGregor, enters the United States before the date of the enactment of this Act, he or she shall be considered to have entered and remained lawfully and shall, if otherwise eligible, be eligible for adjustment of status under section 245 of the Immigration and Nationality Act as of the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 2. REDUCTION OF NUMBER OF AVAILABLE VISAS.

Upon the granting of permanent residence to Belinda McGregor as provided in this Act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper officer to reduce by one number during the current fiscal year the total number of immigrant visas available to natives of the country of the alien's birth under section 203(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1153(c)).

The bill was ordered and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DISPENSING WITH FURTHER CALL OF PRIVATE CALENDAR

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that further call of the Private Calendar be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

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

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 12, 2000.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Enclosed please find copies of resolutions approved by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure on April 11, 2000, in accordance with 40 U.S.C. § 606.

With warm regards, I remain
Sincerely,

BUD SHUSTER,
Chairman.

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM CHAIRMAN OF COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

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

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 13, 2000.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Enclosed are copies of resolutions adopted on April 11, 2000 by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

With kind regards, I am
Sincerely,

BUD SHUSTER,
Chairman.

There was no objection.

FUNDING FOR INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES EDUCATION ACT

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago, Congress passed the Individuals With Disabilities Education Act. Twenty-five years ago, Congress made a commitment to disabled students all over America, promising them we would do our part to make sure they got as good an education as other kids.

Twenty-five years ago, Congress made a promise to contribute 40 percent of the cost of educating disabled children, but it was an empty promise.

For 19 years, the Democrats controlled the House and never once did they even come close to keeping that funding promise. Twenty years of consecutive Democratic Congresses never even funded 5 percent.

Special education has for years been yet another unfunded mandate created only to make those who wrote the law look good and placing an enormous financial burden on local schools.

Since coming into the majority, the Republican House has more than doubled Congress' commitment to disabled kids.

Today, we will be voting on the IDEA Full Funding Act of 2000. I urge my Democratic colleagues to join the Republicans in making good on our commitment to disabled children.

THE FBI IN YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO, OWNED BY THE MOB

(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, I have evidence that certain FBI agents in Youngstown, Ohio, have violated the RICO statute, and I shall prove it. For years they were owned by the Mob; but now they have made a big mistake, Mr. Speaker. Youngstown FBI agents stole large sums of cash that were vouchered to be paid to their street informants. In addition, they failed to report that cash on their tax returns. Bingo. But what is even worse, they quote/unquote suggested to one of their field operative informants that he should commit murder. Mr. Speaker, murder. Not only in Boston, now in Youngstown, Ohio.

It is out of control. The Congress of the United States should pass H.R. 4105. There are buddies investigating buddies in the Justice Department, and they are getting away with murder. Enough is enough.

I yield back the FBI fox in the hen house.

THE SIGNAL WE SEND WITH PNTR

(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, the United States Commission on International Religious Freedom, which was established just 2 years ago by Congress, stated yesterday that there are systematic, egregious, and ongoing manifestations of religious persecution in China. It is obvious to me and many of my fellow Nevadans that this is yet another reason why we should not, I repeat should not, extend the privilege of permanent normal trade relations with China.

Mr. Speaker, granting PNTR to China sends a signal that the United States condones the inexcusable religious persecutions and human rights abuses that occur currently today.

We would also be sending the signal that the United States is willing to endanger its own national security. After all, we would be trading with a country that holds Americans hostage every day by maintaining nuclear weapons targeted at the United States mainland.

Mr. Speaker, there are too many reasons why we should not grant PNTR to China. I encourage my colleagues to stand up for democracy and freedom and against PNTR to China.

I yield back this ill-conceived and dangerous trade policy that calls for the American people to trust its enemy.

WELCOMING THE INLAND EMPIRE MARIACHI YOUTH GROUP TO WASHINGTON

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

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, this week we celebrate Cinco de Mayo. It is a time to celebrate the tremendous courage and the bravery of Mexican Americans throughout our history.

I wish to take this opportunity to invite many of the individuals today as we begin to celebrate Cinco de Mayo to a festivity that will be going on in this area. I currently have invited 28 students from the Inland Empire Mariachi Youth Education Foundation to perform Wednesday at the upper Senate park here in the Capitol. This is an opportunity to learn about cultural traditions and music and heritage. It is an opportunity for many of the individuals to see kids between the ages of 6 to 17 that will be performing here in Washington. For these kids, this is the first time that they have come to Washington, D.C., the first time that they have flown. It is an opportunity to share in part of that heritage, part of the culture, part of the tradition, part of the enrichment, part of that motivation.

I encourage my colleagues that are out there, Members who have an opportunity to attend, please come and watch these kids perform as we begin to celebrate Cinco de Mayo.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Any record votes on postponed questions will be taken after debate has concluded on all motions to suspend the rules but not before 6:00 p.m. today.

RECOGNIZING AND COMMENDING FEDERAL WORKFORCE FOR SUCCESSFULLY ADDRESSING YEAR 2000 COMPUTER CHALLENGE

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 300) recognizing and commending our Nation's Federal workforce for successfully preparing our Nation to withstand any catastrophic year 2000 computer problem disruptions.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 300

Whereas the Year 2000 computer problem (Y2K) created the potential of a catastrophic international problem, causing some computer systems and other electronic devices to erroneously misinterpret the ''00'' in the year as 1900, rather than 2000;

Whereas the American people expected and deserved reliable service from their Federal Government to ensure that critical Federal functions dependent on electronic systems would be performed accurately and in a timely manner;

Whereas, after the initial series of congressional Y2K hearings in the spring of 1996, it became clear that unless appropriate action was taken, the Y2K problem could cause severe consequences on the successful operation of Federal systems;

Whereas Federal agencies and their employees subsequently made significant progress in meeting the challenges posed by the Y2K computer problem;

Whereas minimizing the Y2K problem required a major technological and managerial effort and it was critical that the Federal workforce rise to address this challenge;

Whereas the continued uninterrupted operation of our Nation's Federal systems was due to the comprehensive efforts made by those dedicated, talented, and committed Federal workers who served ably in the front lines of this epic battle in vanquishing the millennium bug;

Whereas the Federal workforce identified and worked to resolve the Y2K problem, giving countless hours and their holidays to assure the American people that major Y2K breakdowns in key infrastructures were unlikely;

Whereas the level of Y2K effort was justified and the threat was very real, and the risks and consequences of inaction were too dire to justify a lesser Federal effort;

Whereas preparation for Y2K led to an unprecedented level of effort that not only improved system inventories and network reliability, but has also accelerated electronic business and international cooperation;

Whereas the efforts of the Federal workforce to solve the Y2K problem provided an important example of the Government's ability to respond to future difficult technological and management challenges; and

Whereas the level of Y2K success in the United States, which has over one-fourth of the world's computer assets and is the most technologically dependent nation in the world, was quite remarkable, and was led by our Federal efforts: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress recognizes and commends the meritorious service of our Nation's Federal workforce, and all those who assisted in the efforts to successfully address the Year 2000 computer challenge.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) each will control 20 minutes.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Con. Res. 300, the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H. Con. Res. 300 recognizes and commends the meritorious service of our Nation's Federal workforce and all those who assisted in the effort to successfully address the Year 2000 computer challenge. Often called Y2K or the Millennium Bug, this was the greatest technological and management challenge confronting this Nation since the Second World War period.

The problem, which involved a programming decision made decades ago, was obviously predictable. Yet management at only one of the 24 largest Federal agencies had the foresight to begin an agency-wide program to prepare its computers to handle the date change in the late 1980s.

That agency, the Social Security Administration, was also the first to complete the work.

As is now well known, when designing computer programs in the 1960s and 1970s, the programmers began using two digits rather than four to indicate the year. In other words, instead of 1967, it was 67. This shortcut enabled programmers to conserve the valuable computer memory of those huge mainframe operations. With the approaching millennium, however, the concern was that these computer systems would misread the year 2000 as simply zero/zero and the computer would think 1900.

This confusion did, in fact, surface in anecdotal examples. In one State, new car buyers found themselves the proud owners of horseless carriages when State computers registered their vehicles as vintage 1900 rather than 2000. In another case, a 104-year-old woman was requested to register for kindergarten when a school district computer miscalculated the date of her birth by 100 years.

None of the problems were irreparable, thanks to an unprecedented nationwide effort to meet the challenge.

1415

However, getting that effort started to take a great deal of work.

Four years ago, the Subcommittee on Government Management, Information and Technology, which I chair, surveyed the Cabinet Secretaries in a questionnaire by the ranking Democratic Member, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), and myself, and the heads of the 24 largest Federal departments and agencies. Some of these leaders had not even heard of the problem.

The subcommittee began a concerted effort to urge government agencies to begin fixing their computer systems through its ongoing hearings, 44 in all, and 10 report cards, which graded each department on its Year 2000 progress.

Recognizing the potentially devastating effect of this computer problem, Congress accelerated its oversight

responsibilities in a bipartisan and bicameral effort. Former House Speaker Newt Gingrich created the House Year 2000 Task Force, which the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) and I co-chaired. Its purpose was to provide Congressional oversight of the Year 2000 compliance efforts of the departments and agencies in the executive branch of the government. Speaker Hastert supported this continuation when he assumed office. Equal attention was provided in the Senate. In fact, since 1996, more than 30 Congressional committees and subcommittees have held Y2K-related hearings.

After several years, letters cosigned by the gentlewoman from Maryland (Chairman MORELLA) of the Subcommittee on Technology of the Committee on Science and myself, the President issued an executive order in February 1998 requiring all Federal departments and agencies in the executive branch of the government to update their computer systems. The order also established the President's Council on Year 2000 Conversion, which, under the leadership of John Koskinen, became a vital instrument in the Government's effort to meet the year 2000 challenge.

Later, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) and I wrote a letter to the United Nations Secretary General, Kofi Annan, urging the United Nations to address this problem. They held one conference. It was very successful. They held a second that was even more successful.

Here at home, however, change did not come quickly in some areas of Federal Government, and this was caused by a systematic management problem in the government, which is why I am a proponent of establishing the separate Office of Management in the Executive Office of the President. Nevertheless, Federal workers were focused on the problem, devoting countless hours and holidays to ensure that government services for millions of America's would not be jeopardized by computer failure.

The unquestionable success of this effort clearly and definitively demonstrated that teamwork, dedication, and strong leadership can stave off the most monumental challenge, including Y2K.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA), the sponsor of this legislation.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time, and I thank him for all the work he has done to allow us to eliminate the possible Y2K computer glitch.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us is the culmination, as you have heard, of 4 years of intensive oversight by the House Y2K Task Force that was originally created by Speaker Gingrich. My fellow Task Force cochair, the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) has very nicely recounted the history of our efforts, so I want to talk about the resolution itself.

H. Con. Res. 300 recognizes our hardworking Federal workers for their successful efforts in preparing our Nation from any catastrophic Year 2000 disruptions.

The fact that our Nation's Federal systems were able to operate unimpeded by Y2K was a direct result of the comprehensive efforts made by those dedicated, talented and committed Federal workers who served ably in the front lines of this epic battle to vanquish the millennium bug. The Federal workforce identified and worked to resolve the Y2K problem, giving countless hours, including their holidays, to assure the American people that major Y2K breakdowns in key infrastructures were unlikely. The risks and consequences of inaction were simply too dire to justify a lesser Federal effort.

So, it is more than appropriate for Congress to commend the distinguished and meritorious service of our Nation's Federal workforce and all those that assisted in the efforts to successfully address the year 2000 computer challenge.

Yes, the Y2K computer problem was one of the greatest information technology challenges facing our Federal Government, and indeed the world. We had the potential of ushering in the 21st Century with the mother of all computer glitches, one with devastating effects on government computers, rendering useless much of the Nation's date sensitive computer data.

All kinds of systems would have been affected, air traffic control, veterans' benefits, Social Security, our nation's electric power grid, postal delivery, Medicaid, national defense, student loans, just to name a few. Yet in the spring of 1996, when we first began our Y2K hearings, the Federal Government was clearly unprepared for the millennium bug, and we in Congress stepped up to the plate and raised awareness about the problem by pushing Federal agencies, private industry, toward immediate corrective measures.

There were many Congressional hearings that were held, and we did indeed vigilantly exercise our oversight authority, and even enacted legislation requiring the creation of a national Federal strategy, prohibiting the Federal purchase of information technology that was not Y2K compliant, providing legal protection for good faith Y2K information sharing and disclosure, and curbing the possibility of flooding our judicial system with frivolous Y2K lawsuits.

But we did have some great concern about Federal agencies, and the initial reports that we received were very disturbing. I commented on the need for having the executive step in in a radio address back in January of 1998, and, following, the President did begin to use the bully pulpit to raise the profile and take decisive action. He created the Y2K Conversion Council and appointed John Koskinen as its chairman, and suddenly Y2K was catapulted to become a top administration management priority, and that helped make a major difference.

We in the House Y2K Task Force worked very closely with the council to determine the scope and the impact of the problem. For example, we focused with particular concern on the Federal Aviation Administration. In just the past year and a half, we have held five specific hearings on just the FAA alone and the potential for Y2K aviation disruption.

I just want to point out that in discussing it many, many times with administrator Jane Garvey, who was appointed after our first set of FAA Y2K hearings, she assured us that she would pilot FAA through the Y2K turbulence and everyone at FAA would fasten their seat belts to get the job done, and, quite frankly, they did. They did. They worked overtime, they worked sometimes the entire 24 hours in every day, and they did accomplish tremendous success with the Federal Aviation Administration.

Finally, in its aftermath, people have asked, was it real or was it overhyped, this problem? Whether the $100 billion spent in the United States was overkill? Were our Y2K efforts truly necessary to stave off an impending disaster, or was it a non-event waiting to happen?

Well, quite frankly, there is no doubt the problem was genuine, the money was well spent. It was not an exaggerated problem. From our first hearing right up to the final one in December of 1999, we witnessed systems that completely failed Y2K tests and crashed completely; and I must say that Y2K was the single most thoroughly investigated issue ever in the history of Congressional oversight. Ultimately, I think two factors tip the balance from the grave uncertainty many of us harbored in the beginning. The first is that we all knew that the Y2K problem would strike on a date certain, January 1, 2000, therefore, allowing us to collectively plan and coordinate efforts toward that deadline.

The other factor was that we were able to forge effective and unprecedented partnerships with the public sector and the private sector, as well as international, many collaborations that allowed us to share information and monitor the world's progress. So the result was a testament to the fact that we prepared well and invested properly.

I believe the investments were not just about Y2K, but also about improving and gaining knowledge about the information technology systems. From our last hearing we learned a number of these lessons.

First, the international Y2K cooperation between organizations on all levels opened up channels for future partnerships. We saw this certainly with FAA, just as an example of the number of new collaborative partnerships that were developed.

Also, the Y2K experience made us rethink the importance of information

technology to businesses. It has helped us to develop a better appreciation on the reliance on information technology. Top management now needs to be more dedicated to information technology on a regular ongoing basis.

Well, now that we have survived the January 1 date rollover, as well as the recently passed February 29th leap year, we can look back and take pride in our role in vanquishing that pesky millennium bug that was supposed to cause such a catastrophe.

To all Federal employees, I salute you for your Y2K efforts. It is an accomplishment about which you should all be very proud. I am proud to be there with our members of the Task Force, indeed my cochair the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN), to be there with you every step of the way. It was an unforgiving deadline. It was clear that we could not have met it without the Federal workforce and the private sector working together, and the President working with Congress. We know the American people were counting on us, and I am proud to say we did not let them down.

I want to finally reiterate my thanks to the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN), who held so many hearings throughout the country, as well as the hearings that we had here on Capitol Hill; the Task Force cochair, the ranking member of my Subcommittee on Technology, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BARCIA); as well as the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Government Management, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) for their leadership. Indeed, for other Members, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS), who is here, and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), it was good teamwork. Well done. Thank you Federal employees and all of us who were involved.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H. Con. Res. 300. Most experts are in agreement that the Y2K problem presented the Federal Government with its greatest management challenge of the last 50 years. Our Nation has over one-fourth of the computer assets and is technologically dependent, as we all understand, and millions of Americans rely every day on uninterrupted computer service for essential services. Certainly the repercussions of failing to conquer the Y2K problem would have had devastating effects on our economy and our national welfare.

Yet, despite the severity of the Y2K challenge, most observers believe we got off to a slow start in focusing on the problem. As we all know, unfortunately, it usually takes a crisis for the government to concentrate its considerable resources and to solve a problem.

For more than 3½ years the Committee on Government Reform Subcommittee on Government Management, Information and Technology, along with the Committee on Science Subcommittee on Technology, held hearings to focus exclusively upon every facet of the Y2K computer problem. Our subcommittee had over 24 hearings on the topic in the last year alone; and I want to commend our subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN); the gentlewoman from Maryland (Chairwoman MORELLA); and the ranking member, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BARCIA) for the outstanding work they have done in leading our Nation through this time of computer crisis.

I also want to thank the General Accounting Office that did outstanding work, particularly Mr. Joel Williamson, who worked very diligently to bring to our attention the progress being made, or not being made, by the various Federal agencies. I also think we owe special thanks to Mr. John Koskinen, who, as chairman of the President's Council on the Y2K Conversion, did yeoman's work to be sure that our Federal agencies, as well as the Nation as a whole, was ready for the clock to strike midnight on December 31, 1999.

Our Federal workers, however, are the ones that are really due the real credit for the ability of our Federal Government to meet the Y2K crisis. The brunt of the work fell on their shoulders, and it is the Federal workers who deserve the real credit. They were the troops in the trenches, they were the ones who were on the front line, they were the ones who gave up their holidays and worked overtime to be sure that the Federal Government computers were working at midnight.

1430

As we approached January 1, 2000, we began to have a higher degree of confidence that we were going to be able to be Y2K compliant and have no significant disruptions. But the truth was, none of us really knew for sure what would happen. Fortunately, we made it through with virtually no problems. The Federal Government's computer systems were ready to successfully operate in the new millennium due to the efforts of these hundreds and even thousands of Federal workers who worked diligently to cure the problems that they found.

We had a smooth transition; the Federal workers did their jobs, and if it is true that the Y2K challenge represented one of the greatest management tasks to face the Federal Government in the last 50 years and that we were slow to focus our attention upon it, then we can take even greater comfort in knowing that it was our Federal workers who handled such a mammoth undertaking with such professionalism and skill.

Mr. Speaker, many of the success stories will never be told to the public and many of our Federal workers will have to take comfort in the fact that it was their efforts in those long weekends and on those holidays that prevented us from having disruptions in computer services. I am glad that this resolution recognizes our Federal workers in one of their finest hours. As a result of their skill, January 1 of 2000 proceeded like any normal day. Once again, we have shown that when faced with a challenge, whether in time of war or peace, the American people are up to the challenge and our Federal workers certainly proved their abilities and their dedication during this time. We owe them a great debt of gratitude.

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

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) who is the ranking minority member; he has been an outstanding member of the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS). No one has worked harder on this issue than the gentleman from what is known as Silicon Valley East, or Fairfax County.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I commend the authors of the resolution on both sides, as well as our Federal workforce and, of course, the contractors who worked together on this thing.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 300. I would like to thank my colleagues, Representatives MORELLA and HORN for introducing this resolution, and commend them for their outstanding leadership on the Y2K issue. Their vigilant oversight made the Administration and agencies recognize the potential disasters associated with the Y2K rollover. As a member of the Government Management Information Technology Subcommittee, I was proud to work with my colleagues on this oversight. This commitment from Congress helped to ensure that our nation did not see an interruption in the delivery of critical goods and services on January 1, 2000.

In 1996, Representatives HORN and MORELLA began the initial hearings on Y2K and discovered that many of our federal operations were significantly behind in addressing the Y2K bug. It was readily apparent that there could be severe consequences if federal agencies and their employees were not able to address the pending Y2K crisis. There were many outside of government that believed the federal workforce would fail. Our federal workforce once again proved those naysayers wrong. Our federal employees rose to meet this challenge and devoted countless hours to tackling the technological complexities of the Y2K problem.

American taxpayers saw their return on investment on January 1, 2000. There were no delayed Social Security checks and no federal services were interrupted. This is due in large part to the federal employees who worked weekends and holidays to ensure that the millennium bug came without so much as a whimper.

As H. Con. Res. 300 states, the United States has over one-quarter of the world's computer assets and is the most technologically dependent nation in the world. The leadership of our federal workforce continues

to ensure that this dependence does not provide a threat to our nation's well-being.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support H. Con. Res. 300 and its swift passage today.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas, and I certainly want to be associated with his fine remarks in congratulating Mr. John Koskinen for leading the executive branch in the Y2K effort, and particularly the Federal workforce. But I also wanted to be associated with the remarks of the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) and the remarks of the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) and all of those folks on both sides of the aisle who made this such a successful bipartisan effort.

Mr. Speaker, this is one of the real success stories in terms of legislation, because we had nothing to read about on January 1. The old axiom with the media is if it bleeds, it leads, and there was no bleeding on January 1, because the Congress, the House and Senate leadership, and the executive branch recognized the importance, devoted their attention to it, came up with the legislation that was necessary, and certainly the executive branch came up with the resources and the leadership that was absolutely essential to make it a nonevent.

I do want to recognize the efforts of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) as well in a related matter. In the private sector it was the gentleman from Virginia who introduced the Y2K liability legislation which ensured that the prediction that the American Bar Association made, which was that there could be as much as $1 trillion of liability suits brought by trial lawyers on January 1, never came to pass because the Congress again enacted preventive legislation to see to it that that did not happen; that lawyers were required to warn companies 30 days in advance; that information was required to be shared; that, in fact, there was a cap on punitive damages; and that grants and loans were made available for small businesses.

So both in the private sector and in the public sector, the Congress did its job. That is the point I want to make. It was a nonevent, but both the legislative and the executive branch deserve a great deal of credit for the fact that it was a nonevent both here in the United States and worldwide. It would not have happened had it not been for the leadership on both sides of the aisle, and they deserve congratulations, as does the Federal workforce and Mr. Koskinen.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, today I support H. Con. Res. 300, a resolution recognizing and commending our Nation's workforce for successfully preparing for the Year 2000 date change.

Contrary to what some felt might happen when the clock struck midnight on January 1, 2000, planes didn't fall from the sky. Telephones retained their dial tone; water still ran from the faucets; and America's New Year celebrations were not left in the dark.

The smooth turnover from 1999 into 2000 is directly related to the hundreds, even thousands, of man-hours directed by our federal agencies toward preventing and correcting potential Y2K problems. Given the disruptions that did not occur, I would say these efforts paid off handsomely.

Y2K preparations paid off in other ways as well. As a result of Y2K concerns, there are now thousands more American families that own equipment needed to be adequately prepared for other types of emergencies, namely snow storms, floods and hurricanes.

Government leaders on every level now have a better understanding of technology management issues, and are more aware of the importance of cooperation between local, state and federal officials. What's more, the millennium bug provided a reason to upgrade government technology systems and to inventory resources.

Just being able to say some five months after Year 2000 rollover that it turned out to be a positive experience is a testament to the hard work of the federal workforce.

It is also a reflection of the extensive efforts of the House Y2K Task Force and to the leadership of the sponsors of this legislation, Representatives MORELLA and HORN. It is a tribute to the efforts of the President's Council on the Year 2000 Conversion, and to U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO) as well.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to be an original cosponsor of this resolution recognizing the good work of our Nation's Federal Workforce and urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 300, Recognizing and Commending our Nation's Federal Workforce for Successfully Preparing our Nation to Withstand any Catastrophic Year 2000 Computer Disruptions.

I want to congratulate Federal Government employees for their efforts in successfully addressing the Y2K problem. I want stress that this Resolution recognizes the hard work of all Federal employees and Federal contractors in evaluating and testing government computer systems.

As was frequently stressed during the past three years, fixing the Y2K computer glitch was not a technical issue; it was a management issue. Therefore, I want to take this opportunity to commend the President and the Vice President for the management structure they developed to attack the Y2K problem. I specifically mention the Vice President because some of my colleagues were ready to blame Vice President GORE if there were any Y2K related problems. As we now know, computer systems were ready for January 1, 2000, and just as some were ready to lay blame so should we be ready to compliment for a job well done. One of their outstanding management decisions was selecting Mr. John Koskinen to be the Chair of the President's Council on Year 2000 Conversion. Mr. Koskinen galvanized and coordinated Federal activities. It is a tribute to Mr. Koskinen's management and diplomatic skills that the American public experienced no disruption of Federal services at the Y2K rollover.

So, to the President, the Vice President, Mr. Koskinen and to all Federal employees, all I have to say is congratulations on a job well done.

In closing, I want to say that it has been a pleasure working with Chairman HORN and Ranking Member TURNER on the Subcommittee on Government Management, Information and Technology on this issue during the past three years. And as always, it has been a pleasure working with Chairwoman MORELLA.

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, having no further requests for time, I urge the adoption of this resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, 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 California (Mr. HORN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 300.

The question was taken.

Mr. HORN. 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.

FEDERAL CONTRACTOR FLEXIBILITY ACT OF 2000

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3582) to restrict the use of mandatory minimum personnel experience and educational requirements in the procurement of information technology goods or services unless sufficiently justified.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3582

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 ''Federal Contractor Flexibility Act of 2000''.

SEC. 2. APPROPRIATE USE OF PERSONNEL EXPERIENCE AND EDUCATIONAL REQUIREMENTS IN THE PROCUREMENT OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY GOODS AND SERVICES.

(a) AMENDMENT OF THE FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Federal Acquisition Regulation issued in accordance with sections 6 and 25 of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 405 and 421) shall be amended to address the use of personnel experience and educational requirements in the procurement of information technology goods and services.

(b) CONTENT OF AMENDMENT.—The amendment issued pursuant to subsection (a) shall, at a minimum, provide that solicitations for the procurement of information technology goods or services shall not set forth any minimum experience or educational requirement for proposed contractor personnel in order for a bidder to be eligible for award of a contract unless the contracting officer first—

(1) determines that the needs of the agency cannot be met without any such requirement; and

(2) explains in writing the basis for that determination.

(c) GAO REPORT.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which the regulations required by subsection (a) are published in the Federal Register, the Comptroller General shall submit to Congress an evaluation of—

(1) executive agency compliance with the regulations; and

(2) conformance of the regulations with existing law, together with any recommendations that the Comptroller General considers appropriate.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this Act:

(1) EXECUTIVE AGENCY.—The term ''executive agency'' has the meaning given that term in section 105 of title 5, United States Code.

(2) INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY.—The term ''information technology'' has the meaning given that term in the Federal Acquisition Regulation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) each will control 20 minutes.

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

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) to explain the legislation before us.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) yielding me this time.

I rise today in support of a piece of legislation I think is very important, H.R. 3582, the Federal Flexibility Act of 2000, legislation which will address an ongoing problem in Federal information technology contracts.

I would like to thank my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Government Management, Information and Technology for his assistance in moving this important legislation forward.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3582 is necessary because Federal contracting officers frequently write into IT contracts minimum personnel requirements that hamper the ability of contractors to find qualified personnel to perform the contract. Oftentimes, this means government contractors cannot hire personnel who they believe can successfully perform the work, but instead they search for just simply qualified resumes. This is a burden on the information and technology industry, it is a burden on the American taxpayer, and it contributes to the chronic worker shortage faced by the technology industry because the Federal Government is the largest purchaser of IT products in the world, spending about $28 billion on goods and services each year.

The Fed-Flex Act would require Federal agencies to justify the minimum personnel requirements frequently written into government contracts. Federal agencies have been experiencing something called ''credential creep'' in the way they write contracts. The problem has become so significant that the Virginia Secretary of Technology, Don Upson, found in a report issued by his office this past September, that minimum personnel requirements are the second largest contributor to the IT workforce shortage in my home State of Virginia. This report was titled ''A Study of Virginia's Information Technology Workforce.'' It strongly recommended that both the government and private sector companies objectively evaluate alternative forms of training and focus on investments in training rather than on degrees or resumes. The nationwide shortage of IT workers is estimated at 364,000, and it is estimated at over 24,000 in the Northern Virginia region alone for the information technology worker shortage.

Now, what these minimum personnel requirements mean for the government is that a Bill Gates or a Michael Dell cannot perform work with the government on most contracts. Since neither one of them holds a college degree, many Federal agencies would not allow them to perform IT work for the government. When Federal agencies write credential creep into contracts, they hinder the ability of Federal contractors to hire qualified personnel to get the job done, and they increase the total cost of the contract to the government and, therefore, the American taxpayer.

In this era of serious labor shortages in nearly every sector of our economy, this practice drives up prices and it limits the flexibility of offers. The government will get better results if it issues performance-based statements of work and leaves it up to the offeror to propose how they will satisfy that requirement. The government should hold the winning offeror accountable for the quality of the cake, not dictate the ingredients that go into the recipe.

Another recent workforce study released by the Information Technology Association of America found that U.S. companies anticipate a demand for 1.6 million IT workers in the next year. According to that study, about 50 percent of the applicants for these jobs would not have the skills required to perform the jobs, meaning that up to 850,000 of these slots go unfilled. The private sector knows it has to adapt to address this shortage and invest in the training that will allow them to get the job done. Let us make sure the Federal Government is not the stumbling block to reaching that goal. The Fed-Flex Act requires agencies to realize that key skills are what matters the most to mission accomplishment within the agencies, not how those skills are acquired.

Recently, there has been ongoing debate about solving the labor shortage in the United States by lifting the cap on H1–B visas. I am a strong supporter of lifting this visa cap, and I am an original cosponsor of my colleague's, the gentleman from California (Mr. DREIER), H.R. 3982, the HI–TECH Act, which raises the cap to 200,000 for H1–Bs. But we all know this is a short-term solution. We need to recognize the new types of training employees receive and encourage American businesses to hire employees who have received less traditional methods of training. We also need to encourage our Federal Government to be a leader in solving the workplace shortage and not remain behind the curve as is so often the case.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3582 recognizes the investment that firms make in their employees every day. Many IT firms spend a significant amount of time and dollars training their employees to be up to speed on the latest products and services. The Fed-Flex Act would require agencies to justify the use of such minimum mandatory personnel requirements before imposing such requirements on a particular solicitation for IT services. The Fed-Flex Act would require agencies to justify the use of such minimum mandatory personnel requirements before imposing such requirements in a particular solicitation for IT services. Where the contracting officer determines that the agency's need cannot be met without such requirement, the legislation would not preclude such requirements. Moreover, the legislation would not preclude the agencies from evaluating the advantages that may be associated with a particular employee's experience or education, including participation in an in-house training and certification program. This bill continues the many successes of recent procurement reforms and redirects government to focus on products, not process.

Recently, a study released by the American Association of Community Colleges indicated that 20 percent of community college attendees are pursuing degrees to work on technology issues. With the worker shortage we face in the Nation, it is of great concern to me that the Federal Government could prevent these highly motivated young people from pursuing a technology career. Credential creep is a Federal Government-wide problem. We have fallen behind in recruiting IT workers for the Federal workforce and training Federal workers to take part in the information technology revolution. Yet, the government demands a college degree for entry level positions that might be filled by individuals who have received another form of job training that may be superior. I believe that Federal flexibility is important to address the immediate need within the government, but I am also committed to working closely with my friends in the workforce community to look at credential creep problems as well.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point to the many organizations that support H.R. 3582. Fed-Flex is supported by ITAA, American Electronics Association, Contract Services Association, Professional Services Council, and CapNet. I would like to quote from a letter sent over by Harris Miller, the President of ITAA. ''The Federal Contractor Flexibility Act is a home run

for practical, efficient, and effective government contracting.'' I would also like to submit a copy of the ITAA letter for the RECORD.

MAY 2, 2000.

Rep. TOM DAVIS.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DAVIS: On behalf of the 26,000 direct and affiliate members of the Information Technology Association of America (ITAA), I write to urge quick passage of the Federal Contractor Flexibility Act of 2000. We applaud you for sponsoring this common sense bill. This is legislation that recognizes a critical demand for appropriately skilled high tech workers is one of the most vexing problems facing employers today—both in and outside of government. At the same time, it realizes that key skills—and not how they are acquired—are what matters most to mission accomplishment within agencies.

A few weeks ago, ITAA released Bridging the Gap: IT Job Skills for a New Millennium, a major national study on the workforce issue. We found that U.S. companies anticipate a demand for 1.6 million IT workers in the next 12 months. Because roughly fifty percent of applicants will not have the skills required to perform these jobs, over 850,000 IT positions will go begging. Our study suggests that in the private sector, this demand pressure has caused hiring managers to revisit the issue of ''what it takes'' to get the job done.

At one time, the federal government's preference for contractor staff with certain years of experience and a college degree was understandable. Unfortunately, what made sense five to ten years ago does not make sense in today's environment. Indeed, so much has changed in information technology that today's college graduates or those from community colleges are very prepared to take on immediate responsibilities at federal agencies. Talented people with skills in database design, programming, web development and other technical areas have invaluable skills that the federal agencies need today, not three or more years from now.

The agencies that do have specific needs should by all means be able to request certain skills sets and experience, but your legislation will eliminate the situation we find today where old boilerplate language with outmoded requirements is commonly used and reused in thousands of contracts. As you have mentioned your comments, it is more than ironic that some of the foremost leaders of the IT industry, Bill Gates, Michael Dell, and Larry Ellison, would be precluded from most Federal contracts since they did not complete their four year degree!

The Federal Contractor Flexibility Act is a homerun for practical, efficient and effective government contracting. We ask that all Members of Congress support its speedy passage into law.

Very truly yours,

HARRIS N. MILLER,
President.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3582 will help ensure that contracts are performance based rather than process driven. I am dismayed to hear that the administration is not ready to support the legislation at this time, and while I applaud OMB and my friend Dee Lee's commitment to performance-based contracting, I believe that the law does not need a clarification on these minimum personnel requirements. Additionally, the letter from OMB concerns me because it recognizes the problem but it does not support the legislative fix that gives it the authority it needs to ensure the problem is corrected.

In my conversations with local Chambers of Commerce in Northern Virginia, and national procurement organizations, I have heard many instances where these personnel requirements have hampered companies' ability to work with government. I have also been presented with evidence that these minimum personnel requirements have been used at various government agencies to favor incumbent contractors rather than promoting open competition. I have even heard of an instance where the contract employees who unpack computers at some agencies are required to hold college degrees.

Mr. Speaker, I will insert the rest of my comments in the RECORD at this time. I just want to urge my colleagues to support this important legislation. I want to thank my colleague next door, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) for his leadership on this issue in cosponsoring this, and my colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) for helping to bring this to the floor so expeditiously.

Mr. Speaker, in the new economy, we are all learning new management techniques and the government can not be last to the table in this effort. Earlier this year, the Department of Labor issued two advisory opinions that threatened to harm the operation of the engine driving our economy, the technology sector. Many of you may be familiar with both the telecommuting and stock options decisions. While we should have those problems solved in the short-term through clarifying Congressional legislation that even the Labor Department has now recognized as necessary, we need to ensure that the government does not continue to impede the development of IT products and services through its own contracting and management processes.

Mr. Speaker, I have also received contract examples from the Departments of Defense and Treasury, and the General Services Administration that include minimum personnel requirements. The Defense Department includes these cumbersome requirements for entry-level IT positions that include such basic tasks as data-entry, and they do not give contractors any opportunity to apply for a waiver. The Treasury contract includes these requirements but then says a company may apply for a waiver after contract award although the waiver requires a significant amount of paperwork to get approved. The GSA requirement is on an IDIQ contract that would affect several companies at the same time and drive-up costs of all of the competing bids.

Mr. Speaker, again I urge my colleagues to support this important legislation. I know it will provide important relief to Virginia and government contractors across the nation. It will also provide a tremendous cost-savings to the government.

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

I rise in strong support of the Federal Contractor Flexibility Act of 2000 which was introduced by our friend, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS), and I want to commend the gentleman for his hard work on this bill. It is a very important piece of legislation, and he did a great job with it.

1445

I also want to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), his neighbor, who also was the primary Democratic sponsor of this legislation.

As has been pointed out, this bill would restrict Federal departments and agencies from using mandatory minimum personnel and experience requirements for contractor personnel in the procurement of information technology goods and services, unless there is some justification for such a restriction.

Currently, Federal information technology procurement officers can require contractors to use employees who, at a minimum, have a college degree. As the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) pointed out, Bill Gates and Michael Dell would not qualify under the current restrictions.

It is obvious I think to all of us that the Federal agencies oftentimes dictate more stringent educational requirements than are necessary to do the job. H.R. 3582 would require Federal agencies to justify those minimum requirements, but it would not preclude them from including such requirements if the contracting officer determined that the agency's needs could not be met without the requirements.

The legislation also would not preclude agencies from evaluating an employee's experience or education, including their participation in in-house training or other certification programs. But most importantly, this legislation will increase the number of information technology workers eligible to assume government contractor information technology jobs, and it would alleviate the current shortage of labor in this field.

Today, we take the first step by eliminating these arbitrary experience and educational requirements for the private IT sector contractors. But I look forward to working with my colleagues so that we can eliminate these same requirements for our Federal employees.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be a cosponsor of this bipartisan measure. Again, I commend the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS); the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN); the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN), our subcommittee chairman; as well as the gentleman from Indiana (Chairman BURTON); and the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), our ranking member, for their work on this bill.

I urge swift passage of H.R. 3582.

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

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA).

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) for yielding me the time, and I rise in strong support of H.R. 3582, the Federal Contractor Flexibility Act of 2000.

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the lead sponsor, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS), for introducing this

bill. I am proud to be a cosponsor of the legislation.

It would require Federal agencies to justify the use of minimum education and experience requirements in their solicitations for information technology services, which have virtually no relation to whether the individual can perform the required work.

Mr. Speaker, under current regulations, Bill Gates, as has been mentioned, would not be allowed to perform IT work for the Federal Government. That is right. The richest, and many would say one of the smartest, men in the world is not allowed to contract with the Federal Government under current law. Why? Because many Federal agencies currently put in place minimum education requirements in solicitations for IT services, and Mr. Gates does not hold a college degree.

This can be blamed on the fact that many agencies are now writing ''credential creep'' into contracts, hindering the ability of Federal contractors to hire qualified personnel who can get the job done. Frequently, these same agencies will require contractors to use employees who have a minimum of a college degree or even more stringent education requirements.

Additionally, Federal agencies dictate to companies the amount of experience employees must have working on certain IT systems. In this era of serious labor shortages in the information technology marketplace, this practice drives up prices and limits the flexibility of offers.

As a representative from Montgomery County, Maryland, which has many high-technology industries and research institutions, I understand the importance of skilled workers to our growing economy. However, I also understand that there currently exists a serious shortage of technology workers in not only the Washington, D.C., metropolitan area but throughout the Nation as well.

Mr. Speaker, passage of H.R. 3582 will enable the Government to get better results by issuing performance-based statements of work and leave it up to the job seeker to propose how he or she will get the job done. The Government's requirement should be on the merit and success of the job, not on dictating how the job is accomplished.

Finally, H.R. 3582 recognizes the investment that firms make in their employees today by not precluding agencies from evaluating the advantages that may be associated with a particular employee's experience or education, including participation in in-house training and certification programs.

Mr. Speaker, this is a common sense piece of legislation. I urge support of its passage.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), the primary Democratic cosponsor of the resolution.

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to thank and acknowledge the leadership of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) for his Federal management reform efforts. He is doing a very fine job on the Committee on Government Reform, and I congratulate him. And also, certainly, the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN), the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) for their efforts. In many areas, this is a committee that can work together and this is certainly an example of good, bipartisan constructive legislation.

I especially want to recognize the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) and his fine staff for their terrific work on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, this ought to be a no-brainer. But it is designed to address something that for years has gone on. It is a classic example of the right hand not only not letting the left hand know what they were doing, but they were working at cross purposes. If we ask people working in the Federal Government, particularly in Labor or Commerce or HHS, they will say that one of the most serious problems today is the fallout from the new economy of people working in the old economy having their jobs replaced by automation or by competition from overseas.

Mr. Speaker, while 80 percent of them get jobs, and better paying jobs, there are 20 percent of them who do not, who are left by the wayside of the new economy highway. And these people want to work hard, they have got the will and the ability, but they do not have the opportunity.

In many cases, it is because they do not have a 4-year college degree. They do not have the preparation, the skills with computers. We are not providing sufficient opportunity for them. And then there are other people who cannot afford a 4-year college degree. They do not need a 4-year college degree.

On the other hand, we have the Federal Government here saying that if one wants to bid for Federal contracts, they have to have a 4-year college degree on many of these information technology contracts.

They do not have to. They do not need it. In fact, all this bill does is to say that if a contracting officer can justify these higher standards, then fine, go ahead with it. But if they cannot justify requiring these college degrees and these higher certifications, then do not require it. Allow companies to hire people that can perform the work. Put the emphasis on the quality product, not the process.

In Virginia, we are recognizing that this is one of the prime causes of the technology shortage. We have a shortage of almost 30,000 vacancies. We cannot fill them. Many of them are in Federal contract work. This is silly. We have the people, the warm bodies; but we do not have the preparation, and it does not make sense to require a 4-year degree.

Mr. Speaker, in this period of unprecedented labor shortage, certainly we ought to take the initiative. I wish the executive branch had taken the initiative itself, but this bill is necessary. I am sure that they are going to enact it because the current practice drives up prices and limits the competition for Federal contracts. We do not want that. That does not serve anybody's purposes.

It has already been said, and I do not want to beat up on Bill Gates, of all people. We keep talking about the fact that he does not have a college degree. Well, he does not; but he did not need it to be successful. He is a classic example. And there are any number of others as well. I think we made our case on that.

The Department of Commerce recently reported that there are more than 600,000 positions in the information technology field that have yet to be filled. And, in fact, they estimate that over the next 10 years we are going to need more than 100,000 a year. I saw a figure today of 130,000 a year. We do not have those people. We do not need to be sending those people through college. We need to be getting them into community colleges, junior colleges, computer training courses, whatever gives them the skills that are necessary.

Now, we are going to get a whole lot of flack when we bring up the H(1)(b) bill. People are going to say we are bringing in laborers from overseas and taking our jobs and so on. My response is going to be, look, raising the cap on H(1)(b) visas is a short-term solution. We have vacancies and we need to fill them and fill them with qualified people, and bringing these people in that can go to work immediately with skills just pumps iron into our economic bloodstream. We need to do this. It makes a lot of sense. But that is not the long-term solution.

Mr. Speaker, the long-term solution is to train people. And not with 4 years; give them the specific training they need. Give them the opportunities; give them the access to these information technology jobs.

If we do, we are going to enable our American workforce to realize its full potential. If we put these kinds of obstacles in the way, all we are doing is limiting our potential economically and socially.

So I think I have made my point. This bill needs to be supported strongly and unanimously, and I trust it will be.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to first commend Melissa Wojciak for her excellent staff work on H.R. 3582, the Federal Contractor Flexibility Act of 2000. Melissa is a true professional and put a lot of her heart into this legislation. That is the kind of people we want on Capitol Hill.

Let me just note a few things. I completely agree with the two gentlemen from Virginia, and if that ever makes this bipartisan, I do not know what does. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) certainly reflected the

floor management's views of what is the essence of this particular legislation.

The fact is, performance-based contracting is a method of acquiring services that focus on successful results or outcomes rather than dictating how the work is to be performed.

Now, I also agree with the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) about the need for education. I have been preaching that for the last 2 years. The community colleges of this Nation, public institutions, and the State universities of this Nation should be working with Silicon Valley east, west, south, north, wherever it is, to get the latest generation of equipment on which they can train people. State budgets never have enough, and as a former university president in charge of a State university for 18 years, I can assure my colleagues that is a true statement across the Nation, that very little money is invested in the technology that these students need to be exposed to.

They also need to be exposed to logic, to math, to science starting in the kindergarten. There ought to be concepts of science that a good public school system has, and that is exactly what is needed.

These are $60,000-a-year jobs, and if that should not wake somebody up, I do not know what it does wake up. We need more of our own citizens, and those who have newly arrived here, from Cambodia, the Vietnamese, the Latin American; and what we need are opportunities for the children of immigrants as well as opportunities for our own citizens.

So I completely agree with the gentleman from Virginia on this issue, and much more needs to be done on that. We cannot just have some fly-by-night operation that does this for individuals; we need a long-term investment by the Silicon Valleys, the computer industry, and they need to quit depending on people from abroad. They need to educate our own people.

Mr. Speaker, with those remarks, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER), who is the ranking member on the subcommittee, for all of his constructive comments during the hearings, during the markup, and now on the floor.

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

1500

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, 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 California (Mr. HORN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3582.

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.

GOLDEN SPIKE/CROSSROADS OF THE WEST NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2932) to authorize the Golden Spike/Crossroads of the West National Heritage Area, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2932

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

SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION OF STUDY.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—For the purposes of this section:

(1) GOLDEN SPIKE RAIL STUDY.—The term ''Golden Spike Rail Study'' means the Golden Spike Rail Feasibility Study, Reconnaissance Survey, Ogden, Utah to Golden Spike National Historic Site'', National Park Service, 1993.

(2) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

(3) STUDY AREA.—The term ''Study Area'' means the Golden Spike/Crossroads of the West National Heritage Area Study Area, the boundaries of which are described in subsection (d).

(b) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a study of the Study Area which includes analysis and documentation necessary to determine whether the Study Area—

(1) has an assemblage of natural, historic, and cultural resources that together represent distinctive aspects of American heritage worthy of recognition, conservation, interpretation, and continuing use, and are best managed through partnerships among public and private entities;

(2) reflects traditions, customs, beliefs, and folk-life that are a valuable part of the national story;

(3) provides outstanding opportunities to conserve natural, historic, cultural, or scenic features;

(4) provides outstanding recreational and educational opportunities;

(5) contains resources important to the identified theme or themes of the Study Area that retain a degree of integrity capable of supporting interpretation;

(6) includes residents, business interests, nonprofit organizations, and local and State governments who have demonstrated support for the concept of a National Heritage Area; and

(7) has a potential management entity to work in partnership with residents, business interests, nonprofit organizations, and local and State governments to develop a National Heritage Area consistent with continued local and State economic activity.

(c) CONSULTATION.—In conducting the study, the Secretary shall—

(1) consult with the State Historic Preservation Officer, State Historical Society, and other appropriate organizations; and

(2) use previously completed materials, including the Golden Spike Rail Study.

(d) BOUNDARIES OF STUDY AREA.—The Study Area shall be comprised of sites relating to completion of the first transcontinental railroad in the State of Utah, concentrating on those areas identified on the map included in the Golden Spike Rail Study.

(e) REPORT.—Not later than 3 fiscal years after funds are first made available to carry out this section, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report on the findings and conclusions of the study and recommendations based upon those findings and conclusions.

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this section.

SEC. 2. CROSSROADS OF THE WEST HISTORIC DISTRICT.

(a) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this section are—

(1) to preserve and interpret, for the educational and inspirational benefit of the public, the contribution to our national heritage of certain historic and cultural lands and edifices of the Crossroads of the West Historic District; and

(2) to enhance cultural and compatible economic redevelopment within the District.

(b) DEFINITIONS.—For the purposes of this section:

(1) DISTRICT.—The term ''District'' means the Crossroads of the West Historic District established by subsection (c).

(2) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.

(3) HISTORIC INFRASTRUCTURE.—The term ''historic infrastructure'' means the District's historic buildings and any other structure that the Secretary determines to be eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.

(c) CROSSROADS OF THE WEST HISTORIC DISTRICT.—

(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established the Crossroads of the West Historic District in the city of Ogden, Utah.

(2) BOUNDARIES.—The boundaries of the District shall be the boundaries depicted on the map entitled ''Crossroads of the West Historic District'', numbered OGGO-20,000, and dated March 22, 2000. The map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Department of the Interior.

(d) DEVELOPMENT PLAN.—The Secretary may make grants and enter into cooperative agreements with the State of Utah, local governments, and nonprofit entities under which the Secretary agrees to pay not more than 50 percent of the costs of—

(1) preparation of a plan for the development of historic, architectural, natural, cultural, and interpretive resources within the District;

(2) implementation of projects approved by the Secretary under the development plan described in paragraph (1); and

(3) an analysis assessing measures that could be taken to encourage economic development and revitalization within the District in a manner consistent with the District's historic character.

(e) RESTORATION, PRESERVATION, AND INTERPRETATION OF PROPERTIES.—

(1) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—The Secretary may enter into cooperative agreements with the State of Utah, local governments, and nonprofit entities owning property within the District under which the Secretary may—

(A) pay not more than 50 percent of the cost of restoring, repairing, rehabilitating, and improving historic infrastructure within the District;

(B) provide technical assistance with respect to the preservation and interpretation of properties within the District; and

(C) mark and provide interpretation of properties within the District.

(2) NON-FEDERAL CONTRIBUTIONS.—When determining the cost of restoring, repairing, rehabilitating, and improving historic infrastructure within the District for the purposes of paragraph (1)(A), the Secretary may consider any donation of property, services, or goods from a non-Federal source as a contribution of funds from a non-Federal source.

(3) PROVISIONS.—A cooperative agreement under paragraph (1) shall provide that—

(A) the Secretary shall have the right of access at reasonable times to public portions of the property for interpretive and other purposes;

(B) no change or alteration may be made in the property except with the agreement of the property owner, the Secretary, and any Federal agency that may have regulatory jurisdiction over the property; and

(C) any construction grant made under this section shall be subject to an agreement that provides—

(I) that conversion, use, or disposal of the project so assisted for purposes contrary to the purposes of this section shall result in a right of the United States to compensation from the beneficiary of the grant; and

(II) for a schedule for such compensation based on the level of Federal investment and the anticipated useful life of the project.

(4) APPLICATIONS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—A property owner that desires to enter into a cooperative agreement under paragraph (1) shall submit to the Secretary an application describing how the project proposed to be funded will further the purposes of the management plan developed for the District.

(B) CONSIDERATION.—In making such funds available under this subsection, the Secretary shall give consideration to projects that provide a greater leverage of Federal funds.

(f) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary to carry out this section not more than $1,000,000 for any fiscal year and not more than $5,000,000 total.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN).

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2932 is a bill I introduced, authorizes a study assessing the feasibility of establishing the Golden Spike/Crossroads of the West National Heritage Area. H.R. 2932 also establishes a Historic District in Ogden, Utah to preserve and interpret historic features relating to the convergence of the intercontinental railway.

The development of our Nation's railway was an important step in our country's development as an economic and industrial super power. The completion of the intercontinental railway was a crowning achievement in our country's history. H.R. 2932 would help to promote a greater public interest and appreciation for this significant event.

The study conducted under this bill charges the Secretary of the Interior to assess the worthiness of the region's historic, recreational, and economic resources for recognition as a National Heritage Area. This study is to be completed with input from the State Historic Agencies and submitted within 3 years.

H.R. 2932 also establishes the Golden Spike/Crossroads of the West Historic District. This Historic District would be an asset of great worth to all the residents and visitors of northern Utah. It would promote the conservation and development of historical and recreational resources associated with the intercontinental railway.

The historic district would be managed by the Secretary of Interior. The Secretary will have the responsibility of making a development plan and inventory of the resources existing in the historical district. The development plan is to be made with public participation and will emphasize economic revitalization that preserves the district's historic character.

It is very important to note that the designation of this historic district will have no effect on existing land-use laws and regulations. Furthermore, the bill will not confer any additional powers of zoning or land use to the Secretary of the Interior or affect private property rights in any way.

Preserving the heritage of our Nation's railroads and their influential role in our history is something I feel is very important. I believe this bill is good for Utah and good for the American people. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2932.

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2932. The gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) has quite accurately explained the legislation to the Members of the House.

Originally, we in the minority had some concerns with this legislation, although we clearly were not questioning the historic value of the area covered by the legislation. Working with the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN), the subcommittee chairman, and with others, we think that the final version of this legislation addresses everyone's concern. We ask that the House support the legislation.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2932, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. 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.

ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT REPORT RESTORATION ACT

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 1744) to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to provide that certain species conservation reports shall continue to be required to be submitted.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 1744

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

SECTION 1. CONTINUATION OF SUBMISSION OF CERTAIN SPECIES CONSERVATION REPORTS.

(a) ANNUAL COST ANALYSIS.—Section 18 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1544) is amended by striking ''On'' and inserting ''Notwithstanding section 3003 of Public Law 104–66 (31 U.S.C. 1113 note; 109 Stat. 734), on''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section takes effect on the earlier of—

(1) the date of enactment of this Act; or

(2) December 19, 1999.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN).

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

Mr. Speaker, the Senate bill was introduced by the late Senator from Rhode Island, Senator John Chafee. It restores the report under the Endangered Species Act.

The Endangered Species Act requires all Federal agencies to use their authorities for the protection and conservation of those species listed as threatened or endangered under the Federal Endangered Species Act. In 1988, section 18 of the ESA was added to require the Secretary of the Interior to send to Congress a report on the amount of taxpayer funds spent by each Federal agency in carrying out the mandates of the ESA.

Since 1990, the Committee on Resources has been receiving these reports which detail Federal spending on endangered and threatened species. The last report indicates that over $300 million has been directly spent by over 20 Federal agencies to protect endangered and threatened species. The reports tell us the amount spent on each listed species so we know where those Federal resources are going and can determine whether this spending is achieving the desired results of recovery of listed species.

Section 3003 of the Federal Reports Elimination and Sunset Act of 1997 terminated a long list of reports to Congress contained in the report of the Clerk of the House. The Clerk's report lists statutorily required reports to Congress from various Executive Branch agencies. Unfortunately, in the zeal to eliminate unnecessary reporting by Federal agencies, this very important and useful report was inadvertently eliminated as well.

S. 1744 simply retains the existing requirement of the Secretary of the Interior to provide Congress with this important information currently required by the Endangered Species Act. It does not affect any other provision of the ESA and does not address any substantive concerns regarding the ESA. I urge Members to support S. 1744 and send this important legislation to the President for his signature.

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation. As explained by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN), this was an inadvertent mistake when this report was terminated by the Federal Reports Elimination Sunset Act of 1995, and it is right for us to reinstate it.

It is obvious to all Members of Congress that the Endangered Species Act has been one of our Nation's keystone environmental laws to protect biodiversity and recover threatened and endangered species from the brink of extinction. This better helps us target our efforts to restoring endangered species.

Section 18 of the Endangered Species Act requires the Secretary of the Interior to report annually to the Congress on ''reasonably identified'' expenditures for the conservation and recovery of threatened and endangered species under the ESA. This report includes an accounting of expenditures from all Federal agencies and from all States that receive section 6 grant funding for conservation activities. Over the years this report has been a valuable tool to discern priorities and trends in how and where ESA funds are spent.

Unfortunately, the section 18 report was included in the list of unnecessary report requirements when Congress passed the Federal Reports Elimination and Sunset Act of 1995. Consequently, this report requirement was scheduled to sunset on December 21, 1999, provided that Congress does not act to reauthorize it.

This bill would correct the initial oversight and simply reauthorize this valuable report requirement. It is my understanding that the Administration did not include this report in the initial list that was forwarded to the Clerk of the House in 1994, and it is my further understanding that the Administration does not oppose its reinstatement at this time.

The Endangered Species Act has been our Nation's keystone environmental law to protect biodiversity and to recover threatened and endangered species from the brink of extinction. This bill would restore a helpful report and do no harm to the Act itself. I support S. 1744 and urge all members to do likewise.

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

Mr. HANSEN. 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 Utah (Mr. HANSEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 1744.

The question was taken.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. 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.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HANSEN. 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. 2932 and S. 1744.

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

There was no objection.

HMONG VETERANS' NATURALIZATION ACT OF 2000

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 371) to expedite the naturalization of aliens who served with special guerilla units in Laos, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 371

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 ''Hmong Veterans' Naturalization Act of 2000''.

SEC. 2. EXEMPTION FROM ENGLISH LANGUAGE REQUIREMENT FOR CERTAIN ALIENS WHO SERVED WITH SPECIAL GUERRILLA UNITS OR IRREGULAR FORCES IN LAOS.

The requirement of paragraph (1) of section 312(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1423(a)(1)) shall not apply to the naturalization of any person—

(1) who—

(A) was admitted into the United States as a refugee from Laos pursuant to section 207 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1157); and

(B) served with a special guerrilla unit, or irregular forces, operating from a base in Laos in support of the United States military at any time during the period beginning February 28, 1961, and ending September 18, 1978; or

(2) who—

(A) satisfies the requirement of paragraph (1)(A); and

(B) was the spouse of a person described in paragraph (1) on the day on which such described person applied for admission into the United States as a refugee.

SEC. 3. SPECIAL CONSIDERATION CONCERNING CIVICS REQUIREMENT FOR CERTAIN ALIENS WHO SERVED WITH SPECIAL GUERRILLA UNITS OR IRREGULAR FORCES IN LAOS.

The Attorney General shall provide for special consideration, as determined by the Attorney General, concerning the requirement of paragraph (2) of section 312(a) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1423(a)(2)) with respect to the naturalization of any person described in paragraph (1) or (2) of section 2 of this Act.

SEC. 4. DOCUMENTATION OF QUALIFYING SERVICE.

A person seeking an exemption under section 2 or special consideration under section 3 shall submit to the Attorney General documentation of their, or their spouse's, service with a special guerrilla unit, or irregular forces, described in section 2(1)(B), in the form of—

(1) original documents;

(2) an affidavit of the serving person's superior officer;

(3) two affidavits from other individuals who also were serving with such a special guerrilla unit, or irregular forces, and who personally knew of the person's service; or

(4) other appropriate proof.

SEC. 5. DETERMINATION OF ELIGIBILITY FOR EXEMPTION AND SPECIAL CONSIDERATION.

In determining a person's eligibility for an exemption under section 2 or special consideration under section 3, the Attorney General—

(1) shall review the refugee processing documentation for the person, or, in an appropriate case, for the person and the person's spouse, to verify that the requirements of section 2 relating to refugee applications and admissions have been satisfied;

(2) shall consider the documentation submitted by the person under section 4;

(3) shall request an advisory opinion from the Secretary of Defense regarding the person's, or their spouse's, service in a special guerrilla unit, or irregular forces, described in section 2(1)(B) and shall take into account that opinion; and

(4) may consider any certification prepared by the organization known as ''Lao Veterans of America, Inc.'', or any similar organization maintaining records with respect to Hmong veterans or their families.

SEC. 6. DEADLINE FOR APPLICATION AND PAYMENT OF FEES.

This Act shall apply to a person only if the person's application for naturalization is filed, as provided in section 334 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1445), with appropriate fees not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 7. LIMITATION ON NUMBER OF BENEFICIARIES.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the total number of aliens who may be granted an exemption under section 2 or special consideration under section 3, or both, may not exceed 45,000.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. VENTO) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HYDE. 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. 371, the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Today, Mr. Speaker, this body considers legislation to facilitate citizenship opportunities for Hmong refugees who were recruited by the United States to assist our combat effort in Indochina. Twenty-five years after the end of the Vietnam War, we honor the heroism and sacrifices of the Hmong.

At great personal peril and loss of life, they fought with us and performed critical roles in dangerous missions on our behalf.

As a former CIA officer pointed out in a statement submitted to the Committee on the Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims in the last Congress, and I quote, ''Throughout the war, CIA's paramilitary forces collected intelligence, used it in combat operations to tie down some 50,000 North Vietnamese forces in Laos, rescued downed American pilots and protected sensitive American installations at remote mountain tops.''

Those Hmong veterans who survive the war face severe persecution for their association with us.

H.R. 371 acknowledges that many Hmong veterans face unique language problems that present insurmountable obstacles to U.S. citizenship. The Hmong we recruited during the Vietnam War, including some at a very early age, lived at a predominantly preliterate society.

Lieutenant Colonel Wangyee Vang, National President, Lao Veterans of America, explained in his statement for the 1997 hearing of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims, ''Cultural barriers and the fact that a written Hmong language was not used in much of Laos until late in its history have compounded the problems of literacy for the Hmong.''

In recognition of their compelling and extraordinary sacrifices, H.R. 371 provides for an exemption from the English language requirement and authorizes special consideration related to the civics requirement.

The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. VENTO), our esteemed colleague, is the author of this legislation, and he may have put it best when he testified as follows before the Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims in the last Congress: ''They probably have passed the most important test, Mr. Chairman, and that is risking their lives for the values and beliefs that we revere as Americans and saving American lives.''

The step we hopefully will take today is overdue. In the 104th Congress, this body passed an omnibus immigration reform bill in a form that included provisions designed to expedite naturalization for those who served with special guerilla units in Laos, but these provisions were not incorporated in the final version of the legislation.

In the 105th Congress, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. VENTO) introduced as H.R. 371 language virtually identical to the original House-passed provisions from the previous Congress.

In June 1997, the Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims held a hearing on H.R. 371. The following year, the subcommittee favorably reported an amended version of the bill to the full Committee on the Judiciary. As amended, H.R. 371 addressed concerns about the potential for fraud by delineating steps to be taken in determining eligibility and limiting to 45,000 the number of potential beneficiaries.

Although the full Committee on the Judiciary in June 1998 ordered the bill as amended in subcommittee favorably reported, no further action was taken in the 105th Congress. In the 106th Congress, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. VENTO) reintroduced his bill under the same number, incorporating changes the Committee on the Judiciary supported in 1998. In March of this year, the full Committee on the Judiciary acted again favorably, this time ordering H.R. 371 reported by voice vote.

As this history documents, the details of this legislation have been considered thoroughly by the Committee on the Judiciary, and we bring it up on the floor today with improvements my committee approved in both the last Congress and the current Congress. In our most recent markup, I displayed a Pandau ''story cloth'' depicting the escape of Hmong refugees across the Mekong River to a camp in Thailand after their villages were strafed by Communist forces in Laos. Such story cloths were a way of communicating Hmong history by people who knew no written language.

This bill will permit a limited number of lawful permanent residents of the United States who served with special guerilla units or irregular forces in support of the U.S. military during the Vietnam war to become citizens. They must have been legally admitted to this country as refugees from Laos, and provision is also made for certain spouses who came as refugees.

1515

It is particularly significant that the bill before us focuses on people who are already here in the United States legally and permanently. In view of their commitment to our democracy and the great hardships they endured when they made common cause with us, we act appropriately by extending a hand to them now and helping them become citizens of their adopted land. This is just and humane legislation Members can endorse regardless of political affiliation.

Governor Ventura of Minnesota appealed to me on behalf of these freedom fighters in February, and I welcomed the opportunity to assure him and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. VENTO) that I would do whatever I could to help get H.R. 371 enacted into law. Supporters of this important bill include the American Legion and the Special Forces Association. I urge my colleagues to support enactment of H.R. 371.

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

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume; and I, of course, rise in strong support of this measure, the Hmong Veterans Naturalization Act.

First and foremost I would like to thank the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), the distinguished chairman, for his leadership and continuing support throughout the committee process. I would also like to, of course, acknowledge the strong support I have had from my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH), who for some time has encouraged and helped me refine this legislation; and of course the ranking member on the committee, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

I would especially like to thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT) for his work in the past years, as well as the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE), the current ranking member on the subcommittee with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH).

Furthermore, of course, the Department of Justice and the Immigration and Naturalization Service have extended themselves and provided assistance and counsel in working out the final language in the bill. As we know in this body, good intentions are not enough. We need to have precise language with regards to Immigration and Naturalization Service issues because misunderstandings do arise.

Today is a historic day and, of course, this past month we have been talking about the 25-year anniversary of the fall of Saigon and the last of the American troops leaving Vietnam. Events have been relived these past weeks, harsh memories of Vietnam that are unpleasant to all Americans. While the Vietnam War is over for all America, the plight of our friends within this region and Laos must be remembered.

The Lao-Hmong soldiers, as young as 10 years old, were recruited and fought and died alongside 58,000 U.S. soldiers, sailors, and airmen in Vietnam. As a result of their contributions, bravery and loyalty to the United States, the Lao-Hmong were tragically overrun by the Communist forces and lost their homeland and status in Laos after the Vietnam War. Between 10,000 and 20,000 Lao-Hmong were killed in combat-related incidents, and over 100,000 had to flee to refugee camps and other nations to survive.

Mr. Speaker, this is a point where we can be very proud that the United States did not abandon these camps and these people, but we responded and opened our doors for refugee assistance and permitted them to come into the United States. Today, in Minnesota, because of the growing population in the Midwest, we have nearly 60,000 Lao-Hmong that now know Minnesota as their new home.

Many of the older Lao-Hmong patriots who made it to the U.S. are separated from their family members and have had great difficulty in adjusting to many aspects of life and culture in the United States, including passing aspects of our required citizenship tests. Learning to read in English has been the greatest obstacle for the Lao-Hmong because written characters in the Hmong language have only been introduced in recent years.

As the chairman of the committee pointed out, the Pandau did the illustrations because they did not have a written language. Very often the only way they could record their history was through their wonderful artwork. If my colleagues would like to see some more of this, Mr. Speaker, they can come to St. Paul, and even in my office. I have a large hanging about the size of a bedspread of this type of depicted character which reflects this wonderful needle work and craft work and history really of the Lao-Hmong and their Chinese origin.

This act, of course, has been explained by the chairman. It facilitates the assistance with regards to citizenship. It extends this benefit. There are

tight limits on the bill. I would note that the chairman of the committee has gone beyond and above the call of duty. He had to arm wrestle Governor Jesse Ventura; and fortunately, they declared a draw and he decided to move ahead with the legislation.

This legislation is supported by a whole host of veterans organizations. It is good legislation. It is targeted legislation. It is limited. And it does respond, I think, to the Lao-Hmong problem.

I would say to my colleagues that while the English language and citizenship tests are important, that the Lao-Hmong have indeed passed a more important test. They put their lives on the line to save American sailors and soldiers. They put their lives on the line for the values that are reflected in the promise of America and in this Nation. And so I am proud to stand here today to represent them and to ask my colleagues for their support in supporting this bill.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VENTO. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to thank this gentleman for this legislation and for sticking with it all this time on behalf of the Lao-Hmong.

As the gentleman knows, California has many Lao-Hmong residents in our State and also in my district, and they have been fantastic constituents and residents of our State and of our country. I want to thank the gentleman so very much for finally getting this bill to the floor again so that we can deal with this problem that he has so adequately addressed.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman; and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I am pleased to rise in strong support of H.R. 371, the Hmong Veterans Naturalization Act of 2000.

It is long overdue, Mr. Speaker, that we gave special recognition to the Hmong, who courageously fought with our personnel in Vietnam. They were working in the underground activities in Laos. I had the opportunity of visiting General Vang Pao headquarters back in 1973, and he showed me all the bullet holes around his headquarters where they had been attacked time and time again. They served valiantly and courageously. Then, after the war was over, we left them out to dry, to hang; and we have not done anything to assist them over these years.

I want to commend our distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), for expediting the naturalization of aliens who served with special guerrilla units in Laos, guerrilla units that did an outstanding job on behalf of our Nation. We can do no less for so many who did so much for all of us.

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to mention that there are 108 sponsors of this, including colleagues like the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND), who has a significant population. The entire Minnesota delegation is in support of this, as are numerous Members from this area.

The gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) wanted to speak on this, and I know they are going to put their statements in the record.

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

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to say that, in addition to being very honored to help pass this excellent bill and the regret it took so many years to get to this point, one of the ancillary benefits of the campaign for this bill was a visit by the governor of Minnesota, Mr. Ventura. He and I did engage in some arm wrestling. And I want to say that the fact that he let me win has nothing to do with my support for this excellent bill.

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 371, the Hmong Veterans' Naturalization Act.

H.R. 371, is a necessary step in assisting the Hmong, a special group of legal immigrants who served with the U.S. Armed Forces and now require help in obtaining U.S. citizenship. It waives the residency requirement for those Hmong and their spouses. Additionally, it waives the English language test and residency requirement for attainment of U.S. citizenship. It would only affect individuals who reside legally in this country and would not grant veteran's status or make the Hmong people who served in the Special Guerrilla Forces eligible for veterans' benefits.

This important legislation would impact thousands of people in the United States, including the large Lao-Hmong community in my home district of western Wisconsin. The history of Hmong demonstrates the need for this legislation. The Hmong are not considered veterans by our government even though they participated in covert operations directed by the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency. Many served in non-uniformed units, therefore making it uncertain if ''veteran'' status can be proved. The Hmong aided our efforts during the Southeastern Asian conflict at a high personal cost. Between 10,000 and 20,000 Hmong lost their lives. The Hmong population lost their homeland to Communist forces. After the war, more than 100,000 Hmong were forced to either flee or live in refugee camps. Many Hmong were separated from their families.

The process of assimilation to the United States has been especially challenging for the Hmong. A major problem for many Hmong is an insufficient command of the English language which prevents them from completing the naturalization process. This is partly due to the fact that the Hmong did not have a written language until the 1950s. Therefore, learning to speak, read, and write the English language has been extremely difficult. The English-learning process has also been stymied by the high rate of illiteracy among the Hmong in this recently acquired written language. The majority of the Hmong who were brought to the United States as political refugees had very little opportunity for education during their war-ravaged years in Laos.

Mr. Speaker, the Hmong people need our help. It is wrong to abandon these men and women who served as valuable allies to us during the Southeastern Asian conflict and that is why I support H.R. 371.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 371, the Hmong Veterans' Naturalization Act of 2000. I commend my colleague, Mr. BRUCE VENTO, for his leadership and sponsorship with this important measure.

The Hmong veterans have more than proven themselves worthy of American citizenship. It is the obligation of the United States government to pass this bill, which will create an exemption of the English language requirement for naturalization purposes.

As many of us are aware, from 1961–73 during the Vietnam War, the Central Intelligence Agency recruited tens of thousands of Hmong and Laotians to serve in special guerrilla forces fighting the North Vietnamese and the Communist government in Laos. These soldiers fought valiantly alongside American troops. Through their efforts, they were able to defend intelligence sites, prevent thousands of U.S. troops from an ambush by North Vietnamese troops, and rescue hundreds of downed American pilots. Between 10,000–20,000 Hmong and Laotian soldiers lost their lives in service to the U.S. government.

Unfortunatley, when the war ended, Hmong and Laotians were forced to flee their country in an effort to avoid persecution by their governments. The sacrifices they had to make were immense—they gave up their homes, their livelihood and their country. Over 150,000 of them have resettled in the U.S. as political refugees.

Since then, many Hmong and Laotian veterans have faced great difficulty in attaining naturalization status. In fact, today, approximately 60.4 percent of the Hmong and 66.1 percent of the Laotians are still legal permanent residents.

The barriers Hmong and Laotian veterans face involve the significant level of illiteracy and predominant lack of formal education in their community. It was only forty short years ago that Hmong became a written language; thus, many in their community have never learned to read, or to write. This fact leads to the incredible difficulty, and sometimes, impossibility, for the Hmong veterans to learn the English language enough to pass the citizenship test.

Mr. Speaker, during the Vietnam war, the U.S. government promised the Hmong and Laotian soldiers that they would find a refuge in the United States if we lost the war. In fact, the CIA promised to evacuate the Hmong, only to leave them behind in 1974.

It is important for us now to fulfill that promise, and to recognize and honor the contributions the Hmong and Laotian veterans have made, as well as the lives that were lost, to

the United States war efforts. The best way for us to do those things is to grant an exemption for these individuals from the English language requirement for naturalization. This exemption, like our fulfillment of the promise, is long overdue.

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Speaker I stand with my colleagues in support of H.R. 371, the Hmong Veterans Naturalization Act.

By approving this bill, we will make an important contribution to the efforts of the thousands of Hmong veterans and their families to become United States citizens. For over two decades, Hmong veterans have encountered serious obstacles that have impeded their ability to become U.S. citizens. This bill addresses this by exempting Hmong veterans from English language proficiency and residency requirements.

Many Americans are only beginning to appreciate and recognize the invaluable service and bravery of Hmong veterans. Today, we have an opportunity to assure that their service to freedom and to the United States will not be forgotten.

Hmong veterans fought in the Vietnam War alongside American forces at great personal peril and loss of life. They performed critical roles in dangerous missions, collected vital intelligence, rescued downed American pilots and defended sensitive American installations at remote locations.

Tragically, at the end of the war and as a result of their service and bravery, tens of thousands of Hmong freedom fighters and their families constantly faced the horrible reality of life in prison camps and the threat of genocide.

Many Hmong veterans and their families sought refuge in the United States. California's Central Valley, which I represent, has been a primary relocation site for them. I am proud that the Central Valley is one of the most ethnically diverse parts of the country and that the Hmong community has contributed greatly to that diversity and enriched us with their traditions.

In light of their service, heroism and dedication to freedom, it is only fitting that America embrace those Hmong veterans that fought with distinction and honor. I urge my colleagues to join me in support of this bill.

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, today I rise as a cosponsor of H.R. 371, the Hmong Veterans' Naturalization Act of 1999, to honor the Hmong people, many of whom risked their lives or died in service to the United States during the Vietnam War.

There are over 16,000 Hmong in my homestate of Wisconsin, and the legislation before the House of Representatives today will help many Hmong patriots who made it to the U.S. and are currently separated from their families.

This bill will allow more Hmomg people to become United States Citizens by providing interpreter-assistance during the citizenship test. Unlike other languages, written characters were only introduced in the Hmong language in recent years, so learning to read in a foreign language presents an extremely difficult challenge. By providing interpreters, the family reunification process in the Hmong community can begin sooner.

Providing this service is a very small token of our appreciation for a people that so loyally fought on behalf of the United States, some of whom started fighting at the age of 10. The Hmong ''mountain men'' not only rescued downed American pilots, but fought heroically alongside U.S. soldiers in the Vietnam War.

It is my hope that by passing this bill today, the United States Congress will show its gratitude to the Hmong people, in appreciation of the many sacrifices they have made for this country.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this is an important bill because the Hmong have stood by the U.S. at a crucial time in our history and now is the time to repay and honor the loyalty of Hmong veterans. The Hmong were a pre-literate society. I would like to congratulate Congressman BRUCE VENTO for his leadership on this issue.

The Hmong had no written language in use when the United States recruited them during the Vietnam War. The best symbol of why H.R. 371 is necessary is the Hmong ''story cloth,'' the Pandau cloth, that is their embroidered cloth record of important historical events and oral traditions.

The Hmong were recruited, largely, as boy soldiers. Many of the veterans of the U.S. secret Army were recruited at age 12, 13 and 14 years of age. The CIA in coordination with ''Air America'' built hundreds of airstrips and bases for the Hmong and their American advisors to conduct military operations.

The Hmong were critical to the American war strategy in S.E. Asia—especially the U.S. air strategy. Mr. Speaker, this legislation provides for the expedited naturalization of Hmong veterans of the U.S. Secret Army currently residing in the United States (as legal aliens) who served with U.S. clandestine and special forces during the Vietnam War by allowing them to take the citizenship test with a translator since the Hmong are a tribal people with no written language, thus relying solely on the ''story cloths''.

The bill is capped at 45,000, in terms of the total number of Hmong veterans, their widows and orphans who currently reside in the United States who would fall under the legislation. This cap is supported by the Hmong veterans in the United States and is considered to be a generous cap. I support this legislation to provide relief to the Hmong heroes.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Hmong Veterans' Naturalization Act because I feel that we should reward these brave individuals who assisted American efforts in the war against communism in Southeast Asia. The Hmong which we seek to honor today were a Laotian-based guerrilla group who fought valiantly alongside American and South Vietnamese troops in Vietnam. Many Hmong risked and lost their lives in defense of democracy at a crucial time in the history of that region. With Communism spreading across the Asian continent during the 60's, it was crucial for American troops to receive indigenous help in defense of South Vietnam. They were brave soldiers of freedom at time of great uncertainty, and their efforts have gone largely ignored for far too long.

Today, the Hmong are valuable citizens and employees in many communities across the United States, including the 10th district of North Carolina which I have the privilege to serve. In fact, I employ several Hmong in my company in Hickory, NC. They are truly great citizens who offer a strong work ethic and another facet of cultural diversity to my community, and to communities across this nation.

The Laotian Hmong have been the victims of persecution and genocide at the hands of the Communist government in Laos, largely due to the help they provided America during the Vietnam War. Now it is time for us to reward them for their sacrifice and service. Please vote yes today on H.R. 371; let us reward these brave people by expediting the naturalization of Hmong aliens who served with these special guerrilla units in Laos during the Vietnam War.

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 Illinois (Mr. HYDE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 371, 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 facilitate the naturalization of aliens who served with special guerrilla units or irregular forces in Laos.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMORIAL TO HONOR DISABLED VETERANS OF THE UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1509) to authorize the Disabled Veterans' LIFE Memorial Foundation to establish a memorial in the District of Columbia or its environs to honor veterans who became disabled while serving in the Armed Forces of the United States.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1509

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

SECTION 1. MEMORIAL TO HONOR DISABLED VETERANS OF THE UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES.

(a) MEMORIAL AUTHORIZED.—The Disabled Veterans' LIFE Memorial Foundation is authorized to establish a memorial on Federal land in the District of Columbia or its environs to honor veterans who became disabled while serving in the Armed Forces of the United States.

(b) COMPLIANCE WITH STANDARDS FOR COMMEMORATIVE WORKS.—The establishment of the memorial shall be in accordance with the Commemorative Works Act (40 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.).

(c) PAYMENT OF EXPENSES.—The Disabled Veterans' LIFE Memorial Foundation shall be solely responsible for acceptance of contributions for, and payment of the expenses of, the establishment of the memorial. No Federal funds may be used to pay any expense of the establishment of the memorial.

(d) DEPOSIT OF EXCESS FUNDS.—If, upon payment of all expenses of the establishment of the memorial (including the maintenance and preservation amount required under section 8(b) of the Commemorative Works Act (40 U.S.C. 1008(b))), or upon expiration of the authority for the memorial under section 10(b) of such Act (40 U.S.C. 1010(b)), there remains a balance of funds received for the establishment of the memorial, the Disabled Veterans' LIFE Memorial Foundation shall transmit the amount of the balance to the Secretary of the Treasury for deposit in the

account provided for in section 8(b)(1) of such Act (40 U.S.C. 1008(b)(1)).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN).

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

I would first like to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON), for his efforts in introducing this bill. He has worked diligently in preparing this legislation. I urge Members' consideration and support of H.R. 1509.

A significant portion of veterans who served in defense of our Nation are disabled. In fact, there are nearly 2.3 million disabled veterans in America today who have fought in foreign conflicts ranging from the Gulf War to World War I. There are even 13 disabled veterans from the Mexican border war against Pancho Villa. Although we honor these men and women on Memorial Day, there is no memorial to commemorate those veterans who were disabled during our Nation's conflicts. H.R. 1509 serves to recognize our disabled veterans by authorizing the Disabled Veterans' LIFE Memorial Foundation to construct a memorial honoring their sacrifice on behalf of our country.

The Disabled Veterans' LIFE Memorial Foundation will be responsible for all expenses associated with the establishment of this memorial. This bill ensures that its establishment will be in compliance with the Commemorative Works Act and that Federal funds will not be used to pay for the memorial.

Mr. Speaker, I again commend the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON) for his tireless work on behalf of America's veterans, and H.R. 1509 reflects his years of service. The gentleman from Texas is a true war hero, and I urge Members to support this bill.

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

(Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this legislation as described by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN).

The minority side of the committee is in strong support of this legislation and in support of taking this important first step in the process. We look forward to a time hopefully when visitors to the Washington area can see a tangible reminder of the courage and the dedication displayed by many of our disabled veterans.

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

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON), the author of this legislation.

(Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I appreciate the gentleman's help in getting this through the committee. I appreciate the help from the Democrat side as well.

I want to ask my colleagues to support this legislation which I introduced. It is to establish a memorial honoring our Nation's disabled veterans. The memorial expresses our thanks and, at the same time, honors the nearly 2.3 million disabled American veterans in our country today.

This memorial would pay tribute to the men and women who have fought in every major conflict this Nation has entered since the great Civil War, including 471,000 wounded in the Civil War; 234,000 wounded in World War I; 670,000 wounded in World War II; 100,000 wounded in Korea; 300,000 wounded in Vietnam; and nearly 500 wounded in the Persian Gulf War.

Despite those staggering numbers, they do not even begin to represent those who returned with no visible physical wounds but who suffered more through emotional agonies wrought by war.

There are monuments, memorials dedicated to the wars our Nation has fought and to those who lost their lives in the effort to preserve the freedom that we all enjoy. But we have not properly acknowledged the sacrifices of those who went and fought those same battles to preserve the same freedoms and who paid a severe price.

1530

We have yet to honor those who returned from battle with the scars and wounds which serve as daily reminders of how just costly a war can be and how precious the privileges that we enjoy in this Nation are.

This memorial would be the only one dedicated to disabled American veterans, many of whom are still living, thereby giving the American people an opportunity to honor and express their gratitude to those who have sacrificed so much for each of us.

It has been 25 years since the conclusion of the Vietnam War, which we have seen on TV in the past week, and 50 years since the Korean War. Those are two wars in which I fought. And I fear the passage of time is going to allow our wounded veterans to fade from the Nation's memory and conscience.

This memorial will ensure that our Nation will not forget the dedication and devotion to duty, honor, and country demonstrated by all disabled American veterans. It is time to honor their commitment to this Nation and to our freedom which we so richly enjoy.

God bless everyone. I hope my colleagues can see clear to passing this bill.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON) for his excellent remarks, and I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER).

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1509, which authorizes a memorial to honor disabled American veterans.

This legislation, sponsored by my friend and distinguished veteran, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON), honors those veterans who not only risked their lives but gave part of themselves for our freedom. The courage and the conviction that are demonstrated by these heroes is inspiring and uniquely American.

Mr. Speaker, the soldiers, sailors, airmen, and Marines who defend our country are national treasures. Disabled veterans are brave men and women who deserve to be honored and remembered for their sacrifices. Their sacrifices teach us one lesson above all, freedom is not free. Our national security is preserved because we have men and women who are willing to pay the price, bear the burden, and meet the demand of keeping our country safe and secure.

All of us owe a great debt to those who wear the uniform in defense of America. As I like to say every day when I get up, I thank God for my life. And I thank our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and Marines for our way of life.

While we can never adequately thank the millions of American disabled veterans, this memorial will stand as an eternal reminder of their honor, service, and sacrifice. These are the heroes who protected freedom in America and ensured democracy for the world.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1509, a bill to establish a memorial honoring veterans who sustained disabling injuries in the service of their nation. I commend the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON) for bringing this measure to the floor at this time, and I urge all of our colleagues to join in supporting this worthy endeavor.

H.R. 1509 grants authorization to the Disabled Veterans Life Memorial Foundation to establish a memorial in our District of Columbia to honor all those veterans who became disabled while serving in our Armed Forces. The establishment of the disabled veterans memorial will be in accordance with the Commemorative Works Act, and this Foundation will be responsible for both managing contributions for and paying the expenses of establishing this memorial.

While all of our veterans deserve our support and appreciation, those who became disabled during their period of service deserve our special recognition. The Federal Government has recognized their extraordinary sacrifices

through the provision of free medical care from service-connected disabilities and the issuance of monthly disability pensions.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, remarkably, there is no separate monument to our disabled veterans in our Nation's capital. This legislation will correct that oversight.

For that reason, I urge my colleagues to give this measure their unwavering support.

Mr. HANSEN. 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 Utah (Mr. HANSEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1509.

The question was taken.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. 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.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 1509.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR APPOINTMENT OF ALAN G. SPOON AS CITIZEN REGENT OF BOARD OF REGENTS OF SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 40) providing for the appointment of Alan G. Spoon as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

The Clerk read as follows:

S.J. RES. 40

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in accordance with section 5581 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (20 U.S.C. 43), the vacancy on the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, in the class other than Members of Congress, occurring by reason of resignation of Louis Gerstner of New York, is filled by the appointment of Alan G. Spoon of Maryland. The appointment is for a term of 6 years and shall take effect on the date of enactment of this joint resolution.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON).

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, S.J. Res. 40 provides for the appointment of Alan Gary Spoon to serve on the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

This 17-member board, which governs the Smithsonian Institution, is comprised of the Chief Justice and Vice President of the United States, three Members each from the House and Senate, and nine citizens who are nominated by the Board and approved jointly in a resolution of Congress.

Alan Spoon has served as chief operating officer and director of The Washington Post Company since May of 1991 and was elected president of that organization in September of 1993.

Prior to that experience, Mr. Spoon also served as president of Newsweek Magazine.

The Washington Post Company's involvement in areas of education and electronic information services, as well as producing technology publications, can prove to be a useful background in his service to the Smithsonian.

Before joining The Washington Post, he was a partner with an international consulting firm specializing in corporate strategy.

Mr. Spoon also brings previous experience with the Smithsonian as a member of the National Museum of Natural History's board of directors.

I believe the Smithsonian can benefit from Alan Spoon's financial, marketing, and management background. I urge my colleagues to support S.J. Res. 40.

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

Mr. Speaker, I have listened intently to the words of the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON) on behalf of Mr. Spoon's nomination to the Smithsonian Board of Regents.

Mr. Spoon is indeed, as has been represented by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON), an outstanding American, an outstanding member of this community, a distinguished business executive; and he will bring a wealth of knowledge, experience, and wisdom to serve on the Smithsonian Board of Regents.

I share the view of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON) that he will be a very, very worthy addition to this Board and will serve the Smithsonian and the Nation well. I rise in support of this resolution.

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. 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 Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate joint resolution, S.J. Res. 40.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on S.J. Res. 40.

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

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR REAPPOINTMENT OF MANUEL L. IBANEZ AS CITIZEN REGENT OF BOARD OF REGENTS OF SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate joint resolution (S.J. Res. 42) providing for the reappointment of Manuel L. Ibanez as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

The Clerk read as follows:

S.J. RES. 42

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, in accordance with section 5581 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (20 U.S.C. 43), the vacancy on the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution, in the class other than Members of Congress, occurring by reason of the expiration of the term of Manual L. Ibanez of Texas on May 4, 2000, is filled by the reappointment of the incumbent for a term of 6 years. The reappointment shall take effect on May 5, 2000.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON).

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Manuel Luis Ibanez has been on the Board of Regents. I can vouch for his ability. He is being asked for reappointment to an additional 6-year term with the Smithsonian Institution. He served as president of Texas A&M University in Kingsville and is presently Professor of Microbiology.

As a current citizen regent of the Smithsonian, he brings a unique knowledge of science because of his specialization in bacterial physiology. He possesses a broad background in academic and public service and combines that with his institutional experience in the areas of grants, awards, and funding.

Dr. Ibanez has been a successful fundraiser while serving as president of Texas A&M University and lends that experience to an institution that relies on constantly increasing its private fund-raising base.

He has also expressed support for expanding the Smithsonian's traveling exhibitions to reach parts of our country that do not normally have access to such exhibits.

Dr. Ibanez has served successfully on the Smithsonian's Board of Regents for the past 6 years.

I urge my colleagues to support S.J. Res. 42, which reappoints Dr. Ibanez for another 6-year term.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, again I rise in support of this resolution.

I have listened to the words of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON) with reference to Dr. Ibanez, and I concur in those remarks.

Mr. Speaker, the Smithsonian Institution is, as my colleagues know, both a museum of extraordinary note but also a very distinguished academic institution. It not only displays knowledge, but it diffuses knowledge, as well.

Dr. Ibanez has served with distinction on the Smithsonian Board. So we have had Mr. Spoon, who is going to bring a new perspective, and Dr. Ibanez, who will continue to have an institutional memory of what has come before and what should go in the future.

So I am very pleased to rise in support of this resolution and to, frankly, thank Dr. Ibanez for agreeing to continue to expend his very valuable time in this volunteer way on behalf of a great American institution, in fact a great world institution, the Smithsonian Institution.

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

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for his comments and I tell him that I appreciate those comments. Because Dr. Ibanez, of course, does live down near the valley in Texas and it is hard to get here, and sometimes those regents come from far away and we are proud to have representation from all over this Nation. It is a great institution.

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 Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate joint resolution, S.J. Res. 42.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on S.J. Res. 42.

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

There was no objection.

AMERICAN INDIAN TRIBAL COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES IMPROVEMENT ACT

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3629) to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to improve the program for American Indian Tribal Colleges and Universities under part A of title III, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3629

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

SECTION 1. APPLICATIONS FOR AND AWARD OF GRANTS.

(a) SIMPLIFICATION OF APPLICATIONS.—Sections 316(d)(2) and 317(d)(2) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1059c(d)(2), 1059d(d)(2)) are each amended by inserting after the first sentence the following: ''The Secretary shall, to the extent possible, prescribe a simplified and streamlined format for such applications that takes into account the limited number of institutions that are eligible for assistance under this section.''.

(b) SPECIAL RULES FOR AWARDS.—

(1) TRIBAL COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES.—Section 316(d) of such Act is further amended by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

''(3) SPECIAL RULES.—

''(A) ELIGIBILITY.—No Tribal College or University that receives funds under this section shall concurrently receive funds under other provisions of this part or part B.

''(B) EXEMPTION.—Section 313(d) shall not apply to institutions that are eligible to receive funds under this section.

''(C) DISTRIBUTION.—In awarding grants under this section, the Secretary shall, to the extent possible and consistent with the competitive process under which such grants are awarded, ensure maximum and equitable distribution among all eligible institutions.''.

(2) ALASKAN NATIVE AND NATIVE HAWAIIAN INSTITUTIONS.—Section 317 of such Act is further amended by striking subsection (e) and by inserting at the end of subsection (d) the following new paragraph:

''(3) SPECIAL RULES.—

''(A) ELIGIBILITY.—No Alaskan Native-serving institution or Native Hawaiian-serving institution that receives funds under this section shall concurrently receive funds under other provisions of this part or part B.

''(B) EXEMPTION.—Section 313(d) shall not apply to institutions that are eligible to receive funds under this section.

''(C) DISTRIBUTION.—In awarding grants under this section, the Secretary shall, to the extent possible and consistent with the competitive process under which such grants are awarded, ensure maximum and equitable distribution among all eligible institutions.''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this Act shall be effective on the date of the enactment of this Act.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3629, as amended, which makes technical improvements to sections 316 and 317 of title III of the Higher Education Act.

I want to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GREEN) for introducing H.R. 3629 and bringing this matter to our attention.

1545

The bill we are considering today takes two technical improvements to title III that relate to tribal colleges and Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian-serving institutions. These institutions are located primarily in remote areas not served by other postsecondary education institutions.

They offer a broad range of degree and vocational certificate programs to students for whom these educational opportunities would otherwise be geographically and culturally inaccessible.

Under title III, grant funds are provided to postsecondary institutions for improving academic programs, for improving their management and fiscal operations, and to help institutions make effective use of technology. Funding is targeted to institutions that enroll large proportions of financially disadvantaged students and have low per-student expenditures.

Mr. Speaker, last year, 17 institutions received grant awards under this program. One used its funds to add computer hardware and software to improve the college's physical management, academic programming, and student services.

These improvements will include Internet access for instructors. Another institution is using its grant award to acquire new technology and provide staff development related to distance education programs.

Another institution is using its grant to acquire computers and Internet access for its students in order to improve academic achievement and increase student retention. Others are using their grant funds for many similar purposes.

The first technical improvement that we are making in this bill directs the Secretary of Education to simplify the application process for the limited number of institutions eligible for funds under this section 316 and 317.

Currently, institutions spend a great deal of time and money preparing applications for funds under the highly competitive title III grant program. For poorer institutions, these costs are often prohibitive. However, if the process is simplified, it is possible that more of the poorer institutions will apply for assistance.

The second improvement will allow these institutions to apply for a new grant without waiting until 2 years lapse after the expiration of a prior grant. Under current law, an institution receives a grant for a 5-year period and then must wait 2 years after the expiration of the grant before applying for another grant.

This 2-year wait-out rule was part of the original title III legislation, and its

purpose was to ensure that title III funding reached the maximum number of institutions. However, in the case of section 316 and 317 institutions, the 2-year wait-out rule is unnecessary.

Based on the current funding available and the limited number of institutions eligible for this program, there is no need for a wait-out period. By removing this restriction, funds for institutional development can go to the maximum number of institutions that submit a qualified application during next year's competition.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Education has included the elimination of the wait-out period in its lists of technical amendments to the higher educational amendments of 1998 and agrees that the wait-out is unnecessary.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support these technical amendments to title III of the Higher Education Act. I want to express my thanks again to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GREEN) for introducing this bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3629. As our Nation becomes increasingly diverse, it is imperative that all of our segments of the population are afforded the opportunity to receive a quality postsecondary education if this Nation is to remain a world power.

Currently, 30 tribal colleges and universities and 13 Alaska-native and Native Hawaiian-serving institutions are doing an excellent job of reaching out and providing services to some of the hardest to reach and most disadvantaged minority students in the country.

During the 1998 reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, Congress created two grant programs, based on the existing Federal aid program for historical black colleges and universities to assist these 43 institutions whose mission it is to serve Native Americans and Native Alaskans and Native Hawaiian students.

Eligible institutions can use program funds for a number of activities including faculty and academic program development and instructional faculty construction and maintenance.

Mr. Speaker, in many cases, these grants make the difference in an institution's viability. However, the Congress inadvertently placed hurdles between these vital institutions and this essential funding by requiring an unnecessary 2-year waiting period and an overly burdensome application process.

H.R. 3629 removes these hurdles by eliminating the waiting period and streamlining the application process. H.R. 3629, which provides some of the poorest schools educating some of the neediest students with easier access to funding that Congress made available to them in 1998, was reported favorably by the Committee on Education and the Workforce and has the support of the administration.

Mr. Speaker, as such, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3629.

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

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GREEN), the sponsor of the bill, the original author of H.R. 3629

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by thanking my friend and colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCKEON), for his support and work on this legislation, as well as my colleague across the aisle, the gentleman from California (Mr. MARTINEZ). I do appreciate their help on this.

Mr. Speaker, today we have a chance to reach out to educational institutions all across America. These institutions may be small in number, but they serve a very great need. Most importantly, the need they serve is experience by a dramatically underserved portion of the population. And for this portion of the population, these Americans, it offers, I believe, some great hope.

Today, we reach out to tribal colleges, not by spending more money, but making sure that for the dollars we do spend that those dollars are more accessible, distributed more equitably and easier to access by all involved. There are 32 tribal colleges in America right now and 12 States serving 25,000 Americans. My own home State of Wisconsin has two, the Lac Courte D'Oreilles Community College and the Menomonee Indian Tribal College.

For the Native Americans served at these institutions, these colleges are closing the gap between the America that is and the America that can be.

In 1998, Congress created the American Indian Tribally Controlled College and University Institutional Development Act. In fiscal year 2000, $6 million has been awarded in a competitive grant program for these institutions in this program.

Last year, 16 tribal colleges applied for grants and eight received grants. We can do more, I believe; and we can reach more tribal colleges, and we can reach more Americans, the Americans that they serve; and that is what this bill attempts to do. Through technical changes that have been supported on both sides of the aisle, voice voted through the subcommittee and supported by the American Indian Higher Education Consortium, this bill will, by removing barriers, get more dollars to more tribal colleges.

As was mentioned previously, it makes some very simple changes. Number one, it directs the Secretary Of Education to simplify and streamline the application process. The current application process requires applicants to address no less than 16 different subject areas, well intended. Unfortunately, I am afraid it may be overkill. It has the unfortunate effect of discouraging fledgling tribal colleges from taking on the grant application process.

We worked closely with the Department of Education in developing these minor changes.

Secondly, this bill would direct the Secretary of Education to ensure a more equitable distribution of these limited dollars to the maximum number of institutions. We are not talking about a lot of dollars here, but it is obviously crucially important that those dollars go as far as they can.

Finally, as has been mentioned, this bill would exempt tribal colleges from the 2-year wait-out period required under title III part A. Again, we have a small number of institutions; but we want to make sure that this money is available to the institutions that most need it, a small number of institutions and perhaps a small number of Americans. But I believe the ripple effect in the area surrounding these institutions will be enormous and help them realize the potential of the American dream.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, the 1998 amendments to the Higher Education Act require all institutions receiving funding under part A of title III to wait 2 years after their 5-year grant expires to apply for an additional grant. We created this wait-out period to maximize fundings to institutions receiving funds under title III. This wait-out period applies only to tribal colleges, universities and Alaska-native and native Hawaiian-serving institutions. Without eliminating this wait-out requirement, there will be a situation in which Federal grant dollars are available but no tribal colleges, universities and Alaska-native and Hawaiian-serving institutions would be eligible to apply because of the small number of these institutions that exist.

I strongly urge my colleagues to support this bill so that these institutions can continue to provide the very high quality education to their students.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER).

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this member is pleased to be a cosponsor of H.R. 3629, the American Indian Tribal Colleges Universities Improvement Act. I commend the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GREEN) for introducing this legislation and the committee for bringing it to the floor.

This is almost orphan legislation. There are too few members unfortunately that pay attention to Native American issues and certainly to tribal college issues. So I am particularly pleased that the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GREEN) has taken this initiative. The committee has brought it to the floor. People like the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), always active on Native American issues, are supporting it, as I would always expect him to be supporting it.

Tribal colleges and universities do play a critical and important role in

providing postsecondary education opportunities for American Indians. These colleges are among the youngest, poorest, and smallest group of institutions of higher education in the United States.

As mentioned by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GREEN), these 32 tribal colleges in the United States serve over 25,000 students. They are severely underfunded. There are two tribal colleges located in the first congressional district in Nebraska, the Nebraska Indian Community College and the Little Priest Tribal College. These two young colleges work with very limited resources to provide educational opportunities where none existed before.

Native Americans in Nebraska already have benefited from the services provided and the education offered by these institutions. This legislation, as we have heard, makes important technical corrections to the Higher Education Act title III strengthening institutions provisions.

This Member would focus on three that seem particularly important to my Native American constituents. First, the bill simplifies the application process. As we heard, it puts all colleges on equal footing regardless of age, size, or level of development.

Second, it directs the Secretary of Education to ensure equitable distribution of funding to the maximum number of tribal colleges possible.

Third, this measure exempts tribal colleges from the 2-year wait-out period now required under title III as mentioned by both the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GREEN) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

These three changes simply give tribal colleges the same application procedures now allowed for historically black colleges and universities in this country. Therefore, it is equitable. It is needed.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, this Member strongly urges his colleagues to support H.R. 3629.

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, as an original cosponsor, I rise in support of H.R. 3629, Representative MARK GREEN's bill to make technical corrections to Sections 316 and 317 of Title III of the Higher Education Act with respect to Tribal Colleges and Alaska Native and Native Hawaiian-serving institutions. Title III provides grant funds to post-secondary institutions for improving academic programs, management and fiscal operations, and the use of technology, which was something I strongly supported during reauthorization of the Higher Education Act. Funding is targeted to institutions that enroll large proportions of financially disadvantaged students and have low per-student expenditures.

In Nebraska, our two fully accredited tribal colleges—Little Priest Tribal College in Winnebago, Nebraska, and Nebraska Indian Community College in Niobrara and Macy, Nebraska, will benefit from this bill. Major challenges face tribal colleges and their communities, and these schools could use all the support they can get for their important work.

H.R. 3629 helps by authorizing several technical changes that have no cost implications. The first technical change requires the Secretary of Education to simplify the grant application process for a limited number of institutions eligible for funds under Section 316 and Section 317. If the process is simplified, and institutions don't need to hire expensive grant writers, it will be possible for more of the poorer institutions to apply for assistance.

The second, and perhaps more important change, will allow institutions to apply immediately for a new grant after the expiration of the prior grant. Under current law, an institution receives a grant for a five-year period and then must wait two years after the expiration of the grant before applying for another grant.

Based on the funding available and the limited number of institutions eligible for the program, there is no need for a wait-out period. By removing this restriction, funds for institutional development can go to the maximum number of institutions that submit a qualified application.

H.R. 3629 makes small but significant changes in the Higher Education Act. The bill should have the unanimous support of the House.

Mr. MARTINEZ. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional speakers, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, 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 California (Mr. MCKEON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3629, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCKEON. 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. 3629, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Wanda Evan, one of his secretaries.

1600

SUPPORTING A NATIONAL CHARTER SCHOOLS WEEK

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 310) supporting a National Charter Schools Week.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 310

Whereas charter schools are public schools authorized by a designated public body and operating on the principles of accountability, parent flexibility, choice, and autonomy;

Whereas in exchange for the flexibility and autonomy given to charter schools, they are held accountable by their sponsors for improving student achievement and for their financial and other operations;

Whereas 36 States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico have passed laws authorizing charter schools;

Whereas 35 States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico will have received more than $350 million in grants from the Federal Government by the end of the current fiscal year for planning, startup, and implementation of charter schools since their authorization in 1994 under title X, part C of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8061 et seq.);

Whereas 32 States, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico are serving approximately 350,000 students in more than 1,700 charter schools during the 1999 to 2000 school year;

Whereas charter schools can be vehicles both for improving student achievement for students who attend them and for stimulating change and improvement in all public schools and benefitting all public school students;

Whereas charter schools in many States serve significant numbers of students with lower income, students of color, and students with disabilities;

Whereas the Charter Schools Expansion Act of 1998 (Public Law 105–278) amended the Federal grant program for charter schools authorized by title X, part C of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8061 et seq.) to strengthen accountability provisions at the Federal, State, and local levels to ensure that charter public schools are of high quality and are truly accountable to the public;

Whereas 7 of 10 charter schools report having a waiting list;

Whereas students in charter schools nationwide have similar demographic characteristics as students in all public schools;

Whereas charter schools have enjoyed broad bipartisan support from the Administration, the Congress, State governors and legislatures, educators, and parents across the Nation; and

Whereas charter schools are laboratories of reform and serve as models of how to educate children as effectively as possible: Now, therefore, be it

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

(1) the Congress acknowledges and commends the charter school movement for its contribution to improving our Nation's public school system; and

(2) it is the sense of the Congress that—

(A) a National Charter Schools Week should be established; and

(B) the President should issue a proclamation calling on the people of the United States to conduct appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities to demonstrate support for charter schools in communities throughout the Nation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) each will control 20 minutes.

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

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I reserve my time.

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

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

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) for giving me the courtesy of going first.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman and my friend from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) noted, I introduced H. Con. Res. 310, which is a resolution supporting a National Charter Schools Week. It is also a bipartisan resolution introduced by myself, but with the support of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), the gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN), the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SANCHEZ), the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI), and others. So we are acting in the best spirit of this House in trying to go forward with a bipartisan resolution on charter schools.

Mr. Speaker, Mark Twain once said that there is a big difference between using the right word and the almost right word, like the difference between ''lightning'' and a ''lightning bug.'' There is a big difference there, just as there is a requirement as we approach public education today in America that we have the right ideas; the right reforms; the right bold, creative initiatives to help move this country in public education forward in this brand new century. Charter schools are part of that right reform and right-now idea.

This National Charter Schools Week seeks to recognize the many accomplishments of charter schools around the country. Seven out of ten charter schools currently have waiting lists.

I also joined in 1998 with the gentleman from California (Mr. RIGGS), to draft a bill that was signed into law to strengthen the accountability provisions, to provide even new support for charter schools around the country.

Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss if I did not recognize the role that President Clinton and Secretary Riley have played in supporting this innovative new idea of charter schools. In 1994 there were less than a dozen charter schools through the whole Nation. In 1999, there are over 1,700 charter schools, and we will probably have over 3,000 charter schools by the year 2002.

Charter schools in many States serve significant numbers of students with lower incomes, students of color, students with disabilities. They are not schools that attempt to cream the best students or cherry pick the best students; they are public schools that attempt to educate in innovative new ways all of the available students.

Mr. Speaker, I think one of the big areas we have seen progress in for charter schools, and I will give a example, to dismiss one of the myths about charter schools, is that we recently had a hearing on the growth of charter schools in our Subcommittee on Education last month. We had Irene Sumida, the Director of Instruction at the Fenton Avenue Charter School in California, testify before the committee. Her school has a population in which about 84 percent of the students are identified as Title I students, meaning many of the poorest students. Sixty-four percent of the students at Fenton are limited English proficient. Ninety percent of the students qualify for free and reduced meals. Eighty-one percent are Hispanic, 14 percent African American. That is the demographics and the composition of the Fenton school.

Since they have been chartered, since they have public school choice, since they have more parental flexibility, here are some of the astounding results that we have seen in that charter school.

Fenton had the highest rate of gain in student attendance of all the schools in the Los Angeles Unified School District, the highest rate of gain in student attendance of all schools in the L.A. Unified School District. A great accomplishment.

Parental participation has increased from a handful of parents attending school meetings to over 400 parents a week, 400 parents a week utilizing Fenton's Family Center to participate in that inner-city school.

Then, you might say, what about the academics? On the California Test of Basic Skills, the number of students scoring at or above the 50th percentile has increased by 383 percent in reading, 253 percent in mathematics, and 280 percent in language.

When we talk about, Mr. Speaker, new ideas, and my constituents at home in Indiana want us to come up with new ideas for public education, it is probably the most important issue to my constituents today, they also want, secondly, better accountability of our schools, better quality in our schools, better achievement from the students. When you get those first two components, thirdly, they are willing to put more resources in to our public schools.

So when you see the results of the Fenton Avenue Charter School in California, which is one example of many of the 1,700 charter schools across the country, you can see why charter schools are part of the reform effort of public school choice in America, of new ideas, of helping all students achieve, regardless of where they live, regardless of income, regardless of color, regardless of religion, charter schools can be part of that effort. So that is one of the reasons that we have targeted and I have introduced this National Charter Schools Week, to provide more information and more knowledge about what charter schools can do.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me conclude and simply say this: In America today, and I spent the last 2 weeks going door-to-door, farm-to-farm, factory-to-factory, back home in Indiana, in the north central part of the State, education is the most important issue to our parents. We do not have a more important issue in America today than investing in our children, making sure they have a good public education system.

At the same time, we are going through a technological revolution in America, maybe more significant than the agricultural revolution or the industrial revolution. We must make sure that our public schools are ready and equipped with the technology and the computers, and that we do not have a huge digital divide between rich and poor in access to this technology.

Thirdly, our businesses everywhere are saying we need more workers. We have a 2.5 percent unemployment rate in northern Indiana and our businesses are saying, across the board, public education reform is part of the effort to get us more workers.

So, for these three reasons, parental involvement, the most important issue in America today; secondly, the technological revolution; thirdly, the businesses need more workers, we bring this charter school resolution before the floor today, in a bipartisan way, with bipartisan support, and we hope that we continue to see a lot of support from Congress, from the Republican and Democratic side, for more resources for start-up costs of more charter schools across the country, and we hope to work with the Committee on Appropriations to achieve that objective.

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

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. TERRY), and, pending that, I ask unanimous consent that the time I control be controlled by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO).

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I stand before you in support of the National Charter Schools Week. Thirty-six states and the District of Columbia currently allow charter schools to operate. Nearly 1,700 charter schools around the country are open, serving some 433,000 children. They have become an increasingly popular alternative among educators and local communities concerned about the effectiveness of traditional standards of public education. It provides alternatives for parents.

We are here to celebrate those States that have adopted that, those 37, but my hope is that it also sheds light on the 13 States, such as mine, Nebraska, that have yet to pass effective charter school legislation. So my State is not able to stand with President Clinton and celebrate charter schools. This is truly a bipartisan issue.

I got a letter just a few weeks ago from some parents in my district whose child was having difficulty learning in his home school, especially reading, under the traditional methods, and they had to send their child to a private school that would have met all the criteria of a traditional public charter school. Now, this is why for those 13 States we need to really heighten the discussion about why we need charter schools. Yet for all these parents in my district, with the needs for their children, the Nebraska legislature has refused to provide charter schools as an option for our students.

Political leaders from both sides of the aisle here today, from top to bottom, from President Clinton to local districts, openly embrace this new concept. I am hopeful that in the next legislative session legislators in Nebraska will make it a priority, bringing our school children in our State the type of educational reform supported by parents, educators, and politically elected officials alike.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI).

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

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to speak in support of this bill which commends the charter school movement for its contribution to improving our Nation's public schools. I have been a supporter of the charter school movement since 1992, when former Representatives McCurdy and Penny and I introduced the Public Schools Redefinition Act of 1992. This bill was based on legislation introduced the previous year by Senators Durenberger of Minnesota and LIEBERMAN of Connecticut. That was the very beginning of Congressional efforts to encourage charter schools.

I am delighted to say that the bipartisan efforts of a handful of dedicated individuals resulted in the subsequent creation by Congress of a Federal public charter schools program in 1994. Later, the Charter School Expansion Act of 1998 revised the public charter school statute by, among other things, increasing its authorization and giving priority for grants to states, providing charter schools with financial autonomy.

We should remember that the charter school movement is a true grassroots movement. It is a movement that was started in the early 1990's by worried parents and frustrated teachers who were sick and tired of the status quo, sick and tired of battling the bureaucracy that strangles educational innovation, and sick and tired of seeing their children wallow in mediocrity and, in some cases, in failure.

It is, therefore, important to keep in mind that Congress should shy away from federally prescribing requirements such as teacher certification. According to the Charter Friends National Network, ''More than two-thirds of the states—with more than 80 percent of the charters—currently have some degree of flexibility in allowing use of teacher qualifications other than traditional certification.''

Any attempt to apply a teacher certification mandate to charter schools would jeopardize their very nature, which is based on autonomy in exchange for academic excellence.

In my State of Wisconsin, I am proud to say we have a strong charter school and school choice program, particularly in the City of Milwaukee, where we have the prominent support of our Governor and other education reform-minded individuals, such as former School Superintendent Howard Fuller and Milwaukee Mayor John Norquist.

1615

Mr. Speaker, the bottom line is that charter schools work. They work because they are free from burdensome regulations; and in return, they are held accountable for academic results. I want to commend the gentleman from Indiana for introducing this resolution; I thank him for the opportunity to speak in support of this measure. I urge all of my colleagues to sport and promote this week as the national charter school week.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DEMINT).

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. Speaker, imagine an educated America where all children get a world-class education and the opportunity to achieve their dreams. Can we imagine a great school in every community for every child, or the best and brightest teaching our children? How about graduating 95 percent of high school seniors and enabling every willing child to receive a higher education. That is our dream for education, and that is why we believe so strongly in charter schools.

Charter schools are springing up throughout the Nation as innovative minds create new ways to offer students a quality education that meets their individual needs. Why do charter schools work? Because they are public schools which receive public support, but they are free from the red tape and the bureaucracy which hinders the success of so many of our schools in the public education system.

Charter schools allow folks who care about their community to bring their ideas together and to create new ways of educating our children. At present, there are over 1,700 charter schools around the Nation, and 10 of these are in my home State of South Carolina. It is my dream and goal to help charter schools flourish in South Carolina, to revitalize our education system.

Today, I rise to praise an excellent charter school in my district which opened its doors last fall, the Greenville Technical Charter High School. This charter high school does an outstanding job of integrating solid academics with a project-based learning curriculum which allows students to experience hands-on learning. Greenville Tech Charter School has over 50 percent of parents participating in various committees and support groups. Schools that are accountable to parents produce a better education product for their students.

The business community has rallied around this new school; and the students from this school have, in turn, returned tremendous contributions to the Greenville community by logging over 1,500 hours of community service. The Greenville Tech Charter High School addresses the needs of a diverse student body. There are currently 100 9th and 100 10th graders enrolled in this school. Twenty-five percent are classified as special education students and 32 percent qualify for free or reduced lunch.

I am proud to say that Greenville Tech Charter High School is creatively tackling the challenges of providing students of many backgrounds the opportunity to receive a superior academically challenging education. This strong education will launch these students into higher education or to success in the working world. Is that not what we all want, educated children who excel in an ever-changing world?

We may have different ideas how to get there, but let us not dispute the fact that charter schools are helping lead the way in making America an educated and prosperous Nation.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BURR).

Mr. BURR of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding me this time.

Let me take this opportunity to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) for their hard work on this issue. The fact is that education should be bipartisan. Every minute that we talk about education, we should spend looking for those new ideas that the gentleman from Indiana talked about, those ideas that affect our children, the children in this country.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to stand before my colleagues today as a sponsor of this legislation, this small token, a resolution to create recognition for the success of charter schools. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, North Carolina is a participant in the charter school program. This year we ranked 11th out of the 37 States, so we have a great deal of success in this. North Carolina permits 100 charter schools to be created. Currently we have 75 schools chartered and up and running; and I believe this year, 20 additional schools will be added. One that has been tremendously successful is the kindergartners at Healthy Start Academy in Durham, North Carolina. They achieved an average test score in the 99th percentile for reading and the 97th percentile for math. What an amazing statistic, given that just about all of the children at that school are eligible for the Federal free lunch program and come from low-income families.

What does this resolution do? Quite simply, it recognizes the success of new ideas, the success of people willing to put politics away and to let policy take over. In North Carolina alone, let me share with my colleagues some brief successes, some things that will happen this week. The America Renaissance Charter School in Statesville, North Carolina, is celebrating this week with a proclamation from the mayor, positive news articles, and National Charter School Week logo shirts. In Raleigh, North Carolina, at SARC Academy, the teachers there plan to go and meet with the general assembly members as our short session of the general assembly starts. In Chapel Hill where Village Charter School is, those students have been invited to a special performance of the University of North Carolina's Opera Work Shop just for the charter school kids.

Mr. Speaker, this is a week that we ought to be proud of, a week that complements the work of this body, and really the creativity and the passion of the American people. I hope every State has the opportunity in the future to introduce charter schools to their communities; and I hope that this Congress stays focused on the bipartisanship that we approached this issue with. I thank the chairman and the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER) for their great success.

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

I want to wrap up on my side by thanking the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BURR), a friend of mine, for his kind comments. He is absolutely right, that what we need to do in this Congress and for this country is to try to work in bipartisan ways, with new ideas, with accountability, with increased quality, with better resources and improved public education in America today. Today, with this resolution that I have introduced, I give a lot of credit to the bipartisan nature today that we have achieved. I hope it continues into the future, and I too want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), the chairman of our committee; and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI), the second ranking member on the Republican side, for their help and sponsorship. I want to thank on my side the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) and the gentleman from California (Mr. MARTINEZ) and others for their help. I want to particularly thank the new Democrats, the gentleman from California (Mr. DOOLEY) and the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SANCHEZ) and a host of other new Democrats that have been very supportive of the whole initiative to start charter schools across the country and support them from a policy perspective.

Mr. Speaker, I would conclude and say again, thanks to my colleagues for the spirit that we see today, the spirit of bipartisanship. I hope it can continue into the Elementary Secondary Education Reauthorization Act. We will be bringing that vote to the floor soon. It was not particularly bipartisan in committee, and I hope we can rekindle the bipartisanship that we saw in the first part of the bill on title I, where an amendment that I offered on increasing the resources and the quality for title I kids, the poorest kids in America; and we were able to get a number of Republicans on to support that amendment and increase title I resources by $1.5 billion, $1.5 billion. When we can increase the quality of a program, we also might look at increasing the resources and quality of that program.

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

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA).

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Colorado for yielding me this time. I also would like to applaud the work of our colleague on the other side of the aisle, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), on his strong support for the charter school movement.

I think what we are talking about today is we are talking about an aspect of the total package of public education; not pointing this out and saying this is the best version of public education, but recognizing that this is a reform in public education that ought to be highlighted, as well as reinforcing the solid public education that has gone on in this country day after day, year after year, for so many years. I want to make sure that our constituents recognize that this is an aspect of the total package of public education that is offered to our children around the country.

This resolution commends the charter school movement for its contribution to improving our Nation's public education system. Charter schools have made tremendous progress in improving and reforming public education. Reports show that parental satisfaction is high, students are eager to learn, teachers and administrators are free from bureaucratic red tape, and more dollars are getting to the classroom. As these innovations and these improvements are highlighted through the charter school movement, we also see that a number of our other public schools are asking for the same kind of freedom and the same kind of relief from bureaucratic red tape, so that as we learn through the charter school movement about reforms and changes that can help public education, I am hopeful that the people who are administering the rest of public education or the legislators take a look at it and say, these things are helping our kids, let us take some of these reforms and let us move them into all of public education.

That is why charter schools in many cases are being seen as the force that is driving change in schools around the country. Parents are given new choice for their children, and other schools have responded by increasing emphasis on parental involvement and high academic standards. That has been going on. But I think also what has been happening is that the charter school movement has been accelerating this pace in certain of our schools. Charter schools have an unprecedented amount of accountability to parents, school board members, and State governments. A school can be closed if it does not do its job and if it does not improve student performance. This method of accountability is spreading to traditional public schools and to the Federal education program.

In the State of Michigan we have 173 charter schools, educating more than 50,000 students. More than 70 percent of these schools have waiting lists. This clearly indicates the success of charter schools in these communities and the desire on the part of parents to have more options in public education. Charter schools represent reform; they represent innovation in public education. I hope all of my colleagues will join me in honoring them and also recognizing the work of all public schools for their important contributions to educating our kids and that they will do that by supporting this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I look forward to the important comments that my colleague, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO), will now make.

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

I too wish to commend the gentleman from Indiana for his work on this resolution. It is an incredibly important advance that this Nation is observing in the entire area of educational improvement. I certainly am in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 310, which acknowledges and commends the charter school movement for its contribution to improving our Nation's public school system and calls for National Charter Schools Week to be established.

As a former public school teacher at Drake Middle School in Colorado and as the Secretary of Education's regional representative in both the Reagan and Bush administration, I have firsthand experience in the trials and tribulations of teaching in the public school system in general. I also had the opportunity just recently, just over the break, to visit two charter schools in Colorado in my district; and it was a pleasure to be there and see how these schools are operating. One has been around since charter schools started in Colorado and Colorado was one of the first States in the Nation to have a charter school law on the books, and they are doing very well.

1630

They are doing very well.

I have also seen the results on the other side of inflicting the many unfunded mandates on our Nation's public schools and believe the charter

school movement is a direct result of the desire for parents to increase their involvement and control over their children's education.

New charter schools have swept the country to the point of including 35 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico, and represent a clear change in how education is disseminated across this great Nation. There are nearly 1,700 charter schools across the country serving almost 400,000 children.

Laboratories of learning are being established from coast to coast and the common denominator between them all is the staunch desire for local hands-on control by parents and teachers. From ''back to basic'' schools in Arizona to ''magnet programs'' in Colorado and even ''outcome-based education'' programs, they are all proving that there is not just one way to teach.

This resolution supporting National Charter Schools Week must be used as a means of celebrating true diversity. Diversity in education, diversity in learning, diversity in thought.

I would like to point out some of the results of Colorado's Charter School Program. In reading proficiency, the charter schools are at least 10 percentage points above the State average. In writing proficiency, they are significantly above the State average in both the fourth grade and seventh grade levels.

While performance is not yet what it should be in the charter schools, they have proven to produce a significant increase in proficiency, resulting in a minimum 10 percent advantage over the average of the entire State. These same results can be found all across the country when charter schools and schools of choice are made available as an option.

We will recall that 10 percent is the difference between two full letter grades in most schools. It takes students from average to above average and there is no better way to enhance self-esteem than to earn better grades.

Mr. Speaker, I have here an article on Colorado's charter schools which appeared in the April 4 edition of the Colorado Springs Gazette; an article on charter schools which appeared in the April 12 edition of The Hill; and a briefing paper entitled, ''How Washington Can Really Help Charter Schools,'' prepared by the Lexington Institute. I would like to submit all three of these into the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I also have a list of States with laws supporting the implementation of charter schools and the strengths and weaknesses of each charter school program, and I will submit those for the RECORD as well.

Supporting National Charter Schools Week lends credence to the proclamation that not everyone thinks alike and not everyone learns alike. Combined with the Charter Schools Expansion Act from the 105th Congress, it acknowledges the success of thinking out of the box by supporting and commending those communities who have chosen to take control of their own destiny.

Mr. Speaker, I should also say there are attempts whenever we have something good happening in education, there is somebody out there that is going to try and stop it. And we have to make sure that the U.S. Department of Education and State departments of education throughout the Nation do not take advantage of the options they have in regulating State bureaucracies and State charter schools to try and stop it.

[From the Colorado Springs Gazette, Apr. 4, 2000]

COLORADO CHARTER SCHOOLS AREN'T PERFECT, BUT THEY GET THE JOB DONE

(By Robert Holland)

A recent report from the U.S. Department of Education documented the phenomenal growth of charter schools. But it took a state-level evaluation in Colorado to show how these largely autonomous public schools can work at their best.

The federal Department of Education reported that 421 charter schools opened in the 12 months before September 1999—a 40 percent jump, the sharpest increase yet. In all, more than 1,700 charter schools have come into existence since 1991, and they serve a quarter of a million students. Organizers receive exemption from many bureaucratic rules in exchange for a written pledge that they will deliver academic results.

In Colorado, charter schools clearly are living up to that promise. On average, charter students were scoring 10 to 16 percentage points above statewide averages, and three-fourths of charter schools also were out-performing their home districts and schools with comparable demographic profiles.

Colorado is a hotbed of activism for school choice. Were it not for the vigorous ongoing advocacy of private-school vouchers by business leaders like Steve Schuck and political leaders like Rep. Tom Tancredo, R-Colo., it is doubtful that the public school establishment would be embracing charters nearly as ardently. Charters don't provide a full range of educational choice, but they are a start.

The Colorado Education Department evaluated 51 charter schools that had been in operation at least two years. These schools constituted 3.3 percent of Colorado's public schools and served 13,000 students (1.9 percent of total enrollment).

The Core Knowledge curriculum developed by University of Virginia English professor E.D. Hirsch Jr., a prominent critic of the school-of-education mentality, was by far the most popular model among Colorado charter organizers. Twenty-two of the 51 schools used Core Knowledge. And the study shows that their confidence was not misplaced: According to the study, 14 of them ''exceeded the expectations set for their performance,'' and the other eight ''generally met'' the expectations.

On the whole the evaluators found the charter schools ''enjoy striking (some times extraordinary) levels of parent involvement,'' a factor universally valued as an ingredient in school success. As for reasons, the evaluators said that being able to seek out the school best for their child gave parents ''a greater sense of commitment'' to the school. In addition, parents appreciated that their schools welcomed their involvement and created opportunities for their participation.

Here are comparisons of the proportions of students who scored ''proficient'' or higher on the Colorado Student Assessment Program:

Third-grade reading: 77 percent of charter students; state average, 67 percent.

Fourth-grade reading: 73 percent of charter students, state average, 59 percent.

Fourth-grade writing: 49 percent of charter students, state average, 34 percent.

Seventh-grade reading: 66 percent of charter students, state average, 56 percent.

Seventh-grade writing: 57 percent of charter students; state average, 41 percent.

The charters exhibited a kind of diversity that is sometimes overlooked: They ''were diverse in size, educational programs, educational philosophies, approach to governance, and assessment strategies. The diversity met the intent of the Colorado Charter Schools Act to offer new educational options to students and their parents.''

In the wake of distressing outbreaks of violence at large schools, many educators are calling for a return to small schools. Colorado's charter schools fill the bill: Only 6 percent of the charters had more than 500 students, while 51 percent enrolled fewer than 200 pupils.

How much of a hand do parents have? Consider: Parents were represented on the governing boards of 90 percent of charter schools, and in 34 of the 47 charters reporting the composition of their boards, parents held a majority of seats.

[From The Hill, Apr. 12, 2000]

CHARTER SCHOOLS, SCHOOL CHOICE GAIN BIPARTISAN STEAM

(By Robert Holland and Don Soifer)

Creating charter schools as a way to foster family choice and competition within public education is an idea gaining a bipartisan head of steam on Capitol Hill.

But taking the next big step—tax credits or vouchers that could extend parental choice to private schools, as the G.I. Bill and Pell Grants do for college students—remains largely a Republican cause, with defections by ''moderate'' GOP lawmakers and threatened vetoes by President Clinton posing formidable obstacles.

Charter schools are a not-to-be-sneezed-at response, though, to education consumers' desire for more choices than a government monopoly typically will allow.

Their phenomenal growth from one school in Minnesota in 1991 to more than 1,700 nationwide today has been the hottest education story of the past decade. Entrepreneurs who organize charter schools get exemptions from stifling bureaucratic rules in exchange for a promise they will deliver academic results.

The biggest obstacle facing charter-school organizers is securing necessary financing for safe and functional facilities. With that concern eased, charters likely would pose even more of a competitive challenge to orthodox public schools. To address the facilities crunch, Rep. Heather Wilson (R-N.M.) in March introduced the Charter School Financing Act of 2000.

Through the Small Business Administration, the bill would distribute $600 million for FY2001 in federal loan guarantees to eligible charter schools. Congress likely will have no more important piece of charter-school legislation before it this year. (The charter section of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act [ESEA] was reauthorized in 1998.)

The concept of providing tax advantages to parents who put money in Education Savings Accounts (ESA) to facilitate their totally free choice of schools has not yet gained nearly as much traction as charter schools.

On March 2, the Senate passed, 61–37, an ESA bill sponsored by Paul Coverdell (R–Ga.) and Robert Torricelli (D–N.J.). However, on the House side, a revolt in late March by 15

''moderate'' Republicans may have killed ESAs for this session.

Still alive, though facing an almost-certain Clinton veto, is the idea of letting federal aid follow needy children to a school of the family's choosing. ''Portability'' received a significant boost when the Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions passed it as an amendment to the ESEA offered by Sen. Judd Gregg (R–N.H.).

His measure would permit up to 10 states and 20 school districts to disburse their Title I aid in the name of individual needy children, and the money would go with the child to whatever public school the parents or guardians chose. Eventually, the choice could be extended to private schools also.

Despite expenditures of more than $130 billion since Title I was passed 35 yeas ago in the heyday of President Johnson's War on Poverty, numerous federal evaluations have shown the massive has had little or no impact on closing the achievement gap for underprivileged children. Gregg voiced the hope that portability will create a competition to serve these children that will boost results.

Even in bilingual education, long a captive of special interests, elements of parental choice are catching on.

The Senate is about to take up House-passed reforms, proposed by House Education Committee Chairman Bill Goodling (R–Pa.) and Arizona Rep. Matt Salmon (R), that would require school districts to obtain informed parental consent before placing children in bilingual programs.

They also would eliminate the current rule mandating that at least 75 percent of federal bilingual dollars be spent to support instruction in students' non-English native languages, with the remainder reserved for ironically termed ''alternative'' programs—that is, classes teaching English, in English.

Republican Sens. Coverdell and Jon Kyl of Arizona are among those championing parental consent and notification provisions like those passed in the House.

Connecticut Democrat Joseph Lieberman also has a plan that would include sweeping bilingual education reforms, such as mandating that teachers of English learners be fluent in English and placing a three-year limit on federally funded bilingual programs.

Many parents new to this country have found that public schools have consigned their children to a kind of linguistic ghetto rather than teaching them promptly the language of jobs and citizenship. Bilingual reform can give the most humble parents the clout to change that.

[From the Lexington Institute, Issue Brief, Apr. 14, 2000]

HOW WASHINGTON CAN REALLY HELP CHARTER SCHOOLS

(By Don Soifer, Executive Vice President)

Charter schools' extraordinary growth—from one school in Minnesota in 1991 to over 1,700 nationwide today—may well be America's biggest education success story of the past decade. In Arizona one in six public schools is a charter school. In North Carolina, Michigan and elsewhere urban charter schools are bringing choice and accountability to families unaccustomed with either. ''When we look back on the 1990s,'' First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton proclaimed to the National Education Association's 1999 national convention, ''the charter school movement may well be one of the ways we have turned around the entire public education system.''

With the President's most recent call for a further dramatic increase in the number of charter schools, and with charters at or near the top of many education reform agendas, it seems that Washington expects to play an increasing role in this unfolding story. The critical task will be to foster the development of charter schools without interfering in their effectiveness.

These proposed federal remedies address many, though certainly not all, of the most formidable challenges facing the nation's charter school entrepreneurs. But they are just that, federal remedies, to advance a movement that is intrinsically local. Many charter school leaders argue that the best thing the federal government can do to cultivate their movement is to stay away while local education providers and state policymakers lay the essential groundwork. The threat of federal over-regulation looms large for charter schools, as revealed by recent intrusions by the Department of Justice's Civil Rights Division.

So how can Washington really help charter schools? The following policy recommendations were written with the guidance of charter school experts and leaders from around the country.

Require states to provide charter schools with their per-pupil share of Title I and other federal funding streams within months of the school's startup. The current process often takes a full year to get these funds to charter schools and can require state officials to engage in shaky guesswork—all at the expense of our most at-risk children.

Increase availability of financing for facilities, frequently the greatest obstacle facing charter school entrepreneurs. Safe and functional housing for charter schools can be hardest to find in urban areas where their mission is most vital. Financing opportunities, low-cost or otherwise, are often just as scarce. Second-hand facilities, perhaps those which previously housed public schools, post offices, or downsized military bases, could provide excellent homes for charter schools if available. Representative Heather Wilson's proposed Charter School Financing Act addresses this crunch by distributing $600 million in federal loan guarantees to charter schools for facilities through the Small Business Administration.

Reallocate to the states the 5 percent of federal charter school funding currently set aside for the U.S. Department of Education to pursue ''national activities'' such as research and dissemination of information. Putting the money in states' hands would enable them to directly address financing or other practical issues.

Protect charter schools' flexibility from rigid teacher-certification requirements. The Clinton Administration boasts of its pro-charter agenda, claiming credit for the remarkable growth of charter schools during its tenure. But the rigid teacher-certification requirements in its current Elementary and Secondary Education Act reauthorization proposal threaten one of charter schools' most vital characteristics—the ability to hire effective teachers with real-world experience outside of traditional teacher-preparation schools and union-embraced professional development. Such a mandate could render futile the autonomy crucial to charter schools' success.

Offer grants beyond the first 3 years of a charter school's existence. This is enough time for some charters to gain necessary traction, but not others. Grants of 5–6 years would also provide successful charter schools with the boost to expand to meet an even greater need.

Ensure that only states with charter school laws on the books receive federal charter school funding. States that produce more charter schools deserve more federal charter school dollars. It is essential that charter school policy decisions should made at the state level. Sending federal funds to non-charter school states does more than just lessen their impact—it provides Washington bureaucrats with a vehicle to circumvent state laws.

Encourage startup grants which foster for-profit organization partnering with local groups. Arizona, which hosts the nation's most mature charter school movement, has a wide range of innovative private-sector funding sources and approaches. Officials there are quick to acknowledge that many of the state's best charter schools are run by, or through partnerships with, for-profit entities. In much the same spirit as enterprise zones that helped reinvigorate inner cities during the 1980s and 90s, private-sector leadership for the charter school movement can bring critical education growth to the urban settings where the need is most urgent.

With so much momentum on the side of America's charter schools, many in Washington, D.C. understandably want to get involved. Some, like Massachusetts Senator John Kerry, have called for making every public school in America a charter school. But as the charter school movement grows rapidly beyond its infancy, Washington must maintain the right middle ground between neglect and smothering. It will be a difficult balancing act.

[From the Center for Education Reform, Apr. 28, 2000]

MAKING SCHOOLS WORK BETTER FOR ALL CHILDREN

CHARTER SCHOOL HIGHLIGHTS AND STATISTICS

There are 37 charter school laws in the United States, Nearly 1,700 charter schools opened this fall in 31 states and the District of Columbia, serving over 400,000 students.

New Charter School States (Currently Unranked): Oklahoma (1999), Oregon (1999)

Charter School States That Have Strong to Medium Strength Laws (23): Arizona (1994), California (1992), Colorado (1993), Connecticut (1996), Delaware (1995), District of Columbia (1996), Florida (1996), Illinois (1996), Louisiana (1995), Massachusetts (1993), Michigan (1993), Minnesota (1991), Missouri (1998), New Hampshire (1995), New Jersey (1996), New York (1998), North Carolina (1996), Ohio (1997), Pennsylvania (1997), South Carolina (1996), Texas (1995), Utah (1998), Wisconsin (1993).

Charter School States That Have Weak Laws (12): Alaska (1995), Arkansas (1995), Georgia (1993), Hawaii (1994), Idaho (1998), Kansas (1994), Mississippi (1997), Nevada (1997), New Mexico (1993), Rhode Island (1995), Virginia (1998), Wyoming (1995).

CHARTER SCHOOLS IN OPERATION, 1999–2000 SCHOOL YEAR

State (year law passed)	*Total opened*
Alaska ('95)	17
Arizona ('94)	352
Arkansas ('95)	0
California ('92)	239
Colorado ('93)	65
Connecticut ('96)	16
Delaware ('95)	5
District of Columbia ('96)	31
Florida ('96)	111
Georgia ('93)	32
Hawaii ('94)	2
Idaho ('98)	8
Illinois ('94)	19
Kansas ('95)	15
Louisiana ('95)	17
Massachusetts ('93)	39
Michigan ('93)	173
Minnesota ('91)	59
Mississippi ('97)	1
Missouri ('98)	18
Nevada ('97)	5
New Hampshire ('95)	0
New Jersey ('96)	46

	Total opened
New Mexico ('93)	3
New York ('98)	7
North Carolina ('96)	75
Ohio ('97)	49
Oklahoma ('99)	0
Oregon ('99)	4
Pennsylvania ('97)	47
Rhode Island ('95)	2
South Carolina ('96)	8
Texas ('95)	167
Utah ('98)	3
Virginia ('98)	0
Wisconsin ('93)	55
Wyoming ('95)	0
Nationwide total	1689

This information has been compiled through state departments of education and charter school resource centers. In some instances, however, there may be slight discrepancies.

For more information, see CER's overview of current *charter school laws,* including state-by-state *rankings of charter school laws* and 32-point *legislative profiles* of each state's charter provisions.

Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), the honorable chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker I ask unanimous consent to reclaim 2 minutes of the time that I yielded back in order that I may also yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), so that the chairman of the committee would have more than 2 minutes to speak.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate all of the brave parents and pioneering educators who have taken part in the charter school movement over the last 9 years, and I certainly want to congratulate those who are here today promoting this legislation. There is no question that their commitment to educating our Nation's youth has made all the difference in the world to thousands of children.

About 7 month ago, I had the privilege of seeing a successful charter school in action when I visited Edison Friendship Public Charter School here in D.C. I will tell my colleagues, it was a privilege. It was a privilege because, number one, the school had just celebrated its first anniversary and during that year, student test scores had doubled. And number two, the parents of the students were actively engaged.

Mr. Speaker, these students have to get to that school on their own. There is no transportation provided. The parents must, of course, sign in relationship to discipline, and must sign in relationship to checking homework to make sure that as a matter of fact the homework is being done. The parents of the students were very actively engaged.

In fact, children are learning in charter schools in some 32 States all across the country. They are learning because, by their very nature, charter schools are free from burdensome rules and regulations and because charter schools increase parental involvement by promoting choice in public education. In exchange for this freedom, charter schools are held accountable. If they do not do the job, they cease to exist.

I firmly believe that it is this do-or-die mentality that empowers students, parents, and teachers alike to perform at a high level. It is this do-or-die mentality this has made the charter school movement so successful, and it is this do-or-die mentality in the name of education that I applaud here today.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all of my fellow colleagues to support H. Con. Res. 310, ''Supporting a National Charter Schools Week,'' which commends the charter school movement for its contribution to improving our Nation's public school system. And improve it we must, because at the present time, we are losing probably 50 percent of our students each year who will never have an opportunity to get a piece of the American dream because they will not be prepared to do it.

We will be voting in the near future again to increase the number who come in from other countries to do our high-tech work. We need to prepare our own to do that.

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, in recognition of "National Charter Schools Week," May 1–5, and in support of H. Con. Res. 310, I rise to acknowledge and congratulate the phenomenal growth and success of charter schools in the United States and the remarkable success they have achieved. Colorado charter schools, I am particularly pleased to report, are among the nation's leaders when it comes to academic performance, parental satisfaction and accountability.

According to a recent study by the Colorado Department of Education (CDE), charter school students significantly outperformed state and local district averages in reading and writing. Other indicators, including parent satisfaction and participation, were also very positive. As the proud parent of three children attending Liberty Common School, a charter school in Fort Collins, Colorado in the Poudre School District, and one of the 51 Colorado charter schools participating in the CDE study, I can attest to the fact that charter schools work, are a catalyst for improvement in our nation's schools, and are in great demand across the country.

On this celebration of charter schools, I hereby submit a letter by Dr. Kathryn Knox, headmaster of Liberty Common School, on her experience testifying before the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigation of the Committee on Education on the success and challenges facing charter schools. Mr. Speaker, it clearly and persuasively addressed the opportunities and challenges facing charter schools today.

NOTES FROM DR. KNOX: WASHINGTON, D.C. TESTIMONY

The question was asked, ''Where were you the two days prior to Spring Break?'' Though it would have been fun to say, ''I was in Hawaii,'' actually, something else more important happened. I had the wonderful opportunity to be part of a bipartisan hearing on charter schools in Washington, D.C. for the Congressional subcommittee on Education and the Workforce. Four of us from different parts of the nation were invited. My colleagues on the panel were Ms. Sumida from Fenton Charter School in California (a district school that had become a charter school by choice, and one in which all continuing teachers resigned from the union in order to form a charter); Ms. Salcido from the Cesar Chavez Charter High School in Washington, D.C. (high population of at-risk students), and Mr. Schroeder from the Charter Friends Network in Minnesota. The chair of the committee was Representative Peter Hoekstra, and the bipartisan representatives were Congressman Bob Schaffer and Congressman Tim Roemer. I was honored to be able to present, with this panel, information about charter successes and challenges and respond to what the federal government was doing to help or hinder charter schools. In addition to the presentation at the Rayburn House, our testimony was taped by CSPAN and broadcast to about 9 million people, so we had the benefit of high visibility for Liberty across the nation. I thought Liberty parents would like to hear a bit about this experience. There were several questions from the members for which I will summarize a response.

Ms. Salcido noted some characteristics of charter schools which we all agreed on including freedom of choice, accountability for results, high standards for all involved in the school, doing away with bureaucracy, supporting innovation and a team-building spirit. Our common goal is to retain our autonomy and clear responsibility to the students, while obtaining fair funding and support of equal capital financing opportunities for the children's sake. Equal capital funding continues to be a challenge for most charter schools. At Liberty, for example, though we officially have 95% of per pupil operating revenue, if the building costs, maintenance, grounds, custodial costs, etc., are subtracted, and into the equation are added the lack of access to other revenue sources including capital reserve funds, mill levy funds, public bond monies, and even vehicle licensing fees, Liberty is operating on about 73% of each dollar given to other public schools.

The Department of Education will have a budget exceeding $120 BILLION, and though we all want equality in funding, and want accountability for results, we don't want strings attached that allow subtle and increasing federal direction and control of local schools. The momentum for charter schools comes locally, and culture is positively different in a good charter school because of the local control. For one example of this: In our case, we received a substantial grant last year from the federal government. Later, we were told that because we had received and accepted federal monies, we had to eliminate our first-come/first-served waiting list and replace it with a lottery. Our charter states that we would hold slots for at-risk students to increase our socioeconomic diversity, but a lottery precludes this desire to reach a more diverse population.

The question about whether teachers feel professional or not in charter schools is responded to by considering the current reality of government-monopoly schooling. Under union contracts, all teachers are treated the

same and paid the same, and after a few years, are allowed to remain whether they are doing an excellent job or not. Prior to the three-year tenure period, teachers are often fired or simply laid off after a year in a school, depending on factors including current financing or the number of tenured teachers at a certain level of salary. In good charter schools, some teachers rise to the top as in any enterprise and should be paid more for their extra work, training, and professional responsibility. Teamwork, trustworthiness and collegiality are required for the development of a good school culture in which all teachers are involved in promoting the entire vision and mission of the school. The current paradigm of separation and isolation must be changed, and negative influences must be able to be removed from the enterprise so that student achievement and collegial teamwork is not hindered. Charter schools allow excellent teachers to develop skills and talents for the good of the students and the school. The entrepreneurial spirit is alive and well for the good of students at Liberty and the whole school. Parent concerns and ideas are also valued here, and parents should always feel welcome to participate actively in the school.

The question about accountability and whether the state should have the ability to shut down a charter school if the school were not performing well, was expanded by Congressman Schaffer, who noted that the few charter schools that have closed may not have responded well to their client's needs and charter expectations, and that is a good thing, but that interestingly, other public schools that are not performing well are not similarly challenged to keep their doors open, but rather often receive MORE financing and help.

Overall, the hearing was fruitful and an opportunity included sharing information about Liberty's successes and challenges, in written form with 125 people, while responding to questions publicly. I am very grateful for this greater visibility for our wonderful school, and very grateful for each of your ideas, time, commitment and care.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 310, the resolution that honors National Charter Schools Week and commends the charter school movement for its contribution to improving our Nation's public school system.

Charter schools have been instrumental in demonstrating that accountability and innovation work together to improve our Nation's schools. This is because of the special agreement that these schools make with their state agency or local school board. The agreement is simple: the school is allowed to determine the best way to provide a quality education and, in exchange, it must produce results.

Charter schools have demonstrated that achievements can be made when local school districts are given the flexibility to shape their education programs in ways that work best for their teachers and students. Of course, in allowing flexibility, charter schools must produce real, accountable results.

And that is the bottom line—results.

In fact, an overwhelming majority of the initial reports on charter schools have demonstrated that charter schools are achieving their academic goals. But not only are academic results promising. Reports show that parental satisfaction is high, students are eager to learn, teachers are enjoying teaching again, administrators are set-free from administrative red-tape, and more dollars are getting to the classroom.

I am not here today to only tout the successes of individual charter schools. The Public Charter Schools Program has a purpose greater than just creating new schools. The larger purpose of this program is to create a dynamic for change and improvement in our public school system. In the eight years since the first charter school opened its doors, we have seen the benefit that charter schools have had for the education system as a whole. Reports have found that wherever large numbers of charter schools are clustered, system-wide academic improvement has been accelerated.

Let us take a lesson from the charter schools experience that local flexibility and accountability are essential elements in the formula of successful schools.

The federal government has invested over $120 billion in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. We have spent all of that money and can't say definitively that it has led to an increase in academic achievement. We must do something to ensure that the hard-earned money of the American people is spent wisely. Charter schools provide evidence that we should emphasize local flexibility and accountability in our federal education reforms.

The bottom line is that charter schools work because they are freed from burdensome regulations and held accountable for academic results. I commend these schools for their innovation in achieving academic results and for the contribution they have made to our nation's public school system. As we move forward in reforming our federal education programs, let us not forget the lessons learned from the charter schools experience.

Mr. TANCREDO. 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 Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 310.

The question was taken.

Mr. ROEMER. 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.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Con. Res. 310.

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

There was no objection.

PERODIC REPORT ON NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO SIGNIFICANT NARCOTICS TRAFFICKERS CENTERED IN COLOMBIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 106–232)

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

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA), 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), I transmit herewith a 6-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to significant narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia that was declared in Executive Order 12978 of October 21, 1995.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 2, 2000.*

COMMUNICATION FROM CHIEF OF STAFF OF HON. JAMES A. TRAFICANT, JR., MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from Paul P. Marcone, Chief of Staff for the Honorable James A. Traficant, Jr., Member of Congress.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, April 13, 2000.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House that I have received a subpoena for testimony before the grand jury issued by the United States District Court for the Northern District of Ohio.

Sincerely,

PAUL P. MARCONE.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 38 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6 p.m.

1803

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS) at 6 o'clock and 3 minutes 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 of the first two motions 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. Con. Res. 300, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 2932, by the yeas and nays.

Proceedings on S. 1744, H.R. 1509, and H. Con. Res. 310 will resume on Wednesday, May 3.

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

RECOGNIZING AND COMMENDING FEDERAL WORKFORCE FOR SUCCESSFULLY ADDRESSING YEAR 2000 COMPUTER CHALLENGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 300.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 300, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 409, nays 0, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 131]

YEAS—409

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth-Hage
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ose
Owens
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Vento
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—25

Brady (TX)
Carson
Coburn
Cook
Ford
Gutierrez
Istook
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCollum
McIntosh
McIntyre
Myrick
Ortiz
Oxley
Saxton
Sessions
Souder
Sweeney
Tauzin
Velazquez
Visclosky
Weldon (FL)
Wise
Young (AK)

1826

Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE, Ms. WOOLSEY and Mr. JONES of North Carolina changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to advise the Members on both sides of the aisle that due to the fact that all the work that we have planned for this week is progressing so nicely, I can now tell Members that we should complete our work by midafternoon on Thursday; and, therefore, we will not be here Friday for votes.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time for the electronic vote on the additional motion to suspend the rules on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

GOLDEN SPIKE/CROSSROADS OF THE WEST NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill H.R. 2932, 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 Utah (Mr. HANSEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2932, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 400, nays 9, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 132]

YEAS—400

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings

Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
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
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ose
Owens
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Vento
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (FL)

NAYS—9

Campbell
Chenoweth-Hage
Coble
Largent
Miller, Gary
Paul
Royce
Sanford
Schaffer

NOT VOTING—25

Carson
Coburn
Cook
Ford
Gutierrez
Istook
Kilpatrick
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCollum
McIntosh
McIntyre
Myrick
Ortiz
Oxley
Rangel
Sessions
Souder
Sweeney
Tauzin
Velazquez
Visclosky
Weldon (FL)
Wise
Young (AK)

1837

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title was amended so as to read: ''A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study of the Golden Spike/Crossroads of the West National Heritage Area Study Area and to establish the Crossroads of the West Historic District in the State of Utah.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained today, May 2, 2000. If I had been present for rollcall No. 131, I would have voted ''yea.'' If I had been present for rollcall No. 132, I would have voted ''yea.''

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. DIAZ-BALART, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106–600) on the resolution (H. Res. 482) providing for the consideration of motions to suspend the rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 673, FLORIDA KEYS WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS ACT OF 2000

Mr. DIAZ-BALART, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106–601) on the resolution (H. Res. 483) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 673) to authorize the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to make grants to the Florida Keys Aqueduct Authority and other appropriate agencies for the purpose of improving water quality throughout the marine ecosystem of the Florida Keys, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2957, LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN BASIN RESTORATION ACT

Mr. DIAZ-BALART, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106–602) on the resolution (H. Res. 484) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2957) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to authorize funding to carry out certain water quality restoration projects for Lake Pontchartrain Basin, Louisiana, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1106, ALTERNATIVE WATER SOURCES ACT OF 1999

Mr. DIAZ-BALART, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106–603) on the resolution (H. Res. 485) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1106) to authorize the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to make grants to State agencies with responsibility for water source development for the purpose of maximizing available water supply and protecting the environment through the development of alternative water sources, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). 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.

AMERICAN AND MEXICAN TRUCK DRIVERS ARE CASUALTIES OF NAFTA

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

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to recognize two often-overlooked groups of people who have been innocent casualties of NAFTA, American and Mexican truck drivers. While I have repeated time and time again that American truckers will be forced to compete with their unregulated and underpaid counterparts south of the border, Mexican truck drivers are often overlooked casualties. But the truth is that NAFTA and its evil minions have forced Mexican truck drivers to work 1, 2 and even 3 days straight to get their goods to the U.S.-Mexican border.

The Mexican Government is one of the accomplices. Even though Canacar, the Mexican trucking association, has asked for 5 more years before the border is opened to unlimited truck hauling, the Mexican Government continually demands that the border be open

immediately. Canacar admits that the Mexican truck fleet is old and in general disrepair, and neither the fleet nor its crews are safely ready to compete with newer American trucks and its rested drivers.

So why does the Mexican Government continue to push for the cross-border opening? Because the Mexican Government does not seem to care much about its own citizens. Right now, the Mexican economic system forces truck operators to drive days on end, and, as reported in a story by the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, most of these drivers are often fueled by narcotics. Mexican truck drivers freely admit that they would prepare for long hauls with beer, marijuana, pills, and cocaine.

According to one driver, ''You must not eat too much meat on a long run, because it will make you sleepy and then you need more cocaine.'' Clearly, these drivers are sleep deprived.

As another driver, Juan Alvarez, put it, ''The biggest problem is lack of sleep. I just drove 36 hours straight. Sometimes I get 6 to 12 hours off between loads.'' Juan does this for $500 for every 15 days that he drives.

The Mexican Government and its company-sponsored union have forced these drivers into this predicament. Unlike American drivers, Mexican drivers have no right to speak freely or bargain collectively. They know little about the specifics of the NAFTA treaty, and their government likes it that way.

So this brings us back to the American truck drivers, who would be unfairly forced to compete against Mexican truck drivers that are treated with indifference by their own government. But American truckers realize that the Mexican truck drivers are not treated as people by their government; and that, simply put, is not the fault of Mexican truck drivers. It is the Mexican system that is at fault. It is our fault for entering into a treaty with a country that has a completely different socio-economic and labor-management structure than ours.

Thankfully, President Clinton did not open up the borders, as NAFTA called for, on January 1, 2000. Because if he did, we would have thousands of these sleep-deprived Mexican truckers driving all over our highways and byways throughout this Nation endangering other truckers and motorists on the road.

1845

In fact, many Mexican trucks and their drivers have already been found illegally in States throughout the United States of America. Most likely because their government tells them little about our current law.

Clearly, President Clinton made the right decision by keeping the border closed. For the sake of all American truckers' jobs and the safety of the American public, let us hope it stays that way for a long, long time.

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

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

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

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

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

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

IN MEMORY OF EVANDER S. SIMPSON

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

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, tonight I rise to pay homage to Evander S. Simpson of Smithfield, North Carolina, who died on April 27 after a long and fruitful life. His passing has removed from North Carolina's Second Congressional District a giant of community service, a leader of humanity, and a man who has left the world immeasurably better than he found it.

The death of Evander Simpson leaves a void that will not soon be filled. Mr. Simpson was a member of what Tom Brokaw called ''The Greatest Generation.'' Those were the men and women who went off collectively to save the world when World War II was thrust upon them. And it was they who, when the war was over, joined in joyous and short-lived celebrations, then immediately began the task of rebuilding their lives and the world that they wanted.

Brokaw's description certainly fits the life of Evander Simpson. Born in 1914 in Sampson County to a father who served for 35 years as a teacher and principal, his future and career direction was foreordained. Mr. Simpson attended the University of North Carolina, eventually receiving a bachelor's degree, a master's degree, and an advanced certificate for school administration from that institution. By the age of 24, Evander had become principal of Newton Grove High School.

World War II intervened; and Mr. Simpson, then serving as Secretary to the Committee on Education in the U.S. House of Representatives, volunteered for the Navy, answering the call, as Tom Brokaw said, ''to help save the world from the two most powerful ruthless and military machines ever assembled, instruments of conquest in the hands of fascist maniacs.'' Mr. Simpson served as a gunnery officer in action in the Arctic and in both the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans.

With the end of the war, Mr. Simpson came home to North Carolina, and for the next 3 years worked at North Carolina State University counseling the thousands of Tar Heel veterans who were flooding into our colleges and universities determined to make up for the time that they had lost while they were off fighting the war. A position as a high school principal followed, but in 1951 Mr. Simpson was appointed superintendent of Johnston County schools, a position which he would hold for 29 years and that would define the rest of his life and leave an indelible impression on the people of Johnston County and North Carolina.

Evander Simpson and Johnston County's schools were at the heart of the county's progress over those 29 years. Eighteen schools were consolidated into five. Accreditation for all schools in the country from the State Department of Public Instruction and the Southern Association of Schools was obtained. Teacher pay supplements were established, kindergarten programs were established county wide, and Mr. Simpson was deeply involved in the establishment of the Johnston County Community College. Mr. Simpson earned a reputation of being one of the top school superintendents in the nation during those years.

An indefatigable man whose devotion to his county was legendary, Evander found time to serve 14 years on the Board of Trustees of the University of North Carolina, to serve as president of the North Carolina Education Association, to serve for 30 years on the Johnston County Board of Health, and to serve for six years on the board of the University of North Carolina at Wilmington.

Mr. Simpson was a Paul Harris Fellow in Rotary International, a member of the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and the Chamber of Commerce. That organization awarded him its Distinguished Citizen Award in 1969. He was a deacon, Sunday school superintendent, and Brooks Bible Class teacher for more than 35 years at Smithfield First Baptist Church.

No man has ever loved his country and its history more than Evander Simpson. Johnston County residents know that his every speech would include references to the great documents of this Nation. A speech to veterans might include George Washington's prayer on his inauguration as President. A speech to a civic club would include a reference to the Declaration of Independence or Lincoln's Gettysburg address, both of which he could recite to memory. The great speeches of history were fodder for his mill, including the great inaugural speech by President Kennedy, ''Ask not what your country can do for you, ask what you can do for your country.''

Generations of Johnston County individuals were influenced by the great good of Evander Simpson. He believed in the innate goodness of men and women, that people of good will could

find acceptable answers to any problem, that the spiritual needs of humanity must be served, that planning for the future was preferable to lamenting of the failures of the past.

The great sportswriter Grantland Rice could have had Evander Simpson in mind when he wrote the following: ''For when the great scorer comes to mark against your name, he writes not that you won or lost but how you played the game.''

Evander Simpson played the game with dedication to God and his community. We who are left can only thank a kind providence that placed him along beside us on this highway of life.

I am also pleased this evening to say to this body that I am also placing with this speech a tribute to Evander Simpson read by Miss Carolyn G. Ennis at Mr. Simpson's funeral on April 30, 2000, and that tribute follows my remarks herewith, Mr. Speaker:

A MAN NAMED SIMPSON

(By Carolyn G. Ennis)

And God stepped out on space
And he looked around and said,
I'm lonely, I'll make me an educator.
So God made many teachers and principals.
And the young children were taught.
And the young children learned. And God said, ''That's good.''
And God said, I'm lonely still. I need a dynamic leader
A man who knows how to look like a banker,
How to act like a gentleman,
How to think like a politician,
And how to work from sunrise to midnight like a homegrown country farmer.
So God made many, many more educators,
But he was lonely still. And God said, ''I'll make me an
Excellent educator:
A man with vision, values, agility and versatility;
A professional man and Crusader with a pioneering spirit.
One whom the power of office will not spoil nor kill,
One who has a conscience and a will,
To do the right thing at the right time, the right way.
So God sat down by the side of the river
In a place called Sampson County.
With his head in his hand he thought and thought.
Then God said, ''I'll make make me an extra—special educator
—A superintendent for schools.
A man for consolidation, accreditation, and integration,
A man for providing sources and resources to develop
The best educational opportunities for all children and
For all teachers in Johnston County;
A man who will know how to ''command'' from his experience
In the military so others will learn how to march in unity
To the same drumbeat for excellence in education.
So God made this ''Educator of Excellence''.
And Johnston County, North Carolina, the United States of
America and the entire educational arena of the world
Have never been quite the same, since God created
Mr. Evander S. Simpson, who was and still is an extra-
Special, excellent educator. And God said, ''That's Good,''
And today, we echo again in fond memory of Mr. E. S. Simpson
Relections of your life to repeat. That's good

ON SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I first want to yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST).

TRIBUTE TO CORPORAL JOHN T. WEED

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. What I would like to do, Mr. Speaker, is to honor a young man who, 33 years ago on May 14, 1967, was a corpsman in the Navy, fought with the Marines in Vietnam, served his country extremely well, and on that particular date put his own life in danger to save my life while in an operation called ''Union'' in the northern part of South Vietnam.

That young man, who went to Vietnam in 1966, in November, stayed more than a year and not only served his country well, not only served the Marines very well, but he acted responsibly as an American and was a fine example of this country to that war-torn region and to the people.

That young man is with us today, Mr. Speaker. His name is John T. Weed from Texas. And I wanted to make this statement to salute his effort, his commitment, his courage, his grace, and his skill.

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

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me and for his patience.

I just talked to former Corporal John T. Weed, who is with us today, and the gentleman who took care of our good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST), when he was badly wounded in Vietnam as a Marine Corpsman.

But what he said, which the gentleman from Maryland did not say, was that, in fact, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST) saved his life twice. The gentleman from Maryland always manages to pass over that when he is talking about John Weed.

I have just had an opportunity to talk to him, and I have to agree with my colleague he is a great American, truly. And he mentioned another thing, and that is that the platoon sergeant, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCHREST), was the most stabilizing influence on his life as an 18-year-old trooper in the Marines.

So I wanted to add my two cents worth and add the rest of the story to the story told by the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I appreciate those announcements by my colleagues.

I have been working on Social Security for the last 5 years. I am very concerned that we are putting off tough decisions that are going to mean that we either, in the future, substantially raise social security taxes on workers or we cut benefits.

And we have done that before. In 1977, when we were short of Social Security funds to pay benefits, we both cut benefits and increased taxes. We did that again in 1983, when money was short in the Social Security Trust Fund. We again in that year cut benefits and raised taxes. So some people are suggesting that we add giant IOUs to the Social Security Trust Fund and assume that the Government is going to pay that money back at a later date.

Let me briefly review a pie chart that shows the budget of the United States for this year. As we can see, the bottom green pie is Social Security. It represents 20 percent of the total budget. Defense only represents 18 percent of the total budget. The 12 appropriation bills that we spend most of the year arguing about is even smaller than the Social Security budget, with 19 percent.

If we take all of the entitlement programs, it represents a little over half of the Federal budget. And here is what is projected by the Social Security Administration actuaries. They are suggesting that if we do nothing, social security taxes, taxes to cover our senior programs, will have to increase from the current 15-odd percent up to 40 percent within the next 38 years. That is if we do nothing. Two choices: either taxes are going to substantially be increased or benefits are going to have to be cut by over one-third.

That is why I think it is so appropriate in this presidential election year that we have an articulate discussion on how to save Social Security. I was disturbed last night when AL GORE started criticizing Governor Bush's proposal that he has not even made yet. So demagogueing this issue is not going to help come to a final solution. It is going to jeopardize being able to work together. Look, we are not going to do this unless Republicans and Democrats work together.

Here is a quick snapshot of the bleak future of Social Security. We have a short-term surplus coming in for the next 11 or 12 years on Social Security. After that we reach into somebody else's pocket to come up with the funds. The estimate from the actuaries is $120 trillion that we are going to be short in terms of our commitment to Social Security over and above what is coming in in taxes.

SHOOTING AT ZOO AND GUN SAFETY LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to welcome Members back and inform

Members, in case someone was off the planet last week, that Columbine came to the Nation's capital last week here where the Congress sits.

At a traditional kids' fun day at the National Zoo, created by the Congress for kids, seven children were shot. One, an 11-year-old boy, lies at Children's Hospital with a bullet in his head. He was the quintessential innocent victim. Harris ''Pappy'' Bates is a big baby of a boy, the kind one would expect to find at the zoo on Easter Monday. Very much still a child, a rotund kid who was named Pappy because he looked like a papoose when he was born.

His family had their first access to the press on Sunday. They thanked people for their prayers and they thanked the President for calling. They said they were praying for the 16-year-old suspect who was being held for the shooting. This family, I must say, gives real meaning to Christianity at a time when so many profess Christianity and speak only of vengeance. Pappy's mother said to me that she had always intended to be at the Million Moms March coming up on Mother's Day. She also said she supported gun safety legislation and always has.

Pappy Bates is one of 700 children killed by gunfire in the Nation's capital, children under 19, during the 1990s. But there have been 80,000 children killed by gunfire since 1978. The gun safety bill pending before us is only part of a very complex puzzle. The networks are in the puzzle, cable is in the puzzle, sports is in the puzzle, violent computer games is in the puzzle, and above all parents, who have the primary responsibility for children, are in the puzzle. We have to work to get all pieces on the table, and I want to work with Members on all pieces of the puzzle. But would we leave guns out of this puzzle?

We are so very close, my colleagues.

1900

Who would, after seeing what happened right here under the nose of the Capitol on Easter Monday, even think of leaving a loophole in the gun bill now stalled before us?

For all Americans, the average Americans, indeed 90 percent of Americans, the instant check will work. But according to the data, the 10 percent that we need 24 hours to look at are 20 times more likely to be criminals or people with a mental defect or people who otherwise should not have a gun.

It has been more than a year since the Columbine youth massacre. Not one more week, Mr. Speaker, not one more week after this week should pass, and certainly not after an 11-year-old lies with a bullet in his brain at Children's Hospital right here in the Nation's capital. Not after Columbine, which itself should have been all we needed, if we needed even that. Not after what had happened at the zoo.

I ask Members to come back with a new resolve to do what we almost have done. We are almost there. It has been difficult. Let us go the rest of the way. Do it for Pappy. But, above all, do it for the children in our districts.

U.S. NEEDS ADMINISTRATION THAT WILL DEAL WITH RUSSIA IN FAIR AND CONSISTENT MANNER ON ARMS CONTROL PROCESS

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

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, over the recess period, I had the occasion of interacting with over 50 senior Russian leaders from the equivalent of our Congress, the State Duma and the Federation Council.

I had the pleasure of meeting them at Columbia University at a conference. I spoke to 25 new Duma deputies at Harvard University and the John F. Kennedy School of Government. And just today, on the other side, we met for an ongoing conference between Senators and House Members and members of the Russian leadership.

The underlying concern expressed by the Russians with America is a lack of confidence in what our real intentions are. They say that oftentimes we will lead them down a path and then undermine what they thought were our ultimate intentions.

That is happening again, Mr. Speaker. We are all happy that the Russian Duma just recently ratified START II, in fact over the break. But, unfortunately, again this administration has led the Russians down a negative road.

Three years ago the administration negotiated substantive changes to the ABM Treaty involving multilateralizing the Treaty and demarcation between theater national missile defense systems.

As required by our Constitution, the administration should have been brought those changes to the Senate for their advice and consent. Repeatedly members of the Senate said, bring them forward, let us look at them and debate them; and repeatedly the administration failed to do that because they knew they did not have the votes to get them passed. So then they convinced the Russians to put those two items on the back of START II so the Senate would have to consider them as a part of the START II protocol issues.

Now we are going to again disappoint the Russians because the administration chose not to have a legitimate debate on those two protocols but rather have the Russians attach them to the START II treaty that they passed in Moscow just several weeks ago.

Mr. Speaker, when are we going to learn? To deal with the Russians, we have to be up front, candid, and consistent. The more games that we play, the more underhanded tactics when we cannot get issues resolved according to our Constitution, the more consternation and frustration it causes in our relationship with Russia.

Unfortunately, once again, the Russians will feel that we have let them down and that our word is not good. How tragic it is and how sad it is. We need an administration, Mr. Speaker, who will deal with Russia in a consistent, fair, and uphanded manner, not one that plays games on the arms control process.

TRIBUTE TO JENARD AND GAIL GROSS AND JEWISH WOMEN INTERNATIONAL

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Jenard and Gail Gross and the Jewish Women International. This is an important evening and an important week as I honor the Jewish Women International organization and my good friends, great Houstonians, great Texans and great Americans, Jenard and Gail Gross.

The Jewish Women International strengthens the lives of women, children, and families through education, advocacy, and action. Jewish Women International focuses on family violence and the emotional health of children on the local, national, and global level.

Jewish Women International spearheads activities to educate the Jewish community about domestic violence. Currently, more than 3,000 rabbis from all branches of Judaism have been alerted to the growing tide of family abuse and have learned how to recognize the signs of abuse in their congregation by reading the Resource Guide for Rabbis on Domestic Violence.

In particular, I would like to honor Gail and Jenard Gross for their unwavering support for Jewish Women International and their efforts involving the Prejudice Awareness Summit.

As we move into the 21st century, clearly the challenge for Americans, with all of our diversity, is to learn to live together in peace, to accept our diversity, to appreciate it, to applaud it. And if there ever are two individuals who applaud and appreciate diversity and live it every day, it is Gail and Jenard Gross.

The Prejudice Awareness Summit is an unprecedented opportunity for teams of students to have a positive interactive learning experience with peers from a variety of ethnic, cultural, racial, and economic backgrounds through one-day workshops on prejudice.

The Prejudice Awareness Summit educates our youth about prejudice by providing a comfortable forum to discuss issues of prejudice. With a thorough knowledge of stereotypes, exposure to powerful speakers, and interactive learning exercises, these students can become leaders in the battle against prejudice.

Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity today to participate in the President

and Mrs. Clinton's teenage summit. One of the points that was made is that we always encourage young people that they are the leaders of tomorrow. And one very eloquent speaker said, our young people are the leaders of today because. Because they are the leaders of today, we need to teach them and educate them to the value of diversity in living the opposition of prejudice.

America's cultural diversity enables our country to achieve great accomplishments. However, our diversity also causes much friction borne of ignorance. The Prejudice Awareness Summit will prepare our Nation's youth to become leaders in a country where diversity can be considered a blessing and not a source of division. The work of Gail and Jenard Gross on behalf of the Prejudice Awareness Summit does not go unnoticed.

On May 4, Jewish Women International will bestow the Good Heart Humanitarian Award on Gail and Jenard Gross. The Good Heart Humanitarian Award honors a member or members of the Houston community contributing to the goals of this organization. This award is presented annually to annually to recognize and pay tribute to outstanding members of the Houston community who have contributed to the humanitarian needs of Houston.

Previously, honorees have included outstanding contributors in the fields of education, health care, politics, the legal profession, the media, and exemplary members of Jewish Women International.

Gail Gross is a very spiritual person, a very humble person. She attributes much of her success to her commitment to meditation, spirituality and her wonderful marriage to her husband Jenard Gross. She is a local, national, an international humanitarian, a savvy businesswoman, and a scholar in numerous areas. She also has just received her doctorate in education. She is now Dr. Gail Gross.

Gail once stated that to her life has three parts: the first part devoted to education, which she has evidenced in her own career and profession; the second part dedicated to raising her children; and the third part, the time she currently devotes to service.

As vice president of Gross Investment/Builders, a real estate company started by her husband, she satisfies her yearning for professional excellence. However, her joy is to serve the Houston community. She does it now every week with her own radio program encouraging, listening, and teaching the community about the value of education of our young people. Whether serving on 24 boards, fundraising, or advocating on behalf of the voiceless, Gail is a shining example of genuine concern and generosity.

Jenard Gross has been in the building and real estate investment field since 1954. During this period he has built and owned more than 14,000 apartment units throughout Texas. He has built several small strip centers, developed a residential subdivision, and invested in land and mini-warehouses. Moreover, he is past president of the Houston Apartment Association and the National Apartment Association.

But he is also a builder for humanity. He has worked as a member of the Board of Regents of Texas Southern University Historically Black College, and he believes in housing those who need to be housed.

Mr. Speaker, as I conclude, Jeanard's business accomplishments are many, but his involvement in a number of civic and philanthropic organizations in the city of Houston are legendary.

Jenard and his wife Gail have always advocated for the voiceless. Many Houstonians have improved their lives due to the generosity and service of Gail and Jenard Gross. They are mighty and great, and I salute them and congratulate them for their great leadership.

I am reminded of a quote by Theodore Roosevelt, who stated:

> Far better it is to dare mighty things, to win glorious triumphs, even though checked with failure, than to take rank with those poor spirits who neither enjoy much nor suffer much, because they live in the gray twilight that knows not victory nor defeat.

Gail and Jenard are persons of action and have dared mighty things for Houston. For their love of Houston and its people we will be eternally grateful. I can think of no other best suited to receive the Good Heart Humanitarian Award and the respect of the American people.

WORLD BANK AIDS MARSHALL PLAN TRUST FUND ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, first I would like to thank my colleagues for allowing tonight's special order to be held to increase awareness of the AIDS epidemic which is really scourging Africa and many other developing nations throughout the world.

Sixty percent of the 16 million deaths, however, have been in sub-Saharan Africa as a result of AIDS.

I would also like to applaud the leadership and commitment of the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman LEACH) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE), the ranking member, of the House Committee on Banking, and also the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), our minority leader, for addressing this huge crises in Africa and throughout the world.

I believe that the diligence of the hearings and the markup held in March of this year on H.R. 3519, the World Bank AIDS Prevention Trust Fund Act, represents a necessary response to the urgency of the AIDS crisis in Africa.

The World Bank AIDS Marshall Plan Trust Fund Act represents the most effective bipartisan strategy to date possible to push this issue to the national forefront.

As we work to establish partnerships and relationships with African countries whether as health care experts, business persons, activists or policymakers, it is critical that we unite to focus both attention and resources on the global emergence of HIV and AIDS which wreaks havoc in developing countries, most tragically in sub-Saharan Africa.

I have worked very closely with my colleague and dear friend, Congressman RON DELLUMS, who served with distinction in this body for over 27 years. Congressman DELLUMS has been instrumental on focusing on this initiative and building constituent and congressional support to address the AIDS pandemic.

With his position as chair of the White House Council on AIDS and as president of the Constituency for Africa, he has engaged in consistent dialogue regarding this pandemic both here and within the United States. And I want to thank him for his remarkable contributions.

Tonight we have Members who will talk about this huge pandemic. We appreciate being allowed the hour of time.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from San Francisco, California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding. But more importantly, I thank her for her tremendous leadership and encouragement on calling to the attention of Congress and the country the global HIV/AIDS issue and working with our former colleague, Congressman RON DELLUMS, on this.

Mr. Speaker, it is really exasperating. For years we have known about the spread of global HIV and AIDS. For years Members of Congress have appealed to both Democratic and Republican administrations to put this issue on the agenda of the G–7.

What do they have to talk about that is more important than the health, or lack thereof, of millions of people in Africa and throughout the world? What has more of an impact on the economies of the developing world than the health of its people?

Now it is being considered a national security issue at long last. I commend the Clinton administration for making this very bold statement. Frankly, it is long overdue.

The extent of the global AIDS epidemic is staggering. Over 23 million people are infected with HIV in Africa, and nearly 14 million Africans have already died from AIDS. The social, economic, and human cost of the crisis is devastating entire nations. And this is just the beginning.

In Asia and India, India already has more infected people than any other nation. When I talk about Africa, I am talking about the continent. In terms of India, one nation, 3½ million infected people.

Experts are predicting that, without significant efforts to treat those with HIV and prevent new infections, the number of people living with HIV/AIDS in India could surpass the combined number of all cases in all African countries within two decades.

1915

We clearly have a long way to go. These numbers are staggering, but any single one of them is a tragedy and we should be motivated by it.

Think of all the orphans that this tragedy has produced. Some of those orphans are HIV infected as well; but even among those who are not, they have tremendous needs and, sadly, this was predictable.

We clearly have a long way to go. I am pleased that as a Nation we are finally beginning to focus more of our attention and resources on the global AIDS epidemic and that the National Security Council has declared HIV/AIDS to be a national security threat.

I just want to inject a word here about our colleague, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT), who has traveled the world on this issue since he came to Congress, which is nearly I think it is over a decade. So, again, this is no surprise and has been no secret. Even though there has been a great deal of denial about it, the problem has existed for a long time.

Many of us in Congress again have been working for years to draw attention to this crisis. We know sadly from our own experience, in my district in San Francisco when I came to Congress 13 years ago, 13,000 people had already died of AIDS in my district. Think of that, Mr. Speaker, if that had happened in your district, how intolerable it would be.

That is the only thing we should not tolerate in our society is the HIV rate that is among us.

Funding for prevention, education, treatment, and care must be increased dramatically and our commitment to the development of an AIDS vaccine must be strengthened.

In terms of our funding, we also have to think internationally. We have begged for the money that we have, about $147 million, and then another $16 million or so for orphans each year; but we need 10 times that to do our share globally in terms of HIV/AIDS.

I have introduced the Vaccines for the New Millennium Act in order to create incentives for private sector biotech and pharmaceutical companies to accelerate their research and development efforts for vaccines against HIV, tuberculosis, and malaria. Vaccines are the best hope to bring this epidemic under control.

It is about prevention. We must do all we can to facilitate cooperation between the public and private sectors in order to bring together the resources and expertise necessary to move quickly towards effective vaccines.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to again call to the attention of our colleague the incredible leadership, well, it is believable so I will just say the great leadership of our colleague, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), on this subject. She has made it a priority. She has developed legislation to meet this terrible challenge. She has not been shy about the amount of money that this is going to require, and she has been very, very bold as she has gone forth with this. She has provided great leadership for us because she has a vision about what she wants to accomplish. She has tremendous knowledge about the subject we are dealing with. She has a plan. She has a plan, a good plan, to attack the challenge; and she and her leadership is able to attract a great deal of support for this cause.

So on behalf of the many people in my district who have died of HIV and live with HIV and AIDS now, I want to commend her and thank her.

One final note is that this weekend I had the privilege of participating in the march on Washington that some of our colleagues were involved in, that we spoke to, the huge crowd, over 800,000 people; and one of the major issues on the agenda of the day was increased funding for HIV and AIDS.

What is important for us to do is with all of our research for a cure, which is very important, it must be relentless. Even though we have some proteas inhibitors that prolong and improve the quality of life, that those drugs must be available to everyone. We cannot say that we are not engaged in research but the cure only goes to the wealthy. The cure must be available across the board and across the world. So I hope that we will be thinking in ways that are new and different about this.

AIDS has been a model, really the mobilization, for support for research, care, and prevention. That mobilization in our country has been a model to other illnesses. Now the mobilization is on the international and national scene, and we must not any longer ignore it. Now that it has been declared a national security threat, at least there is the attention focused at the right level on it.

I would have hoped that compassion for the millions of people who are HIV infected would have been enough motivation, but we will take the help wherever we can get it. Again, I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for her leadership, for the rallying cry she has given; and we are all very, very pleased to follow her lead on this.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, let me just say thanks to my colleague, the gentlewoman from San Francisco, California (Ms. PELOSI), for her very strong support and also for her consistent work throughout the years on behalf of peace and security throughout the world. I thank her very much for everything that she does on behalf of all of our people, not only in the Bay Area but throughout the country and the world.

The gentlewoman mentioned the whole issue of orphans in Africa and the impact of the HIV/AIDS crisis on children. Last year I had the opportunity to participate in a presidential delegation to Africa and met with and witnessed some of the children who had been orphaned by AIDS, many who had the virus. We are told now that there are 7.8 million children in southern Africa alone who are orphaned as a result of AIDS; but by the year 2010, it is expected, if we do nothing, that there will be 40 million children orphaned by AIDS; and this number, 40 million, is the number of children in our entire public school system in the United States of America. Staggering numbers.

So I just want to thank all of the Members here tonight for helping us raise the level of awareness for the country to really understand the tremendous serious implications of what this whole virus presents to us.

Now I would like to yield to my colleague, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA), who has been very instrumental in helping us forge a bipartisan strategy to tackle this pandemic.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for her leadership on this issue and for yielding me the time and for arranging this special global HIV/AIDS special order; also my colleagues who are here and others who would like to be here who do support the concept of recognizing that, as the Clinton administration has, that worldwide AIDS crisis is a threat to the United States national security and that, in fact, it could topple foreign governments, touch off ethnic wars and reverse decades of work in building free-market democracies abroad.

This declaration correctly raises the focus on this epidemic, especially in Africa, which has been reported by CNN to be, quote, ''the worst health calamity since the Middle Ages and one likely to be even worse,'' unquote.

Statistics of the economic, social and personal devastation of the disease in sub-Saharan Africa are staggering. To mention some of them, 23.3 million of the 33.6 million people with AIDS worldwide reside in Africa; 3.8 million of the 5.6 million new HIV infections in 1999 occurred in Africa. African residents accounted for 85 percent of all AIDS-related deaths in 1999, and 10 million of the 13 million children orphaned by AIDS live in Africa.

Life expectancy in Africa is expected to plummet from 59 years to 45 years between the years of 2005 and 2010.

Now, many experts attribute the spread of the virus to a number of factors, including poverty, ignorance, costly treatments, lack of sex education and unsafe sexual practices. Some blame the transient nature of the workforce. Many men, needing to leave their families to drive trucks, work in

mines or on construction projects, engage in sex with commercial sex workers of whom an estimated 90 percent are HIV positive, and in addition many men go untested and unknowingly spread the virus.

Many of those infected cannot afford the potent combination of HIV treatments available in Western countries, and in some countries only 40 percent of the hospitals in some capital cities have access to basic drugs.

While efforts are continuing to find an AIDS vaccine, many experts fear that some African countries hardest hit by the epidemic lack the basic infrastructure to deliver the vaccine to those most in need.

More than 25 percent of working-age adults are estimated to carry the virus. Countries have lost 10 to 20 years of life expectancy due to this disease, and 80 percent of those dying from AIDS were between ages 20 and 50, which is the bulk of the African workforce.

As was mentioned by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), 40 million children will be orphaned by the disease by 2010. Many of these children will be forced to drop out of school to care for a dying parent or take care of younger children. Children themselves are being infected with the disease, many through maternal fetal transmission. And while drugs like AZT have been proven effective in reducing the risk of an HIV-positive mother infecting her newborn child, those drugs often are too costly for most nations.

Legislation has been introduced by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) which particularly target the tragedy in sub-Saharan Africa. However, it also addresses the worldwide AIDS crisis.

H.R. 3519, the World Bank AIDS Prevention Trust Fund Act, directs that the U.S. Government should seek the establishment of a new AIDS prevention trust fund at the World Bank. The bill authorizes U.S. contributions of $100 million a year for 5 years in hopes of leveraging that contribution to obtain contributions from other governments as well as the private sector to reach $1 billion a year. The proceeds of the trust fund would support AIDS education, prevention, treatment and vaccine development efforts in the world's poorest countries, particularly in sub-Saharan Africa.

The President has proposed $350 million to prevent the spread of AIDS around the world. Under the President's proposal, funding will be targeted where it is needed the most, in sub-Saharan Africa. The AIDS Marshall Plan fund for Africa will help to ensure that the Federal Government addresses this issue over the next several years. However, studies indicate that Africa is just the tip of the iceberg. New HIV and AIDS diagnosis are escalating in the Caribbean, Latin America, Asia, and the Balkans at alarming rates.

Now the United States is uniquely positioned to lead the world in the prevention and eradication of HIV and AIDS. The administration's request, the AIDS Marshall Plan fund for Africa, the World Bank AIDS Marshall Plan Trust Fund Act will provide the funding and the framework to respond to the AIDS pandemic in Africa and throughout the world.

I would also like to mention legislation I have introduced to enhance the research on microbicides which would enable and empower women to be able to have a barrier against sexually transmitted diseases and HIV and AIDS.

We can no longer afford to debate whether or not fighting global disease is simply an idealistic crusade. Instead, we must recognize the fact that it has clearly become a fiscal and national security imperative.

The good news is that the United States is taking action. The bad news is it is taking so long.

I conclude with a quote from a physician who directs AIDS prevention at the CDC and he said, ''Oh, yeah, it is very late but better late than never. You rarely get a second chance in an epidemic.''

I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) and the others who have gathered here tonight to focus on this important crisis so that we can do something to ameliorate it.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) for that very eloquent statement and for setting forth the case and bringing out more statistics as it relates to this pandemic, and also for her leadership on not only HIV/AIDS but also on health care issues in general for our country.

Let me also mention that as the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) indicated earlier, AIDS threatens economic security but also human life. It has been set forth in a Washington Post article, which I would like to put into the RECORD, from today. It is titled, ''AIDS is Declared Threat to Security. White House Fears Epidemic Could Destabilize the World.''

1930

HIV and AIDS in Africa has created also an economic crisis, crippling Africa's workforce in many areas and creating even greater economic instability where poverty is ever present. In many countries now, companies are hiring two and three persons, two and three employees to fill one job, because, of course, it is assumed that one or two will die of AIDS.

In the Republic of Congo, according to the National Intelligence Estimate, it indicates, this document indicates that the militias in Anglo and the democratic Republic of Congo show an HIV prevalence rate of 40 to 60 percent.

As the AIDS crisis grows, it will only exacerbate dangerous economic and political instability.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to yield now to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), my colleague who throughout his life has been a consistent supporter for justice and equality and health care for all throughout our world. I want to thank the gentleman for being with us tonight.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the World Bank AIDS Marshall Plan Trust Fund Act. I also want to take this opportunity to commend the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for the outstanding leadership that she is providing on this issue. As a matter of fact, I know that people were concerned when Representative Ron Dellums decided to retire, but they knew that they had someone waiting in the wings ready to take over and take charge and to follow along with some of the tremendous work that he started, and I certainly want to commend Ron, even though not being a current Member of Congress, he is still providing valuable leadership on this issue throughout the world.

As the most developed Nation in the world, we have an obligation and a responsibility to share our technology and medical expertise with developing nations. As a matter of fact, I come from a school of thought which suggests that to those to whom much is given, much is expected in return; therefore, we have not only an opportunity, but also the responsibility to share the great wealth and the great resources of this Nation.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt once said that the test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much, it is whether we provide enough for those who have too little. And I submit to you tonight that the continent of Africa is being stripped of its most precious resource, its people.

Mr. Speaker, more than 11 million Africans have already died from AIDS since its inception; that represents more than 70 percent of the AIDS deaths worldwide. Another 23 million Africans are currently infected with HIV or AIDS.

In South Africa alone, it is estimated that there are more than 1,500 new HIV infections each and every day. We can no longer afford to sit back and do so little or in many instances do nothing about what is happening throughout the world.

HIV/AIDS is a threat, yes, to our national security, but it is also a threat to the security of the world community. I commend President Clinton for his recognition of that fact as we have seen an increase in the proposal of resources to deal with this problem, but those increases that have been proposed are not even enough.

AIDS has a major impact on our trade with Africa. The World Health Organization and other relief organizations were committed to ending this dreaded disease some time ago, but, more importantly, if we continue to do

nothing or little, eventually Africa will have a population of orphans that is unthinkable. Currently, more than 13 million children have lost one or both their parents to AIDS.

The statistics suggest that the number will reach 40 million by the year 2010. Yes, we now have an opportunity, because we had a Marshall Plan to rebuild Europe after the war. It is now time to apply the same principles, the same practices, the same techniques, the same tactics to help prevent the spread of HIV/AIDS in Africa.

Now, is the time for action. Each day that we wait, thousands more are subjected to HIV/AIDS infection. And I say to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), again, I am pleased to join with the gentlewoman and all of those who have come to call for a massive infusion of resources, similar to the Marshall Plan that we used after World War II. If we could do it then, with the strong economy that we are experiencing today there is nothing to prevent us from initiating and implementing this magnificent effort that the gentlewoman and others have put together to bring help, hope, and relief to our dying brothers and sisters in Africa, but also to our dying brothers and sisters in the American streets in every city, village, and hamlet of this Nation and throughout the world. I thank and commend the gentlewoman for her outstanding work.

Ms. LEE. I thank the gentleman. And I want to thank my colleague from Illinois for his very eloquent remarks and his kind remarks and also for bringing clarity to not only this issue but so many of the tough issues which we deal with here in the United States Congress. I also thank the gentleman for bringing this right back home, because this is a global pandemic which we are dealing with. I thank the gentleman for participating with us.

I would like to yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), a colleague who has been really in the forefront challenging the pharmaceutical companies to do the right thing, by providing affordable drugs to those in need, not only in America, but throughout the world.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join my colleagues in thanking the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for being such an outstanding leader and outspoken person on the issue of the global AIDS crisis. It is a little bit hard to follow my colleague from Illinois and his eloquence and his beautiful voice, but I appreciate the opportunity to weigh in on this important issue.

I want to also express my continuing support for H.R. 3519, the World Bank AIDS Marshall Plan Trust Fund Act, which is sponsored by the gentlewoman from California and also the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services from Iowa, and I am very proud to be a cosponsor of that bill.

If enacted, H.R. 3519 would create a worldwide trust fund that is administered by the World Bank and funded by governments, the private sector, and international organizations. Nations would be able to receive grants from the trust fund to address the HIV/AIDS crisis. The bill would direct the United States to contribute $200 million a year, and I hope it stays at no less than $200 million, to the fund for 5 years, the hope being that U.S. contributions would help leverage contributions from others in the private sector and the international community.

Although the passage of this bill would be a significant victory in the battle against HIV/AIDS, it is a small drop in a very big bucket. It is estimated that about $10 billion would be needed to fight AIDS in Africa over the next 5 years, just to fight AIDS in Africa.

We must do much more if we want to seriously address the HIV/AIDS epidemic that is killing millions of people worldwide, and the United States has to lead the way. It is in our own best interests to do so, because HIV/AIDS knows no borders and it threatens the stability of the world, even more than conventional warfare.

I have been extremely concerned in the past by the actions of our government on this issue. While a number of important initiatives have been created and championed by the administration, and I do not want to diminish those, I yet was dismayed when I realized efforts by other nations were being blocked because of objections raised by the pharmaceutical industry and in turn by our government. These were efforts that would lower the cost of AIDS drugs by manufacturing generics or importing them at a lower cost. We saw our own government step in on the side of the pharmaceutical companies to prevent that.

I have been encouraged by recent comments by the administration that appear to reflect a policy change on this issue. I hope that I will not hear any more reports of our administration weighing in to prevent others from addressing their own national emergencies. I would hope that the United States would take advantage of every opportunity to help other nations address this crisis, including relinquishing to the World Trade Organization patents on AIDS drugs that are owned by the United States and were developed using our own taxpayer funds.

I commend the administration and National Security Council for the step taken this week in designating HIV/AIDS as a threat to our national security. Indeed, HIV/AIDS stands to threaten this Nation and others. I must say that I am truly surprised that there are individuals in our Congress who would disagree and contend that the AIDS pandemic is not a national security threat. I can only assume such individuals have not been paying attention or just do not want to face the facts.

We have been hearing a number of those facts. Let me add to those a few additional ones, and I think some bear reiterating.

AIDS is claiming more lives than all armed conflicts in the last century combined. Twelve million men, women, and children in Africa have already died of AIDS. Today in Africa, 5,500 people are buried daily because of AIDS, and that number is expected to more than double. AIDS is the leading cause of death in Africa, but also, and this is very important, among young adult African-American men in the United States as well. It is our problem.

Every day 11,000 people in Africa become infected, one every 8 seconds. According to the Director of the Office of National AIDS Policy, it is estimated that by 2005 there will be more than 100 million, 100 million, HIV/AIDS cases worldwide.

Today in sub-Saharan Africa, one-fifth to one-third of all children have already been orphaned by AIDS. We talked about the 40 million that within the next decade may become orphans. HIV/AIDS runs high among the world's militaries. The rapid loss of senior officers can mean destabilization for those nations where the military plays a central role.

It should be noted that the most effective means of halting the spread of AIDS in the developed or developing world is the use of effective prevention measures, including needle exchange programs and condom distribution, the kinds of efforts that, unfortunately, have been repeatedly opposed by the majority in this body.

I had the privilege of going with the President and other Members of Congress to India and met in New Delhi in a very poor neighborhood Naseem the barber, who was one of 10 barbers trained in New Delhi to not only deliver a shave and a haircut and the neighborhood gossip, but also information about AIDS prevention and a condom. This is a program that is funded in part by USAID, by American taxpayer dollars, and a good and important expenditure of funds.

Since the beginning of the epidemic, 410,800 people in the United States have died from AIDS. Today it is estimated that as many as 700,000 people in the United States have AIDS. We cannot be lulled or allow our children to become lulled into believing that the new drug cocktails, the protease inhibitors, have conquered the disease. Our policies cannot be driven by those who would say that the threat to our national security that AIDS poses does not exist or by those who would claim that it is simply a homosexual disease. It is not, it is a heterosexual disease as well. That is very important.

I was proud to join the Vice President and our Ambassador to the United Nations at a meeting of the United Nations Security Council in January. During that session the Security Council addressed the issue of HIV/AIDS in Africa. This marked the first time that the Security Council looked at a health

issue in the context of a threat to global security. The Vice President made the point that it is time for us to move beyond our classical definition of security.

We have all talked about the staggering statistics, but I want to just end by saying while I was honored to have the opportunity to attend that historic meeting, I left feeling even more unsettled than I expected. The fact that a United Nations panel considered the issue of AIDS in the form of a security meeting and our National Security Council has followed suit should be taken as both a move in the right direction for the international community as well as a serious wake-up call.

1945

We, the international community, are losing the fight currently against AIDS. This beast knows no borders, it does not discriminate by class, race, gender, or nationality. AIDS is not just a detriment to the health of humanity; it is a global security threat and should be addressed as such.

Again, I want to commend my colleague for her tireless effort on this issue and look forward to the passage of H.R. 3519 when it is considered by the entire House.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) for that very succinct and very profound statement and also for her consistent hard work on this issue and many others that we are dealing with here in the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to my colleague, the gentlewoman from Los Angeles, California (Ms. WATERS), whose life has been about fighting injustices wherever they may occur. She has taken the lead here in the United States Congress in terms of the whole HIV/AIDS pandemic, both here in the United States and abroad. The gentlewoman from California has been in the forefront of seeking peace and security on the continent of Africa.

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend my friend and colleague, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), for organizing tonight's Special Order on the HIV/AIDS crisis in Africa and for her general leadership on this issue. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) is providing the kind of leadership that has caused this Congress to finally focus on this crisis and on this epidemic. She is a Member of Congress that served on the staff of one of the most esteemed Members of Congress who is now retired, Congressman Ronald Dellums; and Congressman Dellums decided earlier this year that he was going to give priority time to this issue.

Even though he is away from Congress working in the private sector in the health care industry, he decided that this is the most important issue confronting the world today. So he uses most of his time now not only speaking with Members of Congress, the President of the United States, health organizations, pharmaceutical companies, the USTR. He has just about spoken with everyone imaginable that has the power to do anything about this issue. So as a result of the efforts of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), working along with Congressman Dellums and the rest of us, we are finally, I think, being heard on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to commend President Bill Clinton for recognizing the importance of United States support for international HIV/AIDS treatment and prevention programs. Earlier this year, the President requested an additional $100 million in funding for international HIV/AIDS treatment and prevention programs. These funds would be in addition to the $225 million that the United States is currently spending on these programs.

The impact of the HIV/AIDS epidemic on sub-Saharan Africa has been especially severe. Since the beginning of the epidemic, over 80 percent of all AIDS deaths have occurred in sub-Saharan Africa. By the end of 1999, there were an estimated 23.3 million people in sub-Saharan Africa living with HIV/AIDS. That is 70 percent of the total number of HIV-infected people worldwide. In sub-Saharan Africa, there are over 5,000 AIDS-related funerals per day.

HIV/AIDS treatment and prevention efforts in sub-Saharan Africa are complicated by poverty. Most Africans lack access to the most basic health care services and only the wealthiest people in Africa can afford HIV/AIDS medications and advancements in treatment therapies. Furthermore, high illiteracy rates combined with low levels of education funding have made prevention efforts more difficult.

Nevertheless, experience has proven that HIV/AIDS-prevention programs can make a substantial difference if the programs are funded sufficiently and implemented in an effective manner. Uganda in particular has implemented a highly successful program which has reduced HIV/AIDS infection rates by over 50 percent. I happen to have been in Uganda when I was on one of my trips to Africa with the President when he was there. I had an opportunity to visit the clinics and to talk with people and to understand how seriously they had taken this whole epidemic and how they were moving forward and providing leadership on the continent; and it is working and it shows. Senegal has also developed a successful HIV/AIDS prevention program. However, effective HIV/AIDS treatment and prevention programs cannot be expanded or implemented in other countries without substantial financial assistance from the international community.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3519, the World Bank AIDS Marshall Plan Trust Fund Act, was passed by the Committee on Banking and Financial Services on March 15 of this year by a bipartisan majority thanks to the leadership of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) and to our Chairman, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH). This legislation would direct the Secretary of the Treasury to enter into negotiations with the World Bank for the creation of a World Bank AIDS trust fund to provide grants to support HIV/AIDS treatment and prevention programs in less developed countries, and I am proud to be a cosponsor of this bill.

Now, during the Committee on Banking and Financial Services' consideration of H.R. 3519, I offered an amendment to the bill that increased the amount of funds authorized to be appropriated for payment to the World Bank AIDS trust fund from $100 million to $200 million per year. While $200 million is still only a small fraction of what is needed for HIV/AIDS programs, it would represent a significant commitment of financial resources by the United States and set an example for the international community.

Mr. Speaker, I know that at the time that I offered the amendment, our Chairman was a little bit worried, because this is a difficult issue; and at a time where we have competing interests and we have lots of needs here in this country, it is very difficult sometimes to get our Congress focused on a crisis like this someplace else. However, I feel that the crisis is of such proportions that we must be aggressive and we must be bold; and I still think $200 million is but a drop in the bucket. I am worried now, I am worried that when this bill is on the floor in a few days, that there will be an effort to reduce the amount back to $100 million because of the fear that it will not be passed if it is more than $100 million.

I would like to encourage support from my colleagues to keep the amount at $200 million. Let us not go backwards. Let us move forward, and let us stand up for what is right. I hope that the recent report that was put out by the CIA and others and the work that has been done now by the National Security Council identifying AIDS as a world threat to peace will help our people to understand that we cannot retreat. We must move forward. We cannot reduce the amount in this bill from $100 million to $200 million.

Mr. Speaker, I also offered another amendment that would allow the World Bank trust fund to provide technical assistance to countries to assist them in building the capacity to implement effective HIV/AIDS treatment and prevention programs. I am pleased to report that both of my amendments were passed by the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

The rest of the world does look to us for leadership, and I think there is one other area that we have got to be profoundly supportive of. I would just like to give a little background on that, if I may.

Most HIV/AIDS drug therapies are well beyond the reach, as I said, of all but the wealthiest elites in sub-Saharan Africa. Drug therapies that have

extended the lives of people living with HIV/AIDS in the United States and other developed countries would cost between $4,000 to $20,000 per person per year in sub-Saharan Africa. However, the gross national product per capita in sub-Saharan Africa is only $503 per year. If South Africa is excluded, the GNP per capita is only $308 per year. Furthermore, according to the World Bank, no sub-Saharan African countries spent more than $400 per person per year on health care between 1990 and 1995.

The agreement on trade-related aspects of intellectual property rights, known as TRIPS, is one of the international agreements enforced by the World Trade Organization. The TRIPS agreement allows corporations to benefit from patents over plants and medicines. Corporations use their patent rights to force developing countries to pay for the use of plants and medicines. In some cases, these plants and medicines were developed by indigenous people in developing countries who have been using them for hundreds of years. As a result of the TRIPS agreement, many people in developing countries have been denied lifesaving medicines because they cannot afford to pay for them.

In 1997, the South African government passed a law to make HIV/AIDS drugs more affordable and available for its people. This law allows the importation of commercial drugs from sources other than the manufacturers, a practice called parallel importing, and authorizes the South African government to license local companies to manufacture generic drugs, a practice called ''compulsory licensing.'' The U.S. pharmaceutical industry opposed this law and our own United States Trade Representative attempted to pressure South Africa not to implement it. Fortunately, USTR has recently announced in December of 1999 that it would be more flexible in its policies towards South Africa's situation.

The amendment that I would love to have had passed in my committee would have required the United States Government to encourage sub-Saharan African countries to develop policies to make HIV/AIDS medications available to their populations at affordable prices. It would also require the United States Government to encourage pharmaceutical companies to make HIV/AIDS medications available to the populations of these countries at affordable prices. More importantly, this amendment would direct the United States representative to the WTO to encourage the World Trade Organization to exempt sub-Saharan African countries from the TRIPS agreement and other international agreements that prohibit them from implementing laws that make HIV/AIDS medications available to their populations at affordable prices. This would allow countries such as South Africa to enact legislation to expand the availability and affordability of HIV/AIDS medicines without worrying about WTO challenges to their laws.

Mr. Speaker, access to affordable medicine is essential for sub-Saharan Africans living with HIV/AIDS. It should be the policy of the United States and the WTO to encourage policies that increase the availability and affordability of HIV/AIDS medicines in sub-Saharan Africa, not to challenge or oppose such policies.

Again, the rest of the world looks to the United States for leadership. It is essential that Congress pass the World Bank AIDS Marshall Plan Trust Fund Act that has been initiated and guided by my friend and colleague, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH); and it is equally essential that Congress fully fund the President's request for international HIV/AIDS treatment and prevention programs. Also, it is imperative that we do not pare back the $200 million that we adopted in the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, but rather support it and move forward in a very proud way to join with other leaders in the world, some countries much smaller than ours who are doing more to deal with this crisis than we are doing. I am convinced we can do that.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from California for her very profound statement and also for once again speaking the truth and for making sure that this Congress and administration is challenged to step up to the plate to provide adequate resources to begin to tackle this pandemic at the proportion of which we see the problem.

2000

Madam Speaker, I yield now to the gentlewoman from Houston, Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE), who has been a voice of reason, an advocate for social justice both here and abroad, and who I had the privilege to be with on our presidential delegation when we visited Southern Africa and witnessed the devastation of HIV/AIDS' toll on the orphans in Africa.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE). She is very right that together we were enormously moved, along with the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. KILPATRICK) when we traveled to Southern Africa to witness firsthand what many of us had seen before, but together on this presidential mission.

Let me thank the gentlewoman for carrying forth the vision to help with our former colleague, our dear friend, Ron Dellums, to form and foster and nurture H.R. 3519, the World Bank AIDS Marshall Plan Trust Fund Act, in collaboration with the gentleman from Iowa (Chairman LEACH). Let me thank the gentlewoman for that, because she has put the engine behind the remorse, the devastation, the sadness, the high emotions that have been brought about by understanding that since 1980, in the 1980s, 16 million people have died from AIDS.

Madam Speaker, I would like to read into the RECORD just these simple figures, if I can do this rather quickly, to elaborate on the enormity of this pandemic tragedy with respect to AIDS.

The percentage of adult population infected with HIV or suffering from AIDS in a number of countries in Africa: Zimbabwe, 25.9 percent of the adult population. Botswana, 25.1. Many of these countries I visited, particularly Botswana, a few years ago; and the numbers were climbing then. I visited an AIDS clinic and talked to a woman who had been infected and had lost her son. And I saw the pain of the country trying to grapple with this. One of the issues, of course, was the ability to have the pharmaceuticals to deal with this. The low cost of those drugs is a necessity.

Namibia, 19.4 percent; Zambia, 19.1 percent. This is the percentage of adult adoption. Swaziland, 18.5 percent; Malawi, 14.9; Mozambique, 14.2 percent; South Africa, 12.9 percent. I imagine these nations would say these percentages are growing.

Rwanda, 12.8 percent; Kenya, 11.6 percent; Central African Republic, 10.8 percent; Ivory Coast, 10.1 percent; India, .82; U.S., .76.

Just another example. Number of 15-year-olds per 10,000 of that age group who have lost their mothers or both parents to AIDS: Uganda, 1,100; Zambia, 890; Zimbabwe, 700; Malawi, 580.

The list goes on. The number of Africans that we understand die every day from HIV/AIDS: 5,000, at least.

And so as I stand on the floor of the House, I can only ask that we move quickly to support this legislation, to encourage the full funding that the President has promoted to grab hold of this and declaring this a national security issue, an international security issue; to encourage Kofi Annan to embrace this as well in his commitment to bring down the percentages of HIV infection by putting the resources of the United Nations behind this; by acknowledging that this is the number one killer of women 25 to 44 in the African-American population in the United States.

Madam Speaker, I thank my community, who I marched with 2 weeks ago, in recognizing that in pockets of the 18th Congressional District HIV/AIDS is one of the number-one killers, and to commit to my constituents in Houston as well to join them in the women's, and what I have promoted, the Mothers' March Against AIDS that we will be promoting in the next couple of months, and to say that we have to do more than simply roll up our sleeves. We have to get in the fight and really battle.

It is important to recognize that H.R. 3519, the Marshall Plan, the same concept that we used after World War II, is long overdue and that we must move this legislation along very quickly. It must pass out of the House of Representatives. It must quickly pass out

of the Senate. We must get it to the President's desk, and we must act on it.

It is likewise important that, as we move through the appropriations process, we must recognize that 13 million children have lost one or both of their parents to AIDS, and the number is projected to 40 million in the continent of Africa by 2010.

AIDS in sub-Saharan Africa accounts for nearly half all the infectious disease deaths globally, and what that translates into is TB. Many are suffering from pneumonia, and it leads into other infectious diseases as well.

We well recognize that the Pentagon budget has been one of the largest that we have had. That is why I believe it is so crucial that we have acknowledged that this is a national security issue. With that in mind, I can only say to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) in thanking her for her leadership, this Special Order should not be one in vain. It should be a Special Order of challenge, a special order that energizes us as we provide through the committee process, each of us who has any opportunity to encourage the faster process of this legislation, we should ask that it be declared an emergency and that we move it as quickly as we can to the floor of the House.

Madam Speaker, let me simply thank the gentlewoman for giving me the opportunity to speak and yield back.

Madam Speaker I rise in support of HR 3519, the World Bank AIDS Marshall Plan Trust Fund Act, introduced by Congresswoman Barbara Lee.

As the Clinton Administration formally recognized just a few days ago, the spread of HIV/AIDS in the world today is an international crisis that can no longer be ignored.

The National Security Council, which has never before involved itself in combating infectious diseases, has formally designated the disease as a threat to U.S. national security.

With the establishment of the White House interagency working group on AIDS and the National Security Council's designation, America is taking steps to lead in the fight against the global AIDS crisis.

As HR 3519 correctly reiterates, AIDS is a global emergency that is devastating developing countries.

The creation of a World Wide trust for in which nations would be able to obtain grants to address the needs of HIV/AIDS victim globally is truly needed.

We know that 60% of those that have died from AIDS are in sub-Saharan Africa. That is 16 million people since the 1980's.

An even more heart-wrenching statistic is that 13 million children have lost one or both of their parents to AIDS and this number is projected to reach 40 million by 2010.

AIDS in sub-Saharan Africa accounts for nearly half of all infectious disease deaths globally.

Not since the bubonic plague of the Middle Ages, has there been a more devastating disease.

I applaud the Clinton Administration's recent push to double the budget request to $254 million to combat AIDS overseas.

However, I still believe that much more funding is needed to adequately address this emergency epidemic.

When the Pentagon budget continues to spend more than this $254 million on obsolete aircraft, we are struck with the remaining gap in the battle to tackle this global problem.

Consequently, Senior Clinton Administration officials clearly express their frustration that by all estimates on HIV/AIDS, that nearly $2 billion is needed to adequately prevent the spread of this disease in Africa per year.

Although I realize that this may not be politically feasible at the time, we must take notice of the fact that if the National Security Council can designate AIDS as a national security threat, then it is time for this country to take affirmative steps to combat this devastating tragedy in the international community.

AIDS is significantly shortening the life expectancy of all and will continue to cut more years off people's lives if we do not take responsibility for combating this disease.

I applaud my colleague BARBARA LEE for her leadership. The AIDS Marshall Plan Fund for Africa will help to ensure that the federal government follows through on its recently stated plans to address the international AIDS epidemic.

In conclusion, I also believe that the private sector has a major role in fighting AIDS. In the African Growth and Opportunity, I successfully included a sense of Congress amendment to cause corporations doing business in Africa to set up a private fund that can be utilized to also fight the AIDS devastation. That provision still remains in the bill.

Ms. LEE. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague from Texas once again for participating with us this evening and also for participating and fighting on all of the issues that we tackle here in Congress and for her leadership on the whole HIV/AIDS crisis both here and abroad. I say, Thank you very much, Congresswoman JACKSON-LEE.

Madam Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS), who has been consistent and very instrumental in forcing the United States Congress to deal with the devastating effects of drugs and the impact of drugs as it relates to the HIV/AIDS crisis. I thank the gentleman very much for being with us tonight.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for yielding, and I want to thank her for all that she does every day, everything that she does to put a face on this crisis. I think so often, I think the philosopher Camus said that a lot of times when we get so caught up in statistics, we forget that there are real people behind those statistics.

Certainly, the ones that I will cite in a minute or two are quite frightening. But the gentlewoman and I and many others who have visited Africa know that these statistics have real faces behind them.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to address one of the most challenging and life-threatening public health issues facing the global community: HIV infection and AIDS.

This disease is now the world's deadliest with over 40 million persons infected worldwide. And significantly, our President recently declared AIDS as a national security threat. Not surprisingly, this pandemic affects the most vulnerable citizens of our global community; in fact, nearly 95 percent of infected persons live in developing countries with, sub-Saharan Africa being hit harder than any other region.

Let me mention some startling statistics. New HIV infections in Africa have numbered more than 1.4 million each year since 1991. That is an average of more than 3,800 new HIV/AIDS infections per day in sub-Saharan Africa.

23.3 million adults and children are infected with the HIV virus in the region which has about 10 percent of the world's population, but nearly 70 percent of the worldwide total of infected people.

Life expectancy in these nations has been reduced by disease to between 22 and 40 years.

In several sub-Saharan nations, more than one in four pregnant women is infected with HIV/AIDS, and in many sub-Saharan nations one quarter of all children have already been orphaned by AIDS, 13 million children, the equivalent of all the children enrolled in our public school system.

As leaders of this great Nation, we have a responsibility to take the lead in efforts to overcome this AIDS pandemic. But in order to effectively combat the disease, we must come to a full understanding of two key issues. As Martin Luther King, Sr., said, ''[w]e cannot lead where we do not go, and we cannot teach what we do not know.''

First, we must understand what accounts for this devastating spread of this disease on the African continent. Just to name a few: lack of quality health care, poverty, lack of education, armed conflict, lack of jobs, and limited government assistance are all factors.

Second, we must come to an understanding that all sectors and all spheres of society have to be involved as equal partners in combatting this crisis. The health sector cannot meet this challenge on its own, nor can one government or one nation.

So it is imperative that we have a collective global effort to increase international AIDS spending in Africa and to improve the health care infrastructures of African countries.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3519, the Marshall Plan Trust Fund. I know my colleague, Ms. BARBARA LEE (CA), has worked diligently on this issue for some time now and I am pleased that this House is taken up this issue. Let me also thank the Chairman of the Banking Committee, Congressman JIM LEACH (IA), who is responsible for moving this bill through the Committee.

The HIV/AIDS crisis is a transnational threat. It threatens not only our public health but it is also a threat to our National Security. According to the Washington Post, ''It has the potential to undo decades of work in building free-market democracies abroad.''

On my visit to South Africa in December of last year, I visited an HIV/AIDS clinic and saw

first hand the education and preventive ways to combat this virus. In Soweto, South Africa, when the AIDS virus detonates this black township of 3 million in a decade or so, the disease will wipe out about 600,000 people. This is almost six times as many people as the atomic bombs killed in Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

Some estimates predict that more than 25% of the working age population in South Africa will be infected with HIV by the year 2010. The global spread of AIDS is reaching catastrophic numbers.

HIV/AIDS has greatly reduced the life span of the citizens of South African countries. Life expectancy in Botswana has declined from 61 years five years ago to 47 years, and is expected to drop to 41 years between 2000 and 2005. In Zimbabwe 1 out of every 5 adults is affected and is significantly reducing population growth from 3.3%.

More than 33 million are infected and more than 14 million have died. Of this number, more than 16 million people have died from AIDS since the 1980s, 60% of them from sub-Saharan Africa. In 1998, 200,000 people died from armed conflicts on the subcontinent, while AIDS has caused about 2.2 million deaths.

Former Congressman Ronald Dellums, who is now the President of Healthcare International Management Company, has conceived the AIDS Marshall Plan for Africa as a means to bring treatment to those affected with the HIV/AIDS virus. Also, the NAACP introduced a similar measure declaring HIV/AIDS a crisis in Africa.

The Clinton administration has taken the right step to curb the spread of AIDS. President Clinton recently declared $254 million to prevent the spread of AIDS around the world.

Bristol-Myers, one of the largest pharmaceutical company and is headquartered in the state of New Jersey, has also pledged their support of $1 million to prevent the further spread of HIV and to care for those affected by this devastating disease.

In conclusion, let me say that the spread of infectious diseases poses a threat to our own health here in the U.S. We should support the AIDS Marshall Plan and the Clinton administration's efforts to rid the world of this deadly disease.

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I want to join my colleagues in their support of H.R. 3519 the ''World Bank AIDS Marshall Plan Trust Fund Act.'' In Testimony before the Committee on Government Reform, Sandra Thurman, the Director of the Office of National AIDS Policy, sometimes called the AIDS CZAR said that as of this moment, AIDS has killed 12 million men women and children in Africa. Today and every day, AIDS in Africa buries more than 5,500 men, women and children. And that number is estimated to double in the next few years. AIDS has become the leading cause of death in Africa.

But in order to understand the total dimensions of this tragedy, we not only look at the dead, but we must also look at the living. It is estimated that by the year 2010, 40 million children in Africa will be orphaned by AIDS. These children will have lost their parents, and many will have lost entire families. What will these children do? Who will pay for their education? How will they get the basic necessities of food, clothing and shelter? Who will teach them right from wrong? Forty million children with no connection to society, no connection to family, the community or each other will grow up to be forty million adults who have no sense of past, present, or future. Forty million people who are without moorings can and will destabilize a country, a region, a continent and a world.

I know that the fate of Africa or Africans may not be a high priority for many here. Many may not care about the AIDS virus or its victims. But I don't know anyone here who does not care about children. I ask you to do what you can to prevent the predictions of forty million orphans from coming true. Lets find a way to keep their parents healthy and alive. Lets find a way to provide medical assistance so that there will not be 40 million orphans. The United States can and should be a leader in the fight against this pandemic. We can not be the leader of democracy and turn our backs on these families.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The time of the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) has expired. All time has expired.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. LEE. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of our special order tonight.

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

There was no objection.

TRIBUTE TO THE COLORADO STATE LEGISLATURE

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

Mr. MCINNIS. Madam Speaker, as the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS) knows, I have an hour and I would be happy to yield to the gentleman up to 5 minutes so he could conclude his statement. I think the issue that he is speaking about is very important. I yield up to 5 minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) for yielding.

Second, we must come to an understanding that all sectors and all spheres of society have to be involved as equal persons in combatting this crisis. The health sector cannot meet this challenge on its own, nor can one government or one nation.

So it is imperative that we have a collective global effort to increase international AIDS spending in Africa. This collective effort must also make vaccine research and development a priority and secure access to treatment for infected individuals. We must encourage pharmaceutical companies to reduce the percentage of spending on marketing and advertising and instead reduce drug prices and increase expenditures on patient assistance programs.

Passage of H.R. 3519, the World Bank AIDS Marshall Trust Act, would be an important step towards these goals. This legislation calls for the governments of key nations, the private sector, and nongovernmental entities to partner in the creation of a Marshall Fund to eliminate AIDS. The fund would provide $1 billion over 5 years for research, prevention, and treatment.

I thank the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) and the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LEACH) for having the foresight to introduce this measure. When the history of our time is written, it will record the collective efforts of societies responding to a threat that has put in the balance the future of whole nations. Future generations will judge us on the adequacy of our response.

One of my mentors, the Reverend Jeremiah Wright of Chicago, has stated many times, ''In my time and in my space, I will make a difference with God's grace.''

And so, Madam Speaker, I urge support of H.R. 3519 for this is our space, and this is our time; and we must make a difference with God's grace. With that, I yield back; and I thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding.

Mr. MCINNIS. Madam Speaker, I can tell my colleagues as many have experienced themselves personally, the great time in my life that I served in the State legislature, the State of which I represent here in the United States Congress.

Being able to serve in the State House of Representatives for the State of Colorado meant a great deal to me. I was honored to be elected by the people of the 57th district of the State of Colorado to serve five terms. I had the opportunity to go and serve as the chairman of a committee and ended my career in the State House of Representatives as majority leader.

During that period of time, I established lifetime friendships with fellow legislators on both sides of the aisle. By political design, the activity that we have in Congress in Washington is dramatically different than the type of system that we operate at least in the State of Colorado. In Colorado, for example, we have what we call ''instant voting.'' Now, why do I bring up the facts to my colleagues of instant voting? Because I want to explain what that leads to.

It leads to strong friendships. Why? Because instant voting such as we have in the State of Colorado requires that all of the State legislators, and I speak generically, the State senators as well, have to be on the House floor at the time that the voting machine is opened, as compared to the United States Congress here in the House of Representatives where we have a minimum of 15 minutes on most votes, 5 if it is a subsequent vote, to come to the House floor and cast our vote.

2015

As a result of that here, we do not mill as a group for a very long period of time.

Under the rules of the Colorado House of Representatives, the Colorado State Senate, they in fact work with each other and stand around, sit by each other throughout the entire voting process. As a result of that, they have moments where they get to know the person sitting to their right or the person sitting to their left. They have an opportunity to stand in the back of the chambers and have a cup of coffee with a Democrat or a Republican or somebody from the city or somebody from the rural areas of the State of Colorado.

It is very easy to really bring together strong friendships that last throughout a person's political career and throughout a person's personal career. I was privileged to be fortunate enough to be able to do that.

I also want to point out, as many of my colleagues obviously know, here in the United States Congress, we have to travel great distances, and our travel is very, very extensive. The district that I represent in the State of Colorado is actually geographically larger than the State of Florida. My travel is extensive.

But in the State legislature, one does not have those kinds of traveling requirements. In the Colorado State legislature, one has more opportunity to get to know each other. In the Colorado State legislature, they have 65 members. In the United States Congress, we have 435 in the House, and we have 100 in the Senate. In the Senate in the State of Colorado, they have 35 members.

So simply by the fact that they have a smaller number of people, it is easier to make lasting and strong friendships. That is what I did.

Tonight, I stand here in front of my colleagues talking about a few of those good friends that I made. I am also going to talk about a few fine legislators whom I did not know as well but who are concluding their service for the State of Colorado.

Tomorrow, Wednesday, is the last day that the Colorado State legislature has in session. In Colorado, we have a 120-day limitation. So the legislature can only meet for 120 days. We also have in Colorado term limitations. We have a number of people who are subject to term limitations who will be leaving office or serving their last legislative day tomorrow.

So with the patience of my colleagues, I am going to go through some of the names of some of these people, talk just a little bit about them, because it is kind of special for me to be back here talking to my colleagues, Madam Speaker, as U.S. Congressmen about some people that are very exceptional people in the State of Colorado.

Let me begin with a long-time friend of mine, the speaker of the House in the State of Colorado. His name is Russell George. His wife's name is Neal. They have a fine, fine family.

Russ has impressed me over the years because, number one, no matter whether one agrees with him or disagrees with him, no matter what one thinks of his political leanings on one day or his political leanings on another day, there has never been a question about Russell George's integrity. His integrity is second to none in the State of Colorado.

Now, in the State of Colorado, we have waited for over 20 years on the western side of the State to get a speaker of the House. Russ George became our speaker from western Colorado. Unfortunately, under the term limitations, he could only be the speaker for 240 legislative days. So despite his qualifications, despite his remarkable career, he is out, automatically shoveled out of the Colorado State capitol.

Now Russ has served 8 years in the 57th district. Russ is an attorney at law. He is recognized in the legal community for his capabilities and his exceptional knowledge of the law. He is also recognized in the legal community for his ability to sway in the courtroom. See, he is well known. He is soft spoken, but he is well spoken.

In the Colorado State House of Representatives, he has earned compliments from both sides of the aisle for his fairness and for his leadership. I am confident that after Russ leaves the State House of Representatives in Colorado, that there will be a number of golden opportunities for the people, for him, but for the people who might be lucky enough to retain his services in some way or another.

Russ dealt with a number of tough issues. His latest issue was the Gas and Oil Commission. Now, whether one agrees or not in the State of Colorado with what the speaker of the House attempted to do with the Oil and Gas Commission, the fact is the intensity of his work was reflected even up to the last few days that he served as a legislator. He is to be commended.

I stand in front of all my colleagues tonight, almost all of whom have never met Russell George and would say to each and every one of them, I hope that they some time have the opportunity to at least meet him. I have had the absolute privilege of considering him one of my best friends for many, many, many years.

We have others who are leaving the Colorado House and the Colorado Senate. Debbie Allen. Debbie Allen is a friend of mine. Debbie was elected in 1992. She has worked hard. Some of her key issues have been crime, law enforcement obviously falls into that category, and education issues.

Debbie's husband Bob has been very faithful and good; faithful, meaning that he has been a good supporter. As my colleagues know, to be a State legislator, one has got to have a spouse that is pretty understanding. One has got to have a spouse that is ready to stand by one for those late night hours and the intensity that that job has for that 120-day period. Bob did that.

Debbie served as the chairman of the Education Committee. Madam Speaker, in the State of Colorado this year, education has been an especially tough issue. Now, education has always been a priority of the Republican Party and of the Democratic Party in Colorado. But this year the Republicans really led the fight on more funding for education. Debbie was the chairman of that committee.

She is the owner and the manager of a company called Custom Data Services. She served as a secretary, vice chairman, and chairman of the Arapahoe County Republican Party. She has been a Republican activist. But I can tell my colleagues, as a Republican activist, she still crosses the aisle. She considers many Democrats her friends.

She was the President of Aurora Republican forum, and she was awarded the Junior League Champion for Small Children Award.

Now, Debbie is not totally leaving the legislature. She is going to make a run for the Colorado State Senate, but her years in the State House of Representative are much appreciated.

I want to talk just for a moment here about another friend of mine, and that is representative Bob Hagedorn. Bob was elected in 1992. He was named as the CACI business legislator of the year, and his key issues have been education, reform, and health care.

Bob has faced a pretty tough challenge in the last few years, and he overcame that challenge. While I may not necessarily agree with my friend Bob on a number of different issues in the political arena, I can tell my colleagues I consider him my friend, and I admire him for his courage to overcome the challenges that faced him.

Representative Dorothy Gotlieb. Dorothy is a great person. She is an aggressive, aggressive legislator. She works very hard on the issues of the budget. She served as a member of the Denver Board of Education for 6 years, and she was the President for the Denver Board of Education for 2 years. She served as a member of the State Board of Education for 6 years and 2 years as chairman.

As a member of the Denver Public Schools Athletic League Hall of Fame, she won many different education awards. Dorothy is well known for her expertise in education. She is also known for how hard she pushes to make children the highest priority of State legislative issues.

She obviously was on the Education Committee. She served on the Transportation and the Energy Committee in the State legislature. She served on Criminal Justice. She worked hard on Small Business and efficient in Accountable Government issues.

She, too, is running for the State Senate, but she wraps up her days tomorrow in the State House. I can tell my colleagues something, Dorothy has done a great job. I want my colleagues to know that I hope they someday have the privilege of getting to meet all of these people of which I am trying to

give them some reference to this evening.

Representative Ken Gordon. Ken has done a good job as the House minority leader. Minority leader. I am a Republican. But I can tell my colleagues I respect Ken for his efforts as a minority leader. He has been strong for the Democrats. He stood up on a number of different issues. Ken is also known for his straightforwardness. He had success in his plain language law, which he passed. He was elected in 1992. Ken has done a good job.

I will talk about my good friend Bill Kaufman. Bill is a special guy to me. Bill was appointed to a vacancy in 1993, and he was elected time after time after time since then. He served as chairman of the Judiciary Committee and was a member of the Legal Services Committee. Currently my friend Bill is the Speaker Pro-Temp.

Bill served as an attorney in the Loveland area. He has a good reputation, a strong reputation in the Loveland area for his capabilities in the field of law and for his honesty in that field.

He is very active in the Republican party. He was chairman of the Dole-Kemp campaign in 1996. He coordinated the campaigns of people like Senator Armstrong, Senator Hank Brown, Senator WAYNE ALLARD.

He was named in 1996 as the Legislator of the Year. That is a great honor. CACI and the American Planning Association gave him awards in that regard. He got awards from the Social Legislation Committee and the Colorado Sheriff's Association. He has been very active in education, transportation, and prisons.

Now, the reason Bill is such a good friend is, over the years, I have had a number of tough issues, even as late as last week where I took issues that we work with on this House floor. As my colleagues know, real government is at the local level. That is where the best government is is at the local level. We really should serve more of a perfunctory role. We have duties in regards to defense and in regards to commerce and international trade, but the real government is at the local level.

One can always go to Bill and sit down with Bill and discuss issues or even conflicts between the Federal government and the State government. He would listen, and if he felt that one's position had good merit, not necessarily popular merit, but good merit, he would get behind one.

I am going to miss Bill in the Colorado State House of Representatives. He has got a lot of good years ahead of him. He is a young man, and his career has just gotten off to a start. Tomorrow will be his last day as well, and he is to be congratulated.

I also want to talk about his wife Diana. I will tell my colleagues she is quite a lady, and obviously Bill could not have done this without her.

I will talk about Representative Ron May. Ron May is a good friend of mine. He was out in Colorado Springs, Colorado. I wish my colleagues could meet Ron. Ron is very good on transportation issues. He was elected to the House in 1992. He also has worked very hard on the technological capabilities.

As my colleagues know, I think, as I have spoken before, I think we are in the second industrial revolution in this country when it comes to the Internet. Here is an individual, Ron May, who helps take elected officials like my colleagues and I, and try and bring us up to speed on some of these technological issues.

He served on the city council before he went to the State legislature; and as we all know, that is pretty good training ground. He sponsored a number of bills on workers' compensation, unemployment insurance, highway speed limits, right-to-work law and information systems.

He and his wife Onilla are good people. I will tell my colleagues something, Ron has done a great job for the people of the State of Colorado, and I hope my colleagues have an opportunity to meet him at some point.

Representative Maryanne Keller. Maryanne I do not know well, but I know about her. She was elected in 1992. She cosponsored standards in education legislation, and she is a special education teacher. I have heard more about the representative of her teaching capabilities. They have been very positive. They have been very strong.

As I understand it, she is exactly the kind of person that we want teaching. But she is an excellent teacher, and I also understand, of course, that she did an excellent job or did a good job on education issues. She did an excellent job as a State representative. She, too, will be leaving us.

Same with Representative Ben Clarke. Ben was appointed in 1994. His key issues have been health care. Why are they health care issues? Because Representative Clarke is a retired doctor. He is one of the few doctors we have in the State legislature. Instead of leaving and living a cushy life of retirement, he decided that he would become active in the State legislature, especially in regards to health care issues.

As many of my colleagues on the House floor know this evening, these health care issues are predominant, predominant on our agenda. I can go on and on. I would like to get into another subject and talk about the Republican health plan for prescription services and talk about what we are trying to do to get good health care delivery out in our country. We already have good health care delivery, but better health care delivery.

But I want to come back to Ben. He is also a veteran. He served in the war in Korea. Ben was a good legislator. Tomorrow is his last day. Again, I hope my colleagues have an opportunity to shake his hand someday.

2030

Representative Andy McElhany. Andy is from Colorado Springs. Andy is probably one of the most energetic, dedicated, focused guys I have met. Andy was chairman of the State, Veterans and Military Affairs Committee. He served on the Colorado Springs Park and Recreational Advisory Board. In fact, he was the board chairman. He was a real estate broker. Has a strong reputation for integrity and professionalism in the real estate field in Colorado. He is the Colorado Library Association Legislator of the Year, the Colorado Union of Taxpayers' Friend of Taxpayer, and the Associated Press' Outstanding Legislator.

He was the sponsor of the ''Deadbeat Parent'' bill, denying driver's licenses to parents not paying child support. And talk about something that gets people to pay child support, as Andy told his colleagues and as Andy told me, tell them they are not going to get their driver's license. Most people gasp at that. They say, well, how do they get to work. But the fact is very few people will ever let their license go like that if they have the option of paying off that child support. It works. Andy convinced me of it, and he has proven it.

He worked, obviously, on other areas regarding health care reform, transportation, government efficiency, and tax reform. Andy has done an excellent job as a representative in the Colorado House of Representatives.

Representative Gloria Lebya, appointed in 1995 and elected in 1996. She was active with the Bobby Kennedy campaign in 1968.

She has been a champion and worked very hard with healthy communities. Communities and the centrifuge of how communities come together in regards to community activities has been where she has devoted a lot of her energy.

Again, one of the people who, obviously, I know. I have met with her. I do not know her that well, but I speak about her based on her reputation, and it is a good reputation. So it is easy to speak of her, and I wish her the very best in her future.

Representative Gary McPherson. Gary is a dedicated guy. I have known Gary for some time. He was appointed in 1994 to the Colorado State House. He was a member of the Appropriations and Judiciary Committees. He is an attorney at law, practiced for a number of years with Kissinger and Fellman, a professional corporation.

He was the vice chairman and the board member of the Arapahoe County Recreation District. He was a CACI Legislator of the Year and the recipient of the Aurora Public Schools' Superintendents' award.

He has dealt with legislation regarding minors and smoking. Gary has really focused on the problems that we have with smoking and minors. Later on, if I have the opportunity to finish what I am doing here, I would like to talk a little about how smoking impacts our minor children in this country.

Here is a guy right here, Gary, that that was a big issue for him; and he was really recognized as a leader in the Colorado Legislature as somebody who had good capable facts on what we do with that problem of our young people smoking, of our young people becoming addicted to tobacco, which every one of us in this Chamber knows is a killer. So I hand it to him. He deserves a big star for that one.

He also worked quite aggressively on education, crime, and welfare reform. Gary's done an excellent job in the Colorado House.

Representative Marcy Morrison. Now, Marcy is a character. People like Marcy. She has been very active. Her husband, Howard, is, in my opinion, an excellent guy, a good supporter. She used to be an El Paso County commissioner, and she enjoyed a strong reputation down there in El Paso County for the job she did. She is tough. She is tough, but she has some humor about her. And it is good to see somebody who is tough and holds the line but can smile and sit down and have a cup of coffee with you after the debate.

She served on the Committees of Health, Environment, Welfare and Institutions and Judiciary. She also served on the State of Colorado Board of Health. She sponsored the Post Delivery Care for Stays in Hospitals and immunization for more Colorado children, a pilot program to evaluate health care costs concerning children. She has done an excellent job. She cares and has been very active on the health care issues for seniors, the disabled, and child care.

Marcy has done an excellent job, and she is also one of the people, if any of my colleagues ever go to Colorado and are down in El Paso County, they will hear about Marcy Morrison and they will want to meet her after they hear about her. She is that kind of person.

Representative Penn Pfiffner. Penn was elected in 1992. His wife, Karen, is obviously a spouse who is supportive of the issues she has taken on.

Penn is aggressive. He is tough. I would say that he is probably one of the more conservative members of the House. He is conservative especially when it comes to these economic issues and on social issues as well. But he is particularly astute on economic issues.

He served as an officer in the United States Navy. He served on the Utility Consumer Advisory Board. He has proposed legislation on everything from prison reform to education alternatives to privatization and transportation deregulation.

He currently serves as a consulting economist to construction and real estate industries. He served, obviously, on the Finance Committee. He served on the Legislative Audit and the State, and the Veterans and Military Affairs Committees.

Penn has given good service to the State of Colorado.

I want to visit about another good friend of mine, Senator Dorothy Rupert. Dorothy and I go back a long, long ways. I want to tell a special story about Dorothy and I.

Years ago, she and I came back to Washington, DC, with a group of individuals, other State legislators; and it was the first time that I had ever seen the Vietnam Memorial wall. Obviously, for my generation, the generation of most of us in this room, that Vietnam Memorial wall has a very special feeling; a sad feeling, a warm feeling, a feeling of pleasure that these people have been recognized. All of those feelings were brought out by Dorothy Rupert.

And I will never forget, as long as I have the mental capability to remember, I will never forget that evening. It was a cold evening, but the sun had been shining that day. And as Dorothy and I went up to the Vietnam Memorial wall, and as my colleagues know it is black granite, it had absorbed that sunlight. And even though there was a cold wind, the sun had just gone down; and that wall emitted warmth because it had stored it up from the sunshine during the day. It was as if the soldiers being recognized by that wall once again stood up to help protect us, keep us warm from that cold wind going down through there.

Dorothy was appointed to the State senate in 1995. She obviously served honorably in the State House of Representatives before that. She has worked very extensively on hate crime issues. She is a high school teacher. She is a counselor. And I can tell my colleagues that there were a number of issues that Dorothy and I voted on the opposite side of, but never once did I consider myself really adversarial to Dorothy Rupert. She is the kind of person who has the type of personality that does not disarm someone to a disadvantage. The feeling, I guess, is one of professionalism, the debates that she gets into.

She is recognized by her colleagues as a person who is very caring. She has a heart many, many times the size of her body. Dorothy has served the State of Colorado very well, and her friendship is something that is very special to me.

Now, let me talk about one of my western people, representative Jack Taylor. Jack's done a great job for western Colorado. Jack comes from Steamboat Springs, Colorado. He was elected in 1992. His wife, Geneva, and I go back a long ways as well. She has been very active, and Jack's been very active in the party.

But Jack understands agricultural issues. Jack knows about Colorado water. As I have said many times from this podium, Colorado's water is very unique compared to most States in the Nation. In Colorado, our State is the only State where all of our water goes out. We have no free-flowing water that comes into the State of Colorado for our use. So as a result of that, those water resources are very precious.

We do not get much rain in Colorado. It is an arid State. We depend on our snow fall and spring runoff. Spring runoff does not last all year long. It lasts about 65 to 90 days. We just started it in Colorado. This means if we do not have the capability to store water, we are in a lot of trouble in Colorado. And there are a lot of organizations that want to make sure there are no storage projects on our rivers; that want to make sure there are no diversions from the streams. Well, that is the only way we can survive out in the West. It does not rain in the West like it rains in the East.

Jack Taylor knows that. And Jack Taylor has understood that for a long time. And Jack Taylor has been a good part of the team, lead, frankly, by Rus George, on the water issues back there in the State legislature in Colorado.

He was chairman of the Business Affairs and Labor Committee; served on the Agriculture, Livestock and Natural Resources Committee and the Legislative Audit Committee. He was a businessman for 30 years in Steamboat. He was named Business Legislator of the Year. He earned the Guardian of Small Business Awards and the NFIB, which is the National Federation of Independent Businesses, Colorado Legislator of the Year.

Jack worked very hard to get equal access to telecommunications state-of-the-art technology throughout Colorado. As many of my colleagues know that represent rural districts throughout the United States, we are concerned. We do not want to get behind the eight ball in this second industrial revolution on the Internet. We need technological advancements that are going to the cities. We need those fiberoptics out in the rural areas. It hurts if we in the rural areas do not have access to fiberoptics; if we do not have the technological capability to do business with our colleagues in the cities.

Jack understood this and he pushed it and pursued it very hard. Jack has a strong sense. It is kind of like a sixth sense for him, for common sense. He exercises it well. And, obviously, with his business experience that he brings to the legislative process, it has been of some assistance.

I think he has worked very hard to try to create more efficiencies for government, and I think above probably next to water his strong stances on the right to private property and the respect for private property in Colorado is probably second to none currently in the State legislature. Jack's done a good job. We will miss him in the State House of Representatives.

Senator Bob Martinez. Bob and I go back a long ways. Bob was elected in 1984, same year actually I went into office in the Colorado State House of Representatives. Bob and I had an opportunity to serve many, many years in the State House of Representatives, then he went on the State senate. He was a higher education administrator.

He has always been very strong on adoption and the ability for people to

adopt. He has been very caring for the homeless people. But I will tell my colleagues something else about Bob. Bob has always served in the minority, in the State senate and in the State house. The Republicans have controlled the State house and the State senate since Bob went into office. But Bob had that knack to be able to go across the aisle, and he built up relationships that enabled him to be a very effective legislator despite his political minority status.

Bob is a wonderful guy. He is a good guy to work with. He is a good guy to have as a friend. And he is a neat guy out of the city that understands some of the rural issues that we in rural Colorado faced. I miss Bob. Bob has done good service for the State of Colorado, and he should be recognized for that.

My next friend, Representative Steve Tool, whose father, Gene Tool, is a long-time friend of mine, former chairman of our State party. Steve is a guy, who also like Russell George, has an impeccable reputation. He serves on the Finance Committee, the Judiciary Committee, and the Health Environment and Welfare and Institutions Committee.

He is a strong family man. Has a wonderful family. He is a real estate broker, an appraiser in Fort Collins. He served in the United States Air Force as a navigator on B–52s in Vietnam. He is a Vietnam veteran. He flew 160 missions, 160 missions over Southeast Asia.

He has been very active in and has sponsored legislation for the changing of child abuse resulting in death from a felony to a homicide. He has also been very aggressive in regards to school finance and trying to balance school finance in the State of Colorado so the poorer communities are not left, and to reorganize our educational system to guarantee the maximum amount of dollars into the classroom and the maximum amount of accountability from our teachers who teach our young people. He has done a good job on that.

We are going to miss Steve. He did a good job and I hope my colleagues here on the floor also sometime have an opportunity to meet Steve Tool. He is a young man, and his career has just begun.

Senator Frank Weddig. He was appointed in 1994 and was elected in 1996. He is an electrician. Children's welfare and children's issues.

Again, Frank I do not know well, but you feel like you know him because you have heard about him. As I have said with some of my other colleagues who I have not had an opportunity to meet and know, like a Bob Martinez, or like a Rus George, or like a Jack Taylor or Bill Kaufman, some of those people I did not get to know that well. I kind of looked at their reputations and listened to what their colleagues had to say about them.

2045

Frank has enjoyed a strong reputation amongst his colleagues, and that speaks well for him.

My friend Senator Gloria Tanner. Gloria was appointed in 1994 in the State Senate. She served in the State House of Representatives prior to that. I got to serve with her.

Gloria represented the issues of the minority community very well. She spoke up and helped educate those of us who did not live in the urban areas in the cities. She was very patient with us and very educational with us I guess you would say in walking us through the issues that are unique to minority communities in big cities. She worked hard on the pension fund protection issues. She is a real estate agent. I can tell my colleagues, my service with Gloria Tanner was enjoyable. She is a professional, a real pro.

Well, the State House of Representatives is going to lose their Speaker of the House this year. And the State Senate in Colorado, again because of term limits, loses the Senate president.

Ray Powers. His wife's name is Dorothy, a wonderful, wonderful lady. I have known her for years. Ray has done a tremendous job as the President of the Colorado State Senate. He has had a lot of tough issues. He has been there for many years. He has worked with a lot of people. The people that have worked with Ray walk away from Ray thinking, gosh, that guy is on the ball. He knows what is going on.

To be the leader of the State Senate in Colorado, you have got to have some finesse, you have got to have some capabilities to have a strong personality to deal with people. That happens, too, with the Speaker of the House. But Ray had those.

Ray could deal with people without making them angry. Ray could be firm but he did not have to be mean. He could be firm without being mean. Ray Powers had a lot of capability in convincing people and helping educate his colleagues on the issues of the day.

Now he is a former rancher. He has a ranch down in Colorado Springs. He is active in the local bank down there. He sponsored any number of bills, including bills on the death penalty, highway funding, more judicial requirements or appropriate judicial requirements for judges. He dealt with the major regional presidential primary that we wanted to have there in Colorado. He has been recognized by the United Veterans Committee Distinguished Service Award, the Colorado Springs Chamber of Commerce named his as Legislator of the Year. The Colorado Public Affairs Council named him Business Legislator of the Year.

Dorothy and Ray will do well in their retirement. We are going to miss his service in the Colorado State Senate.

Senator Mike Feeley. Mike is the minority leader elected in 1992. He is smart. He is aggressive. He and I did not agree on a lot of issues but I can tell you, as with some of his colleagues, the disagreements were professional disagreements.

He was recognized by his colleagues as, let us just say, a person of persistence, a person who when he decided to support an issue he stuck with it. He was recognized as the minority leader. He enjoyed a strong reputation for the job that he did as the minority leader.

Mike Feeley is spoken of by the Democrats in the State of Colorado as one who holds future promise for a political office. Frankly, I would like to convert him to a Republican. But the fact is he is a Democrat. They consider him a good Democrat. I consider him a good man, and we are going to miss him.

Dorothy ''Dottie'' Wham. Dorothy is her former name. I called her ''Dottie'' for all those years. I served with Dottie for the 10 years I was in the State legislature.

Let me tell my colleagues something. I am not sure I have had the opportunity to serve with a woman who I think has been more dedicated to the process, more dedicated to being sure that the government in Colorado served the people of the State of Colorado.

She comes from a community from Denver. Her husband Bob is a lawyer well recognized in the community in his own regard. But I will tell you something, Dottie took on tough issue after tough issue. Dottie never was too busy to sit down with those of us outside the Denver metropolitan city limits and talk to us about different issues.

She worked hard on the juvenile justice, on the children's code in Colorado, on the Denver Health Authority, on AIDS legislation, proposed adoption, State recodification, salaries of elected county officials. If there was a tough issue and you wanted somebody who could take the arrows, it was Dottie Wham.

I have deep, deep respect for Dottie. My years with Dottie were nothing but satisfying. My professional career with her and my professional relationship with her was excellent. Dottie will be missed not only by me. She will be missed by the State of Colorado. She will be particularly missed by the City of Denver and by her colleagues.

Ron Tupa. Ron is a representative minority whip. I have actually not gotten to talk with Ron very long, but I saw him on TV the other day. I can tell you about Ron. I watched him and I did not agree with him at all on the issue. I think Ron was talking about campaign reform. And while everybody, of course, wants campaign reform, the issue is how do you go about it. I mean, who gets the short end of the stick? That is what the issue is about.

But as I watched him, I was just flipping through with my remote control. I was in a hotel, as I often am, and sitting there and flipping through with my remote control, I come across this local station coverage and there is Ron.

He is an impressive guy. He speaks well. He was well received by the audience to whom he spoke. I thought his points were frankly to the point. I think Ron is respected outside, not just in the legislature, but outside the legislature. He is a young man. He is a social studies teacher.

I can tell just by listening to him that he probably has a knack for being able to communicate very well with his students. His issues, of course, have been e-mail privacy and some of the education issues. And, as I mentioned, he was the minority whip.

Senator Elsie Lacy. She was elected in the Senate in 1992. I will tell you, Elsie is quite a lady. She is a heck of a State senator. She is a solid, strong State senator. And she is a good friend. Elsie has done a tremendous job for the State of Colorado.

Her husband Duane, in his own regard, is well-respected. But I can tell you, Elsie has the respect of her colleagues. She was chairwoman of the appropriations committee and chairman of the joint budget committee. She served on the Aurora City Council. She worked primarily in transportation, health, education, and local government issues. Although, as chairman of the joint budget committee, her responsibilities obviously were dealing with the budget.

In Colorado, just like here, colleagues in Congress, we deal with some tough issues on the budget.

Elsie was there during the time that Colorado was just beginning to get out of the tough times, so she had to make tough decisions then. And as chairwoman she had to make tough decisions when Colorado got a surplus. Because then everybody thought Colorado had plenty of money. So people would go up to Elsie and say, Elsie, I want more money for this program. You got a surplus in Colorado. We want to start this new government program. We want to start this new government program.

Elsie had a way of being very polite in saying no if it would not give us a balanced budget.

Now, as Elsie told me one time, her choices were never choices on that joint budget committee between bad programs and good programs, as Elsie puts it. And as all of my colleagues here on the floor know, many, many times our choices are between good programs and good programs. The bad programs get eliminated very early on in the process. The tougher choices is as we begin to filter it out and we get to the good programs versus the good programs.

I thought Senator Lacy did an excellent job in shifting through that. And I think her service to the State of Colorado, especially in her focus in regards to the State's budget, will serve the State well for many, many years to come. Because the State of Colorado, I am proud to say, in large part to her and in part to our goner, Governor Bill Owens, its fiscal ship is in order and is strong.

Representative Sue Windells elected in 1998. Her big issues were education and tax reform. She is a teacher. Again, I did not know Sue that well. But I can tell you that, once again, these people that I did not know well, I went and asked because I knew I was going to give these comments tonight, I went to some of my colleagues that do know them and I asked them about them. What about Sue? What are some of her attributes?

She is well-received. She is honorable. She is knowledgeable. And she is respected by her colleagues. What more do you need said about a person?

In politics, if somebody acknowledges that you have got the technical capability, that you understand and care about people and that you are honest, that says a lot. Sue meets every one of those standards, and she is going to be missed.

Senator Dave Wattenberg. I can tell you a lot about Dave Wattenberg. He and I got elected at the same time back in 1982. He and I are from rural Colorado, the same area. Well, we actually bordered each other. He later went to the State Senate because he served in the State House of Representatives.

Dave and I, when we first ran for office, no one either gave Dave or me a chance of winning office. I was running against a very popular and very capable incumbent, and Dave was not given much of a chance of winning the seat.

I will never forget. The day before the election, he and I were sitting in a bar having a drink and Dave asked me, Wattenberg says, Scott, have you ever given any thought as to what is going to happen if by some chance we win this thing? I mean, we spent all this time campaigning, we spent all this time talking as candidates, but you and I have never been able to work as elected officials. I mean, we really are going to have to do what we said we are going to do. We are going to have to get aggressive. We really have got to stand up for issues like water and so on and so forth.

I would say in the State legislature there is probably no one right now as popular as David Wattenberg.

David is a cowboy. He is an old cowboy. I do not mean old in age. I mean old in respect. He is on a ranch up there in the northern part of the State.

For a number of years, Dave did not have opposition. In fact, I will tell my colleagues, he was so popular in one of his elections that his Democrat opponent who was very aggressive against Dave and ran a very aggressive race until about halfway through the race and, after debating Dave on a number of different occasions, liked him so well and felt he was so capable and so deserving as serving that district as State senator, pulled out of the race, and endorsed him.

Have you ever heard of somebody in a partisan race pulling out midway through the race and endorsing the other person?

That speaks very well, by the way, for the Democrat that did that, in my opinion. I am sorry, her name slipped me this evening. But I can tell you, it speaks well for David Wattenberg.

David, as I said, was elected to the House in 1982 and to the Senate in 1992. He is chairman of the agriculture natural resource energy committee. He also served on the business affairs and labor committees. His ranch is called the Wattenberg Ranch in Walden, Colorado.

He sponsored bills on all kinds of things, everything from horse racing to water issues to mining and transportation to tort reform. He specifically focused in on agriculture, water, ranching issues, and banking issues.

He has received any number of awards. He has been named Legislator of the Year, honored by Colorado Ski Country and Consulting Engineers Council and Guardian of Small Business.

As I was on the airplane this morning, I open up the Denver Post or the Rocky Mountain News, I am not sure which one of those two major papers, and there is David Wattenberg dancing on the Senate floor. He was serious but he had good humor.

As I said earlier in my comments about Dave, he is probably the most popular legislator in Colorado today. Dave Wattenberg is going to be sorely missed.

Representative Penfield Tate. I know Penfield by his work. I know him as a person. I have respect for him. I have dealt with him not extensively, but I have dealt with him.

Penfield is one solid guy, and he is known by his work. His work product is excellent. He works aggressively on it. He works hard. He has a strong reputation. His focuses have been primarily education and health issues. He is a member of the Denver Metropolitan Chamber of Commerce. I will tell you, Penfield is a fellow that anybody would like to have work as a partner with him. He has done a good job. We are going to miss him.

Senator Maryanne Tebedo. Maryanne and I went in and she actually was appointed shortly after I was elected. But, in essence, we have served together for 10 years in the State House. She went on to the State Senate.

Her husband Don is a retired air traffic controller. She was chairman of the State Veterans Military Affairs Committee, and she served on the Finance Committee.

She is also our parliamentarian. She is actually a certified professional parliamentarian. She served on the National Task Force on Labor, and she has worked hard on uniform stated permits for concealed weapons, regulations of the funeral board, State boards, highways. I mean, Maryanne has worked on a lot of legislation.

Senator Tebedo, when she took on an issue, she did several things with that issue. Number one, she learned about the issue. Number two, she figured out what the ramifications of her bill would be with that issue. She was aggressive in her pursuit of passing her

legislation. I think she was professional at every step of the way.

Now, not everyone agreed with her. But I will tell you, if you wanted to disagree with Senator Tebedo, you better have your facts in order. Because I never saw her without having her facts in order.

We are going to miss her.

Senator Tom Blickensderfer. Tom is a long-time friend of mine. Tom is a fine man. His wife is Kristen. He just got married 4 or 5 years ago. She is a beautiful woman. And I mean that in a very broad way. She has got all kinds of things about her that just make her a beautiful person.

But back to Tom. Tom is a great guy. He has been an excellent State senator. He was in the State House. He was a Senate majority leader. He was an attorney at law. I knew him well before he came into the State legislature.

His issues ranged from everything from water in the rural areas of the State. We could always go to Tom because Tom would always sit down with us and talk about the rural issues even though he represented a metropolitan area.

His family had a long running reputation in the ski industry in the State of Colorado. Tom's leadership as the majority leader in the Senate has been second to none.

2100

He is a strong leader. He is recognized throughout the political community for his contributions to his party. He is Republican. I am not talking about financial. I am talking about his volunteer time, his help with other candidates.

I will say, in my opinion, Tom has a wonderful future ahead of him. He has a great family. He has a great background. He has served the State of Colorado very well, and Tom is going to do very well in his future.

Representative Stephanie Takis, she was elected in 1996 and her big issue was affordable health care. She is a financial specialist. Again, I did not know Stephanie very well but as with the others I sat down and visited with my colleagues about Stephanie. I did not find anybody who said anything critical, although they had the opportunity to because my conversations with some of my colleagues were in private, and these were the colleagues that I could have that kind of conversation with. Not one bad word said about her.

She has done well in her service to the State of Colorado; and she, too, it appears, has a very promising future ahead of her.

Madam Speaker, I know that my colleagues may be saying, gosh, we sat here this evening; and we have had SCOTT MCINNIS talk about State legislators from the State of Colorado who are concluding their service tomorrow. What has that got to do with us? What has that got to do with the U.S. House of Representatives? After all, these are State legislators. This is the U.S. Congress in Washington, D.C.

It has a lot to do with us because those individuals that I just talked about can set an example for us back here, one that local government really truly is the best government. The Federal people in Washington, D.C., do not always know best. There are certain roles that we have to play, leadership in military, leadership in international trade, leadership in interstate commerce. But the fact is these State legislators are on the line. They are at the front of the battle.

The people that I spoke about this evening, most of my colleagues probably will never even meet one of them, but I can say what I hope was gotten out of my recognitions of these special people was the fact of their integrity, the impeccability of their hard work, the focus on the issues that they really cared about, the ability to cross party aisles. We all know politics is partisan. It is designed to be that way. It has to be that way. Somebody has to be boss. We cannot all be equal bosses. Somebody has to be the leader. So there is always partisan politics, but a real leader has the capability to step aside. The minority may not have a right to rule; but the minority has a right to be heard, and the individuals that I talked about this evening recognize that. They worked on both sides of the aisle.

I consider it a real honor to stand here in front of my colleagues in the House on the House floor of the United States Congress and recognize that tomorrow will be the last day for those colleagues of mine and their service in the State senate or State house respectively, and I want them to know from the highest level of the Federal Government here in the House of Representatives, that we acknowledge the work that they do; that we appreciate their honesty and their integrity and the respect that people who work with them understand that public officials, elected public officials, almost all of them really are good people. They work intensely for the people that they represent. They work intensely on the issues they care about. They work intensely and are proud of the States that they represent or the districts that they represent.

My colleagues in the State of Colorado are an excellent example of this.

Madam Speaker, in my concluding remark, let me just say truly it was my privilege to get to know and work with these people as they served the State of Colorado in the State legislature, and I hope to have a continued professional and profound good friendship with all of my friends in the State of Colorado.

WHAT IS FREE TRADE?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. PAUL. Madam Speaker, I asked for this Special Order this evening to talk about trade. We are going to be dealing with permanent normal trade relations with China here soon, and there is also a privileged resolution that will be brought to the floor that I have introduced, H.J.Res. 90. The discussion in the media and around the House floor has been rather clear about the permanent normal trade status, but there has not been a whole lot of talk yet about whether or not we should even really be in the World Trade Organization.

I took this time mainly because I think there is a lot of misunderstanding about what free trade is. There are not a whole lot of people who get up and say I am opposed to free trade, and many of those who say they are for free trade quite frankly I think they have a distorted definition of what free trade really is.

I would like to spend some time this evening talking a little bit about that, because as a strict constitutionalist and one who endorses laissez-faire capitalism, I do believe in free trade; and there are good reasons why countries should trade with each other.

The first reason I would like to mention is a moral reason. There is a moral element involved in trade, because when governments come in and regulate how citizens spend their money, they are telling them what they can do or cannot do. In a free society, individuals who earn money should be allowed to spend the money the way they want. So if they find that they prefer to buy a car from Japan rather than Detroit, they basically have the moral right to spend their money as they see fit and those kinds of choices should not be made by government. So there is a definite moral argument for free trade.

Patrick Henry many years ago touched on this when he said, ''You are not to inquire how your trade may be increased nor how you are to become a great and powerful people but how your liberties may be secured, for liberty ought to be the direct end of your government.'' We have not heard much talk of liberty with regards to trade, but we do hear a lot about enhancing one's ability to make more money overseas with trading with other nations. But the argument, the moral argument, itself should be enough to convince one in a free society that we should never hamper or interfere with free trade.

When the colonies did not thrive well prior to the Constitution, two of the main reasons why the Constitutional Convention was held was, one, there was no unified currency, that provided a great deal of difficulty in trading among the States, and also trade barriers are among the States.

Even our Constitution was designed to make sure that there were not trade barriers, and this was what the interstate commerce clause was all about. Unfortunately though, in this century the interstate commerce clause has

been taken and twisted around and is the excuse for regulating even trade within a State. Not only interstate trade, but even activities within a State has nothing to do with interstate trade. They use the interstate commerce clause as an excuse, which is a wild distortion of the original intent of the Constitution, but free trade among the States having a unified currency and breaking down the barriers certainly was a great benefit for the development and the industrialization of the United States.

The second argument for free trade is an economic argument. There is a benefit to free trade. Free trade means that you will not have high tariffs and barriers so you cannot buy products and you cannot exert this freedom of choice by buying outside. If you have a restricted majority and you can evenly buy from within, it means you are protecting industries that may not be doing a very good job, and there is not enough competition.

It is conceded that probably it was a blessing in disguise when the automobile companies in this country were having trouble in the 1970s, because the American consumer was not buying the automobiles, the better automobiles were coming in, and it should not have been a surprise to anybody that all of a sudden the American cars got to be much better automobiles and they were able to compete.

There is a tremendous economic benefit to the competition by being able to buy overseas. The other economic argument is that in order to keep a product out, you put on a tariff, a protective tariff. A tariff is a tax. We should not confuse that, we should not think tariff is something softer than a tax in doing something good. A tariff is a tax on the consumer. So those American citizens who want to buy products at lower prices are forced to be taxed.

If you have poor people in this country trying to make it on their own and they are not on welfare, but they can buy clothes or shoes or an automobile or anything from overseas, they are tremendously penalized by forcing them to pay higher prices by buying domestically.

The competition is what really encourages producers to produce better products at lower costs and keep the prices down. If one believes in free trade, they do not enter into free trade for the benefit of somebody else. There is really no need for reciprocity. Free trade is beneficial because it is a moral right. Free trade is beneficial because there is an economic advantage to buying products at a certain price and the competition is beneficial.

There really are no costs in the long run. Free trade does not require management. It is implied here on conversation on the House floor so often that free trade is equivalent to say we will turn over the management of trade to the World Trade Organization, which serves special interests. Well, that is not free trade; that is a misunderstanding of free trade.

Free trade means you can buy and sell freely without interference. You do not need international management. Certainly, if we are not going to have our own government manage our own affairs, we do not want an international body to manage these international trades.

Another thing that free trade does not imply is that this opens up the doors to subsidies. Free trade does not mean subsidies, but inevitably as soon as we start trading with somebody, we accept the notion of managed trade by the World Trade Organization, but immediately we start giving subsidies to our competitors.

If our American companies and our American workers have to compete, the last thing they should ever be required to do is pay some of their tax money to the Government, to send subsidies to their competitors; and that is what is happening. They are forced to subsidize their competitors on foreign aid. They support their competitors overseas at the World Bank. They subsidize their competitors in the Export/Import Bank, the Overseas Private Investment Corporation.

We literally encourage the exportation of jobs by providing overseas protection in insurance that cannot be bought in the private sector. Here a company in the United States goes overseas for cheap labor, and if, for political or economic reasons, they go bust, who bails them out. It is the American taxpayer, once again, the people who are struggling and have to compete with the free trade.

It is so unfair to accept this notion that free trade is synonymous with permitting these subsidies overseas, and, essentially, that is what is happening all the time. Free trade should never mean that through the management of trade that it endorses the notion of retaliation and also to stop dumping.

This whole idea that all of a sudden if somebody comes in with a product with a low price that you can immediately get it stopped and retaliate, and this is all done in the name of free trade, it could be something one endorses. They might argue that they endorse this type of managed trade and subsidized trade; but what is wrong, and I want to make this clear, what is wrong is to call it free trade, because that is not free trade.

Most individuals that I know who promote free trade around Washington, D.C., do not really either understand what free trade is or they do not really endorse it. And they are very interested in the management aspect, because some of the larger companies have a much bigger clout with the World Trade Organization than would the small farmers, small rancher or small businessman because they do not have the same access to the World Trade Organization.

2115

For instance, there has been a big fight in the World Trade Organization with bananas. The Europeans are fighting with the Americans over exportation of bananas. Well, bananas are not grown in Europe and they are not grown in the United States, and yet that is one of the big issues of managed trade, for the benefit of some owners of corporations that are overseas that make big donations to our political parties. That is not coincidental.

So powerful international financial individuals go to the World Trade Organization to try to get an edge on their competitor. If their competitor happens to be doing a better job and selling a little bit lower, then they come immediately to the World Trade Organization and say, Oh, you have to stop them. That is dumping. We certainly do not want to give the consumers the benefit of having a lower price.

So this to me is important, that we try to be clear on how we define free trade, and we should not do this by accepting the idea that management of trade, as well as subsidizing trade and calling it free trade is just not right. Free trade is the ability of an individual or a corporation to buy goods and spend their money as they see fit, and this provides tremendous economic benefits.

The third benefit of free trade, which has been known for many, many centuries, has been the peace effect from trade. It is known that countries that trade with each other and depend on each other for certain products and where the trade has been free and open and communications are free and open and travel is free and open, they are very less likely to fight wars. I happen to personally think this is one of the greatest benefits of free trade, that it leads us to policies that direct us away from military confrontation.

Managed trade and subsidized trade do not qualify. I will mention just a little later why I think it does exactly the opposite.

There is a little bit more to the trade issue than just the benefits of free trade, true free trade, and the disadvantages of managed trade, because we are dealing now when we have a vote on the normal trade status with China, as well as getting out of the World Trade Organization, we are dealing with the issue of sovereignty. The Constitution is very clear. Article I, section 8, gives the Congress the responsibility of dealing with international trade. It does not delegate it to the President, it does not delegate it to a judge, it does not delegate it to an international management organization like the World Trade Organization.

International trade management is to be and trade law is to be dealt with by the U.S. Congress, and yet too often the Congress has been quite willing to renege on that responsibility through fast-track legislation and deliver this authority to our President, as well as delivering through agreements, laws being passed and treaties, delivering

this authority to international bodies such as the UN-IMF-World Trade Organizations, where they make decisions that affect us and our national sovereignty.

The World Trade Organization has been in existence for 5 years. We voted to join the World Trade Organization in the fall of 1994 in the lame duck session after the Republicans took over the control of the House and Senate, but before the new Members were sworn in. So a lame duck session was brought up and they voted, and by majority vote we joined the World Trade Organization, which, under the Constitution, clearly to anybody who has studied the Constitution, is a treaty. So we have actually even invoked a treaty by majority vote.

This is a serious blunder, in my estimation, the way we have dealt with this issue, and we have accepted the idea that we will remain a member based on this particular vote.

Fortunately, in 1994 there was a provision put in the bill that said that any member could bring up a privileged resolution that gives us a chance at least to say is this a good idea to be in the World Trade Organization, or is it not? Now, my guess is that we do not have the majority of the U.S. Congress that thinks it is a bad idea. But I am wondering about the majority of the American people, and I am wondering about the number of groups now that are growing wary of the membership in the World Trade Organization, when you look at what happened in Seattle, as well as demonstrations here in D.C. So there is a growing number of people from various aspects of the political spectrum who are now saying, what does this membership mean to us? Is it good or is it bad? A lot of them are coming down on the side of saying it is bad.

Now, it is also true that some who object to membership in the World Trade Organization happen to be conservative free enterprisers, and others who object are coming from the politics of the left. But there is agreement on both sides of this issue dealing with this aspect, and it has to do with the sovereignty issue.

There may be some labor law and there may be some environmental law that I would object to, but I more strenuously object to the World Trade Organization dictating to us what our labor law ought to be and what our environmental law ought to be. I highly resent the notion that the World Trade Organization can dictate to us tax law.

We are currently under review and the World Trade Organization has ruled against the United States because we have given a tax break to our overseas company, and they have ruled against us and said that this tax break is a tax subsidy, language which annoys me to no end. They have given us until October 1 to get rid of that tax break for our corporations, so they are telling us, the U.S. Congress, what we have to do with tax law.

You say, oh, that cannot be. We do not have to do what they tell us. Well, technically we do not have to, but we will not be a very good member, and this is what we agreed to in the illegal agreement. Certainly it was not a legitimate treaty that we signed. But in this agreement we have come up and said that we would obey what the WTO says.

Our agreement says very clearly that any ruling by the WTO, the Congress is obligated to change the law. This is the interpretation and this is what we signed. This is a serious challenge, and we should not accept so easily this idea that we will just go one step further.

This has not just happened 5 years ago, there has been a gradual erosion of the concept of national sovereignty. It occurred certainly after World War II with the introduction of the United Nations, and now, under current conditions, we do not even ask the Congress to declare war, yet we still fight a lot of wars. We send troops all over the world and we are involved in combat all the time, and our presidents tell us they get the authority from a UN resolution. So we have gradually lost the concept of national sovereignty.

I want to use a quote from somebody that I consider rather typical of the establishment. We talk about the establishment, but nobody ever knows exactly who they are. But I will name this individual who I think is pretty typical of the establishment, and that is Walter Cronkite. He says, ''We need not only an executive to make international law, but we need the military forces to enforce that law and the judicial system to bring the criminals to justice in an international government.''

''But,'' he goes on to say, and this he makes very clear, and this is what we should be aware of, ''the American people are going to begin to realize that perhaps they are going to have to yield some sovereignty to an international body to enforce world law, and I think that is going to come to other people as well.''

So it is not like it has been hidden, it is not like it is a secret. It is something that those who disagree with me about liberty and the Constitution, they believe in internationalism and the World Trade Organization and the United Nations, and they certainly have the right to that belief, but it contradicts everything America stands for and it contradicts our Constitution, so, therefore, we should not allow this to go unchallenged.

Now, the whole idea that treaties could be passed and undermine the ability of our Congress to pass legislation or undermine our Constitution, this was thought about and talked about by the founders of this country. They were rather clear on the idea that a treaty, although the treaty can become the law of the land, a treaty could never be an acceptable law of the land if it amended or changed the Constitution. That would be ridiculous, and they made that very clear.

It could have the effect of the law of the land, as long as it was a legitimate constitutional agreement that we entered into. But Thomas Jefferson said if the treaty power is unlimited, then we do not have a Constitution. Surely the President and the Senate cannot do by treaty what the whole government is interdicted from doing in any way.

So that is very important. We cannot just sit back and accept the idea that the World Trade Organization, we have entered into it, it was not a treaty, it was an agreement, but we have entered into it, and the agreement says we have to do what they tell us, even if it contradicts the whole notion that it is the Congress' and people's responsibility to pass their own laws with regard to the environment, with regard to labor and with regard to tax law.

So I think this is important material. I think this is an important subject, a lot more important than just the vote to trade with China. I think we should trade with China. I think we should trade with Cuba. I think we should trade with everybody possible, unless we are at war with them. I do not think we should have sanctions against Iran, Iraq or Libya, and it does not make much sense to me to be struggling and fighting and giving more foreign aid to a country like China, and at the same time we have sanctions on and refuse to trade and talk with Cuba. That does not make a whole lot of sense. Yet those who believe and promote trade with China are the ones who will be strongly objecting to trade with Cuba and these other countries. So I think a little bit more consistency on this might be better for all of us.

Alexander Hamilton also talked about this. He said a treaty cannot be made which alters the Constitution of the country or which infringes any expressed exception to the powers of the Constitution of the United States.

So these were the founders talking about this, and yet we have drifted a long way. It does not happen overnight. It has been over a 50-year period. Five years ago we went one step further. First we accepted the idea that international finance would be regulated by the IMF. Then we accepted the idea that the World Bank, which was supposed to help the poor people of the world and redistribute wealth, they have redistributed a lot of wealth, but most of it ended up in the hands of wealthy individuals and wealthy politicians. But the poor people of the world never get helped by these programs. Now, 5 years ago we have accepted the notion that the World Trade Organization will bring about order in trade around the country.

Well, since that time we have had a peso crisis in Mexico and we had a crisis with currencies in Southeast Asia. So I would say that the management of finances with the IMF as well as the World Trade Organization has been very unsuccessful, and even if one does not accept my constitutional argument

that we should not be doing this, we should at least consider the fact that what we are doing is not very successful.

What I think we are seeing, when you get tens of thousands of people out on an issue that seems to be esoteric and start talking and demonstrating against our policy, essentially as they did in Seattle and Washington, I would say maybe the grassroots in America are starting to wake up a lot sooner than the people here in the U.S. Congress. So I think that it is very important that we think this through and think of it in the big context, not only in the very narrow context of voting for trade with China or not.

The World Trade Organization does not represent free trade because it is management of trade. It accepts all the complaints from the countries who think that they are being undersold or the competition is getting a little tough for them.

Just this week, the President has announced that he will send seven more complaints to the World Trade Organization, seven different countries who are being charged with unfair trade practices. The United States has not fared well with the World Trade Organization. The World Trade Organization has ruled against us on patents dealing with the playing of music, the World Trade Organization has ruled against us with regard to taxes, and also against us on some anti-dumping resolutions.

2130

But I am afraid that what is happening is, it is just another international bureaucracy that will be able to provide benefits for some very powerful special interests and ignore the little people who have a harder time to get an ear at the World Trade Organization.

The China situation I think is an interesting one because we are spending a lot of effort trading with China. Of course, the tragedy really here is not free trade in trading with China; it has to do with China getting some of our top secrets which to me is more disturbing than trading and buying some things that we might want from China. But China, we have gone to this extent. They have received a tremendous amount. I think they have now received $13 billion from the World Bank. They are the largest recipient of the Export-Import Bank. And, at the same time we send these benefits to China, we still have Members in the Congress who seem to flip flop on the issues who will say well, no, I do not like China; I think China, they are not respectable enough and they will undermine what we are doing, so I do not want to trade with China and they will vote against trade with China, yet at the same time they continue to vote to subsidize China through the Export-Import Bank. That is hard for me to understand why, if one does not want to trade with China, why would one want to continue to send them money. Why would they not vote against the World Bank sending them money. Why would they not vote against the Export-Import Bank sending money over there, because that is subsidizing them. That is where the real harm comes from. Yet, we see that inconsistency all the time.

Madam Speaker, I would like to discuss the third point about free trade that I made, and that is that free trade should lead to peace. I sincerely believe this, if we have free trade. But take an example of this: free trade is supposed to lead to lower taxes and lower prices. But here we have the World Trade Organization not telling us to lower taxes to be equal, that would not be quite as harmful, but here we have a World Trade Organization telling us to raise taxes to equal the competition. So it is working perversely. The same way in the military sense. We trade with China, we subsidize China, and yet China appears to be a threat to Taiwan.

So what do we do? Do we say let us not send any more subsidies to China? No, what we do is we hurry up and say well, there could be a conflict between Taiwan and China, so we send more weapons to Taiwan. So in subsidizing the Communist system in China, as well as militarizing and sending the military weapons and promising that we will support Taiwan, we are bound and determined to stir up a fight over there with us in the middle. So this, in itself, should tell us that this is not free trade. Free trade means that we are less likely to fight with people and yet, we are stirring up trouble over there and literally, but rather typically, we are subsidizing and helping both sides, which we have done for many, many years.

This is why the argument for national sovereignty and the national defense, a strong national defense makes a whole lot of sense, because we do not have to make these determinations. First, we do not have the authority to make the determination of the internal affairs of other nations. We do not have that authority. We probably do not have the wisdom to pick out who the good guys and the bad guys are, but we certainly do not have the finesse to do it by going in there and satisfying all sides. About all we do is we commit ourselves to these conflicts around the world, commit our troops and commit our dollars.

Instead of trying to come back from some of these commitments of troops every place in the world, we are looking for more dragons to slay. We in the Congress are going along with the President, getting prepared to send billions of dollars down to Colombia to support a faction down there that has been in a civil war for decades and 30,000 people killed. And of course the grandiose explanation is that we are going down there and we are going to stop drugs from coming in here, which is a dream, because that is not going to happen. But the real reason why I think we venture out into these areas is to serve the financial interests, because it just happens that those individuals who like to sell helicopters and they like to sell airplanes and they like others who would like to protect oil interests are the ones who are more likely to lobby for us to be in areas like this.

Madam Speaker, free trade, if it were true free trade, we would be less likely ever to fight with other countries. There was one free trade economist who stated that he had a rule, it was called the McDonald rule. He said he has watched it so far and up until now, the best he knows, there has never been two countries that have had McDonalds in each country ever fought a war. So that is rather simplistic, but I think there is a lot of truth to that, that we should trade and talk with people, give people the freedom and the right to spend their money the way they want. Do not take the money from the people who may have short-term disadvantages from free trade and tax them in order to subsidize the competition. That is where I think we really get off track and we do way too much of it.

Madam Speaker, I would like to touch on another subject about trade that is rarely mentioned, and it may well be one of the most important aspects of trade. That has to do with the even flow of trade between countries and their currencies. Balance of payment deficits and current account deficits are very, very important in the long run, especially if they are accompanied by fiat money and not sound money and different currencies being inflated at different rates. This will cause imbalances which causes tremendous shake-outs like we had in Southeast Asia where all of a sudden there are devaluations and some of the protectionist sentiment in order to get an edge on the competitors will be frequently deliberate devaluations where they will prop up currencies in order to get an edge or keep a currency lower in order to get an edge. These things can work for a while, but they usually end up in a crisis, with a currency crisis, higher interest rates, inflations and a downturn in the economy.

Now, fortunately, over the last 10 years, most other countries have done a poorer job than we have. The United States has had a built-in advantage in the 1990s since the breakup of the Soviet Union. We have remained the power house economically and militarily which conveys a certain amount of confidence to our currency and has given us license to counterfeit. It has given our Federal Reserve license to create credit out of thin air for all of the reasons they want to do, to stimulate housing or whatever. Also, to encourage some of these trade imbalances. So some of the protectionists will look and they will say, look how much we buy from China, look how

much we buy from Japan. That is related to the fact that we have a currency that is artificially and temporarily rated very high and foreigners are willing to take our money, creating this imbalance. But that will all come to an end, because we cannot do this forever. When that happens, stocks go down, interest rates go up, the economy drops, and inflation comes back.

The benefits that we have received over these past 10 years have only been temporary. So when we look at the imbalances created by the currency system and the monetary system, we should be prepared to find out that the World Trade Organization will do absolutely nothing to solve that problem. The IMF cannot solve that problem, the World Bank cannot solve that problem, and the World Trade Organization certainly will not solve that problem, because some of the imbalances have already been built into the system.

Madam Speaker, we are the greatest debtor Nation in the world today. Our current account deficit is running at record highs. That will be reversed, and the value of the dollar will be reversed. This will cause some serious problems for all of us. It will be the paying back. We have borrowed money endlessly, the foreigners are willing to take our money, sell us cheap products. Our standard of living goes up, they loan us back the money, they buy into our stock market, so we have an illusion of wealth because we have the greatest counterfeiting machine in the world, and that is the Federal Reserve's ability to create credit out of thin air.

It would be nice if it would last forever and these perceptions would persist, but if one looks at monetary history, one finds out that it never persists forever. It persists only for a limited period of time. There was a time in the 1980s they thought in Japan it would persist forever, and then all of a sudden the investment and the adjustments that were required from the over-capacity built into their system came about, and because they have not permitted the liquidation of the debt and the adjustment in prices and wages, their problems have persisted now for more than 10 years.

So we will have to face up to that. The important thing there is that it is not a trade problem, it is a currency problem. One day, we in the Congress will have to decide whether or not we want a sound currency again, or whether we want to continue manipulating a paper currency, a paper currency backed up by nothing. Nothing but promises, promises that we will tax the American people, and that if the American people are not working hard enough and they are not paying enough taxes or the economy slips, all of a sudden that perceived value of the dollar will go down. So that is a very serious problem that we will be needing to address in the not too distant future.

I would like to mention in a little bit more detail the H. J. Res. 90, because that is the number of the resolution that will be brought to the floor for a vote, and it is not a complicated piece of legislation, it is a single page. It just says that we do not want to be members of the World Trade Organization. People worry, well, what will this mean? It will mean that we believe in free trade. It means that we will trade with China and that we will have low tariffs and that we should not be subsidizing or managing trade for powerful special interests, but it will also mean that we do not endorse this concept that the World Trade Organization should be dictating to us the way we write our laws. The way this was stated is that we must accept the idea that we accept the rules of the WTO. I, of course, think that is a serious mistake, and that we should always work for free trade.

Monesque was very clear on his ideas about what free trade should be and why we should have it in relationship to this issue of war and peace. That, of course, I think is the most important. He says, peace is the natural effect of trade. Two nations who differ with each other become reciprocally dependent, for if one has an interest in buying, the other has an interest in selling, and thus, their union is founded on their mutual necessities. That is true, but what we are doing today by subsidizing and supporting a regime like Red China, not trading with Red China, but subsidizing them at the same time we see the antagonism building with Taiwan and our only answer there is to rush to Taiwan and send them more weapons, and we decide to stand in between them, I think is a foolish policy that will lead to trouble.

Madam Speaker, we should not be the policemen of the world. We should set a standard on free trade. We should set a standard in the ideas of liberty. We should be aware and think more seriously about what Patrick Henry said. If we are concerned only about the immediate financial benefit of some trade agreement, we forget about the bigger picture. And the bigger picture and the bigger the responsibility of all of us, my responsibility and your responsibility to our people, and the American people should think about this too. The most important thing is that we provide liberty for our people to let our people solve their problems. This blind faith in big government and this blind faith in international government and World Trade Organization, the United Nations, and this idea that we can police the world, that is a blind faith which I think has caused a lot of trouble and is bound to bring a lot more pain and suffering to us in the future.

Madam Speaker, I am quite confident that in due time, it will be the undoing of our system if we do not change our ways. Because technically, we are a bankrupt Nation. We talk about huge surpluses, but the huge surpluses are fictitious. The national debt is going up at a rate of $100 billion a month. There is no surplus. There is a commitment made out there, and the wealth of this country is based on borrowed money and a belief that the dollar is going to be remaining strong forever and ever. That fiction will come to an end, and we will be forced to face up to reality, and then we have to decide what really is our purpose. Is our purpose to manage people, tell them how to live, tell them how to live their personal lives? Is our job to manage the economy and distort the general welfare clause and the interstate commerce clause to the point that we tell everybody what they can do with every item they buy?

2145

And are we going to permit agreements that are not treaties to act as treaties to undermine our national sovereignty and write laws for us in the Congress? I do not think that is a very good idea, and I think that is the direction that we are going.

I think there is every reason to believe that if we go back to what America was all about and the importance of the American policies, what made America great, we will be all right. But we have too much emphasis on the commercialism of what people want from special advantage.

Why is it that we here in the Congress are lobbied by lobbyists willing to spend $130 million a month? Why do they come here? Because their interests are best served because we are doing way too much. And I certainly do not believe that the answer is to regulate the lobbyists, regulate the elections or tell people how to spend their own money. What we should regulate is ourselves. We should regulate our insatiable desire to tell people what to do and how to live and how to run the economy and how the world should run.

That is what we cannot seem to control. We seem to not have any ability to just back away and have some belief and conviction that a free society works; that freedom works; that protection of life and liberty is important; the protection of property is important.

Madam Speaker, the World Trade Organization undermines property rights through the patent laws, which they have done; the Congress endlessly buying up land and confiscating land from the people, taking land from the people. We do not honor property rights. We interfere with contracts continuously.

The Government should be protecting liberty. The Government is not here under the original agreement with the people and the Constitution. The Government, we the Congress, the Constitution was designed to protect our liberties, not to undermine them; and yet we spend most of our time here undermining the liberties of the people.

Now the question is: Is that what the people want? Do the people really want us to do this and tell them what to do and how to live endlessly, and they will accept that because they will get

things from us? As long as we take care of them and provide them free medical care and free education and everything is free, everybody knows we have all of that ability to create free things.

Most people, though, I am afraid are on to us. They think the U.S. Congress and the United States Government creates nothing. They are incapable of creating anything. About all they can do is take from one and give to another, and then in the process undermine the principles of liberty. And by doing that, we will undermine the principles of the basic concept of what is necessary to produce a good standard of living. But we concentrate not on liberty, not on freedom. We concentrate on the things that are distributed and redistributed, the advantages and the disadvantages and how we are going to get bigger government. Not only bigger Federal Government, but bigger international government, never talking about what are the advantages to the people if we just give them their freedom. Just leave them alone.

The people I have my greatest sympathies for are the low middle-income people. People who do not want to go on welfare and are getting ripped off by the system because they do have to pay taxes, and they are the first ones who suffer from job losses and suffer from the inflation, and they are the last ones to have any representation up here. If one is on welfare, they have representation. And if one is a giant corporation willing to send equipment overseas and fight wars, they have great representation.

But if one is hard working, believes in freedom, accepts the responsibility for their own acts, believes they should take care of their family, would like to be left alone, then they are seen as an enemy of the State. The Government too often wants to do something to them, like tax them more and more.

So I think it is time we as a Congress started thinking about something other than the transfer of wealth and the control and manipulation of people. Think again once more of the quote that I used as I started tonight by Patrick Henry: ''You are not to inquire how your trade may be increased, nor how you are to become a great and powerful people, but how your liberties may be secured. For liberty ought to be the direct end of your government.''

If we make liberty the direct end of our government, I do not believe for one minute that we will have to worry about the prosperity. Because we have neglected the liberties of our people, I am deeply concerned about the prosperity of our people and I am deeply concerned about the international conflicts that we tend to stir up and demand that we send our troops throughout the world. I think that can lead to trouble. It has in the past. It will in the future.

Because we have drifted from this notion that the Government should be limited. Limited to protecting our liberty, making sure the marketplace is free, making sure that property rights exist, and making sure that we mind our own business. And quite possibly if we would do more of that, minding our own business and not spending this money overseas, we could literally do a better job taking care of our military.

Madam Speaker, our military needs funding. They need a morale boost. They need better training. They need a better mission. And yet we send them hither and yon around the world spending hundreds of billions of dollars, at the same time our defenses are probably as low as they have ever been.

But that is not a ''lack of money'' problem; that is a ''lack of mission'' problem. It is a lack of understanding what policy ought to be. Our policy ought to be, and our purpose ought to be, the preservation of liberty. The preservation of liberty means that we should have free trade and that we should talk to our so-called enemies and trade with them and deal with them, and we are less likely to fight with them.

But we should never fall into the trap of talking and using words incorrectly, this idea that people come and talk so much about free trade and then do not defend free trade, or do not understand it. What they are talking about is managed trade by the World Trade Organization, and it means that we also subsidize our enemies and our competitors around the world. That is not free trade. That is not related to freedom. Freedom is not that complex.

Fortunately for us, we have a document that is rather clear and simple that we all can read and understand. And, unfortunately, we do not read it often enough when we pass this massive legislation here on the House floor and get ourselves involved in too many things. So, hopefully, here in the next couple of weeks as we talk more about trade and we have a vote on China, as well as a vote on whether or not we should even be in the World Trade Organization, hopefully we will have more than five or 10 or 15 or 20, say: That makes sense. Why are we in the World Trade Organization?

We can still believe in freedom, we can still believe in trade, we can still believe in the American dream without accepting the idea that free trade and freedom means we belong to the World Trade Organization. Hopefully, there will be enough people in this Congress to send the message and say at least let us question this. Why do we feel so compelled to belong to these international organizations, joining them not with a treaty but with a mere vote of this Congress and now they are dictating law back to us.

Hopefully, those individuals who are a little bit annoyed with the World Trade Organization because they have encroached upon our lawmaking process dealing with trade law, dealing with labor law, and dealing with environmental law, dealing with tax law, that they will say maybe the problem is not mismanagement of the World Trade Organization; maybe we should not have that much confidence that if we get a few new managers in there, like they think they can do at the IMF. Maybe the problem is that we should not be in the World Trade Organization at all.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ORTIZ (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of a weather delay.

Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and the balance of the week on account of illness in the family.

Mr. COBURN (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and the balance of the week on account of a death in the family.

Mr. MANZULLO (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of a death in the family.

Ms. CARSON (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MCNULTY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. LIPINSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ETHERIDGE, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MCINNIS) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes, today and May 3.

Mr. METCALF, for 5 minutes, today, May 3, and May 5.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at their own request) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 397. An act to authorize the Secretary of Energy to establish a multiagency program to alleviate the problems caused by rapid economic development along the United States-Mexico border, particularly those associated with public health and environmental security, to support the Materials Corridor Partnership Initiative, and to promote energy efficient, environmentally

sound economic development along that border through the development and use of new technology, particularly hazardous waste and materials technology; to the Committee on Science.

S. 408. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey a former Bureau of Land Management administrative site to the city of Carson City, Nevada, for use as a senior center; to the Committee on Resources.

S. 1218. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to issue to the Landusky School District, without consideration, a patent for the surface and mineral estates of certain lots, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

S. 1629. An act to provide for the exchange of certain land in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Resources.

S. 1694. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study on the reclamation and reuse of water and wastewater in the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Resources.

S. 1705. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to enter into land exchanges to acquire from the private owner and to convey to the State of Idaho approximately 1,240 acres of land near the City of Rocks National Reserve, Idaho, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

S. 1727. An act to authorize funding for the expansion annex of the historic Palace of the Governors, a public history museum located, and relating to the history of Hispanic and Native American culture, in the Southwest and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

S. 1778. An act to provide for equal exchanges of land around the Cascade Reservoir; to the Committee on Resources.

S. 1797. An act to provide for a land conveyance to the city of Craig, Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

S. 1836. An act to extend the deadline for commencement of construction of a hydroelectric project in the State of Alabama; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 1849. An act to designate segments and tributaries of White Clay Creek, Delaware and Pennsylvania, as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System; to the Committee on Resources.

S. 1892. An act to authorize the acquisition of the Valles Caldera, to provide for an effective land and wildlife management program for this resource within the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

S. 1910. An act to amend the Act establishing Women's Rights National Historical Park to permit the Secretary of the Interior to acquire title in fee simple to the Hunt House located in Waterloo, New York; to the Committee on Resources.

S. 1946. An act to amend the National Environmental Education Act to redesignate that Act as the ''John H. Chafee Environmental Education Act'', to establish the John H. Chafee Memorial Fellowship Program, to extend the programs under that Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On April 13, 2000:

H.R. 1658. To provide a more just and uniform procedure for Federal civil forfeitures, and for other purposes.

On April 20, 2000:

H.R. 1231. To direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain National Forest lands to Elko County, Nevada, for continued use as a cemetery.

H.R. 1615. To amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to extend the designation of a portion of the Lamprey River in New Hampshire as a recreational river to include an additional river segment.

H.R. 1753. To promote the research, identification, assessment, exploration, and development of gas hydrate resources, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 86. Recognizing the 50th anniversary of the Korean War and the service by members of the Armed Forces during such war, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3090. To amend the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act to restore certain lands to the Elim Native Corporation, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3063. To amend the Mineral Leasing Act to increase the maximum acreage of Federal leases for sodium that may be held by an entity in any one State, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2863. To clarify the legal effect on the United States of the acquisition of a parcel of land in the Red Cliffs Desert Reserve in the State of Utah.

H.R. 2862. To direct the Secretary of the Interior to release reversionary interests held by the United States in certain parcels of land in Washington County, Utah, to facilitate an anticipated land exchange.

H.R. 2368. To assist in the resettlement and relocation of the people of Bikini Atoll by amending the terms of the trust fund established during the United States administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PAUL. Madam Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 54 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 3, 2000, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

7149. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Seed Regulatory and Testing Branch, Agricultural Marketing Service, transmitting the Department's final rule—Increase in Fees for Federal Seed Testing and Certification Services [Docket No. LS–99–05] received March 27, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7150. A letter from the Acting Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Use of Electronic Signatures by Customers, Participants and Clients of Registrants— received March 15, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7151. A letter from the Acting Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Exemption from Registration as a Commodity Trading Advisor (RIN: 3038–AB48) received March 16, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7152. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Seed Regulatory and Testing Branch, Department of Agricultural, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendments to Regulations Under the Federal Seed Act [No. LS–94–012] (RIN: 0581–AB55) received March 7, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7153. A letter from the Regulatory Liaison, Grain Inspection, Packers, and Stockyards Administration, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration, USDA (RIN: 0580–AA70) received March 27, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7154. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Nectarines and Peaches Grown in California; Revision of Handling Requirements for Fresh Nectarines and Peaches [Docket No. FV00–916–1 IFR] received March 23, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7155. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Importation of Poultry Meat and other Poultry Products from Sinaloa and Sonora, Mexico [APHIS Docket No. 98–034–2] received March 27, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7156. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Veterinary Services User Fees; Export Certificate Endorsements [APHIS Docket No. 98–003–02] received March 27, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7157. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Marketing Order Regulating the Handling of Spearmint Oil Produced in the Far West; Revision of the Salable Quantity and Allotment Percentage for Class 3 (Native) Spearmint Oil for the 1999–2000 Marketing Year [Docket No. FV00–985–3 IFR] received March 27, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7158. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Services, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Avacodos Grown in South Florida; Relaxation of Container and Pack Requirements [Docket No. FV00–915–1 FIR] received March 23, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7159. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Importation and Interstate Movement of Certain Land Tortoises [Docket No. 00–016–1] received March 17, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7160. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Fruits and Vegetables, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule— Blueberry Promotion, Research, and Information Order; Referendum Procedures [FV–99–702–FR] received March 7, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7161. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service,

Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Melons Grown in South Texas; Increased Assessment Rate [Docket No. FV00–979–1 FR] received March 7, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7162. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Livestock and Seed Program, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule— Pork Promotion and Research [No. LS–98–007] received March 7, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7163. A letter from the Administrator, Food Safety and Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Food Labeling; Nutrient Content Claims, Definition of Term: Healthy [Docket No. 99–050IF] (RIN: 0583–AC65) received March 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7164. A letter from the Administrator, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—1999–Crop Peanuts National Poundage Quota (RIN: 0560–AF48) received March 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7165. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Dichlormid; Time-Limited Pesticide Tolerance [OPP–300988; FRL–6498–7] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received March 23, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7166. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Cucurbitacins; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [OPP–300965; FRL–6485–3] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received March 16, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7167. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Glufosinate Ammonium; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP–300986; FRL–6498–1] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received March 24, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7168. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Polyvinyl Acetate, Carboxyl Modified Sodium Salt; Tolerance Exemption [OPP–300942; FRL–6389–8] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received March 1, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7169. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the annual report on conditional registration of pesticides during Fiscal Year 1999, pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 136w—4; to the Committee on Agriculture.

7170. A letter from the the Comptroller General, the General Accounting Office, transmitting a review of the President's first special impoundment message for fiscal year 2000, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 685; (H. Doc. No. 106—224); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

7171. A letter from the the Director, the Office of Management and Budget, transmitting Cumulative report on rescissions and deferrals, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 685(e); (H. Doc. No. 106—229); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

7172. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a request for emergency Fiscal Year 2000 supplemental appropriations to assist in reconstruction expenses in Southern Africa; (H. Doc. No. 106—230); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

7173. A letter from the Under Secretary, Comptroller, Department of Defense, transmitting a report of violations of the Antideficiency Act by the Department of the Air Force personnel; to the Committee on Appropriations.

7174. A letter from the Under Secretary, Comptroller, Department of Defense, transmitting a report of the violations of the Antideficiency Act by the Department of the Army; to the Committee on Appropriations.

7175. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting On payment of restructuring costs under defense contracts, pursuant to Public Law 105—85 section 804(a)(1) (111 Stat. 1832); to the Committee on Armed Services.

7176. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting F–22 aircraft program report for FY 2000 and the event-based decisions planned for FY 2001, pursuant to Public Law 104—201, section 218(a) (110 Stat. 2455); to the Committee on Armed Services.

7177. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Research and Engineering, Department of Defense, transmitting the Annual Report of the Scientific Advisory Board of the Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7178. A letter from the Director of Operational Test and Evaluation and Deputy Under Secretary (Science and Technology), Department of Defense, transmitting a report on the selection of the laborities and T&E Centers; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7179. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, Department of Defense, transmitting proposed legislation to authorize military construction and related activities of the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7180. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition and Technology, Department of Defense, transmitting the report on reimbursement of contractor environmental response action cost; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7181. A letter from the Alternate OSD Federal Register Liaison Officer, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Collection From Third Party Players of Reasonable Costs of Healthcare Services (RIN: 0790–AG51) received March 14, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

7182. A letter from the Program Manager, Department of Defense, Pentagon Renovation Program, transmitting the 10th Annual Report on the renovation of the Pentagon Reservation; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7183. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Procurement and Assistance Management, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule—Transfer of Real Property at Defense Nuclear Facilities for Economic Development [Docket No. FM-RM–99–RPROP] (RIN: 1901–AA82) received March 3, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

7184. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the approved retirement and advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list of Lieutenant General Michael C. Short, United States Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7185. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on plans to establish and deploy Rapid Assessment and Intial Detection (RAID) teams that would respond to incidents involving weapons of mass destruction; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7186. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a proposed bill, ''To authorize appropriations for Fiscal Year 2001 for certain maritime programs of the Department of Transportation, and for other purposes''; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7187. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Office of the Secretary, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendments to HUD's Mortgagee Review Board and Civil Money Penalty Regulations [Docket No. FR–4308–I–01] (RIN: 2501–AC44) received March 1, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

7188. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report involving U.S. exports to Turkey, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3)(i); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

7189. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule— Restrictions on the Purchase of Assets from the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation (RIN: 3064–AB37) received March 28, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

7190. A letter from the Assistant, Federal Reserve Board, transmitting the Board's final rule—Regulation Y; Bank Holding Companies and Change in Bank Control [Docket No. R–1062] received March 14, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

7191. A letter from the Assistant, Division of Consumer and Community Affairs, Federal Reserve Board, transmitting the Board's final rule—Truth in Lending [Regulation Z; Docket No. R–1050] received March 27, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

7192. A letter from the Assistant, Federal Reserve Board, transmitting the Board's final rule—Financial Subsidiaries [Regulation H; Docket No. R–1066] (RIN: 1505–AA77) received March 20, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

7193. A letter from the Assistant, Federal Reserve Board, transmitting the Board's final rule—Bank Holding Companies and Change in Bank Control [Regulation Y; Docket No. R–1067] received March 20, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

7194. A letter from the Assistant, Federal Reserve Board, transmitting the Board's final rule—Bank Holding Companies and Change in Bank Control [Regulation Y; Docket No. R–1065] received March 20, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

7195. A letter from the Assistant, Federal Reserve Board, transmitting the Board's final rule—Bank Holding Companies and Change in Bank Control [Regulation Y; Docket No. R–1057] received March 20, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

7196. A letter from the Assistant, Federal Reserve Board, transmitting the Board's final rule—Membership of State Banking Institutions in the Federal Reserve System [Regulation H; Docket No. R–1064] received March 14, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

7197. A letter from the Assistant, Federal Reserve Board, transmitting the Board's final rule—Bank Holding Companies and

Change in Bank Control; Securities Underwriting, Dealing, and Market-Making Activities of Financial Holding Companies [Regulation Y; Docket No. R–1063] received March 14, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

7198. A letter from the Director, Office of Thrift Supervision, transmitting the Office's 2000 compensation plan, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 18336; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

7199. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft bill, ''To amend section 504 of the Housing Act of 1949''; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

7200. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting Final Regulations——Administration of Grants and Agreements with Institutions of Higher Education, Hospitals, and other Non-Profit Organizations, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(f); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

7201. A letter from the Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the twentieth annual report on the implementation of the Age Discrimination Act of 1975 by departments and agencies which administer programs of Federal financial assistance, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 6106a(b); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

7202. A letter from the Administator, Food and Nutrition Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule— Modification of the ''Vegetable Protein Products'' Requirements for the National School Lunch Program, School Breakfast Program, Summer Food Service Program and Child and Adult Care Food Program (RIN: 0584–AC82) received March 13, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

7203. A letter from the Executive Director, Federal Labor Relations Authority, transmitting the Authority's final rule—Amendment of Equal Access to Justice Act Attorney Fees Regulations—received March 1, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

7204. A letter from the Director, Coporate Policy and Research Department, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule—Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing Benefits—received March 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

7205. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Office of Environment, Safety and Health, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule—Internal Dosimetry—received March 23, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7206. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Office of Environment, Safety and Health, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule—The DOE Corporate Lessons Learned Program [DOE-STD 7501–99] received March 23, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7207. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Office of Environment, Safety and Health, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule—Backup Power Sources for DOE Facilities [DOE -STD 3003–2000] received March 23, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7208. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Office of Environment, Safety and Health, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule—Preparation Guide for U.S. Department of Energy Nonreactor Nuclear Facility Safety Analysis Reports [DOE-STD 3009–94] received March 23, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7209. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Indirect Food Additives: Paper and Paperboard Components [Docket No. 95F–0065] received March 16, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7210. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Managment Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Indirect Food Additives: Adjuvants, Production Aids, and Sanitizers [Docket No. 94F–0334] received March 27, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7211. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Public Information; Communications With State and Foreign Government Officials [Docket No. 98N–0518] received March 16, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7212. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Indirect Food Additives: Polymers [Docket No. 99F–0461] received March 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7213. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of Requirements Applicable to Albumin (Human), Plasma Protein Fraction (Human), and Immune Globulin (Human); Confirmation in Part and Technical Amendment [Docket No. 98N–0608] received March 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7214. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, NHTSA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; School Bus Body Joint Strength [Docket No. NHTSA–2000–6994] (RIN: 2127–AH84) received March 17, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7215. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, NHTSA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Anthropomorphic Test Devices; 3–Year-Old Child Crash Test Dummy [Docket No. NHTSA–2000–7051] (RIN: 2127–AG 77) received March 17, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7216. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Phase 2 Emission Standards for New Nonroad Spark-Ignition Handheld Engines At or Below 19 Kilowatts and Minor Amendments to Emission Requirements Applicable to Small Spark-Ignition Engines and Marine Spark-Ignition Engines [FRL–6548–2] (RIN: 2060–AE29) received March 27, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7217. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants: Alabama [AL52–200014; FRL–6568–6] received March 27, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7218. 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; State of Missouri [MO 099–1099; FRL–6568–8] received March 27, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7219. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—West Virginia: Final Determination of Partial Program Adequacy of the State's Municipal Solid Waste Landfill Permitting Program [FRL–6565–6 40 CFR-Part 258] received March 23, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7220. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Oklahoma: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions [FRL–6565–4] received March 23, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7221. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—A Required State Implementation Plan for Carbon Monoxide; Spokane, Washington [FRL–6566–9] received March 23, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7222. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Finding of Failure To Submit A Required State Implementation Plan for Carbon Monoxide; Fairbanks, Alaska [FRL–6566] received March 23, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7223. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; Indiana; Control of Landfill Gas Emissions from Existing Municipal Solid Waste Landfills [IN193–1a; FRL–6566–7] received March 23, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7224. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Municipal Solid Waste Landfills State Plan For Designated Facilities and Pollutants: Idaho [Docket No. 01–0001; FRL–6566–2] received March 23, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7225. 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 New Mexico: Transportation Conformity Rule [NM–26–1–6944a; FRL–6561–6] received March 16, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7226. 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; Texas; Control of Air Pollution from Volatile Organic Compounds, Vent Gas Control and Offset Lithographic Printing Rules [TX–107–2–7424a; FRL–6567–5] received March 24, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7227. A letter from the Director, Office of Regualtory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Connecticut and Rhode Island;

Clean Fuel Fleets [CT061–7220A; A–1–FRL–6542–3] received March 1, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7228. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Prevention of Significant Deterioration Delegation of Authority to Mendocino County Air Pollution Control District to Administer Permits Issued by EPA [NZ001; FRL–6561–80] received March 16, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7229. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Organobromine Production Wastes; Identification and Listing of Hazardous Waste; Land Disposal Restrictions; Listing of CERCLA Hazardous Substances, Reportable Quantities; Final Rule [FRL–6560–4] received March 16, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7230. 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: Oregon [OR–73–7288-a; FRL–6544–2] received March 16, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7231. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; California State Implementation Plan Revision, Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District, San Joaquin Valley Unified Air Pollution Control District, Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District, South Coast Air Quality Air Management District [CA 224–0213a FRL–6549–7] received March 16, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7232. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; California State Implementation Plan Revision, Ventura County Air Pollution Control District, Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District, and Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District [CA 040–0223a; FRL–6563–3] received March 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7233. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Managment and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Outer Continental Shelf Air Regulations Consistency Update for California [FRL–6563–9] received March 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7234. 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 (Refugio and Taft, Texas) [MM Docket No. 99–256 RM–9527] received March 23, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7235. A letter from the Chief, Legal Branch, Accounting Safeguards Division, Common Carrier Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Comprehensive Review of the Accounting Requirements for Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers: Phase 1 [CC Docket No. 99–253] received March 23, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7236. 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 (Lufkin and Corrigan, TX) [MM Docket No. 98–135 RM–9300 RM–9383] received March 23, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7237. A letter from the Chief, Legal Branch, Accounting Safeguards Division, Common Carrier Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—1998 Biennial Regulatory Review— Review of Depreciation Requirements for Incumbent Local Exchange Carriers [CC Docket No. 98–137] United States Telephone Association's Petition for Forbearance from Depreciation Regulation of Price Cap for Local Exchange Carriers [ASD 98–91] received March 14, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7238. A letter from the Senior Attorney, Common Carrier Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule— Telecommunications Relay Services and Speech-to-Speech Services for Individuals with Hearing and Speech Disabilities [CC Docket No. 98–67] received March 14, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7239. A letter from the Deputy Chief, Auctions and Industry Analysis Division, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Part 90 of the Commission's Rules to Facilities Future Development of SMR Systems in the 800 MHz Frequency Band [PR Docket No. 93–144 RM–8117, RM–8030 RM–8029] Implementation of Section 3(n) and 332 of the Communications Act—Regulatory Treatment of Mobile Services [GN Docket No. 93–252] Implementation of Section 309(j) of the Communication Act—Competative Bidding [PP Docket No. 93–253] received March 14, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7240. A letter from the Associate Bureau Chief, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—1998 Biennial Regulatory Review-Amendment of Part 97 of the Commission's Amateur Rules [WT Docket No. 98–143, RM–9148. RM–9150, RM–9196] received March 2, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7241. 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. (Middlebury, Berlin and Hardwick, Vermont) [MM Docket No. 98–72, RM–9265, RM–9368] received March 1, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7242. 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. (Alberton, Montana) [MM Docket No. 99–305 RM–9537] (Big Sky, Montana) [MM Docket No. 99–307 RM–9739] (Albany, Texas) [MM Docket No. 99–286 RM–9713] (Seymour, Texas) [MM Docket No. 99–303 RM–9737] (Inglis, Florida) [MM Docket No. 99–306 RM–9729] received March 1, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7243. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Open Access-Same-Time Information System and Standards of Conduct [Docket No. RM95–9–003; Order No. 638] received March 20, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7244. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Regional Transmission Organizations [Docket No. RM99–2–001; Order No. 2000–A] received March 16, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7245. A letter from the Secretary, Bureau of Consumer Protection, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Rule Concerning Disclosures Regarding Energy Consumption and Water Use of Certain Home Appliances and Other Products Required Under the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (''Appliance Labeling Rule'') [Billing Code 6750–01–M] received March 24, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7246. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Rule Concerning Disclosures Regarding Energy Consumption and Water Use of Certain Home Appliances and Other Products Required Under the Energy Policy and Conservation Act (''Appliance Labeling Rule'')—received March 7, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7247. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—List of Approved Spent Fuel Storage Casks; Revision, NUHOMS 24–P and NUHOMS 52–B (RIN: 3150–AG19) received March 27, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7248. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—List of Approved Spent Fuel Storage Casks: TN–32 Addition (RIN: 3150–AG18) received March 20, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7249. A letter from the Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting a proposed bill for Authorization of Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2001; to the Committee on Commerce.

7250. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Annual Report on the National Institutes of Health (NIH) Clinical Research Loan Repayment Program for Individuals From Disadvantaged Backgrounds (CR-LRP) for FY 1999; to the Committee on Commerce.

7251. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Annual Report of the National Institutes of Health (NIH) AIDS Research Loan Repayment Program (LRP) for FY 1999; to the Committee on Commerce.

7252. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Annual Report in the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD) Contraception and Infertility Research Loan Repayment Program (CIR-LRP) for FY 1999; to the Committee on Commerce.

7253. A letter from the Lieutenant General, Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting the listing of all outstanding Letters of Offer to sell any major defense equipment for $1 million or more; the listing of all Letters of Offer that were accepted, as of December 31, 1999, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

7254. A letter from the Lieutenant General, Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Air Force's Proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to Belgium for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 00–31), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

7255. A letter from the Lieutenant General, Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Air Force's Proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to the United Kingdom for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 00–32), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

7256. A letter from the Lieutenant General, Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Navy's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to Norway for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 00–34), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

7257. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Acquisition and Technology, Department of Defense, transmitting a copy of Transmittal No. 05–00 which constitutes a Request for Final Approval to conclude Supplement 3 to the Program Memorandum of Understanding for Cooperative Production of the Multifunctiona; Information Distribution System Low Volume Terminal (MIDS-LVT), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2767(f); to the Committee on International Relations.

7258. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed Technical Assistance Agreements and Manufacturing License Agreements with Russia (Transmittal No. DTC–125–99), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

7259. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to Japan [Transmittal No. DTC 019–00], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

7260. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report on the activities of United States Government departments and agencies relating to the prevention of nuclear proliferation during January 1, 1998 and December 31, 1998, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 3281; to the Committee on International Relations.

7261. 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.

7262. 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.

7263. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification that effective February 27, 2000, danger pay rate for the Montenegro Province was designated at the 20% level, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 5928; to the Committee on International Relations.

7264. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a Department's report entitled ''Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 1999,'' pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2151n(d); to the Committee on International Relations.

7265. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a listing of gifts by the U.S. Government to foreign individuals during fiscal year 1999, pursuant to Public Law 94—59, title III (89 Stat. 283); to the Committee on International Relations.

7266. A letter from the Director, Agency for International Development, transmitting a report on economic conditions prevailing in Egypt that may affect its ability to meet international debt obligations and stabilize its economy, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2346 nt.; to the Committee on International Relations.

7267. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting the annual report on Military Assistance, Military Exports, and Military Imports for Fiscal Year 1999; to the Committee on International Relations.

7268. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule—Export Administration Regulations Entity List: Removal of Entities, Revision in License Policy, and Reformat of List [Docket No. 981019261–0020–02] (RIN: 0694–AB73) received March 28, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

7269. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revisions to License Exception CTP [Docket No. 000204027–0027–01] (RIN: 0694–AC14) received March 9, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

7270. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision to the Export Administration Regulations; Administrative Enforcement Proceedings [Docket No. 00306060–0060–01] (RIN: 0694–AC16) received March 16, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

7271. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule—Editorial Clarifications and Revisions to the Export Administration Regulations [Docket No. 000207028–0028–01] (RIN: 0694–AC02) received March 16, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

7272. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule—Schedule of Fees for Consular Services, Department of State and Overseas Embassies and Consulates—received March 16, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

7273. A letter from the Staff Director, Commission On Civil Rights, transmitting the annual report on compliance and enforcement activities for fiscal year 1999, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 3413(b)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7274. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 13–298, ''Tax Increment Financing Amendment Act of 2000'' received April 14, 2000, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1—233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7275. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 13–304, ''Harry L. THOMAS, Sr., Recreation Center Designation Temporary Act of 2000'' received April 14, 2000, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1—233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7276. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 13–303, ''Limited Liabilty Company Amendment Act of 2000'' received April 14, 2000, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1—233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7277. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 13–302, ''Management Supervisory Service Exclusion Amendment Act of 2000'' received April 14, 2000, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1—233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7278. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 13–300, ''Retail Service Station Amendment Act of 2000'' received April 14, 2000, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1—233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7279. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 13–299, ''Fairness in Real Estate Transactions and Retirement Funds Protection Amendment Act of 2000'' received April 14, 2000, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1—233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7280. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 13–297, ''Assisted Living Residence Regulatory Act of 2000'' received April 14, 2000, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1—233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7281. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 13–296, ''Tax Conformity Act of 2000'' received April 14, 2000, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1—233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7282. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 13–301, ''Performance Rating Levels Amendment Act of 2000'' received April 14, 2000, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1—233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7283. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 13–313, ''Comprehensive Advisory Neighborhood Commissions Reform Amendment Act of 2000'' received April 14, 2000, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1—233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7284. A letter from the Acting President, Inter-American Foundation, transmitting the Foundation's Fiscal Year 1999 Audited Financial Statements, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 283j—1(c); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7285. A letter from the Director, Administrative Committee of the Federal Register, transmitting the Committee's final rule—Prices, Availability and Official Status of Federal Register Publications (RIN: 3095–ZA02) received March 1, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7286. A letter from the Administrator, Agency for International Development, transmitting the FY 2001 Annual Performance Plan for the U.S. Agency for International Development; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7287. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting a copy of the annual report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act during the calendar year 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7288. A letter from the Executive Director, Committee For Purchase From People Who Are Blind Or Severely Disabled, transmitting the Committee's final rule—Procurement List: Additions—received March 27, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7289. A letter from the Executive Director, Committee For Purchase From People Who Are Blind Or Severely Disabled, transmitting the Committee's final rule—Procurement List: Additions and Deletions—received March 20, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7290. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule— Intergovernmental Consultation—received March 16, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7291. A letter from the President, Federal Financing Bank, transmitting the Annual Management Report of the Federal Financing Bank's 1999 CFOA Report, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7292. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Maritime Commission, transmitting a copy of the annual report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act during the calendar year 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7293. A letter from the Director, Financial Management, General Accounting Office, transmitting transmitting the annual report disclosing the financial condition of the Retirement Plan and Annual Report as required by Public Law 95–595, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9503(a)(1)(B); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7294. A letter from the Chairman, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting a copy of the annual report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act during the calendar year 1999; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7295. A letter from the Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting the report entitled, ''Audit of the District of Columbia Sports and Entertainment Commission for Fiscal Years 1996 Through 1998''; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7296. A letter from the General Counsel, Cost Accounting Standards Board, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the Office's final rule—Cost Accounting Standards Board; Applicability, Thresholds and Waiver of Cost Accounting Standards Coverage—received March 17, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7297. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting written certifications received from agencies confirming that they have assessed the impact of their policies and regulations on the family; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7298. A letter from the Director, Staffing Reinvention Office Employment Service, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule —Excepted Service; The Career Conditional Employment System; Promotion and Internal Placement (RIN: 3206–AI51) received March 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7299. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule—Prevailing Rate Systems; Changes in the Survey Cycle for the Orleans, LA, Nonappropriated Fund Wage Area (RIN: 3206–AJ05) received March 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7300. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the 1999 Annual Performance Report and the 2001 Annual Performance Plan; to the Committee on Government Reform.

7301. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Election Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Filing Copies of Campaign Finance Reports and Statements With State Officers [Notice 2000–4] received March 20, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on House Administration.

7302. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Election Commission, transmitting six recommendations for legislative action, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 437d(d)(2); to the Committee on House Administration.

7303. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Office of Indian Gaming Management, Bureau of Indian Affairs, transmitting the Bureau's final rule— Tribal Revenue Allocation Plans (RIN: 1076–AD74) received March 16, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7304. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Marine Mammals; Incidental Take During Specified Activities (RIN: 1018–AF54) received March 28, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7305. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, National Park Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Personal Watercraft Use Within the NPS System (RIN: 1024–AC65) received March 16, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7306. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting a draft bill, ''To amend the National Historic Trails System Act to designate the Ala Kahakai Trail in Hawaii as a National Historic Trail''; to the Committee on Resources.

7307. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting a draft bill, ''To correct spelling errors in the statutory designations of Hawaiian National Parks, and for other purposes''; to the Committee on Resources.

7308. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Pennsylvania Regulatory Program [PA–127–FOR] received March 20, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7309. A letter from the Director, Wish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Threatened Status for Holocarpha macradenia (Santa Cruz tarplant) (RIN: 1018–AE80) received March 20, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7310. A letter from the Director, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Final Rule for Endangered Status for Four Plants from South Central Coastal California (RIN: 1018–AE81) received March 20, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7311. A letter from the Director, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Determination of Threatened Status for Chlorogalum purpureum (Purple Amole), a Plant from the South Coast Ranges of California (RIN: 1018–AE76) received March 20, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7312. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Bonneville Power Administration, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule—Regarding Bonneville Power Administration's subscription power sales to customer's sales of firm resources—received March 14, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7313. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Indian Environmental General Assistance Program, Final Guidelines on the Award and Management of General Assistance Agreements for Indian Tribes— received March 16, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7314. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Trawling in Steller Sea Lion Critical Habitat in the Western Aleutian District of the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands [Docket No. 000211040–0040–01; I.D. 032100B] received March 29, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7315. A letter from the Chief, Endangered Species Division, Office of Protected Resources, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Sea Turtle Conservation; Shrimp Trawling Requirements [Docket No. 99120 7322–9322–01; I.D. 12–399A] (RIN: 0648–AN30) received March 29, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7316. A letter from the Chief, Endangered Species Division, Office of Protected Resources, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Sea Turtle Conservation; Shimp Trawling Requirements [Docket No. 950427117–9278–11; I.D. 100899A] (RIN: 0648–AN30) received March 29, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7317. A letter from the Chief, Endangered Species Division, Office of Protected Resources, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Sea Turtle Conservation; Restrictions to Fishing Activities [Docket No. 991207322–9328–02; I.D. 120899D] (RIN: 0648–AN45) received March 29, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7318. 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 Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Reef Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; Extension of Effective Date of Red Snapper Bag Limit Reduction [Docket No. 990615162–9162–01; I.D. 122298A] (RIN: 0648–AM73) received March 29, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7319. A letter from the Deputy Asst. Administrator for Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; Red Snapper Minimum Size Limit [Docket No. 990527145–9145–01; I.D. 052199B] (RIN: 0648–AM71) received March 29, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7320. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Financial Assistance for Chesapeake Bay Stock Assessments to Encourage Research Projects for Improvement in the Stock Conditions of the Chesapeake Bay Fisheries [Docket No. 000301055–0055–01; I.D. 012400A] (RIN: 0648–ZA81) received March 28, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7321. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of

the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in the Statistical Area 620 of the Gulf of the Alaska [Docket No. 990304062–9062–01; I.D. 091099B] received March 28, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7322. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 630 of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 000211039–0039–01; I.D. 031600A] received March 28, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7323. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 610 of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 000211039–0039–01; I.D. 031700A] received March 28, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7324. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Vessels Catching Pacific Cod for Processing by the Inshore Component in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 000211039–0039–01; I.D. 030200A] received March 15, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7325. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Vessels Using Hook-and-line or Pot Gear in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands [Docket No. 000211040–0040–01; I.D. 030700B] received March 16, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7326. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Groundfish Fisheries by Vessels using Hook-and-Line Gear in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 000211039–0039–01; I.D. 030800A] received March 16, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7327. 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; Inshore Fee System for Repayment of the Loan to Harvesters of Pollock from the Directed Fishing Allowance Allocated to the Inshore Component Under Section 206(b)(1) of the American Fisheries Act (AFA) [Docket No. 991210331–0017–02; I.D. 102899B] (RIN: 0648–AN34) received March 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7328. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 620 of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 000211039–0039–01; I.D. 031000A] received March 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7329. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Pacific Halibut Fisheries; Catch Sharing Plans [Docket No. 991220343–0071–02; I.D. 120999D] (RIN: 0648–AM52) received March 15, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7330. A letter from the Chief, Endangered Species Division, Office of Protected Resources, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Designated Critical Habitat: Critical Habitat for 19 Evolutionarily Significant Units of Salmon and Steelhead in Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and California [Docket No. 990128036–0025–02; I.D. 012100E] (RIN: 0648–AG49) received March 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7331. A letter from the Chief, Endangered Species Division, Office of Protected Resources, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; 90–Day Findings for a Petition to List North American Populations of Smalltooth Sawfish and Largetooth Sawfish as Endangered Under the Endangered Species Act [Docket No. 000303059–0059–01; I.D. No. 021700B] (RIN: 0648–XA49) received March 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7332. A letter from the 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; A Cost Recovery Program for the Individual Fishing Quota Program [Docket No. 991207325–0063–02; 100699A] (RIN: 0648–AJ52) received March 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7333. A letter from the the Chief Justice, the Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting amendments to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure that have been adopted by the Court, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2072; (H. Doc. No. 106—225); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

7334. A letter from the the Chief Justice, the Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting amendments to the Federal Rules of Bankruptcy Procedure that have been adopted by the Court, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2075; (H. Doc. No. 106—226); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

7335. A letter from the the Chief Justice, the Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting amendments to the Federal Rules of Criminal Procedure adopted by the Court, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2072; (H. Doc. No. 106—227); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

7336. A letter from the the Chief Justice, the Supreme Court of the United States, transmitting amendments to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure that have been adopted by the Court, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 2072; (H. Doc. No. 106—228); to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.

7337. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the Office for Victims of Crime's Report to Congress on the Department of Justice's implementation of the Victims of Crime Act for Fiscal Years 1997 and 1998, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 10604(g); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7338. A letter from the Director, Policy Directives and Instructions Branch, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule—Adjustment of Status for Certain Nationals of Nicaragua and Cuba [INS No. 1893–97; AG Order No. 2293–2000] (RIN: 1115–AF04) received March 28, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7339. A letter from the Director, Policy Directives and Instructions Branch, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule—Adjustment of Status for Certain Nationals of Haiti [INS No. 1963–98; AG Order No. 2294–2000] (RIN: 1115–AF33) received March 28, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7340. A letter from the Director, Policy Directives and Instructions Branch, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule—Petitioning Requirements for the H–1B Nonimmigrant Classification Under Public Law 105–277 [INS 1962–98] (RIN: 1115–AF31) received March 16, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7341. A letter from the Director, Policy Directives and Instructions Branch, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule— Irish Peace Process Cultural and Training Program [INS No. 2000–99] (RIN: 1115–AF51) received March 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7342. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule—Visas: Documentation of Immigrants and Nonimmigrants under the Immigration and Nationality Act, as Amended—received March 28, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7343. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule—VISAS: Nonimmigrant classes; Irish Peace Process Cultural and Training Program Visitors, Q Classification—received March 20, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7344. A letter from the Acting Solicitor, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Changes to Application Examination and Provisional Application Practice [Docket No. 000301056–0056–01] (RIN: 0651–AB13) received March 16, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

7345. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Civil Works, Department of Army, transmitting the flood damage reduction project for the Turkey Creek Basin, Kansas and Missouri; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7346. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Third Extension of Computer Reservations Systems (CRS) Regulations [Docket No. OST–2000–6984] (RIN: 2105–AC75) received March 27, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7347. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc 524 Series and Trent 768–60 and 772–60 Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 99–NE–59–AD; Amendment 39–11605; AD 2000–04–22] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received March 17, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7348. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Sikorsky Model S–61

Helicopters [Docket No. 99–SW–61–AD; Amendment 39–11626; AD 2000–05–16] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received March 17, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7349. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 737 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98–NM–57–AD; Amendment 39–11623; AD 2000–05–13] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received March 17, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7350. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Eurpocopter France Model EC 120B Helicopters [Docket No. 99–SW–85–AD; Amendment 39–11627; AD 2000–05–17] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received March 17, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7351. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Model Fan Jet Falcon Series Airplanes; Model Mystere-Falcon 20, 50, 200, and 900 Series Airplanes; and Model Falcon 10, 900EX, and 2000 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99–NM–319–AD; Amendment 39–11630; AD 2000–05–20] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received March 17, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7352. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Construcciones Aeronautics, S.A. (CASA) Model CN–235–100 and CN–235–200 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99–NM–261–AD; Amendment 39–11614; AD 2000–05–05] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received March 17, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7353. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron Canada (BHTC) Model 407 Helicopters [Docket No. 98–SW–70–AD; Amendment 39–11608; AD 2000–04–25] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received March 17, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7354. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A330 and A340 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99–NM–241–AD; Amendment 39–11613; AD 2000–05–04] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received March 17, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7355. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A300 and A300–600 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99–NM–337–AD; Amendment 39–11616; AD 2000–05–07] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received March 17, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7356. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A319 and A321 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99–NM–353–AD; Amendment 39–11617; AD 2000–05–08] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received March 17, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7357. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Fokker Model F27 Mark 050, 200, 500, and 600 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98–NM–186–AD; Amendment 39–11611; AD 2000–05–02] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received March 17, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7358. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Honeywell International (formerly AlliedSingal Inc.) 36–300(A), 36–280(B), and 36–280(D) Series Auxiliary Power Units [Docket No. 99–NE–34–AD; Amendment 39–11607; AD 2000–04–24] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received March 17, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7359. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Raytheon (Beech) Model 400A and 400T Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99–NM–334–AD; Amendment 39–11615; AD 2000–05–06] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received March 17, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7360. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class E Airspace; Marshall, MO; Correction [Airspace Docket No. 99–ACE–51] received March 17, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7361. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 29946; Amdt. No. 1979] received March 17, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7362. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Terrain Awareness and Warning System [Docket No. 29312; Amendment No. 91–263; 121–273; 135–75] (RIN: 2120–AG46) received March 27, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7363. A letter from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone Regulations: Saint Pete Beach, Florida [COTP Tampa 00–016] (RIN: 2115–AA97) received March 27, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7364. A letter from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operating Regulation; Pass Manchac, LA [CGD08–00–003] received March 23, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7365. A letter from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Pine River (Charlevoix), MI [CGD09–00–001] (RIN: 2115–AE47) received March 23, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7366. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Special Visual Flight Rules [Docket No. FAA–2000–7100; Amdt. No. 91–262] (RIN: 2120–AG94) received March 24, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7367. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Special Federal Aviation Regulation (SFAR) No. 84 Removal of Prohibition Against Certain Flights Within the Territory and Airspace of Serbia-Montenegro [Docket No. 29508] received March 23, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7368. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A319, A320, A321, A330, and A340 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99–NM–349–AD; Amendment 39–11631; AD 200–05–21] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received March 23, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7369. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model SA330F, SA330G, SA330J, AS332C, AS332L, AS332L1, and AS332L2 [Docket No. 2000–SW–06–AD; Amendment 39–11645; AD 2000–06–05] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received March 23, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7370. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; AlliedSignal Inc. ALF502 and LF507 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 96–ANE–36–AD; Amendment 39–11624; AD 2000–05–14] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received March 23, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7371. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter Deutschland GMBH Model MBB-BK 117 Helicopters [Docket No. 98–SW–77–AD; Amendment 39–11647; AD 2000–06–07] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received March 23, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7372. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company (GE) CF34 Series Turbofan Engines; Correction [Docket No. 99–NE–49–AD; Amendment 39–11560; AD 2000–03–03] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received March 23, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7373. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; The New Piper Aircraft, Inc. PA–31 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99–CE–49–AD; Amendment 39–11646; AD 2000–06–06] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received March 27, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7374. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of Class D Airspace, Alexandria England AFB, LA; Revocation of Class D Airspace, Alexandria Esler Regional Airport, LA; and Revision of Class E Airspace, Alexandria, LA [Airspace Docket No. 2000–ASW–10] received March 27, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7375. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Establishment of Class E Airspace; Stingler, OK

[Airspace Docket No. 2000–ASW–02] received March 27, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7376. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of Class D Airspace; Hobbs, NM [Airspace Docket No. 99–ASW–32] received March 27, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7377. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Cessna Aircraft Company 150, 152, 172, 177, 180, 182, 185, 188, 206, 207, 210, and 337 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 97–CE–114–AD; Amendment 39–11641; AD 2000–06–01] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received March 23, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7378. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; British Aerospace Model BAe 146 and Avro 146–RJ Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99–NM–347–AD; Amendment 39–11638; AD 2000–05–28] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received March 23, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7379. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Aerospatiale Model ATR42–200, ATR–42–300, and ATR42–320 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98–NM–94–AD; Amendment 39–11636; AD 2000–05–26] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received March 23, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7380. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Inc. Models DHC–6–1, DHC–6–100, DHC–6–200, and DHC–6–300 Airplanes [Docket No. 99–CE–44–AD; Amendment 39–11643; AD 2000–06–03] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received March 23, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7381. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Fairchild Aircraft Corporation SA226 and SA227 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99–CE–52–AD; Amendment 39–11644; AD 2000–04] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received March 23, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7382. A letter from the Administrator, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting a Study to Congress: Air Carrier Pilot Pre-Employment Screening Standards and Criteria Study; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7383. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 29959; Amdt. No. 1982] received March 27, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7384. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 29958; Amdt. No. 1981] received March 27, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7385. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 29960; Amdt. No. 1983] received March 27, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7386. A letter from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Traffic Separation Scheme in the Approaches to Delaware Bay (RIN: 2115–AF42) received March 7, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7387. A letter from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Special Anchorage Area; Henderson Harbor, New York [CGD09–99–081] (RIN: 2115–AA98) received March 7, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7388. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Establishment of Class E Airspace; Big Bear City, CA [Airspace Docket No. 99–AWP–26] received March 7, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7389. A letter from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operation Regulations: Saugus River, MA [CGD01–99–193] received March 6, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7390. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; MD Helicopters Inc. Model MD600N Helicopters [Docket No. 99–SW–54–AD; Amendment 39–11604; AD 2000–04–21] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received March 7, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7391. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Alexander Schleicher Segelflugzeugbau Models ASH 25M and ASH 26E Sailplanes [Docket No. 99–CE–78–AD; Amendment 39–11599; AD 2000–04–16] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received March 7, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7392. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron Canada Model 407 Helicopters [Docket No. 98–SW–64–AD; Amendment 39–11603; AD 2000–04–20] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received March 7, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7393. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; General Electric Company CF6–80C2 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 99–NE–24–AD; Amendment 39–11597; AD 2000–04–14] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received March 7, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7394. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A340–211, -212, -213, -311, -312, and -313, Series Airplanes; Correction [Docket No. 99–NM–336–AD; Amendment 39–11495; AD 99–27–14] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received March 7, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7395. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Dornier Model 328–100 and -300 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2000–NM–59–AD; Amendment 39–11606; AD 2000–04–23] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received March 7, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7396. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 29947; Amdt. No. 1980] received March 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7397. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—IFR Altitudes; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 29950; Amdt. No. 421] received March 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7398. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 29945; Amdt. No. 1978] received March 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7399. A letter from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Puget Sound Vessel Traffic Service [USCG–1999–6141] (RIN: 2115–AF92) received March 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7400. A letter from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone Regulations; San Juan Harbor, San Juan, Puerto Rico [COTP San Juan 00–013] (RIN: 2115–AA97) received March 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7401. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce plc RB211–524 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 2000–NE–02–AD; Amendment 39–11622; AD 2000–05–12] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received March 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7402. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model AS355N Helicopters [Docket No. 99–SW–87–AD; Amendment 39–11625; AD 2000–05–15] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received March 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7403. A letter from the Program Analayst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A300, A310, and A300–600 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98–NM–211–AD; Amendment 39–11628; AD 2000–05–18] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received March 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7404. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 727 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99–NM–73–AD; Amendment 39–11629; AD 2000–05–19] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received March 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7405. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; British Aerospace Model BAe 146–100A, -200A, and -300A Series Airplanes Equipped with AlliedSignal ALF502R-Series Engines [Docket No. 98–NM–174–AD; Amendment 39–11635; AD 2000–05–25] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received March 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7406. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Honeywell International Inc. KAP 140 and KFC 225 Autopilot Systems [Docket No. 2000–CE–11–AD; Amendment 39–11634; AD 2000–05–24] received March 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7407. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Ayres Corporation S2R Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99–CE–57–AD; Amendment 39–11633; AD 2000–05–23] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received March 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7408. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 737–100, -200, -300, -400, and -500 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98–NM–58–AD; Amendment 39–11639; AD 2000–05–29] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received March 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7409. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99–NM–22–AD; Amendment 39–11640; AD 2000–05–30] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received March 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7410. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; British Aerospace Model BAe 146–100A, -200A, and -300A Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99–NM–237–AD; Amendment 39–11637; AD 2000–05–27] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received March 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7411. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model AS355N Helicopters [Docket No. 99–SW–87–AD; Amendment 39–11625; AD 2000–05–15] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received March 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7412. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Dornier Luftfaht GmbH 228 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99–CE–43–AD; Amendment 39–11642; AD 2000–06–02] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received March 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7413. A letter from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Frequency of Inspection [USCG–1999–4976] (RIN: 2115–AF73) received March 3, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7414. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Award of Grants for Special Projects and Programs Authorized by this Agency's FY 2000 Appropriations Act—received March 16, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7415. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Amendment to the Effluent Limitations Guidelines, Pretreatment Standards, and New Source Performance Standards for the Builders' Paper and Board Mills Point Source Category; Technical Amendment; Removal [FRL–6562–3] received March 16, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7416. A letter from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Collaborative Science, Technology, and Applied Research (CSTAR) Program [Docket No. 991215340–9340–01] (RIN: 0648–ZA78) received March 24, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science.

7417. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule— Appeals Regulations and Rules of Practice—Case Docketing (RIN: 2900–AJ72) received March 16, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

7418. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations Management, Veterans Benefits Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule—Veterans Education: Increased Allowances for the Educational Assistance Test Program (RIN: 2900–AJ87) received March 16, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

7419. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations Management, Veterans Benefits Administration, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule—Eligibility Reporting Requirements (RIN: 2900–AJ09) received March 24, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

7420. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Branch, Customs Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule— Technical Corrections Relating To Customs Forms [T.D. 00–22] received March 23, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7421. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a draft bill entitled, ''Customs Automation Modernization Act of 2000''; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7422. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule—Unemployment Insurance Program Letter No. 3–95, Change 3—received March 6, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7423. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Weighted Average Interest Rate Update —received March 27, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7424. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Transfer of Qualified Replacement Property to a Partnership [Rev. Ruling 2000–18] received March 27, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7425. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Tax Treatment of Cafeteria Plans [TD 8878] (RIN: 1545–AU61) received March 23, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7426. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Request for Comments on the Revision of Proposed Section 987 Regulation [Notice 2000–20] received March 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7427. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Closing agreements concerning variable annuity contracts [Notice 2000–9] received March 20, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7428. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Determination of Interest Rate— received March 20, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7429. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Appeals Settlement Guidelines: Excess Moisture—received March 20, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7430. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Interim Waiver of Signature Requirement for Form SS–4 [Notice 2000–19] received March 20, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7431. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—2000 Prevailing State Assumed Interest Rates [Rev. Ruling 2000–17] received March 20, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7432. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Revision of Revenue Procedure 80–18 to reflect repeal of U.K. Act [Rev. Ruling 2000–13] received March 20, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7433. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Election in respect of losses attributable to a disaster—received March 7, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7434. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Extension of Time to File and Pay Due to Patriot's Day [Notice 2000–17] received March 7, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7435. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Taxation of Fringe Benefits [Rev. Rul. 2000–13] received March 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7436. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—April 2000 Applicable Federal Rates [Rev. Ruling 2000–19] received March 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7437. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Differential Earnings Rate for Mutual Life Insurance Companies [Notice 2000–16] received March 2, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7438. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—2000 Automobile Inflation Adjustment [Rev. Ruling 2000–18] received March 1, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7439. A letter from the General Sales Manager and Vice President, Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report on sales and barter of commodities donated under section 416(b) of the Agricultural Act of 1949; jointly to the Committees on Agriculture and International Relations.

7440. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting the report on the Department of Energy's Activities Relating to the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board Calendar Year 1999; jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and Commerce.

7441. A letter from the Chairman, International Financial Institution Advisory Commission, transmitting the Report of the International Financial Institution Advisory Commission; jointly to the Committees on Banking and Financial Services and Ways and Means.

7442. A letter from the Deputy Executive Secretary, Health Care Financing Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Medicare Program; Prospective Payment System for Hospital Outpatient Services [HCFA–1005–FC] (RIN: 0938–A156) received April 25, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Commerce and Ways and Means.

7443. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services and Attorney General, transmitting the Annual Report on Health Care Fraud and Abuse Control Program FY 1999; jointly to the Committees on Commerce and Ways and Means.

7444. A letter from the Lieutenant General, USA, Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting a copy of the Secretary's Memorandum of Justification for Transfer of Defense Articles and Services to the Government of Bosnia, pursuant to Public Law 104—107, section 540(b) (110 Stat. 736); jointly to the Committees on International Relations and Appropriations.

7445. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of the allocation of funds the Executive Branch intends to make available from funding levels established in the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2000; jointly to the Committees on International Relations and Appropriations.

7446. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a copy of Presidental Determination 2000–10 pursuant to Section 523 of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 2000, as Contained in the Consolidated Appropriations Act for FY 2000; jointly to the Committees on International Relations and Appropriations.

7447. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Election Commission, transmitting 32 recommendations for legislative action, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 438(a)(9); jointly to the Committees on House Administration and the Judiciary.

7448. A letter from the Director, Coporate Audits and Standards, General Accounting Office, transmitting the financial statements of the Capitol Preservation Fund for fiscal years ended September 30, 1999 and 1998; jointly to the Committees on House Administration and Government Reform.

7449. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report on progress made toward achieving benchmarks for a sustainable peace process; (H. Doc. No. 106—231); jointly to the Committees on International Relations, Appropriations, and Armed Services and ordered to be printed.

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. 673. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to make grants to the Florida Keys Aqueduct Authority and other appropriate agencies for the purpose of improving water quality throughout the marine ecosystem of the Florida Keys; with an amendment (Rept. 106–592). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 1106. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to make grants to State agencies with responsibility for water source development for the purpose of maximizing available water supply and protecting the environment through the development of alternative water sources; with an amendment (Rept. 106–593). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 2957. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to authorize funding to carry out certain water quality restoration projects for Lake Pontchartrain Basin, Louisiana, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 106–594). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 855. A bill to amend the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972 relating to the dumping of dredged material in Long Island Sound, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 106–595). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 1237. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to permit grants for the national estuary program to be used for the development and implementation of a comprehensive conservation and management plan, to reauthorize appropriations to carry out the program, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 106–596). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 3313. A bill to amend section 119 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reauthorize the program for Long Island Sound, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 106–597). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 2647. A bill to amend the Act entitled ''An Act relating to the water rights of the Ak-Chin Indian Community'' to clarify certain provisions concerning the leasing of such water rights, and for other purposes (Rept. 106–598). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 3577. A bill to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for the north side pumping division of the Minidoka reclamation project, Idaho (Rept. 106–599). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. REYNOLDS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 482. Resolution providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules (Rept. 106–600). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 483. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 673) to authorize the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to make grants to the Florida Keys Aqueduct Authority and other appropriate agencies for the purpose of improving water quality throughout the marine ecosystem of the Florida Keys (Rept. 106–601). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 484. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2957) to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to authorize funding to carry out certain water quality restoration projects for Lake Pontchartrain Basin, Louisiana, and for other purposes (Rept. 106–602). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. GOSS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 485. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1106) to authorize the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to make grants to State agencies with responsibility for water source development for the purpose of maximizing available water supply and protecting the environment through the development of alternative water sources (Rept. 106–603). Referred to the House Calendar.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

[The following action occurred on April 14, 2000]

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X, the Committee on Banking and Financial Services discharged from further consideration of H.R. 3244.

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 Apr. 14, 2000]

H.R. 3244. Referral to the Committee on Ways and Means extended for a period ending not later than May 2, 2000.

H.R. 1656. Referral to the Committees on Commerce and Education and the Workforce extended for a period ending not later than May 26, 2000.

[Submitted May 2, 2000]

H.R. 3244. Referral to the Committee on Ways and Means extended for a period ending not later than May 3, 2000.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CLAY (for himself, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. OWENS, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. SCOTT, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. FATTAH, Mr.

HINOJOSA, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. KIND, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. FORD, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. WU, Mr. HOLT, and Mr. JEFFERSON):

H.R. 4346. A bill to modernize public schools, reduce class sizes, increase access to technology, enhance school safety, improve teacher quality and strengthen accountability for academic results, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 4347. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to modify authorities relating to the use of pen registers and trap and trace devices, to modify provisions relating to fraud and related activities in connection with computers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, 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. BACA:

H.R. 4348. A bill to require the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to conduct a study of developing residential mortgage programs that provide low-cost health insurance in connection with low-cost mortgages; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. BACA:

H.R. 4349. A bill to provide grants to local educational agencies to provide financial assistance to elementary and secondary schools for obtaining computer software for bilingual education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts:

H.R. 4350. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to provide for the forgiveness of Perkins loans to members of the armed services on active duty; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GEKAS (for himself and Mr. BOUCHER):

H.R. 4351. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to preserve efficient low-cost commercial financing of enterprises based upon the security of their copyrights and copyrightable assets by confirming that a security interest perfected therein through traditional, practical, and appropriate means will prevail over lien creditors; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIBBONS (for himself and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H.R. 4352. A bill to limit the age restrictions imposed by the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration for the issuance or renewal of certain airman certificates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GUTIERREZ (for himself, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. STARK, Mr. EVANS, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. FILNER, Ms. LEE, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. SANDERS, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. WATERS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. WYNN, Mr. HOEFFEL, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. NADLER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. OWENS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Ms. CARSON, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. COYNE, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. TIERNEY, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. PHELPS, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. RAHALL, Ms. WOOLSEY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. OLVER, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. TOWNS, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. CLAY, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. SABO, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. DIXON, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. REYES, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. BACA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD):

H.R. 4353. A bill to provide for a livable wage for employees under Federal contracts and subcontracts; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Government Reform, 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. HASTINGS of Florida:

H.R. 4354. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for the adjustment of status of certain unaccompanied alien children and the establishment of a panel of advisors to assist unaccompanied alien children in immigration proceedings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILLEARY:

H.R. 4355. A bill to authorize retention by the City of Tullahoma, Tennessee, of all funds received under Environmental Protection Agency construction grants c470319–03 and c470319–04; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. LATOURETTE:

H.R. 4356. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide additional protections for Medicare beneficiaries under the MedicareChoice Program; 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. MCGOVERN (for himself, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. WEYGAND, and Ms. PELOSI):

H.R. 4357. A bill to continue the current prohibition of military relations with and assistance for the armed forces of the Republic of Indonesia until the President determines and certifies to the Congress that certain conditions with respect to East Timor are being met; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 4358. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to promote the economic recovery of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OWENS:

H.R. 4359. A bill to provide for permanent resident status for any alien orphan physically present in the United States who is less than 12 years of age and to provide for deferred enforced departure status for any alien physically present in the United States who is the natural and legal parent of a child born in the United States who is less than 18 years of age; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota:

H.R. 4360. A bill to amend title 32, United States Code, to end the prohibition against overtime pay for National Guard technicians; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota:

H.R. 4361. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to extend to National Guard military technicians the applicability of certain provisions concerning separation and retirement of Army Reserve and Air Force Reserve military technicians; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Government Reform, 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. SCARBOROUGH (for himself, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 4362. A bill to require that each Government agency post monthly, on its public Web site, certain statistical data relating to Federal sector equal employment opportunity complaints filed with such agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, 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. SCARBOROUGH:

H.R. 4363. A bill to provide for the implementation of the provisions of law allowing members of the uniformed services to participate in the Thrift Savings Plan; to the Committee on Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, 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. BACA:

H. Con. Res. 313. Concurrent resolution recognizing the historical significance of the Mexican holiday of Cinco de Mayo; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H. Con. Res. 314. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for a bike rodeo to be conducted by the Earth Force Youth Bike Summit; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BACA:

H. Res. 486. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding Cesar E. Chavez and farm worker housing programs; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. BACA:

H. Res. 487. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that schools across the Nation should teach about the role of Native American Indians in American history and culture and lead community service projects that further that education; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

Mr. DREIER introduced a bill (H.R. 4364) for the relief of Fred Forrest; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 25: Mr. PAYNE and Ms. MCKINNEY.
H.R. 49: Mr. MCINTYRE and Ms. BERKLEY.
H.R. 65: Mr. SANDERS.
H.R. 86: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.
H.R. 110: Mr. BACA.
H.R. 148: Mr. COBURN, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. BALDACCI, and Mr. VITTER.
H.R. 303: Mr. TALENT.
H.R. 306: Mr. HOEFFEL and Mr. BACA.
H.R. 347: Mr. COOK.
H.R. 382: Mr. BACA.
H.R. 407: Mr. NORWOOD.
H.R. 453: Mr. CHABOT.
H.R. 488: Mr. LOBIONDO.
H.R. 531: Ms. CARSON and Mr. KLINK.
H.R. 534: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts and Mr. WU.
H.R. 583: Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 670: Mr. ENGEL.
H.R. 684: Ms. PELOSI.
H.R. 783: Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. RILEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. CLEMENT.
H.R. 828: Mr. BATEMAN and Mr. GILMAN.
H.R. 860: Mr. BOSWELL and Mr. COOK.
H.R. 890: Mr. BENTSEN.
H.R. 894: Mr. WAMP.
H.R. 896: Mr. KING and Mr. STENHOLM.
H.R. 914: Mr. GILCHREST and Mr. EDWARDS.
H.R. 920: Mr. ABERCROMBIE and Mr. MEEKS of New York.
H.R. 959: Mr. LAFALCE.
H.R. 1020: Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Mr. BALDACCI.
H.R. 1050: Mr. RANGEL, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 1053: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
H.R. 1071: Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 1083: Mr. SUNUNU.
H.R. 1093: Mr. BECERRA.
H.R. 1095: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.
H.R. 1102: Mr. JENKINS and Mr. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 1115: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 1139: Mr. BACA.
H.R. 1145: Mr. NORWOOD.
H.R. 1168: Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MOORE, and Mr. BOYD.
H.R. 1217: Mr. VISCLOSKY.
H.R. 1227: Mr. SANDERS.
H.R. 1291: Mr. FOSSELLA, Mrs. WILSON, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. PAUL, and Ms. GRANGER.
H.R. 1304: Mr. MEEKS of New York.
H.R. 1310: Mrs. BIGGERT.
H.R. 1311: Mr. MCDERMOTT.
H.R. 1363: Mr. CRANE.
H.R. 1367: Mr. BACA and Ms. MCKINNEY.
H.R. 1413: Ms. DANNER and Mr. CANNON.
H.R. 1485: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.
H.R. 1621: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. BALDACCI, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. WEYGAND, Mr. BACA, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
H.R. 1622: Mr. TRAFICANT and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.
H.R. 1625: Mr. FORD.
H.R. 1690: Mr. MATSUI.
H.R. 1731: Mr. LEVIN.
H.R. 1804: Mr. DUNCAN and Mr. MEEKS of New York.
H.R. 1841: Mr. OLVER and Mr. WU.
H.R. 1917: Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 1976: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
H.R. 2000: Mr. GONZALEZ and Mr. GEJDENSON.
H.R. 2004: Mr. EHRLICH and Mr. BLAGOJEVICH.
H.R. 2059: Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky.
H.R. 2120: Mr. GILMAN.
H.R. 2129: Mr. WISE, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. GOODE, Mr. BUYER, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. BASS, Mr. BOYD, and Mr. LINDER.
H.R. 2136: Mr. DICKEY.
H.R. 2221: Mr. CHAMBLISS.
H.R. 2258: Mr. SANDERS.
H.R. 2298: Mr. STRICKLAND.
H.R. 2308: Mr. NETHERCUTT and Mr. BASS.
H.R. 2339: Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky.
H.R. 2341: Mr. GOODLING and Mr. KANJORSKI.
H.R. 2382: Mr. RAHALL, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. EHLERS, and Mr. HOEFFEL.
H.R. 2391: Mr. ISTOOK and Mr. FOLEY.
H.R. 2511: Mr. WAMP, Mr. MOLLOHAN, and Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin.
H.R. 2553: Mr. BACA.
H.R. 2562: Mr. HOLT, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Ms. BERKLEY.
H.R. 2573: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. HALL of Ohio, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 2631: Mr. TURNER, Mr. MEEKS of New York, and Mr. RODRIGUEZ.
H.R. 2635: Mr. GILMAN.
H.R. 2660: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey and Mr. WU.
H.R. 2697: Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 2713: Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 2722: Mrs. CLAYTON.
H.R. 2727: Mr. STRICKLAND.
H.R. 2741: Mr. BLAGOJEVICH.
H.R. 2867: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.
H.R. 2870: Mr. FOLEY.
H.R. 2883: Mr. MEEHAN and Mrs. TAUSCHER.
H.R. 2925: Mr. MINGE.
H.R. 2969: Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 3000: Mr. CONYERS.
H.R. 3032: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. TIERNEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. BOUCHER.
H.R. 3044: Mr. CLEMENT.
H.R. 3140: Mr. BOSWELL.
H.R. 3192: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. HORN, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. COSTELLO, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. BALDACCI, and Mr. BORSKI.
H.R. 3193: Ms. DELAURO, Mr. HILL of Montana, Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. KINGSTON, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mr. WAMP.
H.R. 3224: Mr. BACA.
H.R. 3235: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mrs. BONO, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BALDACCI, and Mr. BACA.
H.R. 3244: Mr. OXLEY and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 3246: Mr. HOEFFEL.
H.R. 3256: Mr. OSE and Mr. BACA.
H.R. 3267: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA and Mr. BACA.
H.R. 3301: Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. WOLF, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. HOLT.
H.R. 3375: Mr. PORTER.
H.R. 3397: Mr. LANTOS.
H.R. 3461: Mrs. FOWLER.
H.R. 3514: Mr. MEEHAN, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.
H.R. 3518: Mr. BACA.
H.R. 3520: Mr. ANDREWS.
H.R. 3535: Mr. KUCINICH, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, and Mr. RAMSTAD.
H.R. 3544: Mr. FOLEY, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. DICKS, Mr. GILMAN, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. LAZIO, Ms. CARSON, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. LATOURETTE, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. WATTS of Olahoma, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. FORD, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. MOORE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. OBEY, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. VITTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
H.R. 3556: Mr. ANDREWS.
H.R. 3565: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.
H.R. 3569: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 3571: Mr. MEEKS of New York.
H.R. 3573: Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. MEEKS of New York, and Mr. HALL of Ohio.
H.R. 3575: Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, and Mr. ANDREWS.
H.R. 3580: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. MOLLOHAN, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. WEYGAND, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. LEACH, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. STUMP, and Mr. GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 3594: Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, and Mr. VITTER.
H.R. 3614: Mr. FILNER, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. PICKETT, Mr. BASS, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. HINCHEY, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, and Mr. BOUCHER.
H.R. 3633: Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Ms. NORTON, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. CROWLEY, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. DICKS, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. METCALF, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. LAZIO, Ms. CARSON, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. LATOURETTE, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. Wamp, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. BIGGERT, Mr. ROMEMRO-BARCELO, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CAPUANO, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. FORD, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. MOORE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. EVANS, Mr. OBEY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
H.R. 3634: Mr. DELAHUNT.
H.R. 3639: Mr. CLEMENT.
H.R. 3686: Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. CARSON, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. UDALL of Colorado.
H.R. 3694: Mr. STUPAK and Mr. ANDREWS.
H.R. 3709: Mr. ROGAN.
H.R. 3819: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr, FORBES, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.
H.R. 3861: Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H.R. 3885: Mr. EVANS, Mr. HYDE, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, and Mr. BLAGOJEVICH.
H.R. 3915: Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. HANSEN, Mr. NEY, Mr. HORN, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. GOODE, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. GIBBONS, and Mr. TRAFICANT.
H.R. 3916: Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. GORDON, and Mr. GEKAS.
H.R. 3983: Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. REYNOLDS, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. NETHERCUTT.
H.R. 4007: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 4011: Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mrs. THURMAN, and Mr. MORAN of Kansas.
H.R. 4018: Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MINGE, Mr. BISHOP, and Mr. BOEHLERT.
H.R. 4033: Mr. MOORE, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. SABO, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. FORBES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. BACA, Mr. OWENS, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. FORD, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. KOLBE, Mr. BECERRA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. ANDREWS, Mrs. CLAYTON, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. CANNON, and Mr. SANDLIN.
H.R. 4040: Mr. WAMP and Mr. NADLER.
H.R. 4055: Mr. OWENS, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. FILNER, Mr. TALENT, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. BAIRD, Ms. BALDWIN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. BERMAN,

Mr. ROGAN, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. BACA, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. HORN, Mr. RAMSTAD, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. STARK, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. BASS, Ms. CARSON, Mr. DEMINT, and Ms. SANCHEZ.

H.R. 4069: Mr. FARR of California, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. TIERNEY, and Mr. DIXON.

H.R. 4071: Mr. ISAKSON and Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 4085: Mr. MANZULLO.

H.R. 4100: Mr. GILCHREST.

H.R. 4101: Mr. GILCHREST.

H.R. 4105: Mr. DUNCAN.

H.R. 4106: Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HAYES, Mr. KILDEE, and Mrs. MYRICK.

H.R. 4118: Mr. GOODLING.

H.R. 4124: Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. HILLEARY, and Mr. STUPAK.

H.R. 4133: Mr. FARR of California, Mr. SABO, and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 4142: Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.

H.R. 4149: Mr. FOLEY, Mr. SOUDER, and Mr. BALDACCI.

H.R. 4154: Mr. GOODLING, Mr. NEY, Mr. MANZULLO, and Mr. CRANE.

H.R. 4176: Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FROST, Mr. FILNER, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. STARK, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, and Mr. OWENS.

H.R. 4182: Mr. TALENT, Mr. EWING, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. MCCOLLUM, and Mr. KNOLLENBERG.

H.R. 4184: Mr. NETHERCUTT.

H.R. 4200: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. MEEKS of New York, and Ms. KILPATRICK.

H.R. 4207: Mr. METCALF, Mr. BERMAN, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. HOEFFEL, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. STARK, and Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 4209: Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 4211: Ms. ESHOO, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. STARK, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. MCDERMOTT, and Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 4213: Mr. LATOURETTE, Mrs. TAUSCHER, and Mr. GARY MILLER of California.

H.R. 4214: Mr. NEY, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HORN, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. CONYERS, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. GOODE, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. RAHALL, and Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO.

H.R. 4232: Ms. LEE.

H.R. 4233: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Mr. TRAFICANT.

H.R. 4239: Mr. CARDIN, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 4242: Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.

H.R. 4245: Mr. SISISKY, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. NEY, Mr. FILNER, Mr. HORN, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. BUYER.

H.R. 4248: Mr. COOK and Mr. MARTINEZ.

H.R. 4277: Mr. WOLF, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mrs. MORELLA.

H.R. 4278: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H.R. 4281: Mr. WEXLER, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. METCALF, and Mr. RAMSTAD.

H.R. 4290: Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 4303: Mr. GUTKNECHT.

H. R. 4315: Mr. OXLEY and Mr. REGULA.

H.R. 4334: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, and Mr. OWENS.

H. Con. Res. 177: Mr. RAHALL.

H. Con. Res. 209: Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. COOK, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, and Mr. DELAHUNT.

H. Con. Res. 220: Mr. BACHUS.

H. Con. Res. 251: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. DUNN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. ROGAN.

H. Con. Res. 256: Mrs. THURMAN and Mr. SOUDER.

H. Con. Res. 262: Mr. SPENCE.

H. Con. Res. 283: Mr. SPENCE.

H. Con. Res. 286: Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H. Con. Res. 300: Mr. SOUDER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OWENS, and Ms. BERKLEY.

H. Con. Res. 301: Mr. EVANS.

H. Con. Res. 308: Mr. TRAFICANT and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H. Con. Res. 309: Mr. POMEROY, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. MEEHAN, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. UNDERWOOD, and Mr. RAMSTAD.

H. Res. 187: Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. COX, and Mr. CLEMENT.

H. Res. 398: Mr. NADLER, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. OLVER.

H. Res. 414: Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. MEEHAN, and Mr. GONZALEZ.

H. Res. 420: Mr. GILCHREST and Mr. PALLONE.

H. Res. 452: Mr. REYES, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. STUPAK, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H. Res. 459: Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 146 WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MAY 2, 2000 No. 52

Senate

The Senate met at 9:33 a.m. and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Lloyd John Ogilvie, offered the following prayer:

Gracious God, Lord of our lives and Sovereign of this Nation, we thank You for the attitude change that takes place when we remember that we are called to glorify You in our work and to work with excellence to please You. The Senators are responsible to their constituents; their staffs report to them; and others are part of the Senate support team. All of us are employed to serve the Government, but ultimately we are responsible to You for the work we do and how we do it. Help us to realize how privileged we are to be able to work, earn wages, and provide for our needs. Thank You for the dignity of work.

We press on today with enthusiasm, remembering that You have called us to our work and will give us a special measure of strength. Whatever we do, in word or deed, we do it to praise You. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable JUDD GREGG, a Senator from the State of New Hampshire, led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VOINOVICH). The Senator from Alaska.

SCHEDULE

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, today the Senate will begin consideration of the veto override of S. 1287, the nuclear waste repository legislation. By previous consent, the time prior to 12:30 p.m. will be equally divided between Senator MURKOWSKI and the Senators from Nevada. Senator REID is on the floor. At 12:30 p.m., the Senate will recess for the weekly party conference meetings until 2:15 p.m. Following the conferences, there will be 1 hour of debate remaining on the nuclear waste veto override, with a vote scheduled to occur at 3:15 p.m. After the vote, the Senate will resume debate on S. 2, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, with votes possible throughout the evening. The leader thanks his colleagues for their attention.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. VOINOVICH). Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

NUCLEAR WASTE POLICY AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2000—VETO

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of the veto message accompanying S. 1287, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Veto message on S. 1287, a bill to provide for the storage of spent nuclear fuel pending completion of the nuclear waste repository, and for other purposes.

(The text of the President's veto message is printed on page S3017 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 27, 2000.)

The Senate proceeded to consider the veto message.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, there shall be 90 minutes under the control of the Senator from Alaska, Mr. MURKOWSKI, and 90 minutes under the control of the Senators from Nevada, Mr. REID and Mr. BRYAN.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, it is my understanding Senator BINGAMAN has indicated a desire to speak. I believe he is off the floor at this time and will be coming momentarily. I suggest the absence of a quorum and ask unanimous consent that the time be equally taken off both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. 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. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, it is my intent to accommodate Senator BINGAMAN's schedule.

I yield to the ranking member of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, Senator BINGAMAN, with the understanding that the time be charged to the other side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I will take a few minutes to give my perspective on this upcoming vote to override the President's veto.

The question before the Senate is not whether the Senate supports the construction of a nuclear waste repository. Clearly, I support construction of a nuclear waste repository. The President has indicated he does. The Department of Energy has made significant progress on a repository in the time this administration has been in office. In fact, the Department of Energy has made much more progress in the past 7 years under President Clinton than during the preceding 10 years under Presidents Reagan and Bush.

The President, according to the statement he issued, is ''committed to resolving the . . . issue in a timely and sensible manner consistent with sound science and protection of public health, safety, and the environment.''

This bill was not vetoed by the President because he does not want to solve

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

the nuclear waste problem. He vetoed it because, as he stated in his veto message, this bill ''will do nothing to advance'' the program. That is a quote out of the statement that was issued. And secondly, instead of doing something to advance the program, the bill will be ''a step backward.''

What are the problems that face the nuclear waste program today? Let me go through those problems with a little bit of detail so we all understand what those problems are and we can assess whether or not there is anything in this bill that helps us address that.

First, burying tens of thousands of tons of highly radioactive waste in Yucca Mountain and making sure it does not escape for tens of thousands of years—that is the goal we set for ourselves—raises very difficult scientific and technical questions.

Only last month, the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board, which Congress created to advise us on these matters, warned that ''a credible technical basis does not exist for the repository design.'' This is the Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board. This is a group that Congress established. This is not some left-wing environmental organization that made this statement.

That report also went on to say, ''large uncertainties'' still exist in how the Yucca Mountain site will behave, and ''much work remains to be completed.'' That is an exact quote from that review board.

The bill before us does nothing to advance the scientific program that is trying to resolve these issues. Instead, the bill will make it harder for the Department of Energy to resolve these issues by imposing substantial new requirements which will divert the limited resources they have away from the essential scientific work that needs to be done.

A second problem facing the program is public confidence. People need to know that the repository will be safe and will not leak radiation into their water supply now or long into the future. Again, the bill will do nothing to advance public confidence in the repository's safety. Instead, it will undermine that public confidence. Under current law, the repository must meet radiation standards set by the Environmental Protection Agency to protect public health and the environment.

The bill on which we are now voting to override a Presidential veto forbids the Environmental Protection Agency from issuing those standards until this administration leaves office. The proponents of the provision are plainly hoping Governor Bush will be elected President and that his administration will adopt more lax standards than the Clinton administration would adopt. Such a blatant attempt to manipulate the scientific review process is sure to undermine public confidence in the ultimate site suitability determination.

A third problem facing the program is that it is behind schedule. Again, the bill does nothing to accelerate the program. On the contrary, the bill will delay the program further by forbidding the Environmental Protection Agency from issuing its radiation protection standards before June of 2001.

Under current law, EPA will issue the standards this summer, in plenty of time for the Secretary of Energy to take the standards into account in determining whether Yucca Mountain is suitable in 2001. But by delaying the issuance of the standards by nearly one year, the bill is likely to delay the Secretary's suitability determination and his recommendation that the repository be built.

A fourth problem facing the program is that the Department of Energy has not been able to begin moving waste from the States where it is now stored to Yucca Mountain. Again, the bill does nothing to begin moving waste to Yucca Mountain or to accelerate the date at which shipments can begin. On the contrary, the bill will probably obstruct shipments of waste by imposing a host of new obstacles to such shipments.

The bill says no shipment can be made until the Secretary of Energy has determined that emergency responders in every State, every local community, and every tribal jurisdiction, along every primary and every alternative shipping route, have met certain training standards and until the Secretary has given all of those entities financial assistance for 3 years before the first shipment. That is what the bill provides.

The transportation provisions of the bill are far more restrictive than those for shipments to the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant in my State. They are an open invitation to opponents of the nuclear waste program to obstruct shipments to the repository. I think we are all familiar with the availability of the courts to assist in that obstruction, where we put unreasonable restrictions on the Department of Energy, as we have done in the case of transportation to the site.

A fifth problem facing the program—this is the nuclear waste repository program—is the claims against the Government for failing to accept the utilities' waste by the original deadline. The bill permits the Department of Energy to settle these claims by paying the utilities compensation out of the nuclear waste fund—which the utilities said they did not want.

This bill does not permit the Department of Energy to take title to the utilities' waste at the utilities' sites, which is the one near-term solution that was sought by the administration when we went into this debate. In fact, that provision was in the bill when we reported it out of the committee, which I think was a step forward.

Moreover, the bill creates new unfunded liabilities for the Government. It does so by imposing new deadlines that the Department of Energy cannot meet and imposing substantial new requirements without providing funding mechanisms to meet those obligations.

A sixth major problem facing the program is inadequate funding. Our current budget rules make it impossible to give the program the money it requires, even though the fees the utilities pay the Government far exceed what Congress appropriates to the program each year, and the nuclear waste fund has a $9 billion surplus in it. Yet, at the same time, the bill imposes substantial new unfunded spending requirements. So we are setting up and maintaining a prohibition against spending the money at the same time we are imposing new unfunded spending requirements on the program.

These unfunded spending requirements are to provide relief to the utilities under the settlement agreements, to provide financial assistance for transportation planning and training, and to conduct research on alternative waste management technologies.

Finally, the bill does nothing to help the one utility that is actually threatened with having to shut down one of its plants because of insufficient onsite storage capacity. Here I am talking about Northern States Power's Prairie Island plant in Minnesota. Nothing in this bill forestalls the shutdown of that plant in January of 2007.

The bottom line is that this bill will not fix what is wrong with the nuclear waste program. On the contrary, it will make matters worse and move us further from a final solution.

The question before the Senate is whether the bill should pass, ''the objections of the President notwithstanding.'' That is the question for us to vote on this afternoon.

The President said he remains committed to solving the nuclear waste issue. The administration has made considerable progress toward that end and is close to completing the work needed for the site suitability decision next year.

The President says the bill does not help; it does not advance the program's goals.

On the contrary, in his view, it is a major step backward because it is likely to delay the site suitability determination, it undermines public confidence, and it is likely to create new unfunded liabilities for the Government—in fact, not likely, but it does create them.

The President's objections to the bill are well taken, and, in my view, the Senate should not pass the bill over the objections that have been raised by the President.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, we are again faced with the decision of whether to put off an obligation that we have to store nuclear waste that is threatening our industry or just talk some more.

If we reflect on reality, we will find that the last time this issue came before the Senate we had 64 votes in favor. There was one Senator who was

absent. We anticipate that Senator to be here today, so we anticipate approximately 65 votes. In the House, it passed 253–167. So, clearly, a majority in the House and Senate have spoken on this issue.

We have before us the question of the President's veto on the Nuclear Waste Policy Act. I say that the President is wrong. He is wrong for the environment, wrong for the U.S. energy policy, wrong for the economy, and he is wrong for international security.

This has become pretty much a political issue on the floor—whether to override the President's veto and do what is right. What is right is to address the responsibility that we have to the taxpayers of this country. I urge every Member of this body to reflect on the obligation that he or she has at this time. We have a situation where, as a consequence of the inability of the Federal Government to take the waste, which was to occur in 1998, we have a breach of contract with several of our utility companies. That breach of contract has resulted in liability and damages—damages that are assessed now at somewhere between $40 billion and $80 billion. So every Member of this body who does not support an override better be prepared to respond to the American taxpayer and address the reasons and have an excuse for not moving this and terminating that extended liability to the taxpayers.

While the President's veto wasn't based on good science, it was based on crass politics. The President's veto is particularly troublesome because Congress has bent over backward to meet every legitimate concern expressed by this administration. So it is simply clear that this administration doesn't want to take up this matter and resolve it under any circumstances under their watch.

Instead, they apparently want to use it as an election year issue. Well, I think it will come back and bite them as an election year issue. The bill the President vetoed would have disposed of our nuclear waste in a rational and effective way. It would do so by providing early receipt at Yucca Mountain of our civilian and our defense nuclear waste 5 years earlier than under existing law but not until after the Nuclear Regulatory Commission approved a construction permit for the facility, and it would have protected the $16 billion nuclear waste fund from being raided to pay for the Government's default on its contract with the utilities—money that consumers have paid through higher electric rates. It would have protected consumers from the Secretary of Energy unilaterally and unreasonably raising the nuclear waste tax on electricity without the consent of Congress, and it would have preserved the right of the Environmental Protection Agency to set the radiation standards in a manner that fully protects public health and safety.

If you go back and read the bill, it clearly gives the Environmental Protection Agency the obligation of setting the standard. Failure to address this problem does not solve the problem by any means; it simply leaves the waste where it is.

I would like to refer to this chart in back of me because this is the reality. We have the waste at 80 sites in 40 States. It is located in our backyards. Each year that goes by, our ability to continue to store nuclear waste in each of these sites in a safe and reasonable way diminishes. Why? These sites were designed for temporary storage and, in many cases, they have about reached their maximum. Isn't it better to put this at one site, at Yucca Mountain in Nevada, which was designed for the waste?

It is irresponsible to let this situation continue. Rather than exhibiting courage and signing legislation that would address the problem, the President has abdicated his responsibility. Rather than protect the American people, he has chosen to sacrifice them to satisfy the anti-nuclear interests.

The veto is absolutely wrong for the environment. Again, I refer to this chart. Is it better to have this material scattered at 80 sites in 40 States or one, single, easily-monitored location which, I add, is where we have had over 50 years of nuclear testing out in the Nevada desert? This veto means that the administration wants to continue to keep this material near our major population centers, near schools, hospitals, parks, homes, areas where we have earthquakes, such as in California, and in other areas, such as Illinois, where we have severe windstorms at times. The administration's own draft environmental impact statement released in August of last year makes it clear that leaving the material spread around the country could represent a considerable human health risk.

His veto is wrong for the U.S. energy policy. The real agenda of this administration is to kill nuclear power as a means to provide electricity, but they never answered the tough questions—the reality that nuclear power generation consists of 20 percent of the Nation's electricity. It does so without emanating any air pollution or greenhouse gases. How do we address the risk of global warming without nuclear power? It is pretty hard to do. How do we meet our clean air requirements and goals without nuclear power?

There is no alternative suggested by the administration. How do we provide consumers and our economy with the electricity they need if we rule out our nuclear power? The answer is very simple: We can't.

The choice we face is either replace nuclear power with coal-fired power or consumers will go without; that means brownouts, perhaps blackouts. But this should come as no surprise to an administration that has allowed this Nation to become dependent on insecure sources of foreign oil to meet our energy needs. Our energy policy consists of the Secretary of Energy going hat-in-hand to beg for help from countries that once sought our protection to maintain their existence. We have recently seen our increased dependence on oil from Saddam Hussein and Iraq. It was 300,000 barrels a day last year, and this year it is 700,000 barrels a day.

Isn't it rather ironic, as we look at the foreign policy of this country, to recognize that we buy Saddam Hussein's oil and give him our dollars, and we take that oil, put it in our airplanes, and we go out and bomb him.

That is really what we are doing. How ironic.

Furthermore, it has cost the American taxpayer about $10 billion since the end of the Persian Gulf war in 1991 to keep Saddam Hussein fenced in.

The veto is wrong for the economy. Failure to resolve the nuclear waste problem may well turn into a budgetary disaster that will rival the savings and loan crisis.

I say that as a consequence of the increasing liability that goes to the Federal Government for its inability to take that waste when it was due under the contract terms in 1998. That is over $40 billion. It may be closer to $80 billion. That is a liability that is being assumed by the American taxpayer as we delay addressing this obligation.

By failing to resolve the nuclear waste problem, the Federal courts have said this administration has violated its contractual obligations. As I said, this means the Department of Energy may have to pay as much as $40 billion to $80 billion in liability, and possibly more. Where do you think this money is going to come from? You guessed it. The taxpayer. And every Member who doesn't support this veto override had better be able to explain that to his or her constituents. Instead of using this money to keep Social Security solvent, we have to use it to pay for this administration's willful failure to comply with the law.

But keep in mind that even after the taxpayers foot this bill, the nuclear waste problem still won't be dealt with because the President simply won't stand up and recognize that we have an obligation under a contract made 20 years ago to accept the waste.

Further, it is wrong for the international security of this Nation. How do we convince our allies and those who are not to abide by our goal of nuclear nonproliferation when we demonstrate that we have neither the will nor the intelligence to deal with our own domestic problem? How do we convince our European allies to look to us and not Russia for solutions when we demonstrate that we do not have the courage to follow science and our own law? What type of leadership do we show to the world when we are unwilling to honor our commitments to our own citizens? It is not only our security that is jeopardized but also that of our allies who depend on our willingness and capability to defend them to enforce a peace.

This is referred to as a ''mobile Chernobyl'' by some. Opponents of the legislation argue that shipping nuclear waste across the Nation will create a ''mobile Chernobyl.'' The administration seems to agree with these opponents. Yet this very same administration agreed in 1996 to accept 20 tons of foreign nuclear high-level waste shipped to the United States. The administration's Foreign Research Reactor Program brought that in. This foreign nuclear waste is being moved safely in the very same way and in the very same casks that the opponents say U.S. nuclear waste cannot be moved safely.

Let me also observe as we are talking about ''mobile Chernobyls'' that there are 83 nuclear-powered U.S. submarines and naval warships which operate under nuclear power. They are around the world. They operate around the clock in both U.S. and foreign ports to ensure our security. They carry the reactors, and they have done it in a safe and admirable manner for a long period of time. There does not seem to be any concern about these ships. And the shipments we are talking about are dry, stable waste, and not reactors. But they criticize it in the capacity of suggesting this is a Chernobyl-style act. This is fear mongering. It is unnecessary. It is fear in the worst case.

Finally, we recognize the obligation of our Chief Executive. The President of the United States had a choice. The President could have shown courage and chosen for the environment. Instead, he declined. The President could have shown leadership and chosen a sound energy policy. Instead, he refused. The President could have demonstrated concern for the future and chosen for a healthy economy. Instead, he ducked. The President could have shown resolve on our national and international obligations and chosen for our national security. Instead, he abdicated. The President's veto was wrong for the environment, for energy policy, for the economy, and for our national security.

Today, our choice is a simple one.

Again, I note on this chart behind me, all of those areas in green are the States where nuclear waste is stored, 40 States. Do we want to have that, or do we want to have one central disposal facility at Yucca Mountain where we have already expended $6 billion or $7 billion in the design of a permanent repository? Do we want to move it to one central facility in an area where over 800 nuclear devices were tested?

I show you a chart and a picture of the proposed location for the permanent repository at the Nevada site. It was used for previous testing of more than 800 nuclear weapons.

I urge my colleagues not to be misguided and to support the veto override.

Before I yield some time to the other side, I want to make a couple of points relative to the radiation issue which has come up from time to time.

One of the principles originally in S. 1287 was that the Yucca Mountain radiation standards should be set by the NRC and not the EPA. Although I still strongly believe that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission should set this standard, the managers' amendment contains new language—I hope my colleagues will read it—that will permit the EPA to go ahead with its rule as long as both the EPA and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, in consultation with the National Academy of Sciences, agrees that the standard will protect public health, safety, and the environment, and is reasonable and obtainable. If that isn't the best science available, I don't know what is.

This is a very reasonable approach that provides the very best science and the very best peer review, yet allows the EPA to have the obligation to ultimately complete the rule after all the best minds on the subject have been consulted.

I think it is apparent as we address this issue—and I recognize that my State of Alaska does not have nuclear waste stored in it—that if we don't resolve it today, we are going to have to address it at a later date because the fact is nobody wants this waste.

I am particularly sensitive to and appreciate the position of my colleagues from Nevada. The bottom line is they don't want the waste. If the waste were going to be stored in Colorado, we would have the Senators from Colorado speaking here on the floor and objecting to it. It is going to be stored in California, or New Hampshire, or somewhere. That is just the harsh reality of recognizing that no one wants this waste.

But my colleagues from Nevada claim that the Congress chose Nevada to be studied for nuclear waste disposal purely for political reasons. They would have you believe that there are no rational, technical, or scientific reasons for placing spent nuclear fuel in Nevada. That is what they would have you believe. But it is wrong.

The DOE spent over $1 billion studying other potential sites before narrowing the list to three sites, one of which was Yucca Mountain. Congress settled on Yucca Mountain back in 1987. It is geologically unique. The Nevada Test Site has been used to explode nuclear weapons for over 50 years.

This is a picture of the Nevada site. The last weapon exploded there underground was in 1991. The underground tests are still being performed, with nuclear materials being exploded with conventional explosives, with the wholehearted support of the Nevada delegation. In fact, not too long ago one of the Senators from Nevada supported storing spent fuel at the test site. There was a resolution that I believe took place back in 1975 or 1976.

The resolution reads as follows. This is a resolution from the Nevada Assembly, Joint Resolution 15:

Whereas, the people of Southern Nevada have confidence in the safety record of the Nevada test site and the ability of the staff of the site to maintain safety in the handling of nuclear materials;

Whereas, nuclear disposal can be carried out at the Nevada test site with minimal capital investment relative to other locations;

Now, therefore, be it resolved that the Assembly of the State of Nevada jointly with the Legislature of the State of Nevada strongly urges the Energy Research and Development Administration to choose the Nevada test site for the disposal of nuclear waste.

This resolution passed the Nevada Senate by a 12–6 vote, aided by a vote at that time of then State Senator BRYAN and signed by the Governor of Nevada.

What has changed? The Nevada Test Site has not changed. It has the workers, a workforce, an infrastructure for dealing with nuclear materials. The geology has not changed.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a Los Angeles Times article called ''Marketing a Nuclear Wasteland.''

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Feb. 4, 1998]

MARKETING A NUCLEAR WASTELAND

(U.S. tries to drum up business for Nevada Test Site by urging companies to use it for research too risky to try anywhere else. ''No job is too big,'' promotional brochure boasts)

(By Stephanie Simon)

MERCURY, NEV.—This sun-scraped scab of desert has been pounded by the worst mankind could hurl at it: four decades of nuclear explosions.

Those trials are over now. But this echoing expanse remains the proving ground for audacious inventions. Only now it's not the government experimenting, it's private industry.

Need to blow up a building to test a new anti-terrorism design? Do it at the Nevada Test Site. Need to set a chemical fire to try out a new foam flame retardant? Feel free, at the Nevada Test Site.

Dump toxins on the ground to train emergency crews. Bury land mines to test detection technology. Send a brand new, one-of-a-kind reusable rocket hurtling into orbit.

Even the most violent and volatile of experiments can do little to land that has been assaulted by 928 nuclear explosions over the years.

That is why the U.S. Department of Energy is marketing the site—a wasteland bigger than Rhode Island—as the perfect place to conduct research that would not be welcome in the average American neighborhood. As the promotional brochure boasts: ''No job too big.''

The push to woo private industry to the Nevada Test Site mirrors transitions underway at nuclear facilities across the country. With the Cold War over, the government has been trying to shrug off surplus weapons plants by cleaning them up and turning them over to communities for commercial development.

The test site, however, presents some unusual challenges:

It's huge. It's impossible to scrub clean. And it might one day be needed for more nuclear tests. Thus, unlike some other nuclear facilities, it can't be transformed into, say, an industrial park. Instead, the Energy Department seeks to bring in private projects compatible with the site's legacy.

''We're selling the concept of a place where you can do things you can't do anywhere else,'' said Tim Carlson, who runs NTS Development Corp., a nonprofit group commissioned by the government to market the site.

Of course, not every company wants to be associated with a nuclear testing ground, even one that no longer sends mushroom clouds roaring through the dawn. Hundreds of craters from underground blasts still pock the earth like giant thumbprints in a just-baked pie. Yellow signs still warn of radiation here and there in the desert scruff.

''Gerber baby food will never move out here, because of the image,'' NTS consultant Terry Vaeth acknowledged.

But plenty of other companies will. Exempt from many environmental restrictions, the site allows researchers to step outside their labs and conduct real-life, full-scale tests too dangerous to carry out elsewhere.

Consider the Hazardous Materials Spill Center, a tangle of criss-crossing pipes and mock smokestacks gleaming in the dull brown emptiness. It's centered around a giant wind tunnel built to spew toxins into the air—on purpose.

Private firms and government agencies pay up to $1.2 million for the privilege of dumping dangerous brews by the tens of thousands of gallons through the wind tunnel or elsewhere at the facility. From a bank of nearby TV cameras, they can then monitor how the fumes spread in different weather conditions, or whether experimental cleanup methods work.

''It's the only place we've found where we can spill this stuff,'' said Mark Salzbrenner, a senior engineer at DuPont Chemical Co.

Every other year, DuPont holds two weeklong workshops for industrial customers who buy fuming sulfuric acid for products such as shampoo, laundry detergent and pharmaceuticals. Engineers spill the stuff into huge steel pans, then demonstrate how to battle the resulting blazes.

Each workshop costs DuPont $40,000 a fee Salzbrenner considers well worthwhile. After all, he says, ''we're not going to do this in the middle of Los Angeles.''

The spill center has been operating for more than a decade, but promoters are just starting to market it intensively to private industry as part of the drive to commercialize the site. It's a startling shift of focus for this lonely chunk of desert 65 miles northwest of Las Vegas.

For decades, the test site was top secret, off limits a proud if mysterious symbol of America's determination to preserve peace through overwhelming military strength.

Before the test site was established in 1951, the United States had exploded five nuclear bombs on the Bikini Atoll in the Pacific Ocean. With tensions rising in Korea, President Harry Truman decided to shift the nuclear program to the mainland, Nevada, with its dry weather and low population, was selected.

The government conducted a handful of tests on peaceful uses for nuclear explosions in Alaska, Mississippi, New Mexico and Colorado, as well as 104 blasts on Pacific islands. But more than 90% of the nation's nuclear tests took place at the Nevada site.

Then the Cold War crumbled.

In 1992, President George Bush declared a moratorium on nuclear testing that has held to this day. The Energy Department, which runs U.S. nuclear programs, responded with painful cutbacks at weapons assembly and testing facilities from Tennessee to New Mexico.

In the past six years, the department has slashed its nuclear work force by a third. The Nevada site, suddenly stranded with no clear mission, fared even worse: Employment has collapsed from a Cold War peak of 11,000 jobs to fewer than 2,500.

Scientists lost their jobs, of course,but so did lab technicians and welders and mechanics. Half of the site's 3,300 buildings, ranging from trailers to offices to elaborate labs, were vacated and declared surplus. ''It created a kind of vacuum,'' said Susan Haase, a vice president of NTS Development.

To cushion the blow, the Energy Department set aside more than $190 million over five years to help communities affected by the downsizing. Cities could use the grants to retrain laid-off workers, convert weapons plants to commercial use or put together incentive plans to lure new employers.

The Nevada Test Site received nearly $9 million of these funds, but with a caveat: Privatization would have to proceed with caution, because the government still has first dibs on the rugged, mountain-fringed site.

Though the United States has not set off a nuclear explosion in nearly six years, the Nevada site is still used for underground experiments designed to assess the stability of aging weapons.

Also, by law the Energy Department must be prepared to resume full-scale tests within two years if the president ever gives the word. So the government could not simply hand the site to Las Vegas developers and let them have at it.

Clearly, a Ground Zero Casino was out. Instead, NTS Development has tried to market the site to industries that can take advantage of the equipment and brainpower assembled over the years to support nuclear tests.

''You've got a tremendous amount of energy . . . sitting there waiting to be of service again,'' Carlson said.

Local leaders hope that wooing scientific projects to the site will diversify the state's economy, which now leans on gambling and tourism for nearly half its revenue. At the same time, the government is eager to busy laid-off nuclear workers with peacetime challenges so they'll keep their skills sharp in case testing ever resumes.

Whatever the motivation, electrical foreman Clifford Houpt is glad to see so much interest in revving up business for the repair shops and assembly facilities of Mercury, a town that serves as the last site's faded barracks-style base camp. ''We need all the work we can get out here,'' he said.

Some of the projects drawn to the test site represent efforts to atone for the Cold War years of environmental destruction.

Most of the site's new ventures so far have come from private, for-profit companies such as Kistler. Eventually, though, local leaders hope that the federal government will step in with its own projects.

The nonprofit Nevada Testing Institute is pressing Congress to fund a $1-million anti-terrorism center. Engineers could subject buildings to terrorist-style assaults to determine how best to safeguard lives and property, said institute President Pete Mote.

''They may say, 'We need a 20,000-pound bomb, and we want to simulate a building in New York City that a Ryder truck can get within 20 feet of,'" he said. ''We'll say, 'OK, we're the place to do it.'"

The prospect of such projects cheers Nevada civic leaders who would love to see the site once again serve national security—without sending mushroom clouds billowing toward Las Vegas as the early atmospheric tests in the 1950s did.

''We want to take the technology and the personnel we had [for the nuclear industry] and apply it to new areas so we're doing things for society instead of just blowing up bombs,'' said Stephen Rice, associate provost of the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. Or, as NTS Development's Haase put it: ''Taxpayers paid for this place, after all.

NEVADA'S NUCLEAR LEGACY

The United States conducted 928 nuclear tests at the Nevada Test Site between 1951 and 1992. Though most were conventional bombs, the government also tested a nuclear artillery shell, experimented with a nuclear-powered rocket and sought peaceful uses of atomic explosives for earth-moving projects.

SOME FACTS ABOUT THE TEST SITE

Las Vegas residents used to stand on their doorsteps to toast the passing mushroom clouds.

In the early 1950s, troops from all four military services were deployed within a few thousand yards of atmospheric tests to train them in atomic combat.

For a 1953 test dubbed ''Doom Town'' scientists built a mock American community near ground zero, complete with cars, bunkers and mannequin families. The explosion destroyed all but two houses.

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency for years managed a 36-acre farm on the site to test the effect of radiation on cattle, crops and wells.

For a 1957 test, ''Priscilla,,'' engineers built concrete domes, underground garages, bridges and other shelters near ground zero to see how they would fare in a blast. Most did poorly, although a bank vault survived intact.

Scientists built a Japanese-style town and bombarded it with radiation in 1962 to determine whether houses shielded residents from exposure during the Hiroshima and Nagasaki bombings.

Apollo 16 astronauts practiced driving their moon rover through test-site craters thrown up by nuclear explosions.

The test site's base camp, in Mercury, includes dormitory housing for 1,200 as well as warehouses, laboratories, repair shops and a hospital. Recreation facilities include a bowling alley, movie theater, pool, track and cafeteria.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. The subheading reads:

U.S. tries to drum up business for Nevada's Test Site by urging companies to use it for research too risky to try anywhere else. No job is too big, promotional brochures boast. It is huge. It is impossible to scrub clean. We are selling the concept of a place where you can do things you can't do anywhere else, said Tim Carlson, who runs the NTS Development Corporation, a nonprofit commission by the Governor to market the site.

A few more observations from Nevadans quoted by the story:

We take these companies out of someone's backyard and put them here. They are never going to be able to reclaim it for 10,000 or 15,000 years, says Randy Harness of the Sierra Club's Las Vegas chapter. They might as well do research there.

He concludes:

Given the constant monitoring, the site is probably the safest place in the whole United States.

We want to take the technology and the personnel we have in the nuclear industry and apply it to new areas so we are doing things for society instead of just blowing up bombs, said Steven Rice, assistant provost for the University of Nevada, Los Vegas.

Or, as the Nuclear Testing Site Development's Haase put it:

Taxpayers paid for this place, after all. They should get some use out of it.

We are seeing a situation develop where it is fair to say we have the final obligation in the Congress of the United States to address this with resolve once and for all.

I will comment briefly on the specifics of the veto the President saw fit to initiate. In looking at the President's veto message, the President presented the argument that S. 1287 is a step backward because delaying the issue regarding radiation standards delays any decision with regard to the site recommendation. The reality is the radiation standard is only necessary for the license application through March 2000.

The other argument the President reports is that the bill adds unnecessary bureaucracy to issuing standards and delays. The bill says specifically that the EPA issues the radiation standards by June 2001. EPA must also compare provisions with the National Academy's recommendation and justify this scientific basis for the rule. If good science unduly burdens the EPA, then perhaps we have a problem with the proposed rule. We are talking about the EPA having the final determination.

The President further states that the bill does not help with claims against the Federal Government for damages related to failure to accept fuel. The opposite is true. The bill provides early receipt as soon as construction is authorized. That is as early as 2006, January. It permits the Secretary of Energy to enter into settlement agreements with utilities, thus limiting continued liability. I think this is another example of the administration putting responsibility for its own problems on Congress. They seek to minimize damages from their own failure to take the waste and minimize the $40 to $80 billion liability by cooperating with Congress. Is that too much to ask? I ask my colleagues to explain to their constituencies why they are exposing them to continued litigation at the expense of the taxpayer, as the $40 to $80 billion claims against the Federal Government continues to mount.

Another argument is S. 1287 doesn't promote settlement because it doesn't have ''take title'' language. Mr. President, one time it had take title language but the Secretary of Energy, Secretary Richardson, didn't do his part to gain support from the States that opposed it. Why did the States oppose it? They feared the Federal Government would simply leave the waste in their States, take title to it and leave it. More importantly, the DOE has argued in the past; the Ninth Circuit, in 1991, said that the Department of Energy already had the authority to take title. That was granted by the 1954 Atomic Energy Act. This is another smokescreen.

What is lacking is not legal authority but a political exercise of will. This administration, unfortunately, does not have that political will.

It is interesting to note some of the support. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Governor of the State of New York, George Pataki.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF NEW YORK

April 21, 2000.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Now before you is the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 2000 (S. 1287). On behalf of the citizens of New York State who have been forced to temporarily store more than 2,000 tons of radioactive nuclear waste, I urge you to sign this bill into law.

Because the Federal government has failed in its statutory obligation to build a permanent and safe nuclear disposal site by 1998, our State and others are faced with continued on-site management of high-level radioactive waste. With S. 1287 Congress has developed a sensible plan that will, if signed by you, begin a process leading to this facility finally being built.

This bill has passed both the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives by large majorities and would allow New York State to transport the radioactive waste we have been storing on an interim basis. Disposal of this waste is one of the most important environmental concerns facing New York and other states with nuclear facilities and failure to seize the opportunity we now have with passage of S. 1287 could pose serious risks for us all.

Enactment of the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 2000 will also allow us to avoid continued litigation over the Federal government's failure to live up to its commitment to accept this waste. The plan laid out after years of debate and discussion in Congress moves us closer to protecting the health and safety of all Americans and should be signed.

As time passes, the problem of finding a means for the safe disposal of nuclear waste grows more complicated. Your support is needed on this critical issue of national importance, and I respectfully request that you sign S. 1287 so the process of shipping radioactive waste out of New York and other states into a safe, permanent Federal facility can finally begin.

Very truly yours,

GEORGE E. PATAKI.

The Honorable WILLIAM J. CLINTON,
President,
The White House,
Washington, DC.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I will read briefly from the letter.

APRIL 21, 2000.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Now before you is the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 2000 (S. 1287). On behalf of the citizens of New York State who have been forced to temporarily store more than 2,000 tons of radioactive nuclear waste, I urge you to sign this bill into law.

Because the Federal government has failed in its statutory obligation to build a permanent and safe nuclear disposal site by 1998, our State and others are faced with continued on-site management of high-level radioactive waste. With S. 1287 Congress has developed a sensible plan that will, if signed by you, begin a process leading to this facility finally being built.

This bill has passed both the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives by large majorities and would allow New York State to transport the radioactive waste we have been storing on an interim basis. Disposal of this waste is one of the most important environmental concerns facing New York and other states with nuclear facilities.

This is an appeal by the Governor of New York, to this body, to override the President's veto.

Another point. Some of the affected States that would have high-level waste have been storing this waste at interim sites, sites that were not designed for a permanent storage.

Ratepayers from the State of New York paid in over $1 billion in their electric bill for the Federal Government to take that waste. There are seven sites in New York, about 2,167 metric tons of waste. As a consequence, the State dependence on nuclear energy is about 26 percent. They had one shutdown of one plant, Indian Point, in 1974. The point is to show in New York the significance of what it means and why we have this letter from the Governor of New York addressing this body asking to move this bill and override the President's veto.

Another State with a significant amount of waste is Colorado. Federal payments of about $6.3 million have been paid by the ratepayers in Colorado. There is one unit that is closed, Fort St. Vrain, and about 15 metric tons of waste. There is a significant amount of Department of Energy defense waste. The alternative is to leave the waste in Colorado or move it out.

Illinois is another State where there is a significant amount of waste as a consequence of the fact that 39 percent of Illinois' power generation comes from nuclear energy. In Illinois, the ratepayers have paid $2 billion to the Federal Government to take the waste. They have 11 units and approximately 5,215 metric tons of waste. Is that waste going to stay in those numerous sites where the 11 units are, or are we going to move it out to one central location in Nevada?

In North Carolina, in 1998, the ratepayers have paid over $706 million to the Federal Government to take the waste. As I have indicated, the Federal Government is in violation of the contract. Thirty-one percent of the State of North Carolina is dependent on nuclear energy. As a consequence, they are looking at 1,400 metric tons.

Do we want to leave that waste in temporary storage, or do we want to move it now when we have an opportunity?

The State of Oregon has a significant amount of waste stored at Hanford. Hanford is in Washington, but the site certainly affects Oregon as well. The ratepayers have paid $108 million. The Trojan plant in Oregon has been closed for decommissioning. Do we want to leave it closed, or do we want to move the high-level waste out of there to one central site? There are 424 metric tons in Oregon.

Whether one is talking about Massachusetts, Connecticut, Arkansas, Wisconsin, Georgia, Louisiana, Washington State, Maine, Pennsylvania, or Vermont, these are all States which have a significant amount of waste that has been generated by the utilities under the assumption that the Federal Government would take that waste in 1998. The Federal Government has failed to take that waste and, as a consequence, the litigation goes on.

I am amused because we have a statement by the Vice President on this

question of the veto override. Looking at his statement, I see a rather curious phraseology. I ask unanimous consent that statement be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY THE VICE PRESIDENT ON YUCCA MOUNTAIN VETO

Today's veto of the nuclear waste bill is an important step to protect health, safety and the environment. This legislation was rejected because it does nothing to assist in conducting the best scientific research into the propriety of the Yucca Mountain site, as a long-term geologic repository for high level nuclear waste. Rather, the legislation limits the ability of the Environmental Protection Agency to set appropriate radiation emissions standards for the site. I believe that we need to find a permanent solution for the disposal of high-level nuclear waste, but one that is based on the best available science, in order to protect public health and the environment. I wish to commend Senator Reid, Senator Bryan and Representative Berkley for their tireless work to help us defeat the ill-advised approach in this bill.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. He states:

Today's veto of the nuclear waste bill is an important step to protect the health, safety, and the environment.

He is saying the President's veto is in the interest of protecting health, safety, and the environment. He is saying leave it at those sites in the 40 States. That must be what he is saying.

He says:

This legislation was rejected because it does nothing to assist in conducting the best scientific research into the . . . Yucca Mountain site. . . .

What are the EPA, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and the National Academy of Sciences? That is the best science we have, and yet he says there is no science involved in this process.

He says:

. . . the legislation limits the ability of the Environmental Protection Agency to set appropriate radiation . . . standards.

That is contrary to reality. It does not. We do give that authority to the EPA.

He further says:

I believe we need to find a permanent solution for the disposal—

We all agree we need a permanent solution, but the Vice President does not suggest any permanent solution. He says we ought to have one.

We have spent almost $7 billion digging a hole out of Yucca Mountain and, in 1998, the ratepayers have paid $16 billion to the Federal Government to take the waste. Now the taxpayers, as a consequence of the inability of the Federal Government to live under the terms of that contract, are looking at a liability exposure of $40 billion to $80 billion.

When the Vice President makes that kind of a statement, I wonder what he is talking about—we need to find a permanent solution. This is a permanent solution for disposal of the high-level nuclear waste and is one based on the best science available to protect public health and the environment.

This is just another issue of politics. Obviously, there is a certain sensitivity about overriding any President's veto, but there is a recognition of and an obligation to do what is in the interest of the taxpayers and of protecting those 80 sites in 40 States where this waste is stored and getting on with the obligation.

What concerns me more than anything is the reality that at some point in time we may find ourselves in a position where we simply are unable to come to grips with this matter. I am going to quote one of my friends from Nevada who, in a February 9 press release, indicated a key victory on the nuclear waste bill. It is entitled, ''Senators Secure Votes Needed to Sustain Presidential Veto.''

The interesting paragraph reads, under a criticism of S. 1287:

The Environmental Protection Agency will have full authority to set radiation standards for Yucca Mountain which many experts say will ultimately prevent—

Ultimately prevent—

the site from ever being licensed as a nuclear waste dump.

Make no mistake about this, there is a conscientious effort by many people who are antinuclear to simply stop the nuclear industry in its tracks by making sure there is no permanent repository for that waste. The sequence of what will happen is these reactor sites are licensed for a certain capacity. When that capacity fills up, those plants have to shut down, and we can bid goodbye to the nuclear industry. The problem is the administration and those who oppose it have not suggested an alternative as to where we are going to pick up the power.

It is fair to say the ultimate objective of some people is to ensure that Yucca Mountain is never used, others never want to see a permanent repository built, regardless of where it is. In deference to my good friends from Nevada, clearly they do not want it in their State under any terms and circumstances.

That is the posture of where we are, but we do have an opportunity today to bring this matter to a head by overriding the President's veto and getting on with the business at hand.

I have used a good deal of time this morning. I yield the floor to the other side. First, how much time have I used?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAPO). The Senator has used 35½ minutes.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. That is all that has been used on this side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, on behalf of the leader, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate resumes the pending ESEA legislation this afternoon, debate only be in order for the remainder of the session today.

Mr. REID. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, how much time was used by Senator BINGAMAN this morning on behalf of the people wishing to sustain the Presidential veto?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Twelve minutes.

Mr. REID. And the remaining time, after the morning formalities took place, is evenly divided between the two respective parties?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, my friend from Alaska talked about a little history this morning, or words to that effect. ''Heard a little history'' is not very accurate. For example, the chart they just took down shows the Nevada Test Site. Yucca Mountain is not the Nevada Test Site. It is a mountain in Nye County. It is separate and apart from the Nevada Test Site.

What my friends from Alaska should do is pull out new notes, not the old ones. That is what they were trying to do previously with interim storage: take it to the Nevada Test Site. This is a new bill. They are back at Yucca Mountain, which is not the Nevada Test Site. Of course, the Nevada Test Site had a lot of aboveground tests and some underground tests. That whole area is contaminated, and it is going to cost billions and billions of dollars to clean up that area.

Nevada has sacrificed a great deal. We have done it for national security.

I, as a young boy, watched the tests go off above ground. We did not know this would kill people. The dust clouds did not blow toward where I was watching, thank goodness, at least to my perspective. It blew the other way, causing the highest rate of cancer in America. People in southern Utah and parts of Nevada suffered and still today suffer from the effects of those aboveground tests.

As to the underground tests, the Department of Energy and this administration recently included Nevada Test Site workers for the ability to be compensated for exposure to radiation-type injuries and illnesses as a result of working on the underground tests. So Nevada has given a great deal. But, I repeat, the Nevada Test Site is not Yucca Mountain. History—but the wrong history.

I also say, there is some intimation here, by my friend, for whom I have the greatest respect, the chairman of the Energy Committee, who is attempting to override the President's veto, talking about radiation standards. He talks about the manager's amendment. No one should be fooled. This bill the President vetoed is the same one—the identical one—that Members of the Senate voted on just a few months ago. Nothing has changed. For my friend to intimate that the managers suddenly changed things from the national Nuclear Regulatory Commission back at the EPA—that was in the bill to begin with.

My friend, interestingly, pointed out and showed pictures of States where

Senators had the courage to vote for the right principle. Every State he talked about—Colorado, New York, Oregon, North Carolina, Massachusetts—is a State where Senators had the courage to vote, and they will vote to sustain the Presidential veto. And why? Because every—I am not talking about 90 percent or 98 percent; I am talking about every—environmental group in America supports the sustainment of the Presidential veto—every environmental group.

My friend says, I do not understand what Vice President GORE is saying when he says this veto is protecting the environment. Of course it is protecting the environment.

My colleague also brings up something that took place—a resolution—25 years ago in the Nevada State Legislature. That was 25 years ago. We, in Nevada, in 1982, suddenly began to learn very quickly that there were 70,000 tons of nuclear waste stored around the country. Nevadans—everyone in this country—have a different perspective than they did before.

I show my colleagues a chart. This is a chart that is comparable to the one my friend from Alaska showed. What this chart shows is that there are nuclear-generating facilities all over America. In fact, there are 100-some-odd sites where nuclear power is generated in America today.

He showed his chart. He said: Wouldn't it be wonderful? And the nuclear power industry runs ads around the country costing hundreds of thousands of dollars—full-page ads, newspaper ads. What they do in these adds is say: Instead of having all these sites, wouldn't it be wonderful to wind up having just one? That is a sleight of hand, if there ever was one.

I will show you another chart.

What will happen is, we will not wind up with simply one site, we will wind up with one more site. These other places will still be generating nuclear waste. There will be nuclear waste stored in those sites. Even those sites that are closed down will still have nuclear waste. They will be nuclear waste sites for many years to come.

Why do we want to establish a new repository at Yucca Mountain?

Let me show you what this chart shows. This chart illustrates a nuclear nightmare. It does not show the highways. We could show highways here, too. But we just wanted to make this relatively simple for illustrative purposes. This chart shows the railroads in America where nuclear waste will be carried to this one site. If this does not send a chill down your spine, nothing will. Why? Because accidents happen on the railways all the time.

The chart shows an accident that happened very recently. It happened on March 21, 2000. This is a picture of an accident that happened in Oregon. The part of Oregon where this accident took place has dense farmland, lots of water. In this instance, there was a track slightly out of line. There was no notice for the accident. Train cars went tumbling over each other.

Let's see what the newspaper reported about this accident.

On this chart, you can see an article from this newspaper, the LaGrande Observer, of March 21, 2000. We thought we would get a fairly recently one. But you can pick any time of the year. These accidents happen all the time.

But this article shown on the chart is about the same accident that is depicted in the previous picture. In the picture, you can see one locomotive, and down here you can see another locomotive in yellow. They are tumbled—turned all over. You can see that it crumpled everything in its path. You can see railcars with stuff pouring out of them. This is what they are going to haul nuclear waste in.

One problem: They have not figured out any way to safely store nuclear waste for transportation purposes. They have come up with some dry cask storage containers. These dry cask storage containers, they say, are fine—unless you have an accident and are going more than 30 miles per hour. If you go more than 30 miles per hour, it will breach the container.

They also say these containers they have developed are really safe in a fire—unless it is fueled by diesel and burns for more than 30 minutes. We have one train in recent months that burned for 4 days.

Also, the point is always raised, what are we going to do with nuclear waste? In 1982, that was probably a pretty good question. But as the years roll on, that is not a very good question because there is an easy answer. You do just as they do out at Calvert Cliffs in Southern Maryland—a nuclear-power-generating facility—you store it onsite.

Dry cask storage—it is pretty safe if you leave it onsite because you are not going to be traveling 30 miles per hour; it is going to be stationary. And, likely, there will not be a diesel fire. Diesel burns very hot. So the odds are very good that if you store it onsite, it will be safe. That is what they are doing at Calvert Cliffs and other places around the country. We do not need to transport all this stuff across America.

I show my colleagues again the chart with the train tracks. We do not need to have this nuclear nightmare. Remember, this chart I am showing you now does not have the highways on it. This is only the railroads. We do not need to establish this very dangerous precedent of hauling nuclear waste all over America.

The situation is beyond my ability to comprehend except, when I think about it, it is easier to understand because the very powerful, greedy nuclear power industry knows it will be safer to leave it where it is. They helped defeat a provision that said the United States of America will take title to this waste. They would not allow that to take place in one of the previous bills.

They want an issue because they do not want any responsibility for the poison they have created. They want to be able to wash their hands of it and send it someplace else. But they cannot do that, even though they might try, because there are always going to be the nuclear waste sites where the nuclear-generating facilities exist.

We know there are all kinds of problems—problems that relate to transportation. Transportation problems are replete with danger. We know terrorist threats are significant. We know that no matter how hard you try, you cannot keep the trainloads or the truckloads of nuclear waste secret. For example—this is in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD from previous debates—one organization wanted to see if they could follow things nuclear on the highways and railways in this country. Yes, they could.

Ground water protection. Not only in Nevada, but all along the routes where 50-plus million people are within a slingshot of these trains and highways, they are all going to be exposed.

The risk to children is significant. Radiation standards are not only serious in Nevada but wherever these trains and trucks travel.

The other question the American public should ask is, Why are we having this debate? We have voted on nuclear waste time after time. Every vote we have taken has shown we have enough votes to sustain a Presidential veto. In fact, it shows there is ground being lost by the nuclear power industry. For the first time since 1982, in the House of Representatives there was a vote taken that had 51 votes more than necessary to sustain a Presidential veto. That was the first time they have had enough votes to sustain a Presidential veto, and they did it by more than 50 votes in the House.

One reason we are on this path is to take up time. The Senate should be doing other things, but we are here debating whether or not the Presidential veto will be sustained.

We should be talking about the juvenile justice bill. Why should we be talking about juvenile justice? Let's see the chart. One of my staff went on a short vacation to New Orleans. In the paper they had a number of cartoons, and one he brought home to me was from the Dayton Daily News. This is one reason we should be debating things other than nuclear waste on the Senate floor today. The number of Americans who died from all our wars since 1775: 650,858. That is the number of Americans who died in all our wars since 1775. The number of Americans who died from guns in the last 20 years tops that: 700,000. All the wars since 1775 compared to 700,000. I say maybe we should be doing some work here on the Senate floor dealing with guns.

I am from a Western State. I have been a police officer. I have been a prosecutor. I have been involved in things relating to guns all my life. As I have said on the floor before, when I

was 12 years old I was given a 12-gauge shotgun for my birthday. I still have that gun. I am very proud of it. I have a rifle my brothers had when they were younger, and I now have that, and I have all kinds of pistols. I have guns. I believe in the second amendment. But I also believe we have to stop certain things.

For example, I think we have to stop crazy people, people with emotional problems, and people who are felons, from purchasing guns. That is something we need to debate because there are gun loopholes that allow people to buy guns who should not be able to buy guns. You can go to a gun show in Las Vegas or Denver or Hartford and there are no restrictions; anybody can sell to anybody. We should close that loophole. Pawn shops—there are loopholes there.

We need to constructively determine why in America, in the last 20 years, 700,000 people have been killed by guns—700,000. But no, after the Columbine killings, we passed a juvenile justice bill and nothing has happened. The House passed something. We passed something. We have waited more than a year for a conference to be appointed to deal with that issue. No, we are here debating nuclear waste.

There are a lot of other issues we should talk about, such as Medicare. For 35 years Medicare has been in existence. When Medicare came into being, there was no need for a prescription drug benefit because doctors didn't use them to keep people well—they didn't exist. In the 35 years since Medicare came into being, there are many prescription drugs that save lives and make for people having very good years in those so-called golden years. We should do something to change Medicare. The average senior citizen now has 18 prescriptions filled every year.

We need to debate this issue. We need to spend some time on this floor determining why senior citizens on Medicare do not have a prescription drug benefit. But no, this is an issue we are not going to get to right away. Perhaps we won't get to it this year. We are going to spend our time talking about nuclear waste and other issues that are simply fillers of time.

Paying down the debt? I think it would be good if we had a little discussion on paying down the debt. There is always a constant harangue. George W. Bush, his answer to every problem in the world is lower taxes. International problems? Lower the taxes. What to do about the surplus? Lower the taxes. That is his one-liner: Lower the taxes. I guess he learned it from his dad who said ''Read my lips.'' But the fact of the matter is, paying down the debt is something we should talk about here because before lowering taxes we should talk about the $5.7 trillion debt we have and figure out a way to reduce that significantly.

Patients' Bill of Rights? We had a hearing, and Senator DORGAN and I are going to come to the floor this week, or the first chance we get, to talk about that hearing we had in Las Vegas. At the hearing we had in Las Vegas, I guarantee everyone in this room, had they heard these stories, tears would come to their eyes and some would break down and cry, as they did in that room.

One man had two broken legs. He was covered by the managed care industry. They won't get him a wheelchair. He crawled to the orthopedic surgeon, and the surgeon said: I can't help you, go to the HMO. Somebody drove him there. He crawled in on his hands and knees and then finally got a wheelchair. He said he has been so denigrated, his spirit has been so broken at how he has been treated by his managed care provider, he felt what he wanted to do was buy a quart of gasoline, douse himself with gasoline, and set himself afire.

Another woman who had cancer—she was a nurse—she told of the hurdles she had to jump to receive minimal treatment.

We had a doctor come in and talk about the impossibility patients have in trying to get care. He is one of the physicians who acknowledged that he has lied to insurance companies in an effort to get treatment that patients badly need.

That is what the Patients' Bill of Rights is all about, and that is what we should be talking about on the Senate floor today, doing something to protect people who are sick and need help. They may need to go to an emergency room. A woman may need to go to a gynecologist. They are prevented from doing so because of managed care entities that have a lock on this country.

What about saving Social Security? Why are we not talking about Social Security? Social Security is not in the danger that people say it is in, but it is something we need to take a look at and debate here. How we are going to prolong Social Security past the year 2040 so people can draw 100 percent of their benefits, not 75 to 80 percent?

Public schools? It seems everything the majority does regarding schools is something to tear down public schools. We need to talk about our need for more teachers. We need to give school districts help in school construction. This great Nation is the only superpower left in the world. Doesn't it seem this Nation could spend more than one-half of 1 percent of its budget on education? We spend one-half of 1 percent of the Federal budget on education. We can do better than that. This has nothing to do with taking away from the power of local schools, from school districts, to control their schools. There are national problems in which the Federal Government must be involved.

There are lots of things we should be working on, but wasting a day of time in sustaining a Presidential veto is not one of them. As I said before, the people who have the courage to vote to sustain the Presidential veto are doing the right thing. They are doing the right thing for their States. They are doing the right thing for the country. They are doing the right thing in the process for the environment. So when Vice President GORE said, following the veto by the President, that this is a proenvironmental stand the President took—he said it. I do not think there is anyone in this body who can question the Vice President's credentials on the environment.

We have a lot more to say. The fact of the matter is this is an important issue. It is important to the country.

I look forward to the President's veto being sustained. I acknowledge and congratulate and applaud the President for doing this. It would have been easy for him to go with the States with all the power and the money, but he decided to do what he thought was right for the environment. I think he has done a very courageous thing. I will always remember the President's stand on this issue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I yield the 20 minutes remaining to our good friend from Idaho.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, before I proceed, let me yield 2 minutes to my good friend from Washington for a comment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, for nearly 60 years, the citizens of the Tri-Cities in Washington state, Richland, Kennewick and Pasco, have worked to guarantee our nation's nuclear defense. Now it's time for the federal government to guarantee these citizens—and the rest of the Northwest—that the nuclear waste produced at Hanford will be moved to an adequate storage facility for permanent disposal.

The Hanford site contains 177 underground tanks full of radioactive and chemical byproduct waste. These aren't small tanks—some are as large as a four story apartment building, and, in toto, they hold 54 million gallons of waste: two-thirds of the nation's defense-related nuclear waste. This waste resulted from nearly 45 years of plutonium production at Hanford. Unfortunately, at least 66 of these tanks have exceeded their design life by thirty years and have leaked radioactive waste into the soil near the Columbia River. This problem is not going away.

We need a safe, permanent repository for this waste. We need the federal government to be focused on opening the repository. We need this nuclear waste legislation to become law.

Many of the opponents of this legislation are acting as if they do not want a solution to this problem at all. They would rather have commercial waste stored at reactors all around the country and defense waste stored in temporary structures, including the leaking underground tanks at Hanford. Delaying work on the repository is not the answer.

Continuing with the present situation is irresponsible. I urge an override of the President's veto of this nuclear waste legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho is recognized.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I thought it was important for my colleague, the senior Senator from the State of Washington, to make those statements because, as we are here today on the floor talking about nuclear waste, I must tell my colleague from the State of Nevada it is an important issue. I am sorry he and his colleagues haven't gained traction on the issue of guns, but America is wise to that. Try as you may, second amendment rights prevail in our country.

What we are here to talk about today is the absence of this administration's energy policy. Now, brownouts and blackouts and escalating fuel prices seem to take second or third place on the list of priorities about which the Senator from Nevada would like to talk. I think the American consumer and that elderly person whose air-conditioning may go out this summer at the peak of a heat spell would say this issue is a mighty important issue for this Senate to be considering.

So as it relates to priorities, while I am going to say that some of what the Senator from Nevada suggested is important for the Senate to address, but this issue is among them in priority. But, of course, my colleagues on the other side have been running for cover for months because they know that Bill Clinton has no energy strategy, never has had one, and doesn't propose one. He simply runs around Nevada sticking his head in the sand and talking about the politics of the issue instead of the substance of the issue.

Well, the veto we are here to attempt to override today is the fundamental difference between politics and substance. You heard the Senator from Alaska, Mr. MURKOWSKI, in great detail talking about the practicality of needing a national nuclear waste policy implemented in this country to be able to sustain our nuclear energy as we now have it, but, most importantly, to move forward into the future.

For a few moments today, let me talk about where we get our electricity. Somehow, it just comes when you throw on a switch. The bulbs light up, the heater turns on, the air-conditioner turns on, and we don't stop to think about the long-term strategy and policy that this country has been engaged in for decades to assure that the light does come on, that the air-conditioner does turn on, and that we have abundant energy.

Sixty percent of our electricity comes from coal. Given the concern of the other side about climate change, we aren't building new coal plants, we are not pushing forward on the technology of clean coal—the kind of technology that we ought to be pushing and giving priority to. The Clinton-Gore administration wants to make this situation dramatically worse by tying our hands and tying U.S. power companies to a Kyoto treaty, while allowing our economic competitors in developing nations to pollute at will.

Shame on you, Bill Clinton and AL GORE, for that kind of silly environmental policy. Climate change is a serious issue, but it isn't addressed in a helpful manner when you walk away from the negotiating table with an agreement that lets China and India and other major developing nations pollute at will, penalizing our economy, and doing so by trying to develop an anti-fossil-fuel bias in this country, along with the anti-nuclear-energy bias on which the President based his veto.

We get 20 percent of our electricity from nuclear power. That is why we are having this debate today. We have to sustain at least 20 percent of our energy base coming from nuclear if we are ever going to have clean air and gain the standards in the nonattainment areas that we want to set. Any right-thinking scientist and right-thinking politician today knows that fact. They can't argue otherwise. We won't get to the clean air levels this country wants without at least a 20-percent blend in our energy base coming from nuclear.

We have about 10 percent of our electricity coming from hydropower, and the Presiding Officer and I know how silly this has become in the Pacific Northwest. We have a President, a Vice President, and a Secretary of the Interior who want to take dams down—all in the name of what? Environmental radicals who want to roll back to a history of a century ago and try to reestablish ourselves without the kind of very clean power that our hydro base provides for us. It is not a large base; it is 10 percent of our base, though. Again, it is part of that 10 percent, 60 percent, 20 percent that has built the stability of an integrated power system for our country over the years that has brought us the best electrical service of any nation in the history of the world.

What we are talking about today is sustaining that capability. We are not talking about tearing dams down. We are talking about finding a safe repository for nuclear waste so we can complete the cycle of nuclear energy and allow it to go forward.

We get a small percentage of our electricity from solar and wind and biomass. Let me be perfectly clear about my support for these technologies because I do support them and I am willing to continue to allow taxpayer dollars to go into the investment of the technology as it relates to solar and wind and biomass. I am also willing to invest in fuel cells and fusion energy and other kinds of new technology that may someday supplant the kind of technology about which we are talking.

But let's have a reality check because if the Senator from Nevada is going to talk about the importance, or the lack thereof, of what we debate today, let's talk about this President and this administration's energy budget and where they want to spend money. They want to spend a lot of money on wind. They have even said that it is their goal to have 5 percent of our electricity generated by wind by the year 2020. It just so happens that the States of Nevada and Idaho have a little wind. It doesn't all come from politicians. It is kind of natural, and it flows through the Rocky Mountains out of Canada. It is the way Mother Nature created the natural environment which creates a wind opportunity out there.

But let me talk to you for a moment about a recent report in analyzing the 5 percent wind blend by the year 2020 that this President wants.

If you calculate what is needed to meet the goal of 5 percent of our electricity coming from wind energy that would require 133,000 windmills. The current wind turbines generate about 750 kilowatts of electricity each. Some of these 750 kilowatt wind turbines have been installed in Iowa. They are impressive and huge in size. They are on towers 213 feet tall. In addition to that, they have blades with a sweep of 164 feet in diameter. What is something comparable in height? Well, that is about the height of the Capitol dome in the building in which we are standing today.

Can't you just see all of those spread across the State of Nevada and Idaho? What are the environmentalists going to say again about vistas, visions, and horizons? You know and I know what they are going to say—''no windmills.'' But that is what this administration wants to talk about because they have this illusion that somehow that is environmentally sensitive.

Have you ever caught an eagle in a 164-foot blade? It is referred to as ''avian mortality''—eagles, condors, flying into the turbines and being killed. Yes. Those machines aren't very environmentally sensitive, and they make a great sound across the countryside. They are probably the loudest producer of electricity of any technology we have today.

One-hundred and thirty-plus thousand windmills is the answer to no nuclear waste policy? I don't think so. I don't think America thinks so. When they are faced with those realities, I think they will turn on this administration and say, Why aren't you being responsible? Why create a problem when you can solve a problem with a single location in a permanent, deep, geologic repository that is environmentally safe and sound for all under the most stringent of laws and the best technology available?

That is what we are talking about. That is a right and responsible choice for the American people to contemplate and for this Senate to debate.

There is going to be debate on guns. There is going to be debate on health care. There is going to be debate on prescription drugs. But, in my opinion, a well founded, well orchestrated energy policy for this country is every bit

as valuable and important for us to be involved in as any one of those issues.

A veto override that this President offered and gave, in my opinion, is not an environmental vote. Voting for a sound and sane policy for nuclear waste is the No. 1 environmental vote all of us will be making. Let's not try to hide it and walk away from it. Let's deal with it up front and in a way that is right and responsible to recognize.

As I thought about what I would say here today that might convince my colleagues to vote for a Presidential override, because for some it is a tough vote and it is a partisan vote, tragically enough, good national energy policy has in this instance become an issue of politics.

There is a letter from J.V. Parrish of Energy Northwest based in Richland, WA. He writes about the importance of this legislation. I found his words compelling. I want to read them to you. He says:

> Because the Federal Government has not had an effective program to receive spent fuel from this country's commercial power reactors, most of these reactors will have to spend several millions of dollars of ratepayer dollars to provide temporary storage. My own company will spend in excess of $25 million. This is money that could be better spent by the households and businesses in the region on things that would improve their futures.

What is he talking about? He is talking about utility companies having to charge their ratepayers more because this administration failed to be responsible in their energy policy.

I think as time goes on we will find a lot of other things in which our President failed to be responsible, and history will record him differently. I hope the absence of a nuclear waste policy is one of them because that is the way it deserves to be remembered.

All I would say to President Clinton is: In vetoing this bill, you have failed, once again, to do the right thing for the country but my colleagues and I don't have to be a party to your failure.

I encourage my colleagues to vote to override the President's mistake and override this veto.

Mr. President, I yield my time.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, how much time is remaining from the 20 minutes that was allotted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ENZI). Three and one-half minutes are still remaining.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I want to point out a couple of things. I saw my friend from California on the floor a few moments ago. I guess she intends to speak.

Let me point out something that I think is paramount as we address this matter. That is the reality of where this waste is and where this waste is coming in.

I think it is important to note that San Francisco is obviously key because just up from the area of Sacramento and the Sacramento River is Concord, CA. Concord, CA, is unique inasmuch as it has been designated by the Clinton administration as one of the major west coast ports for receiving high-level nuclear waste under the Foreign Research Reactor Program.

It is kind of interesting because over a 13-year period some portion of 20 tons of spent nuclear fuel from 41 countries will be shipped to the United States for storage, and a good portion of that will come into Concord, CA. Once it gets into Concord, CA, it will be shipped from the Concord Naval Weapons Station in California, and it will follow a route up to Idaho. That shipment will either go by rail or truck.

I think it is significant to recognize the reality that we move waste. The waste moves in areas that are prone to earthquakes. California certainly is. California has four nuclear reactors currently: San Onofre, Rancho Seco—and one which is shut down. Here is another opportunity for the waste to simply stay at the shutdown reactor, or move almost 20 percent of California's electricity which comes from nuclear energy.

I might add that the residents of California have paid $762 million into a nuclear waste fund. That is three-quarters of a billion dollars.

In 1998, nuclear reactors avoided about 5.35 million metric tons of CO2 emissions. Have they helped with the greenhouse gases? Since 1983, the total avoided greenhouse emissions are 83 million metric tons. These are to be avoided as a consequence of the contribution of nuclear power in California. During 1998, nuclear power avoided 878 tons of sulfur dioxide in California.

If indeed my friend from California intends to speak on this issue, I would certainly encourage her to address the concerns of California being chosen as the West Coast recipient for the transfer of waste from the 41 countries and some 20 tons of spent fuel.

On the east coast, the Charleston Naval Weapons Station in South Carolina will be the recipient of waste moving by rail and truck.

This is pertinent to the discussion at hand. We have heard in detail the question of the important agenda before the Senate, whether we are talking about juvenile justice, protecting Medicare or Patients' Bill of Rights. These are all important issues, but so is this. It is important we get this issue behind us. It is costing the taxpayers a good deal every day it goes unresolved—$40 to $80 billion in liability. That continues to increase as a consequence of the Nation's inability to honor the sanctity of the contracts.

I urge my colleagues to reflect on the importance of this bill, the importance of this legislation, and not be misled. It is meaningful to the taxpayers of this country that we vote today to override the President's veto.

How much time remains on this side?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The time remaining is 27½ minutes out of the original 90.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. And we have more this afternoon, is that right?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. One hour equally divided.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. BRYAN. I yield myself 20 minutes.

The proponents of this legislation, who would have us override the Presidential veto, proclaim this is an environmental savior. In point of fact, this legislation is an unenvironmental travesty. It represents the most cynical assault to date on the environment.

I will respond to a general criticism frequently made. That is, that the deadline for the opening of a permanent repository in 1998 as contemplated in the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, enacted in 1982, has been breached. There is no permanent repository that will be opened for any time within the foreseeable future, in my judgment. The reason is that politics, not science, has been involved in this process, including proponents of nuclear power and, more specifically, the nuclear industry itself, and its advocates who appear on the floor.

Let me briefly, as I have on many occasions over the past 12 years of my Senate tenure, give a little bit of history. In 1982, the Nuclear Waste Policy Act was enacted by the Congress. It sought to search the entire country for three sites to be studied. Those would be sent to the President of the United States, and the President himself would select one of those sites as the repository location. It was contemplated there would be regional equity in balance, and indeed, some of the promising geologic formations in upper New England, the formations of granite, would be examined. We would look at the salt dome locations in the southeastern part of our States, and, yes, the geology of Nevada would be considered, as well, what was referred to as welded tuff.

That was a fair and balanced approach. Let science look throughout the country for the best sites. Those sites would be recommended. That did not occur. It did not occur because politics, not science, dictated the conclusion. No sooner had the act been signed into law in January of 1983 by then-President Reagan than the Department of Energy made a unilateral decision it would not look at the granite formations because the people in that part of the country would strongly resist the location of a permanent repository in their State. Is that science? Of course not. It was politics.

Then in the 1984 Presidential campaign, President Reagan assured those in the Southeast that the salt dome formations would not be considered. Was that science? Of course not. It was politics.

Then finally in 1987, legislation, which is infamously known in my State as the ''Screw Nevada'' bill, the

whole concept of the original Nuclear Waste Policy Act to search the country and truly try to come up with the right science and the right location, all of that was cast into the ash bin because politics, not science, dictated only one site would be studied.

When I hear the lamentations about the delays and all the money that has been spent, it is politics that has caused that, and politics that interfered with the science of the process.

Today we have the most recent cynical political attempt to manipulate the process. In that 1982 legislation, the Environmental Protection Agency was selected as the agency to establish health and safety standards. Who better than the Environmental Protection Agency? For more than a decade, that was not questioned.

Then in 1992, there was, in the Energy Act of that year, an attempt to inject another aspect of the equation. The National Academy of Sciences was asked to review the process and come up with a range of recommendations. Make no mistake, the distinguished predecessor chairman to the distinguished Senator from Alaska has been debating as a great advocate of nuclear power and was advocating a position sought for the nuclear power industry. It was his hope and expectation that the National Academy of Sciences would somehow cast an aspersion and question the credibility of the Environmental Protection Agency's proposed regulations when they were issued.

We have the regulations now. Let me describe them briefly. This chart expresses the recommendations or the regulations proposed by the EPA in terms of the millirems of radioactive exposure per year per person. That is one of the standards involved. The EPA has proposed a standard of millirems. That is 15 millirems and is the only reason we are on floor today debating the veto override of the President. That is the EPA's proposed standard.

Now what does National Academy of Sciences say the appropriate standard should be? Remember, they expressed that in a range. NAS refers to the National Academy of Science. They are saying the range should be between 2 and 20 millirems; 15, by any standard, is in that mid-range. S. 1287 in its original iteration—not the bill before the Senate, but in the original iteration—proposed a standard that was nearly twice the rate of exposure per person per year, a 30 millirem standard. That is what the nuclear industry desires, the 30 millirem standard. The NRC has come up with a standard of 25 millirems. WIPP, a waste isolation facility in the State of New Mexico which currently houses transuranic nuclear waste, the standard set by EPA not objected to, 15 millirem.

Why the difference? Why are we debating this? Because the nuclear power industry does not want a 15 millirem standard; they prefer a 30 millirem standard. The legislation ultimately submitted by the President interferes with the Environmental Protection Agency in moving forward with that and seeks to delay the final rule of 15 millirems.

My friend from Alaska has pointed out his responsibilities as the chairman of this committee. I understand that. I respect that and I respect him. But let's talk about what we are trying to do. We are trying to jury-rig, to skew this standard so that under every circumstance Yucca Mountain will meet the scientific criteria. The only way they can do that is to move the goalposts, and that is what the Senator from Alaska has indicated is his primary purpose. What he wants is to ''make sure that the measuring,'' referring to radioactivity, ''is under a regulation that allows waste to go to Yucca Mountain.''

That says nothing about safety—safety for millions of Americans, safety for several hundreds of thousands of people who would live within the affected vicinity, the 2 million people who live in Nevada. That is what we are talking about, health and safety. We are not talking about whether nuclear power is good or bad. That debate can be had another day. We are talking about health and safety. That is why many of us have become energized.

It is fair to say there are different ways in which these accidents have occurred, but I wish to illustrate the magnitude of the problem. With radioactivity, we are talking about something that is lethal, deadly, not for generations, but thousands of years—not only a few generations, but thousands of generations. We are not talking about a mistake we could make today and correct in the next Congress or the next decade or even in the next century; and we are talking about something that is lethal.

Our friends advocating on behalf of this legislation do not like us to point this out, but let's talk a little bit about the history, since history has been mentioned. In the dawn of the nuclear age, between 1945 and 1968, some 23 years, there were a series of accidents involving nuclear reactors and nuclear power. Some six people were killed as a consequence. I am not suggesting the circumstances are identical to what would be involved with the storage of high-level radioactivity, but I point out this is not just an academic discussion. We are talking about things that cause people to die—not get sick and then get well, but die. That is a very final medical judgment: Death.

In the Soviet Union, in 1957, a container of nuclear waste exploded and nearly 11,000 people were evacuated. We don't know how many people may have died as a consequence of that. Theirs is a society, unlike our own, that is closed. We don't get as much information as we would like.

In 1961, at Idaho Falls, ID, an explosion occurred within a reactor vessel that resulted in the individuals who were at the reactor site being impaled with a spent fuel rod. Two men were killed. To give you some indication of how lethal, how deadly this is, the remains of those two men who were tragically killed in that accident, by virtue of their contact with the spent fuel rod—and that is what we are talking about with the civilian reactor waste—by virtue of their contact, their bodies themselves had become high-level nuclear waste. It is a rather unpleasant thought but it is true. So in making the arrangements the relatives had to make, they were not only talking about selecting something that might be at the local undertaker's home; they had to design a facility that protected against high-level nuclear waste because the victims themselves had become high-level nuclear waste. That is why health and safety is such a critical concern for us.

We could go on and on. We had the Three Mile Island tragedy. Fortunately, that situation did not result in any loss of life.

Let me comment on Chernobyl for a moment, because, yes, I have referred to this legislation as the ''mobile Chernobyl.'' I do so because it involves some very serious issues. Last week, in the Washington Post—and I will yield in a moment to my colleague from California who has rejoined us on the floor, but let me finish this thought, if I may—the United Nations released an assessment of the Chernobyl nuclear meltdown that occurred 14 years ago, saying the worst health consequences for 7.1 million people may be yet to come. Then, in making the contrast my colleague from Nevada and I tried to make on so many occasions, in explaining in Chernobyl, at least 100 times as much radiation was released by this accident as by the two atomic bombs we dropped in World War II on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. Then this article goes on to say:

> The number of those likely to develop serious medical conditions because of delayed reactions to radiation exposure will not be known until 2016 at the earliest.

Yes, this is about health and safety; and do I get mad? You bet I do, because we are talking about the health and safety, not only of millions of Americans, but 2 million people who live in my own State. Do we want science and not politics to be the way in which these standards are set? The answer is you bet we do. I am greatly offended and outraged the suggestion would be made on the floor of the Senate that we should let politics dictate this health and safety issue because we want to make sure that, whatever the cost, we have to make sure Yucca Mountain qualifies. That was not the concept and spirit of the 1982 legislation, and it should not be the spirit that activates us today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague from California be recognized and, upon the completion of her remarks, I might again be recognized to take the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Nevada, Mr. BRYAN, and Senator REID, the assistant Democratic leader, for their incredible leadership, and I might say sometimes lonely leadership, on this issue of nuclear waste safety.

I strongly oppose S. 1287. I believe the bill is bad policy. President Clinton has rejected it, and I urge my colleagues in the Senate to join him. I think it is a dangerous bill. I think it is important to note that this Senate has stopped this bill in its tracks five times at least. I believe today we will stop it again. So the question is, Why do we keep turning to this bill over and over and over again when so many people, including the President of the United States and the Vice President, have so many concerns that, in fact, it would be quite dangerous for our people? Why do we turn to it?

I think Senator REID was quite eloquent when he made the point, it is not as if we do not have other things to do. It is not as if there are not issues that are crying out to be debated and discussed on this Senate floor. He mentioned a few of those. I thought it would be good to simply summarize what I think about what he said.

Clearly, we need to take up education. We are going to an education bill. However, we are now taking time away from that education debate when people want us to make it the No. 1 issue: smaller class sizes, afterschool—we know the things people want—school renovation, teacher training. We are now taking precious time of the Senate away from that when we could be starting that debate.

A good Patients' Bill of Rights bill passed out of the House of Representatives. I thought the bill that passed out of the Senate was not as good. It was really a sham. I thought it was an HMO Bill of Rights for the HMOs. But that is in the conference committee. We ought to work on that.

Sensible gun control—we passed five sensible gun control measures in the juvenile justice bill.

Every day 12 children die of gun violence. In my State of California, it is the No. 1 cause of death among children. Senator REID had an incredible cartoon that ran showing the amazing number of deaths. During the Vietnam war, there were 58,000 deaths over an 11-year period. In the last 11 years, we have lost 300,000 Americans to gun violence. Why are we taking up a bill that is dangerous—and I will get into why it is dangerous—when we could be making our lives less dangerous? It does not make sense.

Then Senator CRAIG from Idaho says this administration has no energy policy. Maybe that is because the Republican side keeps reducing the amount the President wants to spend on energy efficiency, which is so important. It is the cheapest way to get more energy.

Campaign finance reform is an issue Senator MCCAIN and Senator FEINGOLD bring continually before us. It passed in the House, but it is getting the death knell in the Senate. This is just a handful of issues. If protecting the health of our citizens is our highest priority—and indeed it should be—then we should not be taking up a bill that will expose our people to illness and danger. This is not a bill that makes life better for our people. It is a bill that is going to make life worse for our people.

It has been described as a compromise bill, but, in my view, it is still an attempt to bypass and preempt science and legislate the scientific suitability of Yucca Mountain, NV, as a high-level nuclear waste dump. It is not based on reality or on fact. Instead of finding a repository that meets the health and safety standards we have established in law, this legislation attempts to weaken our health and safety standards to make Yucca Mountain fit because some people committed themselves to Yucca Mountain, and it does not seem to matter what the facts are; they just keep on going down that path. I cannot, and I will not, support such action.

For many years, we have debated the suitability of a high-level radioactive waste dump at Yucca Mountain, and for years I have been on the Senate floor with my colleagues from Nevada fighting to protect the health and safety of the citizens of Nevada.

I want my colleagues to know that today I am fighting not only for their citizens but for the citizens of the State of California. In fact, because of recent studies, we know that if we go forward with Yucca Mountain, it will seriously impact the people I represent.

Yucca Mountain is only 17 miles from the California border and from Death Valley National Park. I have a map to show how close we are. We can see where the Yucca Mountain repository site is and how close Death Valley National Park is to Yucca Mountain. There is Yucca Mountain, Death Valley National Park in Inyo County, and then San Bernardino County.

I want to show my colleagues the beauty of Death Valley National Park. This is one magnificent view of Death Valley National Park. It amazes me when we make these incredibly important investments in our environment and in the beauty of our Nation to protect and preserve it, with the next vote, we vote for a nuclear waste dump that can adversely impact on this national treasure. I will explain that.

The development of Yucca Mountain has the potential to contaminate California's ground water. It poses a threat to the health and safety of Californians from possible transportation accidents related to the shipping of high-level nuclear waste through Inyo, San Bernardino, and neighboring California counties.

Since its inception as a national monument in 1933, the Federal Government has invested more than $600 million in Death Valley National Park. The park receives over 1.4 million visitors each and every year.

The communities surrounding the park are economically dependent on tourism. The income generated by the presence of the park exceeds $125 million per year. The park has been the most significant element in the sustainable growth of the tourist industry in the Mojave Desert. This chart is a blown-up photo of how close the national park is to Yucca Mountain and why these two counties have concerns.

Scientific studies show that a significant part of the regional ground water aquifer surrounding Yucca Mountain discharges in Death Valley because the valley is downgradient of areas to the east. If the ground water at Death Valley is contaminated from nuclear waste stored at Yucca Mountain, it will be the demise of the park and the surrounding communities.

The long-term viability of fish, wildlife, and human population in these areas are largely dependent on water from this aquifer. The vast majority of the park's visitors rely on services and facilities at the park headquarters near Furnace Creek. These facilities are all dependent upon the ground water aquifer that flows under or near Yucca Mountain. Unfortunately, there is no alternative water source that can support these visitor facilities and wildlife resources. So I cannot understand why, on the one hand, we create a magnificent park—we spent $600 million on it; we get tourist dollars from it—and on the other hand in another vote we endanger this magnificent monument and the people who live in the surrounding areas.

Water is life in the desert. Water quality must be preserved for the viability of Death Valley National Park, the dependent tourism industry, and the surrounding communities.

We do not have the science that tells us that Yucca Mountain is safe, and the potential loss is far too great. It has been hard to get the Energy Department to accept California's connection to the site. Every time they talk about the site, they talk about Nevada. Finally, they recognize that Inyo County, CA, as an effective unit of local government under the Nuclear Waste Policy Act, actually qualifies. There had to be, unfortunately, a lawsuit by the county that resulted in DOE granting affected unit status in 1991.

It is very important my colleagues understand that my concern comes from the local people.

I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a letter from the board of supervisors of the county of Inyo.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Independence, CA, February 1, 2000.

Hon. BARBARA BOXER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR BOXER, I am writing to express concern with S. 1287, the Nuclear Waste

Policy Amendments Act of 1999. S. 1287 proposes to abandon current specific DOE guidelines for determining the suitability of Yucca Mountain, Nevada (for siting of a nuclear waste repository) in lieu of less-demanding, generalized criteria. S. 1287 also removes the role of the Environmental Protection Agency from determining the human health standard to which repository design and operations should be held.

S. 1287, as it currently stands, would replace DOE's current and specific site suitability criteria (10 CFR 960—adopted in 1986 after considerable public input) with a generalized ''total system performance assessment'' approach (proposed in 10 CFR 963) which does not require the site to meet specific criteria with regard to site geology and hydrology or waste package performance. Replacement of the current site suitability criteria by 10 CFR 963 would reduce the likelihood that the repository would be designed and constructed using the best available technology. Individual components of the repository system could be less than optimal in design and performance if computer modeling of the design showed it capable of meeting NRC's less-demanding standard. Given the significant long-term risk that development of the repository places on California populations and resources, any compromises on repository design, operations or materials cannot be tolerated.

S. 1287 allows the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to set a standard for protection of the public from radiological exposure associated with development of the repository. The power to set a standard for the Yucca Mountain project rightfully belongs with the EPA in its traditional role of setting health standards for Federal projects. In our recent response to EPA's proposed radiological health standard for the repository, Inyo County stated its strong support for EPA authority over the project and for use of a standard which focuses on maintaining the safety of groundwater in the Yucca Mountain-Amargosa Valley-Death Valley region.

Based on these considerations, S. 1287 will not provide adequate protection for Inyo County resources or citizens. We hope that the provisions in the bill for setting repository standards and for changing the site suitability guidelines will be deleted.

We appreciate your continued support of Inyo County's efforts to safeguard the health and safety of its citizens.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL DORAME,
Supervisor, Fifth District County of Inyo.

Mrs. BOXER. I shall not read the entire letter. The Board of Supervisors, County of Inyo—and these are the local government officials to whom my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are constantly saying we have to pay attention—let us pay attention to them. They are saying:

[We] are writing to express concern with S. 1287, the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 1999.

They go on to say why it is flawed. They say there is a ''significant long-term risk that development of the repository places on California''—that it places California in an untenable position. In very strong language they ask that we not approve this. They say it does not ''provide adequate protection for Inyo County resources or citizens'' and that they are very concerned about it.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the Board of Supervisors of San Bernardino County.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS,
COUNTY OF SAN BERNARDINO,
San Bernardino, CA, January 12, 2000.

Hon. BARBARA BOXER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR BOXER: The Board of Supervisors unanimously approved the attached resolution at our meeting yesterday. It expresses our substantial concern over the lack of notification from the Department of Energy with regard to their plans to transport thousands of shipments of high-level radioactive waste through the major cities of our County.

The only hearing held in this State took place in a remote area hundreds of miles from our major population centers. In addition we were not provided with any official notification of the Issuance of the Environmental Impact Statement nor were we provided a copy of same.

While we understand that transportation and storage/disposal of this material is essential for operation of various facilities, it is only appropriate that the jurisdictions which will be recipient of the majority of these shipments be given notice and response opportunities.

We ask for your strong support for our request to the Department of Energy for full disclosure, additional time for response and review, and for a public hearing to be held in our area. The hearing should be held somewhere near the population centers which will be subject to these shipments and the potential dangers imposed thereby.

We appreciate your serious consideration of this request.

Sincerely,

JERRY EAVES,
Supervisor, Fifth District.

RESOLUTION NO. 2000–10

Whereas, the United States Department of Energy, has prepared an Environmental Impact Statement for the Yucca Mountain High Level Radioactive Waste Disposal Site, and

Whereas, the COUNTY of SAN BERNARDINO has learned through non-official sources that the United States Government plans to construct and operate a disposal site for high level radioactive waste which will include spent nuclear fuel rods, and

Whereas, no less than a year ago, the COUNTY of SAN BERNARDINO was provided inadequate notification on another Department of Energy Radioactive Waste project and formally expressed its objections to the lack of proper notification, and

Whereas, almost all of the shipment will pass through major population centers in San Bernardino County on Interstate Highways 10, 15 and 40, State Route 247 and rail lines in San Bernardino County, and

Whereas, the project presents obvious potential hazards from transportation accidents, which place an unnecessary additional burden on emergency response resources; and

Whereas, had it not been for the news media; the public would not have known that the project was underway because no public hearing has been scheduled or held in San Bernardino County or anywhere else in Southern California, and

Whereas, there has been no opportunity for our citizens to review or comment on this project in a formal setting, and

Whereas, the citizens of the COUNTY of SAN BERNARDINO have a right to be informed of and have an opportunity to comment on a project of this magnitude that poses a potential significant threat to their health, property, air and water quality and other natural resources, and

Now, therefore, be it *Resolved,* That the Board of Supervisors of the COUNTY of SAN BERNARDINO, petition the United States Department of Energy to extend the comment period on the Yucca Mountain Project, and

Further be it Resolved that public hearings be held by the Department of Energy in San Bernardino County so as to provide our citizens a reasonable opportunity to comment on this project, and

Further be it Resolved that this resolution be forwarded without delay to United States Senators Boxer and Feinstein and Congressmen Lewis, Baca and Miller.

Mrs. BOXER. This letter expresses substantial concern over this project. They are asking us to be very careful with shipments and with the entire project.

Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from the County of Ventura.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COUNTY OF VENTURA,
Washington, DC, February 1, 2000.

Hon. BARBARA BOXER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR BOXER: I am writing to reiterate the Ventura County Board of Supervisors' opposition to S. 1287, the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments of 1999, which, as currently written, would allow spent nuclear fuel and radioactive waste to be transported through Ventura County.

The Board of Supervisors endorses the development of a national policy for the transportation of spent nuclear fuel. However, the Board opposes transporting these materials through Ventura County. County officials and residents are concerned about the proximity of the Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant in San Luis Obispo County and the vulnerability to potential disasters related to the transportation of hazardous materials through the community, which poses serious health and safety risks to County residents.

Please vote against S. 1287 unless it is amended to prohibit the transportation of spent nuclear fuel and radioactive waste through Ventura County and other heavily populated areas.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS P. WALTERS,
Washington Representative.

Mrs. BOXER. In this letter they reiterate their opposition to this bill. They say it would be very dangerous for their residents because the waste could be transported through Ventura County.

On this map I show my colleagues, even the counties next to Inyo and San Bernardino are very upset that waste will come all through California. Ventura County is taking a stand. They say:

Please vote against S. 1287. . . .

I have a letter from the California Energy Commission. I ask unanimous consent it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION,
Sacramento, CA, February 7, 2000.

Hon. BARBARA BOXER,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR BOXER: We have reviewed S. 1287 (Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 2000) (NWPA) and offer the following comments.

The State of California, including thirteen California agencies, has reviewed the Department of Energy's (DOE) Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the proposed Yucca Mountain High-Level Nuclear Waste Repository. This review, coordinated by the California Energy Commission, identified major areas of deficiencies and scientific uncertainties in the DEIS regarding potential transportation and groundwater impacts in California from the repository. In light of these deficiencies and uncertainties, there are serious questions whether a decision should/can be made on the Yucca Mt. site's suitability in time for shipments to begin in 2007, as required by S. 1287.

These deficiencies and uncertainties include the need for better data and more realistic models to evaluate groundwater flow and potential radionuclide migration toward regional groundwater supplies in eastern California. In addition, there are major scientific uncertainties regarding key variables affecting how well geologic and engineered barriers at the repository can isolate the wastes from the environment. For example, there is considerable uncertainty regarding waste package corrosion rates, potential water seepage through the walls of the repository, groundwater levels and flow beneath the repository, and the potential impact on California aquifers from the potential impact on California aquifers from the potential migration of radionuclides from the repository. California is concerned about these uncertainties and deficiencies in studies of the Yucca Mt. project and the serious lack of progress in DOE's developing transportation plans for shipments to the repository.

Potential major impacts in California from the proposed repository include: (1) transportation impacts, (2) potential radionuclide contamination of groundwater in the Death Valley region, and (3) impacts on wildlife, natural habitat and public parks along shipment corridors and from groundwater contamination. Transportation is the single area of the proposed Yucca Mt. project that will affect the most people across the United States, since the shipments will be traveling cross-country on the nation's highways and railways. California is a major generator of spent nuclear fuel and currently stores this waste at four operating commercial nuclear power reactors, three commercial reactors being decommissioned, and at five research reactor locations throughout the State. Under current plans, spent nuclear fuel shipments from California reactors will begin the first year of shipments to a repository or storage facility.

In addition to the spent fuel generated in California, a major portion of the shipments from other states to the Yucca Mountain site could be routed through California. This concern was elevated recently when DOE decided, over the objections of California and Inyo and San Bernardino Counties, to reroute through southeastern California, along California Route 127, thousands of low-level waste shipments from eastern states to the Nevada Test Site, in order to avoid nuclear waste shipments through Las Vegas and over Hoover Dam. We objected to DOE's rerouting these shipments over California Route 127 because this roadway was not engineered for such large volumes of heavy truck traffic, lacks timely emergency response capability, is heavily traveled by tourists, and is subject to periodic flash flooding. We are concerned that S. 1287, by requiring that shipments minimize transport through heavily populated areas, could force NWPA shipments onto roadways in California, such as State Route 127, that are not suitable for such shipments.

The massive scale of these shipments to the repository or interim storage site will be unprecedented. Nevada's preliminary estimates of potential legal-weight truck shipments to Yucca Mountain show that an estimated 74,000 truck shipments, about three-fourths of the total, could traverse southern California under DOE's ''mostly truck'' scenario. Shipments could average five truck shipments daily through California during the 39-year time period of waste emplacement. Under a mixed truck and rail scenario, California could receive an average of two truck shipments per day and 4–5 rail shipments per week for 39 years. Under a ''best case'' scenario that assumes the use of large rail shipping containers, Nevada estimates there could be more than 26,000 truck shipments and 9,800 shipments through California to the repository.

We are concerned that S. 1287 would require NWPA shipments begin prematurely before the necessary studies determining the site's suitability have been completed and before the transportation impacts of this decision have been fully evaluated. S. 1287 accelerates the schedule for the repository by requiring shipments to begin at the earliest practicable date and no later than January 31, 2007. In contrast, DOE has been planning for shipments to begin in 2010, a date considered by many to be overly optimistic. Shipping waste to a site before the necessary scientific evaluations of the site have been completed and before route-specific transportation impacts have been fully evaluated could have costly results. The DOE nuclear weapons complex has many examples of inappropriate sites where expediency has created a legacy of very costly waste clean-up, e.g., Hanford, Washington. The use of methods that were not fully tested for the storage and disposal of nuclear wastes has resulted in contaminants from these wastes leaking into the environment. Transporting waste to a site, as mandated by S. 1287, before the appropriate analyses are completed could create a ''de facto'' high-level waste repository in perpetuity with unknown and potentially serious long-term public and environmental consequences.

Attached is information that might be useful in formulating your position on S. 1287. It includes (1) our specific comments on S. 1287, (2) an overview of our comments on the Yucca Mountain Draft EIS, and (3) Resolution 99–014 passed by the Western Governor's Association on Spent Nuclear Fuel Shipments. If you have any questions regarding these materials, please phone me at (916) 654–4001 or Barbara Byron at (916) 654–4976.

Sincerely,

ROBERT A. LAURIE,
Commissioner and State Liaison Officer to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Mrs. BOXER. This letter is quite long and goes into all the objections, with detailed comments, and the concerns they have about Yucca Mountain.

I think the important point here is, this is not just a Nevada issue. Even when in my mind it was, I would never subject the people of Nevada to this kind of a dangerous policy. It now includes the people of California. We are very concerned about transportation routes, very concerned about the ability of this material to migrate into an aquifer that serves the counties surrounding it, and we could go on and on.

Even the Western Governors' Association has repeatedly asked the Energy Department to complete an analysis of the transportation routes to Yucca Mountain, to no avail.

So we have a lot of problems with this bill in my home State of California.

The radiation to be allowed at Yucca Mountain would be much higher than is allowed under current regulations. The DOE study finds that maximum doses at the site would be 50 millirems per year. I am sure my colleagues have gone into it, but sometimes you repeat facts because they are very important. I would like to put the numbers into perspective.

That amount of radiation would equal approximately 5,000 chest x rays annually. It is 2,000 times higher than what the public is currently permitted to receive from an operating powerplant under EPA regulations.

I will say, under NRC and DOE risk estimates, it is my understanding—I am going to just double-check here—studies have shown that if these people were exposed to the maximum, virtually all of them would get cancer. That is how much and how high these levels are.

In conclusion, my colleagues from Nevada have done us a great service. Even before I knew the extent to which they were actually fighting was not only for Nevada but for California, I knew they were doing the right thing, because if we do not stand up and protect the health and safety of the people we represent, what use are we? What good are we?

When a physician takes his or her test to get licensed, they say: Do no harm. At a minimum, do no harm. This does harm. If we were, in fact, to allow this matter to move forward, I think the people would become even more cynical than they are about Government. They will ask: What special interests are behind this one? How on Earth can we throw out the health and safety regulations to push through this site? Is that the best we can do for this site?

I will tell you, it makes me sick at heart. The only thing that keeps me going on this one is my colleagues from Nevada, who have stood up in the face of powerful committee chairmen. And you will hear them today. Oh, you will hear them today. The Senators from Nevada have stood up for the people of this country. I stand with them. I stand with the people of California, who want to protect Death Valley National Park, who want to protect the water supply there, who want to protect our Federal investment there, who want to protect the health and safety of the people who have to drink the water and live there.

So let us do what we have done five times before. Let us beat back this ill-advised attempt to put a nuclear waste dump where it does not belong. Let us feel good that we have protected the people of this country. Let us turn to

the matters to make life better for our people: Sensible gun laws, an HMO Patients' Bill of Rights, education, after-school programs, smaller class sizes, and campaign finance reform.

For goodness' sake, let's do something in this Chamber that helps people, not exposes them to risk.

Yesterday I was at the Albert Einstein Medical School in New York. They are doing extraordinary things to find cures for cancer, to invest in ways to make our people healthier, to work with the Federal Government to make sure we have enough money going into research. Why would we do things around here that would elevate people's risk of getting cancer? I do not understand it. It does not add up. I listened to the arguments on the other side. They simply do not add up.

So, again, I associate myself with my friends from Nevada. They are courageous. They are brave. They are right. They are protecting the people of Nevada and the people of California. I hope they will be successful. I will be working with them.

As I understand it, the Senator from Nevada, Mr. BRYAN, will now have some time for further remarks.

Mr. DOMENICI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada, under a previous agreement, is to be allowed to continue now after the Senator from California. He has 5 minutes remaining on his time.

Mr. BRYAN. I assure the Senator, I will only speak for 5 minutes because I understand he has a commitment at noon.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, it was my understanding that after the Senator from Nevada spoke and after the Senator from New Mexico spoke, I would be able to speak.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if I could ask my friend from Nevada to yield for a minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator Nevada has the floor.

Mr. REID. So everyone understands what we would like to have happen, Senator BRYAN will speak for 5 or 6 minutes, and then Senator DOMENICI will take time under the control of Senator MURKOWSKI for whatever time he may consume, and then Senator BRYAN and I would be happy to yield to Senator ROCKEFELLER 10 minutes to speak on another issue. He has been very supportive of us on this underlying issue of nuclear waste. He wants to speak on something regarding his ranking membership dealing with veterans, introducing some legislation. We are happy to allow him to do that.

I ask that in the form of a unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, for the remaining 5 or 6 minutes, let me just complete my thoughts on the issue of health and safety because I think this is the overriding issue.

EPA has proposed a standard of 15 millirems, consistent with what was done in New Mexico. S. 1287, in its original form, doubled this. We are debating this issue today because the nuclear utilities do not want the 15-millirem standard. That is what we are talking about.

One can have a difference of opinion as to whether or not nuclear power is good or bad or whether Yucca Mountain is or is not the proper scientific site. I might say, parenthetically, no one has ever made a determination that Yucca Mountain will meet the suitability standards. That remains to be seen. But how in God's world can we say we ought to change a health and public safety standard, one that is set by independent agents?

Let me point out that the history of matters nuclear has indicated that we have underestimated the risk and danger to public health. In the immediate aftermath of World War II, we exposed military veterans at Bikini and Eniwetok to levels of radiation exposure that today would be absolutely a crime. In my own youth, while growing up in Nevada, watching the detonations at Frenchman's Flat, where they dropped nuclear bombs out of B–29s, we were told it is ''absolutely safe, don't worry about a thing.'' Today, we know that nobody in his or her right mind would suggest that anyplace in the world. Indeed, the tragedy is that people downwind from that died of cancer and have suffered from other mutations.

There are literally hundreds of thousands of people in this country who helped us in America prevail in the cold war, working in our nuclear weapons production facilities, in the nuclear testing program in Nevada, who were told the diseases that they suffered from and the suffering and the death that families had endured had nothing to do with radiation. Today, to the great credit of this administration and the Secretary of Energy, Mr. Richardson, we now acknowledge that it was wrong, that people did become ill, and people did die because of radiation.

Every person in this Chamber will recall in his or her own personal life how, and today, when you get an x ray at your dentist, or a chest x ray, the amount of radioactive exposure you have is much less than it was earlier because we are fearful of what the consequences of this exposure over a period of time can mean. Many will recall going to the local shoe store and getting on a fluoroscope; you could see the bones in your feet and your mom or your dad would look at that just to see whether or not you had the correct fitting. That was exposure to radioactivity. There is no place in the country where that would be tolerated today. What did we learn? We learned the risk of radioactivity is much greater than we had originally thought.

To conclude this aspect of my discussion today, the whole history of radioactivity exposure, in terms of its impact upon us as human beings, has been that the standards ought to be increased in terms of safety. We have done that in the private sector; we have done that publicly. Now this legislation would suggest that we abandon that, and that in the name of helping out nuclear power industries—utilities particularly—we should reject the health and safety standard. It was good enough for our friends in New Mexico, and I support that, but never objected to. We simply say, look, what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander. Fifteen millirems is within the range of the National Academy of Sciences. To do anything less is a cynical and cavalier disregard for the public health of citizens in America generally, and Nevadans particularly.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I yield myself up to 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I rise to support override of the President's veto of the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act. This bill, S. 1287, under Senator MURKOWSKI's leadership, provided the first opportunity for real progress on nuclear waste issues during the term of the Clinton Administration.

With nuclear energy providing 22 percent of our Nation's electrical power, it is simply irresponsible for the Administration to continue to avoid all attempts at improving our handling of spent nuclear fuel. We must maintain nuclear energy as a viable energy option for our nation, and without concrete progress on nuclear waste, we will lose this part of our national energy supply.

American consumers are still facing dramatically higher prices for gas and oil, driven in no small part by the failure of this Administration to develop a coherent energy policy. We can't afford to place 22 percent of our electrical supply in jeopardy, and then pretend to be surprised when energy prices skyrocket.

These recent oil shocks have proven again the folly of over dependence on a single source of energy. They should have reinforced to the Administration that we need, more than ever before, a coherent energy policy that maintains a diverse energy supply portfolio. Nuclear energy is an important component of that portfolio.

As I've noted in the last few months, our response to this latest oil price episode was to approach the OPEC countries, tin barrel in hand, asking them to increase the flow of oil and lower our prices. That only serves to make us more dependent on their oil and increase the impact of the next episode of restricted oil availability.

Senator MURKOWSKI incorporated a very large range of concessions into the current bill, concessions that met every one of the Administration's advertised concerns. Unfortunately, as

we've seen before, this Administration is so determined to undercut the role of nuclear energy, that new objections were invented faster than concessions were granted.

I find it interesting that the Administration is treating the two major electrical producers in the nation, coal and nuclear, in somewhat similar ways. These two sources together account for over 70 percent of our electricity. Yet in both cases, the Administration is not focusing resources on actions that would address remaining concerns with these two sources. Our dependence on foreign oil would be far more serious with loss of either of these energy sources.

For coal, they should be increasing resources on clean coal technologies. For nuclear, they should be advancing timetables for addressing spent nuclear fuel. Neither is happening.

I believe that consumer concerns relating to nuclear energy are changing, as more information about the successes of this energy source becomes better known. Just yesterday, I checked on an MSNBC Internet poll on the 20 year anniversary of the Three Mile Island nuclear accident.

In that poll, 80 percent of over 18,000 people responding said that they believe nuclear energy is safe, with 85 percent favoring licensing of new plants.

I find it amazing how fear of anything in this country with ''nuclear'' in its title, like ''nuclear waste,'' seems to paralyze our ability to act decisively. Nuclear issues are immediately faced with immense political challenges.

There are many great examples of how nuclear technologies impact our daily lives. Yet few of our citizens know enough about the benefits we've gained from harnessing the nucleus to support actions focused on reducing the remaining risks.

Just one example that should be better understood and appreciated involves our nuclear navy. Their experience has important lessons for better understanding of these technologies.

The *Nautilus*, our first nuclear powered submarine, was launched in 1954. Since then, the Navy has launched over 200 nuclear powered ships, and about 85 are currently in operation. Recently, the Navy was operating slightly over 100 reactors, about the same number as those operating in civilian power stations across the country.

The Navy's safety record is exemplary. Our nuclear ships are welcomed into over 150 ports in over 50 countries. A 1999 review of their safety record was conducted by the General Accounting Office. That report stated:

> No significant accident—one resulting in fuel degradation—has ever occurred.

For an Office like GAO, that identifies and publicizes problems with government programs, that's a pretty impressive statement.

Our nuclear powered ships have traveled over 117 million miles without serious incidents. Further, the Navy commissioned 33 new reactors in the 1990s, that puts them ahead of civilian power by a score of 33 to zero. And Navy reactors have more than twice the operational hours of our civilian systems.

The nuclear Navy story is a great American success story, one that is completely enabled by appropriate and careful use of nuclear power. Its contributed to the freedoms we so cherish.

Nuclear energy is another great American success story, it is not a supply that we can afford to lose. It's a clean source of power, without release of greenhouse gases, with a superlative safety record over the last decade. The efficiency of nuclear plants has risen consistently and their operating costs are among the lowest of all energy sources.

I've repeatedly emphasized that the United States must maintain nuclear energy as a viable option for future energy requirements. And without some near-term waste solution, like interim storage or an early receipt facility, we are killing this option. We may be depriving future generations of a reliable power source that they may desperately need.

There is no excuse for the years that the issue of nuclear waste has been with us. Near-term credible solutions are not technically difficult. We absolutely must progress towards early receipt of spent fuel at a central location, at least faster than the 2010 estimates for opening Yucca Mountain that we now face or risk losing nuclear power in this country.

Senator MURKOWSKI's bill is a significant step toward breaking the deadlock which continues to threaten the future of nuclear energy in the U.S. I appreciate that he made some very tough decisions in crafting this bill that blends ideas from many sources to seek compromise in this difficult area.

One concession involves tying the issuance of a license for the ''early receipt facility'' to construction authorization for the permanent repository. I'd much prefer that we simply moved ahead with interim storage. An interim storage facility can proceed on its own merits, quite independent of decisions surrounding a permanent repository. Such an interim storage facility could be operational well before the ''early receipt facility'' authorized in this act.

There are absolutely no technical issues associated with interim storage in dry casks, other countries certainly use it. Nevertheless, in the interests of seeking a compromise on this issue, I supported this act's approach with the early receipt facility.

I appreciate that Senator MURKOWSKI included Title III in the new bill with my proposal to create a new DOE Office of Spent Nuclear Fuel Research. This new Office would organize a research program to explore new, improved national strategies for spent nuclear fuel.

Spent fuel has immense energy potential—that we are simply tossing away with our focus only on a permanent repository. We could be recycling that spent fuel back into civilian fuel and extracting additional energy. We could follow the examples of France, the U.K., and Japan in reprocessing the fuel to not only extract more energy, but also to reduce the volume and toxicity of the final waste forms.

Now I'm well aware that reprocessing is not viewed as economically desirable now, because of today's very low uranium prices. Furthermore, it must only be done with careful attention to proliferation issues. But I submit that the U.S. should be prepared for a future evaluation that may determine that we are too hasty today to treat this spent fuel as waste, and that instead we should have been viewing it as an energy resource for future generations.

We do not have the knowledge today to make that decision. Title III establishes a research program to evaluate options to provide real data for such a future decision.

This research program would have other benefits. We may want to reduce the toxicity of materials in any repository to address public concerns. Or we may find we need another repository in the future, and want to incorporate advanced technologies into the final waste products at that time. We could, for example, decide that we want to maximize the storage potential of a future repository, and that would require some treatment of the spent fuel before final disposition.

Title III requires that a range of advanced approaches for spent fuel be studied with the new Office of Spent Nuclear Fuel Research. As we do this, I'll encourage the Department to seek international cooperation. I know, based on personal contacts, that France, Russia, and Japan are eager to join with us in an international study of spent fuel options.

Title III requires that we focus on research programs that minimize proliferation and health risks from the spent fuel. And it requires that we study the economic implications of each technology.

With Title III, the United States will be prepared, some years in the future, to make the most intelligent decision regarding the future of nuclear energy as one of our major power sources. Maybe at that time, we'll have other better energy alternatives and decide that we can move away from nuclear power. Or we may find that we need nuclear energy to continue and even expand its current contribution to our nation's power grid. In any case, this research will provide the framework to guide Congress in these future decisions.

Mr. President, I want to specifically discuss one of the compromises that Senator MURKOWSKI developed. In my view, his largest compromise involves the choice between the Environmental Protection Agency or the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to set the radiation-protection standards for Yucca

Mountain and for the ''early release facility.''

The NRC has the technical expertise to set these standards. Furthermore, the NRC is a non-political organization, in sharp contrast to the political nature of the EPA. We need unbiased technical knowledge in setting these standards, there should be no place for politics at all. The EPA has proposed a draft standard already, that has been widely criticized for its inconsistency and lack of scientific rigor—events that do not enhance their credibility for this role.

I appreciate, however, the care that Senator MURKOWSKI has demonstrated in providing the ultimate authority to the EPA. His new language requires both the NRC and the National Academy of Sciences to comment on the EPA's draft standard. And he provides a period of time, until mid-2001, for the EPA to assess concerns with their standard and issue a valid standard.

These additions have the effect of providing a strong role for both the NRC and NAS to share their scientific knowledge with the EPA and help guide the EPA toward a credible standard.

Mr. President, I want to again thank Senator MURKOWSKI for his leadership in preparing this bill and in leading this over ride discussion. We need to overturn the President's veto, to ensure that we finally attain some movement in the nation's ability to deal with high level nuclear waste.

Mr. President, I won't respond to the millirem argument with reference to New Mexico and WIPP. Frankly, I believe it is irrelevant. Nonetheless, I wish to talk about nuclear energy power and what is happening to the United States of America. I say to the Senators from Nevada, I compliment them. They have been able, for a number of years, to delay the United States of America from having an underground permanent repository, and today, once again, they are successful. I understand they are acting in what they think is the best interest of their State. They are, once again, going to preclude the United States from coming up with an interim storage facility for nuclear waste.

Whatever the arguments have been, there is no science or engineering issue with reference to whether or not the United States of America can build, plan, and safely maintain an interim storage facility for high-level nuclear waste. Let me repeat. Nobody can, with any credibility, come to the floor of the Senate and say we cannot do that. In fact, we are doing so many things with reference to nuclear energy, with reference to radiation, that are more difficult than building an interim storage facility, a temporary storage facility for high-level waste for 25 or 50 years. In fact, the idea that we must find a permanent repository, one that will last for 20,000 or 30,000 years, for the fuel rods that come out of nuclear power reactors before we can proceed to take care of it for 50 or 100 years, borders on lunacy. It borders on standing reality on its head. The only possible reason could be that we don't believe we will build a permanent one if we build interim ones. But the truth is that it is not difficult; it is very safe once you have established it, and the only possible argument could be transportation.

We should have a debate on the floor of the Senate on whether it is dangerous for the American people to transport nuclear waste from fuel sites across the United States—and every Senator knows where they are in their States—to interim facilities that we don't have today. We told the American people that the waste would move from their states. Nobody should conclude that it is unsafe to move it across the United States. We are moving more, and risking more dangerous things on a regular basis, across the highways of the United States, with utter and total safety, than would be involved in this.

What is the issue? It seems to me that any time you are involved with radiation and anything nuclear, those who oppose it rely upon scaring the American people or their constituents, when the truth is that the United States of America gets 22 percent of its electricity from nuclear powerplants. Let me suggest that anybody who wants to test out what I am going to say have at it. That 22 percent of electricity produced in nuclear powerplants is the safest electricity produced in America. If you want to talk about risk of lives, injuries, health conditions, anything you would like, those are the safest sites producing electricity for the engine of American industry and for Americans living every day with computers built upon energy sources and electricity, and the like.

I laud Senator MURKOWSKI for his compromise legislation. Actually, I thought he might have even given away too much at one point, but looking at how things are going, he can't even get this passed. He has conceded a number of issues since this was originally proposed.

What do we do? We continue our dependence upon oil, and now natural gas, for our electricity in the future. This administration, by vetoing this bill and other actions, does the following things: One, they don't spend money on coal technology that will clean that technology up. Two, they don't spend money on finding an interim facility for nuclear waste. And then, three, we go begging those in Saudi Arabia and in Central and South America to continue to provide us with reasonably priced oil because we have become hostage to their oil.

Here we are, as a nation, worrying about oil supplies while the Democrats on that side get up and say this is not an issue; that the issues are Medicaid, Medicare, or Social Security. Well, the issue about 7 weeks ago was skyrocketing oil prices, which caused skyrocketing gasoline prices. What if we cannot produce electricity as we need it in America? Think what would happen to America.

Think what would happen in the United States if, in fact, we decided, as a nation, that we were not going to do anything with nuclear power, it is too dangerous, too scary, and we decided to shut it down. The United States would become a basket case soon.

When the Democrats get up in rhythm with each of them, saying this is not an important issue, my friends, this is a big issue. This is one of the most important issues to America's future because it has been made the linchpin about which we discuss the future of improved nuclear power in the United States of America.

I've become a strong advocate for nuclear power. I speak to it wherever I can. People listen. I think people believe we ought to continue with it. But we can't continue with it unless we decide what to do with the waste.

Recently, my spirits were lifted a bit by a poll on MSNBC Internet. I know it is not scientific poll, but it is pretty interesting. It's being conducted on the 20th anniversary of Three Mile Island. People still hearken back to that event and say, ''Look at what happened with nuclear power.'' Well, actually nothing happened. There was a leak. Nobody got hurt, and nothing happened.

Over 18,000 people responded on that MSNBC Internet poll, and 80 percent believe nuclear energy is safe. Eighty-five percent favor licensing power plants in the future for nuclear power.

Right now, today, the U.S. Navy has slightly over 100 nuclear reactors with partially spent fuel rods in the power plant. Those 100 nuclear power plants are sailing the oceans and the seas of the world in the hulls of submarines, battleships, and aircraft carriers. Some have two power plants in them—two complete nuclear reactors with the fuel rods that we are down here talking about and we don't know what to do with. They are on ships. Those ships are welcomed in almost every seaport in the world, except New Zealand because it had some argument about it years ago.

Imagine, all the big ports in America welcoming U.S. Navy ships into their waters and their harbors. What do they have in them? Nuclear power plants with their fuel rods. Why do they let them in? Why don't they say that is terrible, as we are saying here on the floor, and people are going to get hurt? Because they have been audited, and reaudited.

The General Accounting Office has looked at it and concluded, like no other study, that U.S. Navy ships are totally safe, never having had an accident since the *Nautilus* was launched in 1954.

We are here today arguing about whether we can safely take spent fuel rods—not in a pond of water where, if something happens, it goes everywhere. But we are talking about whether we

can haul it down the road or highway and take it somewhere. It is on all the oceans of the world, and nobody is even talking about it.

Then we are arguing about, once you get it there, it is just too scary to think of storing it there.

France has about 80 percent of its energy in nuclear. They get the benefits of what I am bringing to the surface now—there is no air pollution to speak of in France because nuclear power does not create the air pollution we are worried about with reference to global warming.

The United States of America runs around the world negotiating how to clean our air so we will not have global warming. And here we're talking about the principal source of electricity that would be totally clean. We scare our people to death about moving fuel rods down a highway when the oceans and seas of the world have nuclear power plants floating under water and on top of the water by virtue of 100 U.S. Navy ships at sea.

Actually, France, which I just described, does not today have a permanent repository.

You heard the argument, fellow Senators, and those listening, that we don't want to have interim storage until we have a permanent repository for certain.

I think France is pretty concerned about the health and safety of their constituents, the French people. They aren't building underground repositories yet because they are very satisfied with having interim, temporary storage. Sooner perhaps than later, they will find a way to use that spent fuel, which is highly radiated, either to produce more energy, or they will break it into its components and make sure they can safely put it somewhere.

There is no question in this Senator's mind, that this is a big issue. This is America trying to turn science, engineering, and safety on its head to try to make fear where there is no reality of fear, to try to conclude that this great Nation cannot take care of the nuclear waste coming out of our powerplants with the end product being no more nuclear power.

What a shame, if that happened in the Nation that started it, that led it, that built the safest reactors in the world—safer than 20 or 30 coal-burning, electricity-generating plants, or any kind of plant.

What if we as a matter of fact kill nuclear power while the rest of the world proceeds to use it in China, Japan, Europe? We're doing that by not finding a way to do the easiest part of the fuel cycle, which is to temporarily put spent fuel somewhere in a repository of interim measure?

It would appear to me that, innocently or intentionally, those who oppose it are failing to recognize the significance of the future of nuclear energy and nuclear power for America and for a world that wants to be clean and wants to have growth and prosperity without global warming.

From my standpoint, not only do I refute the argument that this is not important, that there are other issues more important.

I want to say that the President is making a very big mistake for America's future by vetoing this compromise bill. The Congress passed it in both bodies overwhelmingly. Now, because of his veto ban, we need 66 votes in the Senate. That is probably too hard to do for an issue such as this. But sooner or later, a President will sign a bill. I am hoping it is sooner.

Obviously, we shouldn't try it again with the current President because it won't fly. But I personally believe the day will come soon when we will have the repository, wherever it is, and we will not come to the floor of the Senate and hearken back to the numerous times we have denied the validity and credibility of the fact that it can be easily and safely transported and easily and safely put in 30- to 50-year interim repositories.

I yield the floor. I thank the Senate for listening.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous agreement, the Senator from West Virginia is recognized for up to 10 minutes.

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. I thank the Presiding Officer.

VIETNAM: HONORING THOSE WHO SERVED

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, this past Sunday, April 30, was the 25th anniversary of the end of the Vietnam war. And that reaches deep into the soul of every Member of this body, all across America, and all across the world.

Our involvement with Vietnam was filled with discord, it was filled with anxiety, and it tore sections and generations of our country apart. It began slowly. It gradually escalated and became ''a bottomless quagmire'' for America, ''our longest, costliest, and . . . least popular war,'' until it finally came to an end.

Many in our country were very ambivalent about this war. Some thought we didn't fight hard enough, some thought we turned our backs on the South Vietnamese, and some thought we should have fought a lot harder. Many became disillusioned with our Government. I think that experience changed the nature of American politics and public life for at least some time to come.

However, there should be no ambivalence whatsoever about those who fought that war. Today I want to pay homage to those who fought that war. It doesn't matter whether you were for or against the war. All who served there deserve our appreciation, our respect, our caring, our compassion. It would have been easier to fight in a popular war. There are such wars, oddly enough. It is obtuse to say that, but it is true.

But it took guts, courage, and endurance to fight in that war and survive it; to resist the erosion of the bad morale which overtook at least part of our ground forces in Vietnam. And then, of course, there was the lack of united support from the home front which had to have just overwhelming consequences, not only while the soldiers were there, but even more so when they returned.

Those who served did their duty, and they did it under very difficult, trying circumstances. Their motto might very well have been what Alexander Pope said:

> Act well your part, therein all honor lies.

Looking back at this war, like the war before it and others, what strikes me with enormous poignancy and tenderness, is how young our soldiers were. Many were teenagers—18- and 19-year-old men and women—from familiar and comfortable surroundings, leading lives we all might identify with, sent to a completely foreign country, a foreign culture, halfway around the world, not knowing what to expect. They encountered baking heat, torrential rain, fire ants, leeches, and the enemy. They could not imagine the world of horror that awaited them when they got there. Presumably they were trained and told about it, but I think it was unimaginable to them when they got there. There was no clear enemy line. They could be ambushed at any minute. They couldn't tell enemies from allies.

Some never came back. The more than 58,000 names on the Vietnam Memorial Wall attest to that. But painful as it is to view those names, it does not begin to encompass the scope of pain caused by that war. Like a pebble thrown in a pool, each single name on the wall is ringed by concentric circles of others touched by that person's death—widows, mothers, fathers, sisters, brothers, aunts, uncles, friends. For all in that pool, certain hopes and dreams died as well. We grieve for all of them.

Some came back wounded. In an instant, life could change. Soldiers could step on a landmine; they could be killed by friendly fire; they could come under random attack. They never knew from moment to moment. Due to the wonders of modern medicine, many of those who, in earlier wars, would have died, did not and were saved; they survived. But merely surviving posed tremendous burdens on those who did. The process of adapting, accepting, and moving on is easy to say, very hard to do.

So I salute the stubborn resilience and perseverance of those who did move on with life after recovering from injury.

Some came back suffering from emotional trauma—people call it PTSD—and many other things. For them, it has been a very hard road to make peace with the past. They are still haunted by it, fighting it in their nightmares, in startle reflexes to sudden noises which bring back memories of perceived danger. They may turn to

alcohol to numb the constant pain, to drown the memories.

Veterans suffering from post-traumatic stress disorder deserve our most profound compassion, love and caring. As we have discovered, PTSD in fact goes back even to World War I. We are discovering a lot of things about the consequences of war. We have no way of knowing what people have been through, those of us who were not there. But we cannot judge their continuing pain. We cannot judge them. But we can honor them, and we need to do that, to respect them for what they have done, and to hope they will recover as others did.

As a Senator from West Virginia, I have more than a personal interest in this war. Statistics show that West Virginia's soldiers suffered more casualties per capita during that war than any other State in the Union. On this day, I salute our West Virginia veterans in particular. I am enormously proud of the sons and daughters of West Virginia, who, as they have done throughout history, volunteered or were drafted, and went to fight and to protect their country and their freedom, mountain men doing what needed to be done.

That fighting spirit and strength of character runs incredibly deep in this Senator's State, and this Senator is very proud of it.

Lyndon Johnson called the war ''dirty, brutal and difficult.'' It tore apart our country, devastated lives, caused tremendous personal hardship and unbearable pain. Twenty years later, the scars are still healing.

I am reminded of the words of Maya Lin, the young architect student who designed the Vietnam Memorial. In conceptualizing the form of her design, she wrote:

> I thought about what death is, what a loss is. A sharp pain that lessens with time, but never quite heals over. The idea occurred to me there on the site. Take a knife and cut open the earth, and with time, the grass would heal it.

With time, the wounds of Vietnam will heal. But we should never forget the courage and bravery of those who served there. Let us always honor our men and women who fought and died in Vietnam.

(The remarks of Mr. ROCKEFELLER pertaining to the introduction of S. 2494 are located in today's RECORD under ''Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.'')

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to Senator GRAMS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

NUCLEAR WASTE POLICY ACT OF 2000—VETO—Continued

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I want to take just a few minutes today to speak about the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act and the President's recent veto of this legislation.

Throughout the past 5 years, I have repeatedly come to the Senate floor to discuss this important issue and its impact on my home State of Minnesota. I have, on countless occasions, laid out for Members of the Senate the history of the nuclear energy program and the promises made by the Federal Government. Every time I sit down to discuss this matter with stakeholders, I am reminded that the Federal Government not only allowed, but strongly encouraged, the construction of nuclear power plants across the country.

This point needs to be clearly understood by the Members of this body. Our Nation's nuclear utilities did not go out and invest in nuclear power in spite of Federal Government warnings of future difficulties. Instead, they were encouraged by the Federal Government to turn to nuclear power to meet increasing energy demands. Utilities and states were told to move forward with investments in nuclear technologies because it is a sound source of energy production.

It is important to note that the Federal Government's support for nuclear power was based on some very sound considerations. First, and I believe most important, nuclear power is environmentally friendly. Nothing is burned in a nuclear reactor so there are no emissions released into the atmosphere. In fact, nuclear energy is responsible for over 90% of the reductions in greenhouse gas emissions that have come out of the energy industry since 1973. Between 1973 and 1996, nuclear power accounted for emissions reductions of 34.6 million tons of nitrogen oxide and 80.2 million tons of sulfur dioxide.

Second, nuclear power is a reliable base-load source of power. Families, farmers, businesses, and individuals who are served by nuclear power are served by one of the most reliable sources of electricity. In Minnesota, nuclear power accounts for roughly 30% of our base-load generation.

Third, nuclear energy is a homegrown technology and the United States led the way in its development. We have long been the world leader in nuclear technology and continue to be the world's largest nuclear producing country. Using nuclear power increases our energy security.

Finally, much of the world recognizes those same values and promotes the use of nuclear power because of its reliability, its environmental benefits, and its value to energy independence.

Because of those reasons, the Federal Government threw one more bone to our Nation's utilities. It said if you build nuclear power, we will take care of your nuclear waste. We will build a repository and take it out of your States. In response to those promises, over 30 States took the Federal Government at its word and allowed civilian nuclear energy production to move forward.

Ratepayers agreed to share some of the responsibilities, but were promised some things in return. They agreed to pay a fee attached to their energy bill to pay for the proper handling of the spent nuclear fuel in exchange for an assurance that the Federal Government meet its responsibility to manage any waste storage challenges. Because of these promises and measures taken by the Federal Government, ratepayers have now paid over $15 billion, including interest, into the Nuclear Waste Fund. Today, these payments continue, exceeding $600 million annually, or $70,000 for every hour of every day of the year. In Minnesota alone, ratepayers have paid over $300 million into the Nuclear Waste Fund.

In summary, the Federal Government promoted nuclear power, utilities agreed to invest in nuclear power, states agreed to host nuclear power plants, and ratepayers assumed the responsibility of investing in the long-term storage of nuclear waste. And still, nuclear waste is stranded on the banks of the Mississippi River in Minnesota and on countless other sites across the country because the Department of Energy has a very short-term memory and this administration has virtually no sense of responsibility.

We can argue all day long in this Chamber on the merits of nuclear power. But we cannot deny that the Federal Government promoted nuclear power and promised to take care of nuclear waste.

The Clinton administration, however, would have you believe that they do not have a responsibility to deal with nuclear power. I have been working with Senator MURKOWSKI and many other Members over the roughly 5 years that I have been in the Senate to establish an interim repository for nuclear waste and move forward with the development of a permanent repository. We have brought a bill to the floor that accomplishes those objectives in each of the past two Congresses. Each time, we passed the bill in both the House and the Senate with overwhelming, bipartisan support. Just over 2 years ago, we passed a bill that would have removed nuclear waste from States by a vote of 65–34 and the House passed the bill with 307 supporters—a veto-proof majority. We have had extensive debate with the opportunity for anyone to offer amendments. We have thoroughly addressed most issues related to nuclear waste storage, including the transportation of waste across the United States. Yet every time we have passed a bill that fulfills the Federal Government's commitments, President Clinton has issued his veto threat and stopped our efforts in their tracks.

Here we are again. The President has vetoed the legislation before us today and apparently taken great pride in doing so. Time and again, when confronted with making the tough decisions about the future of our Nation's energy supply, this President has ''punted,'' and refused to take any responsibility for the energy needs of our growing economy.

If it were not such a serious matter, I would have to say that the President's approach to energy policy is comical. When was the last time anyone here heard the President speak in any great detail about energy issues? He does not. I do not think he cares or at least his policies reflect a great degree of indifference to the energy needs of our Nation's consumers.

He has turned over the reins of the Energy Department not just to Secretary Richardson, but to AL GORE, and Bruce Babbitt, and Carol Browner, and anyone else who has an agenda with an aspect of the energy industry.

As many of my colleagues know, I have been a strong critic of the Department of Energy since coming to Congress in 1992. I have long argued that the Department has failed miserably on its most basic mission of increasing our Nation's energy independence. The Department was created in the late 1970's in response to that decade's energy crisis. Since that time, our reliance on foreign oil has increased from 35% to almost 60% today. In the 1970s, we were looking to increase our use of nuclear energy, today we are looking at closing down plants before their licenses have expired. In the 1970s, much like today, hydro power was a very popular form of electricity generation among the American public. Even still, this Administration wants to rip apart hydro dams in the Northwest and, I guess, replace them with fossil fuels.

Therein lies the great irony of the Clinton administration's approach to energy and the environment. This administration had the vision to agree to legally binding reductions in greenhouse gas emissions while at the same time failing to take even the most basic steps to protect emissions free nuclear power plants from shutting down. I asked the administration's chief Kyoto negotiator, Stuart Eizenstat, about nuclear energy during a Foreign Relations Committee hearing and he said that we absolutely needed nuclear energy to meet the demands of the Treaty. In fact, he said that he believed his own administration ought to have done more and ought to be doing more to promote nuclear power. Mr. Eizenstat, the President's signature on this bill would have been a great first step. Instead, this President has taken an action which I argue is harmful to the environment and contradicts his statements and actions that he wants to improve air quality in our country.

Nuclear energy, however, is not the only example of this administration's hypocrisy on energy and the environment. Hydro power, as well, is an emissions free form of electricity generation. Yet this administration is engaged in at least two separate activities that undermine the future of hydro power and its environmental benefits. As I mentioned earlier, this administration wants to rip open hydro dams in the northwest and, I guess, replace that electricity with fossil fuels. Second, this administration, in its electricity restructuring proposals, wants to require a certain usage of renewable energy but refuses to include hydro power as a renewable energy source. These are all perfect examples of how this administration isn't truly interested in results oriented clean air goals. Instead, they want to deeply involve themselves in the process of achieving environmental goals, regulate like crazy, and predetermine winners and losers. Unfortunately, the only real losers in the Clinton energy circus are the American consumers.

I want to touch on one last Clinton administration energy and environment contradiction. As my colleagues know, this administration has been opposed to new oil and gas development on public land. In fact, Vice President GORE recently stated that he would do everything in his power to stop offshore oil and gas leasing. Both President Clinton and Vice President GORE tout these stances against oil and gas development as part of their legacy of environmental protection. I ask my colleagues, do you think other nations on whom we rely for our oil supplies are employing the environmental protections and reviews that we require? Do you think Iran, Libya, or Iraq are going the extra mile to protect the environment? Do you think the OPEC nations are holding themselves to the stringent environmental standards to which we hold companies on U.S. soil? We all know the answer is an emphatic no. Yet this administration is opposing virtually any exploration of oil and gas reserves on public land for environmental reasons, while at the same time, it employs its ''tin cup diplomacy'' that relies upon countries like Iran, Iraq, Libya and others to increase their production for us. I ask my colleagues, if you look at the global impacts of the Clinton administration's actions, who are the real environmentalists? Certainly not the Clinton administration. It is clear to me that this administration's policy against exploration and development, when compared against its policy of begging for increased oil production abroad, is a net loss for American jobs, family checkbooks, domestic energy security, and the environment.

I am getting a little off track, but I believe this point needs to be clearly understood when we are talking about a long- term plan to remove, transport, and store nuclear waste. This administration is not concerned about results, nor is it really concerned about the environment. Instead, this administration is concerned solely with its political agenda and keeping the nuclear industry on the ropes.

We can, as a nation, move forward now and deal with our nuclear waste. There is simply no scientific nor technological reasons why we cannot move waste from civilian reactors to a central repository. In fact, we ship waste across our Nation right now—including the waste we have accepted from 41 other nations under the Atoms for Peace program. Our Nation's fleet of nuclear powered vessels go from international port to port. They protect the world and our Nation's interests in a way that is only allowed them through the use of nuclear power. There is overwhelming proof that we can transport nuclear waste on ships, roads, and rail without a threat to either the environment or human beings.

I am going to support the legislation before us, and I urge my colleagues to do the same. If the President is not going to have an energy policy, then we in Congress had better step forward and forge one of our own. When the brownouts begin increasing in frequency and energy rates rise, President Clinton will be long gone and we will be left to explain to our constituents why their family lost its power, their business lost a days work, or their farm was unable to milk its cows.

I thank the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I thank Senator GRAMS for his statement, particularly for highlighting the risk we face in not acting, inasmuch as some of our plants that anticipated having Yucca Mountain available for permanent storage, indeed, are in danger.

Maryland, for example, has two reactors at Calvert Cliffs producing over 13,000 kilowatts a year. They provide 26 percent of the clean electricity for the State of Maryland. The consumers in Maryland have paid $337 million into the nuclear waste fund since 1982. There are 741 metric tons stored there, and it is short term. It is temporary because, when they built that plant, they were looking at Yucca Mountain as a permanent storage. Indeed, there is genuine concern about the ability to maintain this very clean source of energy if, indeed, we do not act in this body and override the President's veto.

Before we break, I wish to take my colleagues through a brief summary of the inconsistencies of this administration with regard to transportation.

In 1996, the Clinton administration agreed to participate in the Foreign Research Reactor Program where, over a 13-year period, some 20 tons of spent nuclear fuel from 41 countries will be shipped to the United States for storage. It goes into Concord, CA, and up to Idaho on railroads and highways. It goes into Savannah River and is moved there through the rail system, as well as highways.

At the Savannah River site in South Carolina, as well as the Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory, this waste is moved, depending on whether it comes from the west coast or east coast—shipment comes in on freighters through the Charleston Naval Weapons Station in South Carolina and the Concord Naval Weapons Station in California—the spent fuel is transported from the ship to a final designation by either rail or truck.

Shall we leave it in California? Shall we leave it in South Carolina?

The President mentions the importance of nonproliferation goals that a central repository will meet and that the nonproliferation for these shipments of foreign spent fuel is a good one. We do not want terrorists or rogue governments coming into possession of these weapons, but let's look at reality.

For example, when the program started in 1996, we were faced with transporting spent fuel from a reactor in Bogota, Colombia. The spent fuel was moved from the reactor, loaded into a shipping cask, placed into a semitractor trailer truck for shipment, and then what did we do? We went to the Russians.

We chartered a Russian Antonov AN–124 airplane large enough to carry tanks and helicopters and drove the semi aboard the plane and flew the shipment to the seaport city of Cartagena and placed it on a freighter. It then joined spent fuel already loaded from Chile. It was delivered to the Charleston weapons center where it was loaded on railcars to Savannah River.

This was the Department of Energy acting to pull out all stops, sparing no expense to complete this important shipment. Administration policy then is to take nuclear fuel from foreign nations flying, shipping, and trucking all over the world and storing it at military facilities, and even building interim storage sites in the United States, but this administration will not address the waste generated by the domestic nuclear power industry; it will not reconcile a policy to address this in a responsible manner. It would rather leave it at the 40 States in 80 sites. That is what this administration proposes to do. It is unconscionable at a time when we are looking to the nuclear energy for roughly 20 percent of the power generated in the United States, and this administration does not accept its responsibility. That is why I urge all my colleagues to look at this realistically: Do we want the waste concentrated where it is in temporary storage, or do we want it in a permanent repository where we have already expended some $7 billion to place it?

I believe my time has expired or is about to expire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has a minute and a half left.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. In a minute and a half, I note the Senator from California showed a beautiful picture of Death Valley. I will show you a beautiful picture of the proposed location of the repository out at Yucca Mountain.

This is it. It is not very pretty. We have had 800 nuclear weapons tests in the last 50 years. That is the area we are talking about.

Some suggest, why are we talking about this when we have other more important things to do? This is an obligation of this Congress. The House has acted. It is up to the Senate to act now and move this legislation over the President's veto.

This is important. This costs the taxpayers money. We have an obligation. Furthermore, this is the pending business of the Senate at this time because the House voted. It went down to the President. The President vetoed it. It is the standing order of business before this body. So it is most appropriate that we resolve this matter today.

I encourage my colleagues this afternoon to vote to override the President's veto.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. BRYAN. In my 12 years in the Senate, I have to say this is the most unfocused debate we have had on this issue. We are not here today to debate whether or not nuclear power is good or bad for the Nation. We are not here today to debate whether interim storage is an appropriate response. We are not here to debate whether or not France has no pollution, as some have suggested, because they have nuclear reactors. I must say, parenthetically, I am not aware that France propels its automotive fleet through nuclear power. But perhaps we can discuss that at some other date.

Very simply, what we are here to talk about is a piece of legislation which the President of the United States has courageously vetoed that would alter the health and safety standards for the Nation. That is the issue. Every American—regardless of his or her politics—should be proud of the President's position.

Our colleagues on the other side of the aisle have taunted our colleagues who support the position that my colleague from Nevada and I have been advocating, as well as the distinguished Senators from California and New Mexico today, saying: What are you going to tell your constituents when you return home? The answer that every Member can give, with a straight face, in responding to that question is: Look, I voted to uphold the health and safety standards of the Nation. I was not prepared for any industry, even though I might support nuclear power, to reduce the health and safety standards for millions of people in this country. I will not do it for nuclear power. I will not do it for anything else. I will not be beholding to a special interest. I am voting in the best interests of my constituents and the Nation in upholding public health and safety.

That is the answer. That is the most powerful response that can be given.

May I inquire how much time I have left.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Twelve seconds.

Mr. BRYAN. Twelve seconds.

I yield the remainder of my time.

RECESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 12:30 p.m. having arrived, the Senate will be in recess until the hour of 2:15 p.m.

Thereupon, at 12:33 p.m., the Senate recessed until 2:16 p.m.; whereupon, the Senate reassembled when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. INHOFE).

NUCLEAR WASTE POLICY AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2000—VETO—Continued

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 2:15 p.m. having arrived, there will now be 30 minutes under the control of the Senators from Nevada, Mr. REID and Mr. BRYAN, and 30 minutes under the control of the Senator from Alaska, Mr. MURKOWSKI.

Who seeks time?

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I yield 6 minutes to my good friend, the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, I have been around this place a long time and a lot of things have happened that I can't quite understand, one of them being the veto of this measure by the President of the United States. If you stop and think, you see that it is purely political. For that reason, I hope this Senate will not hesitate to vote to override the veto of S. 1287, the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 2000.

The President's decision to veto this vital legislation is just further evidence that the Clinton administration has no energy policy, except the appeasement of the doctrinaire environmentalists.

Because of the President's purely political veto, the United States will continue to have spent fuel assemblies piling up at all nuclear generation facilities throughout the United States—including five facilities in North Carolina.

The taxpayers of my state alone have paid more than $700 million into the Nuclear Waste Disposal Fund justifiably expecting that the spent fuel assemblies would be transported to Yucca Mountain, Nevada, for permanent storage.

But no, it was not to happen, according to the environmentalists, and therefore according to the President of the United States, who immediately got his pen out and vetoed it.

A portion of the monthly electric bill payments of North Carolinians and other states goes into this fund, but while the Administration plays its political veto game, North Carolina's utility companies have been forced to construct holding pools or dry cask storage facilities to store this used material. This has caused additional expense for the utilities and higher prices for their customers.

Why did Mr. Clinton veto this legislation? Clearly it was to appease the self-proclaimed environmentalists, who so piously proclaim their concern about the air Americans breathe. We are all concerned about that.

Mr. President, it has long been self-evident that these so-called self-proclaimed environmentalists are opposed

to nuclear energy production—which is, behind hydro-power, the cleanest source of electricity. Nuclear power generation does not emit greenhouse gasses into the atmosphere.

The question is inevitable. Is it not better for the environment that no fossil fuels are burned?

So while the President plays politics to please the self-proclaimed environmentalists the spent fuel assemblies continue piling up all over the country in spite of the availability of the Yucca Mountain storage site which—according to the experts— poses absolutely no environmental risks for the permanent disposal of the spent fuel assemblies.

A handful of North Carolina anti-nuclear activists are complaining about the on-site storage of this material. If these activists were truly concerned about the environment, they would support this legislation and urge the federal government to complete construction of the national storage site at Yucca Mountain in one of the most remote areas of the United States.

I have at hand a copy of a letter sent to President Clinton by the Executive Director of the Public Staff of the North Carolina Utilities Commission urging the President to sign S. 1287. I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORTH CAROLINA PUBLIC STAFF UTILITIES COMMISSION, RALEIGH, NC,

April 11, 2000.

The President,
The White House,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: As Executive Director of the Public Staff-North Carolina Utilities Commission, I am keenly aware of the need for an effective federal nuclear waste management program, and I strongly encourage you to sign S. 1287 passed earlier in the year by the Senate and House.

Nuclear energy accounts for nearly half of the electricity produced in North Carolina. Our state's electricity consumers have paid more than $700 million into the Nuclear Waste Fund. The national repository for nuclear spent fuel, however, is currently not scheduled to open until 2010, twelve years behind the statutory obligation in the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982.

The two nuclear plant operators in North Carolina—as well as those around the country—are being forced to undertake costly, alternative measures to compensate for the delays and shortcomings in the federal program.

The nuclear waste legislation on the table will be a positive step in the right direction and will provide nuclear plant operators and the communities around their facilities some assurance that the Federal Government will fulfill its obligations in this matter. It is not sound public policy to force nuclear plants to continue indefinitely on-site interim storage of their spent fuel. It is a more responsible course to consolidate the spent fuel in a central facility designed for safe, permanent disposal.

I understand you have reservations about S. 1287. The bill may be imperfect, but it represents a sensible and long overdue first step in restoring public confidence in a federal program that is a vital component of our national energy policy.

I request your support of S. 1287.

Sincererly,

ROBERT P. GRUBER.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I yield myself 12 minutes.

This debate is not about nuclear power. It is not about whether you are in favor of nuclear power generation or opposed to it. But it is about health and safety concerns in America we should have for nuclear waste and other such issues. It is about health and safety. That is what S. 1287 is all about—lowering health and safety standards relevant to nuclear waste.

My good friend, with whom I have worked for many years on the water subcommittee of Appropriations—I have great respect for the chairman of the Budget Committee—came to this floor this morning and spoke in favor of overriding the Presidential veto. My friend, the senior Senator from New Mexico, said ''radiation standards are irrelevant.'' That is a quote. I can't imagine anyone saying that, including my good friend from New Mexico, who is someone who should know better—''radiation standards are irrelevant.''

I guess that is what they said earlier in this century when we had patent medicines. They advertised, saying they would cure all kinds of diseases—arthritis, lumbago, and pleurisy—and the medicines wound up killing people. It is the same when they talk about x rays being irrelevant. Radiation from x rays is irrelevant, except it kills people. My father-in-law was an x ray technician. He died as a young man from cancer of the blood as a result of being exposed to x rays.

Radiation standards are relevant. They are as relevant today as they were then. They are as relevant today as they were when we were told 50 years ago that aboveground nuclear tests were OK, that radiation was not relevant. We sent soldiers and others into these nuclear clouds and they died, and some are still sick as a result of that.

Radiation is relevant. It is relevant in the transportation of nuclear waste. It is relevant in the storage of nuclear waste. That is what this debate is all about.

Of course, this is a challenge. We have 100 sites that are generating nuclear power today. They are indicated on this chart. But to say we are going to eliminate all 100 sites and wind up with one in Nevada is not true. We will wind up with 100 of them. With the one additional nuclear waste site in Nevada, instead of 108 we will have 109. These places aren't going away. Some are generating nuclear waste. Those that aren't generating nuclear waste will be nuclear repositories for many years to come.

The reason radiation is relevant is we have a nuclear nightmare. I have placed on this chart only the railways where nuclear waste will be transported. I haven't added the highways. This is a nuclear nightmare because accidents are happening every day, literally.

This is from a recent newspaper account in LaGrande, OR. An accident happened because a rail was a little out of line, causing this terrible accident. Locomotives are dumped all over. Here are locomotives which you can just barely see. You can see a little bit of yellow down here. Here is one dumped in the marsh.

We have a farm back here. One of my staff members happens to be here on the floor today, Kai Anderson. This was his family's farm. This train derailed where people lived.

These accidents happen all the time—3 engines, 29 cars derailed. You can see stuff dumped out all over.

Radiation matters. Radiation is not, as my friend said, ''irrelevant.'' We have a challenge, as we indicated. But this debate is not about whether or not you are in favor of nuclear power generation. This debate is not about Nevada. It is about our country. It is about health and safety standards for our country.

If this bill is allowed to pass, 43 States will have nuclear waste passing through them without appropriate health and safety standards.

My friend from North Carolina talked about not understanding why the veto took place. I made notes as he spoke. He said it was ''political.'' If the President were political, he certainly wouldn't go against 40 States, many of them very heavily populated States. He wouldn't go against the biggest businesses in those States—utilities. He did it because he believed in the health and safety of the people of this country. He could have gone with where the numbers were. He decided not to do that.

The citizens of North Carolina, he said, deserve to know why he is doing it. It is an easy answer why the President did this—because the people of North Carolina deserve health and safety standards just as everyone else. They may have some stored nuclear waste there. But they need to have it stored in a safe manner.

As I said this morning, if you are wondering what we are going to do with our nuclear waste, it is an easy question to answer. What we are going to do with our nuclear waste is what they are doing at various sites around the country. They are storing it onsite.

We have already spent in the State of Nevada over $7 billion characterizing Yucca Mountain. You could store it onsite safely in dry cask storage containers. You could establish a nuclear waste repository site where the waste is generated—where the power is generated. You could do that for $5 million. It would be safe. It would not be subject to terrorist threats.

We don't have to worry about transportation. We don't have to worry about the loss of public confidence. It would be cheap. We could save this country and the utilities money. My friend from North Carolina talked about not millions but billions of dollars. Ground water would be protected. There would be no risk to children.

There would be decent radiation protection standards.

I can't express enough my appreciation to the President and the Vice President for their support on this issue, and also the courageous Senators—Democrats and the two Republicans. The Senator from Rhode Island and the Senator from Colorado, with untold pressure being placed on them, are going to vote to sustain the Presidential veto. The 33 very powerful and courageous Democrats—and I say the same about my 2 Republican friends—I am very appreciative of their support and courage.

I reserve the remainder of our time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I grant 5 minutes to Senator SESSIONS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from Alaska. I appreciate his leadership on this issue.

I see the poster the Senator from Nevada has of a train wreck. But I have heard many others say on this floor that if a train carrying nuclear waste wrecks, the nuclear waste doesn't blow up; it just lies on the ground. There was once a train with chemicals on board wreck about 200 yards from my mother's house. That was a very dangerous train wreck; with explosions and chemicals leaking into the air and on the ground. Had it been nuclear waste, it would have been sealed up and would not have blown up, or have gone into the air, or seeped onto the ground. It would have just sat there—posing little risk to people or the environment. It is just not that dangerous to transport. In fact, as Senator DOMENICI has noted, ships and submarines with nuclear fuel in them ply the oceans every day. Those ships use the same fuel and create the very same nuclear waste which we are looking to dispose of today.

I will note that this debate is a political issue. There was an excellent film on global warming on ''Frontline'' about 2 weeks ago. Basically, they concluded our energy needs could not be met and our environmental needs could not be met without nuclear energy. There was no other conclusion you could reach from watching that, but an activist who opposed nuclear energy said the main reason she opposed it was because we could not get rid of the waste. That is an absolutely bogus argument.

We have the ability to solve this problem. But until we do, we have, in effect, shut off our ability to produce a cleaner environment and get on with emission free energy production at a reasonable cost.

The President has noted, in the State of the Union, that we have to do something about global warming. He attempted to get us to ratify the Kyoto treaty to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 7 percent from the 1990 levels. But this Senate, voted unanimously, 95–0, against the agreement.

Our greenhouse gas emissions have gone up 8 percent since 1990. So to meet the Kyoto agreement, we would have to have over a 15-percent reduction in greenhouse gas emissions between now and 2012. There is no way that can be done without nuclear power.

The Energy Information Agency predicts a 30-percent increase in demand in electricity in this country by the year 2015. 20 percent of our power today comes from nuclear energy. France produces over 60 percent, and Japan, nearly 50 of its electricity from nuclear power sources.

Between 1973 and 1997, nuclear power generation avoided the emission of 82.2 million tons of sulfur dioxide and 37 million tons of nitrous oxide into the atmosphere. In 1997 alone, emissions of sulfur dioxide would have been about 5 million tons higher and emissions of nitrogen oxide, 2.4 million tons higher, had fossil fuel generation replaced nuclear. Billions of tons of carbon and millions of tons of methane—believed to be the most significant greenhouse gas—are not emitted because of nuclear power. The building blocks of ozone, a proven irritant and health risk to sensitive children and the elderly, is not emitted at all by nuclear power plants. Ozone precursors are emitted in all other fossil production of power.

Sixteen percent of the world's electricity is coming from nuclear power, but we here in the U.S. have a strained situation because we cannot dispose of the waste. This problem drives up the cost of nuclear power which makes this cleanest of all power generation sources almost uneconomical. Certainly, one of the main reasons we are not building any new plants today is because of our inability to solve the waste problem.

Even as some in the environmental movement are changing their views on nuclear power, the Vice President is not. In the April 22, edition of the Congressional Quarterly:

> Vice President Gore stated he does ''not support an increased reliance on nuclear power for electricity production'' but would ''keep open the option of relicensing nuclear power plants.''

I visited the Tennessee Valley Authority's existing plant a few weeks ago in north Alabama. They set a record for safe operation without one shut down in over 500 days. It produces no environmental discharge. One thousand workers are there, quite happy, making excellent wages and providing a steady, 24-hour-a-day supply of clean electricity for the Tennessee Valley Authority.

That is good for this country. It means we are not having to burn coal. It means we are not having to import oil to generate our power.

But members of the Administration are not unanimous in their position on nuclear power. In 1998, Under Secretary of State Stuart Eizenstat remarked:

> I believe very firmly that nuclear has to be a significant part of our energy future and a large part of the Western world if we're going to meet these emission reduction targets. Those who think we can accomplish these goals without a significant nuclear industry are simply mistaken.

Another administration official, Ambassador John Ritch, speaking to the North Atlantic Assembly said:

> The reality is that, of all energy forms—

This is the President's own appointee—

> capable of meeting the world's expanding energy needs, nuclear power yields the least and most easily managed waste.

I agree with Senator DOMENICI. We are almost at the point of lunacy if we cannot choose a place in the desert of this country—where we had hundreds of bombs exploded while developing our nuclear weaponry—to bury nuclear waste deep down a tunnel, under a solid rock mountain and secure it there. What is it that we cannot do? We are storing this waste in hundreds of nuclear powerplants all over America and we cannot put it out in the desert and seal it up, yet we have ships traveling all over the world powered by nuclear energy that have this same spent fuel in them?

This is not wise. I call on the people of this country to rethink our position on nuclear power. There are 40,000 tons of spent nuclear fuel stored in 71 sites around this country. We have the ability to safely solve this waste problem and move ahead with a viable nuclear program to supply clean, low cost energy to our country.

I thank the Chair and the distinguished chairman of this committee for his excellent work. I do hope this veto will not be sustained.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, how much time do we have on both sides?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska has 19 minutes. The Senator from Nevada has 21 minutes.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, my friend from Alabama said if there was an accident it would not be nearly as bad as a chemical accident, a trainload of chemicals compared to a trainload of nuclear waste because the container would not breach.

I do not know where my friend got that information because we have already established there is no container that can sustain an accident where the vehicle is going more than 30 miles an hour or, in fact, if it was a diesel fire.

Mr. SESSIONS. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, on this legislation we are talking about 12,000 shipments through Illinois, 11,000 shipments through Nebraska and Wyoming, 14,000 shipments through Utah. We have already had seven nuclear waste transportation accidents. The average has been one accident for every 300 shipments.

S. 1287 would result in 10 times as many shipments of nuclear waste over longer distances. Currently, the statistics would lead us to expect, scientifically, 150 more accidents for this

transportation plan. Are you ready to take that risk? I say to anyone the answer should be emphatically no.

It would be no because let's assume there would not be a nuclear explosion when the train wrecked or the truck wrecked. But, remember, we are talking about the most poisonous substance known to man. If there is a breach in the container, a tiny, tiny breach, the amount of plutonium on the end of a pin would make you sick, if not kill you. These transportation risks are expensive and dangerous.

The Department of Energy estimates an accident with a small release of radioactivity in a rural area would contaminate a 42-square mile area, require almost 2 years to clean up, and cost almost $1 billion to clean that up, one accident—the Department of Energy, in their own words: ''A small release.''

This is something that is very dangerous. We are talking about the health and safety standards for the people of America. They deserve the best. This legislation gives them the worst.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I would like to point out a couple of things. We can show all the pictures we want around here about ''what if's'' but the facts remain. There was no nuclear waste associated with that particular photograph of the unfortunate train wreck.

Let's talk a little bit about how this is stored. There have been 1,500 tests performed to confirm and approve container safety. In the Nuclear Regulatory Commission tests, transportation canisters have been subject to some very tough tests, as they should be, tests that confirmed that they did not break open. They survived a 30-foot free-fall onto an unyielding surface, which is the same as a crash into a concrete bridge abutment at 120 miles an hour. Puncture tests, as well, were done, allowing the container to fall 40 inches onto a steel rod 6 inches in diameter; 30 minutes in a fire of 1,475 degrees that engulfs the whole container; submerging the container under 3 feet of water for 8 hours. It goes on and on. It is rather interesting to note, about 10 years ago we were looking at flying nuclear waste for reprocessing from Japan to France. At that time, the requirement was to design a cask that would withstand a free-fall from 30,000 feet. We were advised it was technically available.

What we have here is almost a Nevada litmus test. Everyone has to be against Yucca Mountain. I know there is a good deal of pressure on Members, out of allegiance to my good friends from Nevada, from those who do not want the waste in their State. That is the bottom line. If they have to kill the nuclear waste industry to achieve it, that is what will happen.

I am holding a copy of the U.S. Navy Nuclear Propulsion Program. This is the so-called ''Mobile Chernobyl,'' some 90 reactors moving all over the world. It is entitled ''Over 117 Million Miles Safely Steamed on Nuclear Power.'' That is the record of our Navy. What we are hearing today is nothing but fear tactics of the worst kind, and this is emanated by the veto of the President.

Let's be realistic; the EPA has the sole and final authority to issue a radiation standard. I do not want to hear any Member reinterpreting that any other way. They—the EPA—must set forth a scientific basis for the rule. That is the best science. On June 1, 2001, they—meaning the EPA—are free to issue whatever standard they deem appropriate. They have the final say. We can only hope it makes a sensible and achievable interpretation and is based on sound science.

We talk about the science. In the President's veto message, he talks about the science. The Vice President talks about the science. We are talking about the best science—the EPA, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and the National Academy of Sciences, with the EPA having the sole and final authority. There is absolutely no question about that if you read the bill.

Let's look at something else. Taking the waste is a Federal responsibility, the sanctity of a contract. The deadline was 1998. The ratepayers have paid $16 billion to the Federal Government to take that waste. The taxpayers have spent some $6 billion already at Yucca Mountain where we have the hole in which to put the waste.

The longer the delay, the more liability the Federal Government has for not taking the waste because the utilities are suing the Federal Government for not taking the waste. That is some $40 billion to $80 billion. It is estimated it will cost each taxpaying family in the United States $1,300.

I will talk about foreign-domestic transportation. We have seen 300 safe domestic shipments over the last 30 years—no injury, no radiation. This chart shows the network all over the country. Since 1996, transport of foreign reactor fuel has come into this country from 41 other nations. That is over 20 tons over the next 13 years.

To where does it go? It goes into Concord, CA, Sacramento River, and moves up to Idaho. On the east coast, it goes to the Charleston Naval Weapons Center by rail up to Savannah River, and by truck on the highways. It is shipped as high-level waste from other countries. In the debate, the Senators from Nevada never acknowledged that exists. They never acknowledged there is an inconsistency in our policy.

We accept it from foreign governments, and we store it in the United States, but this administration will not address its obligation to take the domestically produced waste from our own utilities and the ratepayers have paid the Government to take it. That is the inconsistency. That is what is wrong with the administration's policy.

One example of this is U.S. participation in foreign shipments. A semi truck full of spent fuel was loaded into a chartered Russian Antonov AN–124 cargo plane and flown from Bogota, Colombia, to Cartagena so it could join a shipment from Chile bound for Charleston by freighter. The flight was believed to be necessary to avoid terrorists in Colombia, and the shipment went off without a hitch.

The point of this message is obvious. We are doing it for foreign nations. We are shipping it all over the world to two places in the United States: Concord, CA, and Charleston, SC. I do not know if the Senators from those States are concerned about it. I do not see them speaking on the floor about it in indignation. Do we want to leave the spent fuel at 80 sites in 40 States, as this chart shows? That is the alternative.

I leave all Members with one thought. Putting politics aside, how will you as a Senator explain why today you voted to leave the waste in your State, subjecting your taxpayers to continued liability for broken promises of this administration?

I urge my colleagues to vote to override the President's veto. Let's put this issue behind us once and for all. If we do not, it will come back at a greater cost to the taxpayers.

Finally, on the issue of health and safety, about which we have heard so much from our good friends from Nevada, this waste is spread out at 80 sites in 40 States, as I have indicated. I have another chart which shows that. These might be determined to be 80 mini Yucca Mountains, but they were not designed for permanent storage. They were designed for short-term storage, just as we have seen at Calvert Cliffs in Maryland. The current onsite storage was designed for short-term storage, not long-term storage.

In conclusion, I encourage my colleagues to remember that in the 1999 Department of Energy draft EIS report, it said:

> Leaving the waste onsite represents considerable human health risks as opposed to one central remote facility in the Nevada desert.

That is a statement by this administration relative to the issue of health and safety and leaving this waste where it is in these 40 States at these 80 sites.

Again, I encourage my colleagues to reflect on what they are going to say to their constituents when they go home and say, I guess I voted to leave the waste in my State, when, indeed, they had an obligation and an opportunity to move it to one central facility that has been selected at Yucca Mountain, an area where we had 800 nuclear weapons tests over a 50-year period and where we did our experimentation with the nuclear bomb—an area, frankly, that is probably already so polluted that it can never be cleaned up.

I ask my colleagues to read the letter, which is printed earlier in the

RECORD, from Governor George E. Pataki, who indicated that the citizens of New York State have been forced to temporarily store more than 2,000 tons of radioactive waste and urged the President to sign this bill into law, and the statement that disposal of this waste is one of the most important environmental concerns facing New York and other States with nuclear facilities.

I yield the floor.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, I am pleased to yield to my colleague from Illinois 3 minutes of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, the issue of nuclear waste is an important one in my home state of Illinois. More than half the electricity generated in our state comes from nuclear power plants. We have an extraordinarily large amount of nuclear waste in our state. We would like to see it moved, once and for all, to a safe facility away from population centers in Illinois and virtually in every other state.

In that respect, I admire the Senator from Alaska for his tenacity in trying to come forward with a nuclear waste bill that will put to rest an issue that literally will challenge us for centuries to come.

This nuclear waste, once transported, is still dangerous. We have to find a politically and scientifically acceptable way to move it to a safe spot in America where we can not only store it for the future generations that we can think of, but also for the generations in centuries to come who could still be exposed to this hazard.

Having said that, the nuclear waste bill supported by the majority, and vetoed by President Clinton, fails the most important test. This bill, S. 1287, the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 2000, is not environmentally responsible.

First, it prevents the Federal Government from taking ownership and legal responsibility for the nuclear waste in Illinois and around the nation. The omission of this provision undermines the U.S. Department of Energy's efforts to resolve lawsuits with utilities and to focus on the development of a permanent repository for this waste.

In addition, this bill establishes unrealistic deadlines for the completion of a repository and the transportation of waste to that facility. The bill sets deadlines for the Department of Energy under terms that the Department of Energy says they cannot meet. They are physically impossible. Failure to set realistic deadlines threatens public health and safety and the environment, and will only lead to further lawsuits in the future.

Finally—I believe this is the most telling point—this bill purposely bars the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency from establishing a radiation safety standard for the national waste site until after the Presidential election. The science will not change after the Presidential election, but many writing this bill hope the President will change and that they will be able to elect a President who has a different environmental point of view.

When it comes to the safety of future generations from radiation hazards, it should not be determined by the outcome of an election. It should be determined by scientists who take into account public health and safety.

I refuse to be part of this deal that plays politics with the health and safety of Illinoisans and millions of Americans. I want the nuclear waste safely removed from my state and stored safely so it will never endanger future generations. The President was right to veto this bill. I support his position.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. President, I begin by thanking Senator MURKOWSKI for his efforts in introducing and promoting the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act which addresses an issue of critical importance to the nation and in particular to the State of Illinois. I rise today to ask my colleagues to join me in voting to override the President's veto of this vital legislation.

Nuclear waste disposal policy is one of the most significant issue facing our nation and my home State of Illinois. Illinois is home to 11 operating nuclear units which account for 38.4 percent of the electricity generated in Illinois in 1998. Nuclear energy also provided 20 percent of the electricity consumed by the nation as a whole last year.

Nuclear power also yields a large amount of nuclear waste. Since we do not presently reprocess this material, it must be stored, usually on site at nuclear facilities in communities throughout our nation.

Illinois is home to over 4,300 metric tons of commercial nuclear waste out of 30,000 tons located throughout the nation. This is more commercial nuclear waste than is found in any other State in the Union.

Utility companies from Illinois and throughout the country along with their consumers have paid approximately $16 billion into a fund to provide for a central national site for the storage of this waste mandated by the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982. But as of yet, there has been no action taken by the Department of Energy to take this waste as it was mandated to do by 1998. Illinois consumers alone have contributed $2.14 billion to the federal Nuclear Waste Fund since 1983. This is about 12.5 percent of the total amount contributed to the fund today.

The DOE was required by statute to take possession of this waste in 1998. It failed to do so, and we now have a very serious problem. We need to decide the best way to allocate the costs of storage at existing facilities. To this end, Senator MURKOWSKI offered this legislation which addresses DOE's failure and requires the Department to take responsibility for the costs associated with its failure to act.

I again thank Senator MURKOWSKI for his longstanding support on this issue of critical importance to my State of Illinois and the nation. It is my hope that we can enact Senator MURKOWSKI's legislation and I urge all of my colleagues to vote to override the President's veto.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CRAPO). The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. President, I thank my colleague from Illinois because he has encapsulated the essence of this argument. This is not about science. This is about politics, as he reminds us. Because the time is short, I will respond to some of the issues that have been raised.

First of all, we have heard many paeans to the nuclear power industry. Whether you are for or against nuclear power is not the issue. I might say, parenthetically, there is nothing preventing any community that wants to establish a nuclear reactor from doing so. That is a matter of community choice. The fact that for 20 years no community has chosen to do so may tell us the concerns people have about their health and safety.

We have heard the Kyoto agreement discussed and interim storage. None of those are the issues. We have talked about why Paris apparently has less pollution than the United States because of nuclear power. All of these things have no relevance.

Here are the issues—and the only issues. The question is one of health and safety. Who is going to make that determination? Is it going to be the Environmental Protection Agency, which, by law, for 20 years has provided that standard?

What this is all about, when striped to the bare bones, is an attempt to circumvent the standard proposed by the EPA of 15 millirems. That is what we are talking about today.

My friend from Illinois is so right. They want to put this off until next year, hoping that a new political process, with a new President, might change the results in a measure far more favorable to the nuclear power industry. That is politics.

We hear over and over again the deadline of 1998 has been missed. It is true that the deadline for accepting the waste was missed in 1998. And where does the fault lie? It lies right here in the Congress. It is politics. Because the original nuclear waste bill said that we would search all over the entire country and look for the best geology, the best site. That was the science in 1987, when the legislation focused on one site and one site only. That was politics. The geology of that site is immensely complex. We will not know for some years whether or not that is scientifically suitable.

We are told about the costs that are incurred by utility ratepayers. Indeed, there have been costs incurred. But for more than a decade this Senator and this administration has said to each

utility that incurs costs as a result of not having a 1998 permanent repository open that we will reimburse them for the cost.

If in this legislation we said, look, take title and eliminate the potential liability that the reactor utility sites would have and compensate the utilities for any expenses they have incurred because of the delay, this Senator would support that legislation.

What is involved here is not compensation or reimbursement or delay; it is to change the basic science. Health and safety is the issue.

Let me say to my friend from Alaska, with whom I agree on many other issues, the area depicted by the photo, when he repeatedly made reference to Yucca Mountain, is 25 miles from Yucca Mountain. That is the Nevada Test Site. We are talking about an area that is totally geographically removed.

Let me talk about the issue that the nuclear utilities run all of these full-page ads, that rather than 101 sites—we heard today 80 sites—how about a single site? Just have a single site in Nevada. That is a bogus issue, a red herring.

So long as each nuclear reactor continues to generate power, there will be a nuclear waste site at that reactor. As those spent fuel rods are removed from the reactor, they are placed in pools about which the senior Senator from North Carolina talked. That has nothing to do with whether Yucca Mountain is established or not established. That is the way these spent fuel rods are first addressed. There will be storage at those sites for years to come if Yucca Mountain were determined tomorrow to be suitable.

The proposed site contemplates that, if approved, there will be a 25- to 30-year period of shipments. So the notion that somehow this legislation will establish a single site is a bogus argument.

Let me talk about transportation for a moment because that has been treated very lightly, in my judgment, by colleagues on the other side of the aisle. Transportation is a legitimate issue. We are talking about 43 States. We are talking about 51 million Americans who live within a mile or less of these sites.

This map shows the highways in red, the rail in blue, going through all of the major cities, particularly in the eastern part of the United States.

What about the accidents? The Department of Energy itself says over the lifetime of this disposal process, one could expect 70 to 310 accidents.

Each year in America there are 2,000 derailments. Each year there are approximately 200 collisions. We are talking about shipments of a magnitude that we have never seen before: 35,000 to 100,000 shipments over this 25-year period of time.

Although these casks have been described as having fallen from the heavens, in point of fact, the casks that the Department of Energy would like to use are much larger than any that have been previously tested. There have been no tests conclusively done with respect thereto. They are an earlier model.

What does this all really amount to? It amounts to congressional irresponsibility, to yield to the pressure of a special interest group that wants to change the rules that are designed to protect 270 million Americans.

Finally, I would say the answer to the question that the Senator from Alaska propounded—how do you explain, as a Senator, your vote to sustain the President's veto?—that ought to be a proud moment for every Senator. Because every Senator could stand up and say: I resisted the pressures of a special interest lobbying group, the nuclear utilities in America. What I voted for was what was right for the country and that is to protect the health and safety of the American public—270 million of us who rely upon the Environmental Protection Agency standard, a standard that was unchallenged for 20 years that exists with respect to the nuclear repository in New Mexico, the so-called WIPP site, at 15 millirems.

Remember, the original version of S. 1287—we tend to forget that is the bill before us, which admittedly has been modified—would have set health and safety standards where the American public—each citizen—could be exposed to twice the amount of radiation that the EPA has said is safe for us.

Is that what we really want in America, to set health and safety standards to accommodate the interests of the special interest groups, the nuclear utilities, or should we not as Senators, Democrats and Republicans, from the Northeast to the Southwest, from Seattle to Tampa, be saying that we ought to support the health and safety standard that protects the American public?

We can debate energy policy in America. That is a debate for another day. However, as Americans, how can we provide less safety, less protection than the Environmental Protection Agency? Every Senator on this floor knows, as do I think most Americans who follow the issue, the only reason we would propose to change the standards—not sites, as my friend from Illinois reminds us —is that it is politics, with the hopes that perhaps in November there may be a new administration that is beholden to the nuclear power industry and will make it easier, at the risk of public health and safety, to site nuclear waste somewhere in America.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is recognized.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, how much time remains on both sides?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska has 8 minutes. The Senator from Nevada has 4 minutes.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I yield 5 minutes to my good friend, the Senator from Louisiana.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, this has been a very difficult issue for us to try to resolve. It is with a great deal of thought and consideration that I come to the floor to announce that I will be voting to override the President's veto. It is a very difficult vote, obviously, but a correct and necessary vote for my State of Louisiana.

The Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982 required the Department of Energy to provide a Federal repository for used nuclear fuel no later than January 31, 1998. Here we are, 2 years after that deadline, and there is still no central repository for spent nuclear fuel in 40 States. In fact, according to the Department of Energy's latest projections, the placement of waste underground at Yucca, which I have visited, would take place, at the earliest, in 2010, and only then if it receives full regulatory approval. That leaves us at least 12 years behind schedule.

Meanwhile, millions of American families and businesses have been paying, not once but twice, for this delay. They pay once to fund the Federal management of used nuclear fuel at a central repository and again when electric utility companies have to build temporary storage space. As a result, since 1983, American consumers have paid approximately $16 billion to this nuclear waste fund through add-ons to their utility bills without a real satisfactory result. Still, the Federal Government continues to collect nearly $700 million a year from electricity consumers. Future generations of Americans, our children and grandchildren, will pay a high price for continued inaction. We must push to do something, and that is what this debate is about.

Also, the situation for the more than 100 operating nuclear powerplants storing used fuel onsite grows ever more urgent. Plants are running out of storage space. In Louisiana, we have two nuclear powerplants: Riverbend Reactor in St. Francisville and Waterford near New Orleans. These plants will reach maximum storage capacity very soon, and waiting until 2010 poses definite problems for my State.

This legislation is a necessary step toward meeting the Federal Government's legal obligation to safely and responsibly manage used nuclear fuel and high-level nuclear waste. It provides the necessary tools to begin moving used nuclear fuel to a central facility for disposal if scientific investigation demonstrates that the Yucca Mountain repository site in Nevada is suitable. This is an important step that we need to take.

S. 1287 establishes three definitive deadlines for developing a repository for used nuclear fuel at Yucca Mountain. First, it reaffirms that by December of 2001, the Secretary of Energy must make a recommendation to the President on whether Yucca Mountain

is a suitable site for a nuclear waste repository. Second, it requires the President to make a subsequent recommendation regarding Yucca Mountain's suitability to Congress by March 2002. Third, it requires a decision on the construction authorization application for a repository at Yucca Mountain by January 2006. In addition, the bill enhances an already safe transportation system with more training and state involvement in routing.

According to the President's veto message issued on April 25th the administration has two primary concerns with S. 1287. First, ''the bill would limit the EPA's authority to issue radiation standards that protect human health and environment and would prohibit the issuance of EPA's final standards until June 2001.'' In fact, under the bill the EPA retains authority to establish radiation standards that protect public health and the environment near Yucca Mountain. The bill seeks the participation of experts on radiation safety at the National Academy of Sciences and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission in order to establish the best public health and environmental standards possible. Second, the administration argues that ''the bill does little to minimize the potential for continued claims against the Federal Government for damages as a result of the delay in accepting spent fuel from utilities.'' I point out that the federal government bears responsibility for this delay and should not be completely absolved. Under the legislation the Energy Department is given specific authority to reach settlements with the utility companies that have filed lawsuits for the Department's failure to meet the congressionally mandated requirement to move used nuclear fuel. In addition, the Department is prohibited from using the funds accumulated in the Nuclear Waste Fund for settlements, except when the funds are used for containers or other aspects of storage that would be required to meet the Department's obligation to move the fuel to a repository.

Mr. President, it is difficult to come to the floor to speak on an override. It will be very rare, I hope, in my career that I will vote to override any President because I do respect the office, but I also respect the role of the Congress.

I think this is the right vote for the Congress and for my State.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, how much time is remaining?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada has 4 minutes remaining. The Senator from Alaska has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, I want to make a point one more time on the issue of transportation. This has often been characterized as an issue of Nevada versus the entire country. As more and more people around the country are aware of the implications for their families and their own security in terms of health and safety, we are beginning to get the attention of the public. Just this past week, the Deseret News in Salt Lake City, UT, strongly supported the President's veto. That publication does not have a long track record of being supportive of this administration and particularly this President. But it indicates the nature of the concern.

Here again, take a look at the routes that are involved in the transportation. This will occur around the clock for 25 to 30 years: 30,000 to 100,000 shipments. It is said that, gee, we have had transports before and nothing has happened. That is true; we have had no fatalities as a result, but we have had 58 accidents. I suppose before the disaster of the *Challenger* we could talk proudly about our space program and the shuttle launches that never had a fatality.

It is not a question of what the history has been as to whether or not there has been a fatality. We are talking about something of a magnitude many times greater, and I think our colleagues must look at that. There are many States—43 States and 51 million Americans. But it has been said repeatedly that we have to do something. The deadline has been missed, there is no question. But as I pointed out a moment ago, this Congress bears the responsibility. It politicized the action. Had we let the Nuclear Waste Policy Act unfold as it was originally contemplated back in 1982, we might very well have had the solution to the permanent repository issue.

This health and safety standard ought to anger every American watching. It is cynical for a political and a special interest purpose—this is what this bill is all about, special interest legislation—to change a health and safety standard that is designed to protect the Nation.

Finally, just a reference that comes up again and again. We were told by someone obliquely that if we don't do something, somehow the waste will pile up and we will not be able to generate nuclear power.

Twenty years ago this summer, the same argument was advanced by the distinguished chairman's predecessor—that if we did not get, what was then referred to, away from an active program on line, we would soon have to shut down nuclear reactors around the country. It was not true then, and it is not true now. No reactor waste is exposed because of space. There is dry cask storage available, it is licensed, and approved for up to a period of 100 years.

Let's do this right. Let science and not politics prevail.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, as we wind down our debate, I compliment my friends from Nevada for their points of view. But I would like to remind all of my colleagues of the obligations we have.

Senator DURBIN from Illinois expressed concern about why we are waiting until 2001.

We are all very much aware that this administration and the Environmental Protection Agency came down today without a doubt to set a standard that was unattainable. Make no mistake about it, that is what some of these folks would like to see happen.

I quote from the press release of my friend, Senator REID, of February 9:

> Under this bill, the Environmental Protection Agency will have full authority to set radiation standards for Yucca Mountain, which many experts say will ultimately prevent the site from ever being licensed as a nuclear waste dump.

There you have it. They don't want to ever see it accomplish its purpose.

We talk about courage. We talk about health. We talk about safety. But the real issue is politics, and it is Nevada politics against the recognition of the rest of the country that we have this waste at 80 sites in 40 States, and this administration is simply caving in to Nevada politics.

Let me talk about courage.

It is going to take courage to tell your constituents the money they paid to move the waste has been taken by the Federal Government and the waste is still not moved.

It is going to take courage to tell your constituents the Federal Government has broken its word again, and you support that Government, you support that decision, and you support the President who tells you he has justification for overriding the veto.

It takes courage to tell your constituents you think this waste is safer near their homes, their schools, their hospitals, and their playgrounds than it is in one site in Nevada.

It takes courage to tell your constituents to ignore the findings of the administration's draft EIS that found that leaving the material spread around the country would ''represent a considerable health risk.''

There you have it. There you have the capsule of what this is all about.

I urge my colleagues to vote to override the President's veto and to meet our obligation as Senators to resolve this problem once and for all.

I thank the Chair.

Again, I thank my colleagues on the other side of the issue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the hour of 3:15 p.m. having arrived, the Senate will now vote on the question of overriding the President's veto.

The question is, Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding? The yeas and nays are mandatory under the Constitution. The clerk will call the roll.

The Legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. ROTH) is necessarily absent.

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 64, nays 35, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 88 Leg.]

YEAS—64

Abraham	Graham	McCain
Allard	Gramm	McConnell
Ashcroft	Grams	Murkowski
Bennett	Grassley	Murray
Bond	Gregg	Nickles
Breaux	Hagel	Robb
Brownback	Hatch	Roberts
Bunning	Helms	Santorum
Burns	Hollings	Sessions
Cleland	Hutchinson	Shelby
Cochran	Hutchison	Smith (NH)
Collins	Inhofe	Smith (OR)
Coverdell	Jeffords	Snowe
Craig	Kerrey	Specter
Crapo	Kohl	Stevens
DeWine	Kyl	Thomas
Domenici	Landrieu	Thompson
Edwards	Leahy	Thurmond
Enzi	Levin	Voinovich
Fitzgerald	Lincoln	Warner
Frist	Lugar	
Gorton	Mack	

NAYS—35

Akaka	Dodd	Lott
Baucus	Dorgan	Mikulski
Bayh	Durbin	Moynihan
Biden	Feingold	Reed
Bingaman	Feinstein	Reid
Boxer	Harkin	Rockefeller
Bryan	Inouye	Sarbanes
Byrd	Johnson	Schumer
Campbell	Kennedy	Torricelli
Chafee, L.	Kerry	Wellstone
Conrad	Lautenberg	Wyden
Daschle	Lieberman	

NOT VOTING—1

Roth

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I change my vote to no, and I enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which the veto message was sustained, and I send the motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to reconsider would be premature until the vote is announced.

On this vote, the yeas are 64, the nays are 35. Two-thirds of the Senators voting not having voted in the affirmative, the bill on reconsideration fails to pass over the President's veto.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I enter a motion to reconsider the vote by which the veto message was sustained, and I send a motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion is entered.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I would like to express my personal disappointment that today the Senate was unable to override the President's veto of S. 1287, the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 2000.

Twelve years have passed since Congress directed the Department of Energy (DOE) to take responsibility for the disposal of nuclear waste created by commercial nuclear power plants and our nation's defense programs. Today, there are more than 100,000 tons of spent nuclear fuel that must be dealt with. DOE is absolutely obligated under the NWPA of 1982 to begin accepting spent nuclear fuel from utility sites. Today DOE is no closer in coming up with a solution. This is unacceptable. This is in fact wrong—so say the Federal Courts. The law is clear, and DOE has not met its obligation.

The President sent his message—once again he chose not to enact sound energy policy. Once again, he chose to ignore the growing energy demands of this nation. Therefore, it became Congress's duty to vote for sound science, fiscal responsibility, safety, and honoring a federal commitment to tens of millions of consumers across the nation who benefit from nuclear energy.

This should be a bipartisan effort for a safe, practical and workable solution for America's spent fuel storage needs. The proper storage of spent fuel should not be a partisan issue—it is a safety issue. This bill incorporates key concepts embraced by the Congress, the Administration, and the nuclear industry.

Where is the Administration? Where is DOE? Where is the solution? All of America's experience in waste management over the last 25 years of improving environmental protection has taught Congress that safe, effective waste handling practices entail using centralized, permitted, and controlled facilities to gather and manage accumulated waste. It is the goal of our nation's nuclear waste management policy to develop a specially designed disposal facility. The federal government is now 12 years behind schedule in managing nuclear waste from 140 sites in 40 states. The sites have spent fuel sitting in their ''backyard,'' and this fuel needs to be gathered and accumulated. This lack of a central storage capacity could very possibly cause the closing of several nuclear power plants. These affected plants produce nearly 20 percent of America's electricity. Closing these plants just does not make sense.

This bill would permit early receipt of fuel at Yucca Mountain following issuance of a repository construction authorization by federal regulators. In the meantime, improved environmental and public safety would be provided at the site and during transportation from the states to a federal repository.

The citizens, in some 100 communities where fuel is stored today, challenged the federal government to get this bill done. It is unfortunate that this goal has not yet been achieved.

The nuclear industry has already committed to the federal government $16 billion exclusively for the nuclear waste management program. The nuclear industry continues to pay $700 million annually with only one-third of that amount being spent on the program. The federal government needs to honor its commitment to the American people and the power community. The federal government needs to protect those 100 communities. This bill would ensure adequate funding for the lifecycle of this program and limit the use of these funds.

To ensure that the federal government meets its commitment to states and electricity consumers, it is vital that there be a mandate for completion of the nuclear waste management program—this program would give the federal government title to nuclear waste currently stored on-site at facilities across the nation, a site for permanent disposal, and a transportation infrastructure to safely move used fuel from plants to the storage facility.

Mr. President, nuclear energy is a significant part of America's energy future, and must remain part of the energy mix. America needs nuclear power to maintain our secure, reliable, and affordable supplies of electricity. We have realized this year more than ever that this Administration lacks a sound energy policy. The President's veto of the Nuclear Waste Storage Act is a prime example.

Mr. President, this federal foot dragging is unfortunate and unacceptable. It is in the best interest of this nation for Congress to override the President's veto. This is achievable, and I look forward to the opportunity to revisit this issue.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I thank my good friends, Senator REID and Senator BRYAN, for the spirited debate on this nuclear waste legislation on the President's veto override.

I also thank the professional staff on the other side who assisted with this bill and my own staff: Colleen Deegan, Andrew Lundquist, and Kristin Phillips, Trici Heninger, Jim Beirne, BRYAN Hannegan.

I also thank the leader for his guidance and counsel. As we look at this vote, which, as I understand, officially was, prior to the reconsideration, 65–34, we have one Republican Senator out today, the chairman of the Finance Committee, Senator ROTH. We would have had, had he been here, 66 votes. We are 1 vote shy. It is my understanding, according to the rules of reconsideration, that this matter may come up again at the pleasure of the leadership because it does remain on the calendar. Is that correct, Mr. President?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska is correct; it would take a motion to proceed.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Again, I thank my colleagues for their confidence and recognition that this matter still remains to be resolved by either this Senate in this session or at a later time because the contribution of the nuclear industry is such that we simply cannot allow it to strangle on its own waste. We really do not have that alternative.

I yield the floor and thank the leader for his courtesy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, if the leader does not mind—I see him standing—I also extend my hand of congratulations to the Senator from Alaska. He has been a gentleman during this entire debate. We have appreciated his courtesies. We also appreciate the leader working out a time arrangement for us. It saved everybody a lot of time and effort.

Of course, part of the wait was because there were a number of Republicans who were missing last week, and

we thought it appropriate they be here when the vote took place.

We are in a parliamentary position now where the leader, at any time he desires, can call this forward. It is a nondebatable motion to proceed. I hope, however, that the leader will continue the good faith that has been shown by all parties on this issue for many years, not only this year, and that if, in fact, something comes up because of travel or illness the leader will give us an opportunity to know when this matter will come forward.

Mr. LOTT. Will the Senator yield? Mr. President, I assure the Senators from Nevada that we have proceeded in good faith on both sides of the aisle on this issue from day one. I have always understood how important it is and how difficult it is for the Senators from Nevada. I also understand, on the other side, how important this issue is to Senators all across America who have nuclear waste in their respective States in cooling pools or in conditions of uncertainty where something needs to be done.

There will not be a surprise on this issue. If there is a decision made that we will need to reconsider, it will not be based on absentees or something of that nature. But I do think it is such an important issue and it is so close now—really 1 vote—keeping that option open for a while longer is worthwhile, but I will certainly notify Senator REID and Senator BRYAN, as I have in the past, before we proceed on it.

Mr. REID. I thank the leader.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, will the leader yield for a moment?

Mr. LOTT. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, I express my appreciation for the leader's forthrightness in indicating that we have tried to accommodate each other in terms of the time. I recognize that, as the leader, he has a difficult schedule to maintain. This is an issue that for Senator REID, for me, and for Nevadans is of paramount importance. We think it is important for the country. I appreciate the spirit of the Senator's response. I appreciate the spirit in which the chairman of the Energy Committee has conducted this debate. We disagree, but he, as well, has been courteous and very responsible in the exchange.

I thank three members of my staff who have done an extraordinary job: Brock Richter, Brent Heberlee, Jean Neal, and previously Joe Barry; they have worked on this issue for many months, some for the past 12 years. I acknowledge and thank them for their efforts. Again, I thank the leader for his commitment. I yield the floor.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, on February 10th of this year, the Senate passed S. 1287, the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments of 2000. I commend the distinguished Chairman and Ranking Member of the Energy Committee for the time and effort they have dedicated to this issue. However, I did not vote for this bill, because it contains many of the same flaws as in past bills, including safety and licensing issues, inadequate delivery schedules, and a failure to address specific storage problems of some companies.

One of the companies in our region of the country that has such a storage problem is Northern States Power, NSP. Minnesota state law prevents NSP from expanding its nuclear waste storage capacity. As a result, NSP will be forced to shut down its Prairie Island nuclear power plant when it runs out of storage space in January, 2007. Mr. President, this is an issue of critical concern. NSP serves 1.5 million electricity users in five states, including 84,000 customers in my own state of North Dakota. If NSP is forced to close its Prairie Island plant, the resulting impact on electricity customers in our region would be devastating. Grid reliability could be compromised, and the energy costs of many North Dakotans could increase substantially. In a cold-weather state such as mine, any increase in electricity costs is a matter of great concern. In short, this utility is caught between a state law and federal inaction—and we need to address the problem.

While I agree with the Administration's decision to veto the nuclear waste bill, I am also disappointed by its failure to proactively work with Congress to reach a compromise on nuclear waste storage, particularly in light of the fact that North Dakotans have invested nearly $14 million to pay for the construction of a permanent waste storage facility with little to show for it.

In the coming weeks, I will be working with the Appropriations Committee to craft a solution to the problems brought on by state laws that limit or restrict the storage of spent nuclear fuel. I encourage the participation of the Administration and my colleagues in the Senate in this effort. I hope that this will be one of many efforts to address the outstanding issues that have, up to this point, prevented comprehensive nuclear waste legislation from becoming law.

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES ACT—Resumed

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report S. 2.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2) to extend programs and activities under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority leader.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I believe the pending business is the Educational Opportunities Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, as we get ready to resume general debate on this bill, let me say again how important this issue obviously is in America. People across this country in every State put the highest priority on the need to improve the quality of our education to have safe and drug-free schools, to have accountability, to have rewards for good teachers, and have a way of making sure our education system is based on learning and that it is child centered. This legislation does that.

I listened yesterday and participated in the debate. I thought there was excellent debate. A number of Senators came to the floor and made statements. I do not know how many, but probably 12 to 15 Senators spoke yesterday. There are a number of Senators on both sides who wish to speak further today.

There are some legitimate disagreements about how to proceed on improving the quality of education in America and the accessibility of education. There are those who say the current system is working fine and we ought to keep it the way it is. I do not agree with that.

There are people who say the Federal Government must have control and dictate or the right things will not be done by the States, the local school districts, the administrators, and the teachers. I do not agree with that.

It is legitimate to have debate because we have spent billions of dollars since 1965 trying to improve the quality of education in America, and the test scores show we are, at best, holding our own and slipping in a number of critical areas. We need to think outside the box. We need to think of different and innovative ways to provide learning opportunities for our children in America.

I think it calls for flexibility as to how the funds are used at the local level. I think it calls for rewards for good teachers, but accountability for all teachers and for students. I think we need some evidence, with the flexibility, that our children are actually making progress.

So this is an important debate as we go forward. I am glad we are having it. We have spent a lot of our time on education this year in the Senate. We passed the education savings account bill earlier this year to allow parents to be able to save for their children's needs, with their own money, for their children K through 12. Now we are going to have this continued debate and amendments of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Later on this year, when we get to the Labor-HHS and education appropriations bill, I am sure we are going to have some good discussion about the funding level for higher education—loans, grants, the work-study program. We need the whole package to improve education and to make our children capable of competing in the world market, to be trained to do the job they need to make a good living for their families.

So this is an important debate. I am glad we got an agreement to stay on general debate today. We are hoping to go forward tomorrow with the first four amendments on education, two on

each side, so that we can have some legitimate debate about how to best help education in America and help learning for our children in America.

But I am worried about a lot of what I am hearing. I am hearing there may be amendments to the education bill on everything from agriculture, to NCAA gambling, to campaign finance reform, to minimum wage, to guns. Where is the limit on all the subjects that could be raised on an issue that is No. 1 in the minds of the American people—education?

We are not starting off by saying we are not going to do this or not going to do that. We are starting. We are going forward. We are starting in kindergarten. We are going to go to the first grade. We are going to have general debate and education amendments and take stock of where we are.

If there is a center ground that must and should be found in America on any subject, it is education. What we have—the status quo—is not working well enough. The Federal Government has a role. We need for it to be a more positive role and a results-oriented role.

So let's have the debate. Let's have amendments on education. I hope my colleagues—on both sides of the aisle—will not make this important legislation a piece of flypaper to attract every amendment that is flying around in this Chamber. It would be a terrible discredit to a vital issue in the minds and hearts of the American people.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORTON). The Senator from Vermont.

Mr. JEFFORDS. We are commencing further debate on the ESEA, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. I think it is important that we do spend this time on general debate because it is a big bill. There are a number of very important problems to be discussed. Hopefully, we will reach a consensus at some point so that the bill will pass.

Mr. President, I would like to take a little bit of time today, until others arrive, to talk about the role of teachers in our efforts to improve educational opportunities for young people. S.2 includes some important changes related to the critical job of providing teachers with opportunities to enhance their professional skills. Supporting our Nation's teachers must be at the foundation of our education reform efforts because the better our Nation's teachers are—the better chance our Nation's students will have to ''make the grade'' in the 21st century.

A 1999 survey by the U.S. Department of Education on the preparation and qualifications of public school teachers reported that continued learning in the teaching profession is ''key to building educators' capacity for effective teaching, particularly in a profession where the demands are changing and expanding.'' An investment in our Nation's teachers is a wise one. And we need to make wise investments with our Federal resources to ensure that the Federal dollars for professional development support activities that will foster improvements in teaching and learning that benefit students in the classroom.

Our Nation's classrooms are changing. All across this country, students are expected to learn to higher standards and perform at increasingly challenging levels. We will never get students to where they ''need to be'' unless our Nation's teachers have the knowledge base to teach to those demanding standards. While there is near total agreement that strong, capable teachers are the ones that will make the most significant, positive difference in the education of our nation's students, we have not done enough to help them be at the top of their game.

There are still too many educators teaching outside their field of expertise. Too often, teachers are offered one-shot, one-day workshops for professional development that do little to improve teaching and learning in the classroom. Professional development activities often lack the connection to the everyday challenges that teachers face in their classrooms. The most recent evaluation of the Eisenhower Professional Development program notes that ''The need for high-quality professional development that focuses on subject-matter content and how students learn that content is all the more pressing in light of the many teachers who teach outside their areas of specialization.''

Title II of this bill addresses these serious deficiencies in professional development ''head on.'' S. 2 draws on the strongest elements of the Eisenhower program while including authority for other initiatives that have an impact on ''teacher quality.'' The bill provides flexibility to school districts to address the specific needs of individual schools through programs such as: recruitment and hiring initiatives; teacher mentoring and retention initiates and professional development activities.

It prohibits Federal dollars from being used for ''one-shot'' workshops that have been criticized for being relatively ineffective because they are usually short term; lacking in continuity; lacking in adequate followup; and typically isolated from the participants' classroom and school contexts.

The bill before the Senate provides significant resources—$2 billion—to school districts to improve the quality of teaching in the classroom. It combines funds and authorities from the Eisenhower program and the class size reduction program in an effort to give school districts the flexibility that they need to make decisions about what investments in ''teacher quality'' will have the greatest impact on learning in their schools.

In an effort to set the record straight, I would like to clarify a point that has been made by my colleagues on the other side of the aisle with regard to hiring teachers. The language in Title II makes it very clear that only certified or licensed teachers can be hired under this program. I would like to read from the text of the bill on page 210, Section 2031(b)(1):

> Each Local Education Agency that receives a subgrant to carryout this subpart may use the funds made available though the subgrant to carryout the following activities: (1) Recruiting and hiring certified or licensed teachers, including teachers certified though State and local alternative routes, in order to reduce class size or hiring special education teachers.

This language is very straight forward and to the point—if you use Title II funds for hiring teachers—they must be certified or licensed.

There has also been some criticism about what kind of professional development programs can be supported under this bill. The language in S. 2 is very strong on this point. The bill ensures that professional development funded with Federal dollars be related to the curriculum and tied to the academic subject the teacher is responsible for teaching.

Professional development must be tied to challenging State or local standards; tied to strategies that demonstrate effectiveness in improving student academic achievement and student performance or be a project that will substantially increase the knowledge and teaching skills of the teacher. They must be developed with extensive participation of teachers and other educators and must be of sufficient intensity and duration to have a positive and lasting impact on the performance of a teacher in the classroom. It prohibits ''one-shot, one-day'' workshops unless they are part of a long-term comprehensive program.

This bill—for perhaps the first time in Federal law—makes it crystal clear that Federal funds must be used for activities that will improve teaching and learning in the classroom—not for fad-type activities that have no relationship to what teachers want and need to know to be better at their jobs.

The structure of title II makes a great deal of common sense and will result in a real improvement in teacher quality. My home State of Vermont serves as a good example of success through local decisionmaking. Vermont strongly supports the class size money. Yet, since the first dollar was appropriated for class-size reduction, Vermont sought greater flexibility to use that money for professional development activities that would improve the quality of the teacher in the classroom. Because Vermont already had small classes—sizes that happen to meet the Federally mandated standard of 18—those dollars were able to go for professional development.

I want other States to do what Vermont has done if that is what is in the best interest of their students. Reducing class size is important. Having a dynamic, qualified teacher at the head of the classroom is of equal or greater importance. Title II of this bill supports both efforts—high quality

professional development and hiring teachers to reduce class size—yet does it in a way that allows school districts to come up with their own recipe for improvement that will work for its students.

S. 2 has a new focus on the needs of other educators as well. In all the schools I have visited over the years, I can tell almost immediately if the school is a good one by meeting the principal. Principals have the ability to transform the environment at a school and make it a place where inquiry, collaboration, and learning flourish. That is why I am so pleased that Title II of this bill includes a new program to support professional development for school leaders. The program is based in large part on a Vermont model—the Snelling Center for School Leadership. It will support training in effective leadership, management and instructional skills and practice; enhancing and developing school management and business skills; improving the effective use of education technology; and encouraging highly qualified individuals to become school leaders.

In general, I am pleased that S. 2 makes a significant and thoughtful investment in programs that will give our nation's teachers the knowledge and ''know-how'' to educate our nation's young people. Supporting our nation's teachers is one of the best ways that we can invest in the future well-being of our Nation.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire is recognized.

Mr. GREGG. Are we under time control?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no control of time.

Mr. GREGG. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I rise to respond to some of the points made by some of our colleagues on the other side of the aisle during the debate yesterday because, unfortunately, they have attempted, I believe, to mischaracterize our bill as it comes forward. The reason for mischaracterizing it I don't understand. Maybe they are not fully informed about it or they simply believe the bill is so strong that they can't defend it when they talk about it in its real form; therefore, they must characterize it as a fantasy and then attack the fantasy as being inappropriate.

Let's begin with the Senator from Massachusetts who came to the floor yesterday and said that the flexibility we are suggesting to the States will just revisit the situation where States were spending education dollars on things such as uniforms and tubas. I must say, I think the Senator from Massachusetts is in a time warp on this point. That happened back when tubas and uniforms were bought, and I think one or two schools actually did that.

Title I was passed in 1965. That was 35 years ago. I think it is important that people catch up with today and the events of today. It is important that people catch up with the events of today and the educational system of today. We have had 35 years of title I, the proposal as structured by a Democratic Congress for the purpose of addressing the issue of education of low-income children. That Congress was controlled by the Democrats for the vast majority of those 35 years.

What have we gotten as a result of that? We have spent $120 billion to $130 billion on title I, and the achievement level of low-income children has not improved; it has either decreased or it has stayed the same. We know low-income children in the fourth grade are reading at two grade levels lower than the other children in that grade level. We know the low-income children in our inner cities are reading at grade levels significantly lower, and some can't read at all as they head toward high school graduation.

We know, for example, as this chart shows, that 70 percent-plus of our students in high-poverty schools are below the basic levels in reading, 60 percent-plus are below the basic levels in math, and almost 70 percent are below the basic levels in science. We know the program has not worked. Yet Members from the other side decide to stroll onto the floor and start citing problems from 30 years ago and acting as if they have corrected those problems over the last 35 years.

They haven't corrected the problems in education. They have aggravated the problems in education. Generation after generation of children have been put through a system that has not allowed them to achieve. Low-income children have been denied the American dream because they haven't been educated to read and to write. They are complicit in this. They say the status quo works. They basically say they have the answers.

Let me quote from the President on this point. I like to hold up these charts myself, and I can read them. This is from the Washington Post in which the President is quoted. He told the reporters the Federal money for new teachers does not belong to the States and local school districts. ''It is not their money,'' he said.

That is the attitude on the other side, that it is not their money. Well, whose money is it? Where does this money come from? It is obviously the taxpayers' money, and it obviously is coming out of the local school districts and States. It comes to Washington. But for some reason, the mentality on the other side is that we then capture this money here in Washington, send it back to the States, and tell the States exactly what to do with it—categorical, targeted, and straitjacketed programs; programs after programs, regulations after regulations, 900 pages of new law. What do they get for it? What have we gotten for it after 35 years? Very little. Our low-income kids have gotten even less—virtually no improvement in their academic efforts.

So the Members on the other side come to the floor and they say things such as, ''This money will be spent, once again, as it was 35 years ago, if flexibility is given to the States, on tubas and football uniforms.''

I guess they didn't read the bill because it is very specific. For the first time, we are expecting achievement in exchange for giving the States these flexibility opportunities with these funds. This bill, as a result of the Republican initiative, says there must be academic achievement. It must be provable. It must be academic achievement which can be shown to have occurred through tests that have been given at the local level. The academic achievement must occur amongst our low-income kids so they are not left behind.

We are not suggesting dumbing down, as has occurred, regrettably, in too many school systems. We are not suggesting lowering the average so that it looks as if the low-income child is getting closer to the norm. No, we are saying low-income children's achievement must improve as a result of low-income kids actually doing better in math and science and reading in relationship to their peers.

Equally important is that the achievement accountability standards in this bill are very specific in saying they will be disaggregated. What does that mean? That means they are not going to be able to hide the performance of low-income kids behind throwing them in with the average; you will have to look at groups on the basis of their abilities and their classification so we will know whether poor children from the inner city are actually improving in their educational efforts, and we won't have a poor child being claimed to have improved because he or she is put in a pool with kids who have higher incomes and who are attending different school systems.

So we have very specific achievement requirements in this bill. You cannot, in any way, come down here and, in fairness, or with objectivity, or, in my opinion, with an accurate reading of our bill, claim this is the type of program that occurred 30 or 35 years ago and it is, therefore, not going to work today.

This is entirely different. It is an attempt to acknowledge what study after study has shown. Study after study has shown it is not Federal programs and title I that have worked to help kids; local communities and States focusing on kids' education have helped kids. In those States that have actually seen an increase in the achievement levels of low-income kids, such as Texas and North Carolina, success has been specifically achieved because the local schools had flexibility and control over the State money. It wasn't because of Federal dollars. In fact, a NEPA study by the National Education Goals Panel reported that ''the study concludes that the most plausible explanation for test score gains are found in the policy

environment established in each State''—not in any policies that came out of Washington.

The point is this: The other side is trying to mislead us. It is making representations which are totally inaccurate on the issue of how these dollars, which are put into more flexible arenas such as Straight A's portability, will be used.

There is specific accountability. Straight A's requires that States establish annual numeric goals for increasing the percentage of economically disadvantaged students, of minority students, and of students with limited English proficiency. It requires that those kids meet higher abilities of proficiency and that they advance in their ability in math, science, and English.

This representation, which we have now heard for at least a day and we have heard in the press for numerous days, about the ability to just simply throw money in the school systems and allow them to spend it for whatever they want—tubas, footballs, or uniforms—is a fantasy being made by people who are living in a time warp, not only a time warp relevant to that fantasy, but it is a time warp about what is the proper way to approach education. They are unwilling to look at any change. They are so mired in the status quo that they are unwilling to consider any change—even one such as we put forward as an options approach versus an approach which requires the States to do something. We say the States should have the option to try these new ideas. We don't say they must try the ideas.

Another area: There was a representation that Straight A's would end up undermining the ability of kids to achieve in the sense that the school will get the money, that the money won't flow to the low-income child, and that it will be used on some other activity within the school system. They are not talking here about tubas and uniforms. They are talking about another school activity which might end up benefiting the average-income student versus the low-income student. That may be.

But the point is, of course, that at end of the day the school system must prove the academic achievement of the low-income child has increased to get the money. However they spend the money, the results of spending the money must be that the academic achievement of the low-income child must improve. This is the new trust we put into this bill. We are concerned about the achievement of the low-income child, and we are not willing to spend another 35 years throwing money at a problem and creating a status quo in education that loses another generation or two of kids.

Senator MURRAY came to the floor. She said this is a block grant. First, it is not a block grant because it has all of the categorical programs still in place. The money flows into the States. The States still have the categorical programs. They can spend it on any one of those programs. But they will have the ability to move it amongst those programs. They have the accountability standard which we put in place.

But, more important than that, she goes on and says block grant programs are always easy to cut and therefore we shouldn't do this because the programs might get cut and might end up reducing funding.

I point out that it is this Republican Congress that has significantly increased funding for education over the last 4 years. We have increased Federal funding for K through 12 by 67 percent. That is a big improvement.

Equally important, it is this administration—and specifically on the other side of the aisle—that has suggested cutting block grant programs. Title VI, which is the only true block grant under ESEA, has been put in for zeroing out and for cutting in every Clinton/Gore budget. That is a block grant program that has been proposed as zeroing out.

There is a certain disingenuousness when Members on the other side of the aisle come down here and give us crocodile tears about cutting educational spending—especially block grant educational spending—when it is their side that has proposed time and time again in their budgets that we do exactly that.

It is our side that has proposed and has succeeded in significantly increasing funding for the various functions of education—elementary and secondary specifically—and this bill does the same.

It is an important debate we are pursuing right now because it is a debate over the fundamental question of how we improve education for our children, and specifically for our low-income children. It does none of us any good to have a mischaracterization and a misrepresentation of the proposals that are brought to the floor.

Regrettably, the other side has participated in hyperbole of a rather aggressive nature. I suggest if they really wanted to debate the issue of education, they would turn from hyperbole to getting into substance.

Explain to us why we shouldn't put pressure on the local school districts to require that low-income children succeed.

Explain to us why we should not empower parents, teachers, principals, and school board members to make the decisions as to how to better educate low-income children.

Explain to us why they believe—by ''they'' I mean the people here in Washington who represent the educational establishment in Washington—they know more about educating a child, a low-income child specifically, in the town of Rye, or the town of Epping, or the town of Grantham, NH, than the people who spend their whole life in Rye, in Epping, and in Grantham, NH, working to educate that child, and the parents of that child who happen to be totally committed to its education.

Why do we believe we know more and can do a better job?

We have put forward a series of proposals which say to the States: You do not have to take any of them. You can continue this program called title I exactly as it is, if that is what you desire. But if you want to try something more creative, we are going to give you four or five really good options that have worked in other States such as Arizona, or in other cities such as Seattle. And you can undertake those proposals. But it is up to you to make that choice.

The other side needs to come down here and explain to us substantively why it is inappropriate to give States those options when we don't deny that there is a chance to use title I. They refuse to do that. They refuse to address the substance of the issue. Instead, they use hyperbole and go back 56 years to find a problem that has no relationship to today. It is a meager response to this bill coming from the other side of the aisle. Regrettably, it does not do them a service and it doesn't do this debate a great deal of service.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. COVERDELL. Mr. President, I will propound a unanimous consent that the other speakers be Senator SESSIONS of Alabama, Senator HUTCHINSON of Arkansas, and Senator GRAMS of Minnesota, which I think is in keeping with our normal protocol of those who have arrived in the order in which they arrived.

I propound that unanimous consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Under the unanimous consent agreement, the Senator from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from New Hampshire. He served on the Education Committee for a number of years. You can see the passion, the conviction, and the knowledge he brings to bear on this issue, as the Chair himself has done over the years.

It is time for some changes. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act was passed as part of President Lyndon Johnson's Great Society in 1965.

I have been in schools in Alabama. I have talked to teachers. I have been in 18 schools in Alabama since January 1 of this year.

I was in Selma, AL, just Friday afternoon and spent some time with the new and innovative school they have created. All of the sixth grade is in one building. They call it a ''discovery school.'' They emphasize art, music, and special programs that give the kids electives. But the faculty has gotten together and created a system in which those electives are very substantive.

One of the classes was sports math for kids who like sports. There is a lot of useful mathematics in sports. They are teaching them batting averages and how to calculate all sorts of factors relating to sports programs. That was their idea.

The faculty of that school got together with the principal in the town of Selma to create a better way to educate sixth graders in that community.

We are not capable of doing that here. We will have to vote one day on the defense budget.

We have never been elected to run education in America. We were not elected to do that. The same people who elect us, as the Senator from Washington many times has eloquently said, elected our school board leaders to run education in our communities. They didn't elect us to run education. They elect them to run education. Education is fundamentally a local State community project. It needs to be done by people who know our children's names, who care about them, who know the school buildings, who know the offices.

We are not doing that. We are trying to micromanage education from Washington. We have 700 Federal Government education programs in this country. Imagine that, 700. We talk about empowering schools to develop plans of excellence, and some of our friends from the Democratic side say we don't believe in accountability.

It finally dawned on me, their definition of ''accountability'' is a Federal mandate stating precisely how the money has to be spent in their school system. They define that as accountability. That is not accountability. We are pouring millions of dollars into schools in which learning is not occurring. Under all these programs and all the grants and the 700 programs, nobody knows whether or not learning is occurring.

That is not exactly so. We are beginning to understand that learning is not occurring in many of the schools. Children are operating far below their grade level. That is no longer acceptable.

We need a system of real accountability, a system that tells the American people and parents whether or not learning is occurring. We don't want some national test that will be pushed on every school. In Alabama, we have a very tough new testing system in the 4th, 8th and 12th grade. Students do not get their diploma if they do not take the test and pass. Kids are getting worried. I asked a teacher in Selma the other day did they think kids were actually wising up and were their parents getting more energized and were they aware they were not going to get their diploma unless they met certain minimum standards. The teacher said teachers and parents understand it, children understand it, and they are doing a better job of doing their homework and taking learning more seriously instead of just going through the motions of going to school every day and expecting the diploma to be handed to them when they finish school.

I remember somebody talked about textbooks and how good our textbooks ought to be. What good is a $500 textbook, the best words ever written, if the child is not going to read and is not motivated to read it and the parents are not engaged in helping them read it and there is no sense of urgency or motivation in learning?

Obviously, that is the key to education in America. We will not mandate from Washington, DC. It has to come from the local communities. That is consistent with what modern management is all about.

The Senator from New Hampshire indicated this is old thinking: Run any business from the top down. Every good CEO knows, that all the new management techniques are to empower people at the lowest level who are actually doing the job that is necessary for success. You empower them, motivate them, and encourage them to use their creative power to do that job better every day. That is what we ought to do with an education bill. That is so fundamental to me as to be without dispute.

I taught 1 year in the sixth grade in the public school. My wife taught a number of years. It was a great time but challenging. Our teachers are working desperately to try to educate on a daily basis. Sometimes our regulations and paperwork are unnecessarily adding to their daily burdens. They complain to me about it at every school I visit. I always try to visit classrooms, talk to the principal and try to have an hour or so with a teacher just to talk to them about what they think is important. They are complaining to me about Federal paperwork on a regular basis at every school. They say it is much too burdensome and unnecessary, and it keeps them from doing what they would like to do to improve education in their school.

I am excited about this legislation. We have, in this Congress, increased funding for education every year. We spent more last year on education than the President asked for. We believe in education. We want children to learn. We are not here to feather the nests of bureaucrats. I know people get scared when we talk about a system that doesn't guarantee this program will continue as it has for 35 years. It scares people. The people who are working in those programs are talented and they will be needed in our school system. People are not going to be fired. But we need changes. Every business, every government agency needs to make some changes. Thirty-five years is enough. After 35 years, it is time we reevaluate what we are doing and make some decisions.

We want to see education improve. What does that mean? That means learning is occurring. When children go to class in September and come out in May, they have learned something. The more they have learned during that time, the better we are as a nation. This is critical. We have to figure out how to do that. We will not do it by polling data from Washington setting up 701 Government programs. That is not the way to do it. We have to, with humility, recognize our limits as a Senate and as a Congress. We have to trust the people we have elected in our local communities to run our education systems. We have to encourage parents to be involved in education, both in the schools and in their children's homework and learning. We have to insist local schools have testing programs that actually determine whether or not they are getting better in their mathematics, reading, English, and science.

We want them to improve. We don't want to be at the bottom of the world in test scores in science and mathematics. That is not acceptable in the greatest nation the world has ever known. We cannot allow that to continue. But it will not be business as usual. There will have to be some changes. This legislation will give States an option, a chance to say to the Federal Government, let us try, give us the free reign to run. Let us present to you a program of excellence. Our teachers have signed on, our principals have signed on, the community has signed on. We will have the special sixth grade, this discovery school for sixth graders, and they will learn a lot of different things, including, as they did in Selma, dance, ballet, tap, and music as part of their education curriculum. We believe children will learn better. We know these children. We love this community. We love this school. Give us a chance to do some of these things and inculcate that as part of their schooling.

I believe we will see progress. I believe that is the only way we will see progress. I am excited that what has been produced by this Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions—and this is my first year serving on that committee. I believe this is a good step in the right direction. We will be sending more Federal dollars than ever before to our classroom. We will be sending it down to the classroom, to the principals and teachers who know our children's names. We will be challenging them to provide programs of excellence in which actual learning occurs. That is what we should do. I thank Chairman JEFFORDS and the others who have worked on it.

I see Senator HUTCHINSON, who has been such an outstanding champion of these values. We have worked together on a number of issues. He shares our concerns about empowering our teachers and helping them as they teach in the classroom. We can do better, and this bill is a step in that direction.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. COLLINS). Under the previous order, the Senator from Arkansas is recognized.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Madam President, I commend Senator SESSIONS from Alabama. The Senator from Alabama has been a strong voice for change on the HELP Committee. He has been a very influential member in the writing and offering of this legislation, as has the Senator from Washington, who has been one of the outstanding leaders in this Nation. He returns periodically from our recesses and reports on his visits to the schools in Washington State. He made a conscientious effort to gain the input of local educators, the ones to whom we ought to be listening. I commend his great efforts in this debate.

This is an important debate. As I said yesterday, I believe this is the most important issue and the most important debate the Senate will have in this Congress. It is important, as Senator GREGG said, for us to have this debate on the substantive issues. There are very real, philosophical issues as to what should be the Federal role in education. It is that philosophical difference that should be debated. I am afraid, as I listened to the other side yesterday during their speeches, that what I saw was a straw man being erected and knocked down. That is a very common practice in debate but not very illuminating when it comes to what ought to be the public policy of the United States regarding our public schools.

During the 35 years of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Washington made its imprint very deeply; it engraved it into the status quo. The ''status quo,'' that is what Ronald Reagan used to say is Latin for ''the mess we are in.'' If you look at the statistics and studies and reports, you cannot help but conclude that American education is a mess today.

American 12th graders rank 19th out of 21 industrialized nations in mathematics. Only Cyprus and South Africa fared worse. You can take a whole smorgasbord of studies and facts and statistics to indicate the status quo is not sufficient.

The Democratic side, the other side in this debate, has clearly aligned themselves with the status quo. They said it explicitly. They said it forthrightly. They said it candidly. Senator KENNEDY, who is always very articulate and succinct in the way he expresses himself, said we should stick with the tried and the tested. That is an honorable position to take. It is a position we deserve to debate on the floor of the Senate, not misrepresenting or mischaracterizing the bill the committee has presented.

If you want to preserve the status quo, if you want to stay with the tried and the tested, then clearly the bill the HELP Committee has produced is not the bill for you. This is a bill that takes a dramatically new approach. It is a bill that says the past may have been tried and tested, but it is also a past that has clearly been flawed. While American 12th graders have been ranked 19th and 21st among industrialized nations in mathematics since 1993, 10 million American kids reach 12th grade without having learned to read at the basic level.

Senator GREGG said it very well: That is the problem in American education today. We have young people who are reaching 12th grade, preparing to graduate from high school, who cannot read and write. It is not sufficient. It is irresponsible, and it is reprehensible for this Senate to defend that kind of status quo.

Twenty million high school seniors cannot do basic math, and 25 million are illiterate in American history. That should embarrass us as Americans. It certainly ought to embarrass us as U.S. Senators.

What about middle school test scores? Two-thirds of American eighth graders are still performing below the proficiency level in reading. But it is not only high school and middle school students being shortchanged by our Washington cubical-based system; over three-quarters of fourth grade children in urban high-poverty schools are reading below basic on the National Assessment of Education Progress. Those kids, in particular, are the ones title I was intended to help most.

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as it originated 35 years ago, was created to help those disadvantaged children who were from distressed urban schools. Yet it is these very children, three-quarters of whom are in the fourth grade, who are reading below the basic level. Those are the children we are failing, those we had promised we were going to help when we established the ESEA 35 years ago.

Last year—and I think this will demonstrate the tragic failure of America today—when the Children's Scholarship Foundation, a private scholarship fund—no public dollars, no Federal dollars, no ESEA dollars; private dollars, a private scholarship fund—offered 40,000 scholarships for tuition, 1.25 million applications were received. Even though families were required to make a matching contribution from their own pockets of $1,000, 1.25 million applications were received for 40,000 scholarships from the Children's Scholarship Foundation.

Does that not tell us that the status quo has tragically failed American families and American children? In urban districts, the Children's Scholarship Foundation demand was high. A staggering 44 percent of eligible parents in Baltimore applied; 33 percent of the parents in Washington, DC, applied for these scholarships. In the poorest communities, parents simply are not satisfied with their schools.

So I say to my colleagues, one could make the argument our country's education system is in a state of emergency, and you would have compelling data to back up that claim. Clearly, the ''tried and tested programs'' are flat busted. They even say that expanding Washington control would fix the multitude of programs. That is nothing more than robbing our kids of their future.

I mentioned yesterday that the President a year ago, as quoted in the New York Times, said he wanted Washington to have more control over education. I will say again, we have too much Washington control. Just last week, back in the State of Arkansas during our recess, I visited an elementary school in North Little Rock. I spoke to a very, very impressive class of fourth graders. I had been invited to come and talk to them about government. They were seated around. For 45 minutes we did a give-and-take. They asked me questions and I asked them questions. I asked them questions to try to get an idea of where they were in their understanding of American government. It was inspirational. Frankly, they knew more than many civics classes and government classes in high schools that I had visited and to whom I had spoken.

The key wasn't any ESEA program. Frankly, it wasn't any title I program. It was that they had a tremendous teacher. I am convinced more and more as I visit schools, the key to good education is good principals and good teachers who are excited about their job and want to communicate facts and information and truth to children.

So I went to this school. While I was at the school, after I made my presentation, the principal, who sat through the 45-minute session with the fourth graders, half jokingly—I say, only half jokingly—introduced me to one whom he described as ''his boss.'' He said, ''Meet my boss, the title I coordinator for our schools.''

I thought in that little joking comment there was a real truth that was being communicated. The other side has said that title I is only 7 percent of the local school district's budget, it is only 7 percent of their funds, but I think when a principal says, ''Meet my boss, this is the title I coordinator,'' it says that while it may only be 7 percent, it wields tremendous influence on the decisions made by local educators. It is a revealing comment, indicative of the extent to which our Federal bureaucracy has assumed control of our local schools. While 7 percent of the education dollars come from the Federal Government, I am repeatedly told by educators, half of all the paperwork is done to obtain Federal grants and comply with Federal regulations.

Child-based education is the focus of the bill the HELP Committee has produced. The pending legislation before us is based upon children; not systems and bureaucracies, but what is best for the children. Make no mistake about it, we have a bill that is about educating America's children, not keeping a failing, dilapidated system on life support.

The bill before us pioneers a new direction for the Federal Government's role in education. It includes four student-focused initiatives, including the

Straight A's program, which we have heard a lot about and which I think is the heartbeat of this legislation. It is a 15-State demonstration program. As Senator GREGG said, no State has to do it. No State is compelled to do it. No State is required to get into the Straight A's program.

If they want to continue with the calcified system of bureaucracy that we have created over the last 35 years, they can do it, but 15 States will be given the opportunity to exchange the mandates, the regulations, the prescriptive formulas from Washington, DC, for freedom to mingle and merge those funds and use them as they deem most important for those children. The bill before us moves us in that direction.

It also has a Teacher Empowerment Act. It has child-centered funding, and it has public school choice, all geared to students, under the premise that no child ought to be chained in a school that has failed year after year. The Department of Education tells us there are literally hundreds of schools that have been adjudged failing schools in which children are trapped. No child ought to be trapped in those schools.

I have listened carefully to the bill's opponents who claim our legislation is nothing more than a blank check to the States. Having served in the State legislature in Arkansas and worked with local school boards, I do not subscribe to the notion that Washington is somehow omniscient. It is not. Nor do I subscribe to the notion that the States are incompetent or uncaring.

Beyond that, this bill is not a blank check. It requires accountability and student performance measures in exchange for flexibility and discretion by States and local schools. That is something the current system does not have and opponents fail to mention.

I say to all my colleagues, when they listen to the eloquent speeches on the other side of the aisle and when they speak about blank checks and lack of accountability, ask yourselves what kind of accountability exists in the current system. I will tell you what accountability means under the current ESEA. It means: Did you fill out the grant application correctly? Did you get the ''i's'' dotted and the ''t's'' crossed? Did you fill it out in the correct manner?

The second thing accountability means under the current system is: Did you spend the money in the prescribed way? That is all accountability means. There is no accountability as to whether kids are learning. There is no accountability as to whether academic progress is being attained. In fact, if you fail, the likelihood is we will just fund your failure at a higher level.

That is not real accountability. Rather than cubical-based bureaucrats in Washington pulling the funding strings, funding will be allocated directly to the States and based on how well each school's students are performing.

Let me illustrate what is happening under the current Washington-based, top-down system.

School districts currently receive funds under more than a dozen Federal categorical grant programs. The only accountability for many of these programs lies in how the money is spent, not in improving student achievement. Washington requires schools to spend money on technology, but there are no requirements for what matters most: Are the kids learning?

Officials in an elementary school in my home State think that one of their greatest needs is to remediate children early. This is referring to a principal whom I talked with last night and again today in a situation that arose in her elementary school.

She thought the greatest need was to begin remediation early, as soon as the deficiency could be identified, rather than waiting until the end of the school year and sending the children to summer school. To achieve this, the principal wanted to implement a concept known as point-in-time remediation, which is designed to help underachieving students before they fall irreversibly behind.

This principal needed to hire a new teacher who would spend time each day working in different classrooms throughout the school assisting students who were struggling below grade level. In her desire to do what she believed was best for her children and to utilize this point-in-time remediation, she made an application for a Federal grant. Her title I coordinator rewrote her grant application as a request for funding to hire a teacher to reduce class size, and the application was then approved.

She now had an approved grant for class size reduction, which has been one of the hallmarks of what the other side said we needed to be doing: provide 100,000 teachers from the Federal level to reduce class size. That is what this title I coordinator did. She rewrote the principal's application so it would comply with the program that was most likely to get approved—class size reduction. The application was approved.

Here is the problem: The school does not have a class size problem. They do have a desire to work with students to keep them from falling behind. Unfortunately, for many of the children of this Arkansas elementary school, under our current one-size-fits-all, overly prescriptive Federal education system, arbitrarily lowering class size is more important than meeting the real needs of children. This principal is faced with the alternative: I either fudge, I cheat, I do not follow the prescription of the grant application and what the grant was given for or I cheat my children whom I care about, for whom I want to do point-in-time remediation.

That was the choice this principal was facing. That is the choice our one-size-fits-all approach to education from the Federal level gives educators over and over.

The arguments I have heard repeatedly from the other side echo the arguments we heard a few years ago when we sought to reform welfare: block grants, blank checks, cannot trust the States; they are going to hurt people; they are not compassionate.

What happened is, nationwide welfare caseloads have fallen in half since we passed welfare reform and gave the States the same kind of latitude that we now would like to give them in regard to education. The sky did not fall. Disaster did not occur. The States did not turn their backs upon the needy. But hope and opportunity and a way up and out was created for millions of Americans who had been trapped in a welfare system that did not do anyone justice.

Now we are hearing the same arguments regarding education: You cannot trust the States; they will build swimming pools; it is a blank check; they are not compassionate; they do not care; they are not going to do what is right for the children.

I reject that, and I think the American people reject the notion that wisdom flows out of the beltway in Washington, DC.

Under the Straight A's Program, States do not receive a blank check. Before a State is even eligible to participate in the optional demonstration program, it must have a rigorous accountability system in place. It must establish specific numeric performance goals for student achievement in every subject and grade in which students are assessed. It must establish specific numeric goals to reduce the achievement gap and to increase student achievement for all children. No more averaging. No more aggregating the test results so as to conceal the failure of the current system. They must establish numeric goals reducing the achievement gap, which is still all too real between the disadvantaged students and those who have more advantages.

Under our bill, it must establish an accountability system to ensure schools are held accountable for substantially increasing student performance for all children, regardless of income, race, or ethnicity. That is far from a blank check. That is not the end.

Then a State signs a performance contract with the Secretary setting forth the performance goals by which the State's progress will be measured and describing how the State intends to improve achievement for all students and narrow that achievement gap. Unlike current law, Straight A's forces States to measure the progress of all children by requiring States to take into account the progress of students from every school district and school in the State so that no community is left behind.

States must make improvements in the proportion of students at proficient and advanced levels of performance from year to year so that no child is left behind.

Most importantly, States must include annual numerical goals for improving student achievement for specific groups of children, including disadvantaged students, so that no child is left behind.

Right now, title I—I know my good friend, the distinguished Senator from Minnesota, cares about disadvantaged children—only serves two-thirds of the eligible children. That is a tragedy. That is a disgrace. Under the bill our committee has produced, every title I eligible child will be assured of being served.

For the first time, the Federal Government will not make schools fill out paperwork to show us what they are spending their money on, but we will make States show us that every child in every school in every school district is learning.

Block grants. I heard Senator KENNEDY say this yesterday, and I think some others on the other side of the aisle also said this: Block grants will surely result in abuses.

We are, of course, investigating this, but let me point back to the example of a school building a swimming pool with a block grant. First of all, I do not know if that is accurate, and I do not know if they were violating the law at the time, if it did occur. But beyond that, there is no honest way to compare the block grant experience of the 1960s with the accountability provisions that are required in the Straight A's proposal in the legislation before the Senate. It is apples and oranges. It is not even fair to make such a comparison. But they do so.

In that allegation, in that attack upon this bill, there is the insinuation or the suggestion that currently, under the status quo—which is so roundly defended—there is somehow accountability and those abuses do not occur. On that, I know they are wrong.

Let me give you an example. I want to show some pictures.

Last August, during a recess, I toured a lot of the Delta area in Arkansas, which is the poorest area in the State of Arkansas. It is also the poorest area in the United States. We hear about Appalachia. Today, the Delta of the Mississippi River is the poorest area in this Nation. So I spent almost 2 weeks in the Delta area of Arkansas.

During that time, I visited the rural health clinics, I visited the hospitals, and I visited schools. But one I will never forget—I had staff go down this past week to verify that I had my facts straight—was the Holly Grove school in southern Arkansas in the Delta.

It is about 95 percent minority—95 percent African American. They are in a 50-year-old building. The building is older than the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. They have a very low property tax base, so they have very little funding. Frankly, it is an issue the State needs to address in the equitable distribution of State funds. But that is not my point at this moment.

So I went into the building. It is 50 years old. It is dilapidated, falling down. We hear about inner-city schools falling down. This rural school surely is as bad as any inner-city school I have ever visited or seen or heard about.

The ceilings are 12 feet high, so it is very difficult to heat. That in itself makes it a very bad learning environment. The lighting is very poor. Then, worse yet, the ceiling is collapsing. Tiles are falling down, tiles are missing. There are big water stains. You can see it in this picture. These are the water stains in the tile of the ceiling. There are missing tiles in the ceiling. This picture gives you an idea of the conditions in the building.

This picture shows the outside of the school, the school door. This one school building, by the way, houses Head Start through the 12th grade. As you can see from the picture, the paint is in very poor condition. The building itself, while brick, is 50 years old.

I want to show you an amazing thing. I toured the school. The principal took me through the school. There were broken windows. The ceiling was, as I said, collapsing. We opened this one door, and I had the most amazing sight. I saw state-of-the-art exercise equipment.

Here is a picture of it. This was taken last week. These are treadmills—I suspect better than what we have in the Senate gym. There were a number of treadmills. And then, if you don't like treadmills, they had Stairmasters, a number of Stairmasters. This is brand new equipment. This was all purchased last year. If you want to go beyond the Stairmasters and the treadmills, there is Nautilus equipment, state-of-the-art, brand new Nautilus equipment, a big room full of this equipment.

Mr. HARKIN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Let me finish my story. Then maybe I will answer the question and be glad to yield.

After having looked at the terrible conditions in the building, the conditions to which the students were being exposed every day, I asked the principal: Where did you get the money? Where did you get the money to buy all of this state-of-the-art equipment? And he said, rather sheepishly: This was a Federal grant.

We went back and talked about it. He applied for this grant. The school applied for the grant. This was the way they could spend the money. Then he said: I would much rather have spent the money on improving my facilities. I would much rather have lowered the ceiling, put good lighting in, painted the rooms. I would much rather have had some resources to do that.

The answer on the other side is: Well, we will just start a school construction program from up here. Do you know what will happen then? We will spend school construction money where they don't need school construction. What we had here was a typical Federal Government approach, a prescriptive categorical grant. Do you know how much money they got? They got $239,000 for the Holly Grove school to buy athletic equipment.

To my colleagues, I say that is the insanity we must end. I am not saying that is not good. I am glad they have the equipment. I am sure the community can come in and use it in the evening. There is probably some good coming out of this state-of-the-art athletic equipment. But that is not what they needed, and the principal knew it.

Under our legislation, that principal and the school district, working together with the school board, would be able to decide what was needed most.

For a lot of schools, maybe it would be nice. I don't know. For an after-school learning program, maybe they could use the equipment. Or maybe a school could use computers, or maybe they could use tutors, or maybe they could use new textbooks. But when they talk about swimming pools from block grants, I want you to remember this picture because that is the current system.

I am not shy about how I feel about education. As is Senator SESSIONS, I am excited about the legislation this committee has produced. This is a debate about education, not elections. It is a debate about student achievement, not bureaucratic preservation.

If the underlying bill is passed and signed into law, the American people will be the beneficiaries, the American children will know they have a better opportunity in the future, and we will know we did our job.

I think this bill is so good and the facts so clear and the message so strong that proponents of the status quo are worried this could actually happen. In fact, some colleagues have already stated their intentions to offer amendments that they know darn good and well will kill this bill—kill it.

I am elated that so far the debate has been about educating our kids. I hope it continues. However, I understand a gun and gun violence debate is coming. Who knows? Possibly campaign finance, maybe prescription drugs, too—all important issues in their own place, to be sure. But there isn't any American who follows this debate who does not understand what that would do to this bill. It would kill it. That is what they want to do.

I respect any Member's right to have their amendment debated on the floor of the Senate. I, too, have that right. I want to preserve it. But the Senate has already debated a juvenile crime bill. Members have stated their positions, and they have taken tough votes. What we need to do is ensure that this debate remains on education.

I implore my colleagues on the other side to reject the temptation to offer extraneous, unrelated, nongermane amendments to this bill. Let's have an honest debate on education. We can disagree and disagree vehemently. We

can have an honest philosophical difference over what the role of the Federal Government ought to be. Let's have that debate and take those arguments to the American people. But let's not clutter this up with extraneous, nongermane issues.

With millions of American students struggling to read, millions of American students who don't know the basics of U.S. history or don't exhibit basic mathematic skills, you would think we could collectively improve student performance by passing the pending legislation. We will soon see if we can bring our children to the halls of learning or keep them outside spinning endlessly on the merry-go-round of Washington politics.

I will conclude by quoting a former Secretary of Education, Bill Bennett. He used this analogy, and it is appropriate in our debate on the floor of the Senate. This was back in 1988, and it is true today under the ESEA:

> If you serve a child a rotten hamburger in America, Federal, State and local agencies will investigate you, summon you, close you down, whatever. But if you provide a child with a rotten education, nothing happens, except that you're likely to be given more money to do it with.

That is the current system. That is the status quo. I won't defend it. We want to change it. This legislation does that. I hope as this debate goes forward we will have an opportunity to vote on the substance of the Educational Opportunities Act.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GORTON). Under the previous order, the Senator from Minnesota, Mr. GRAMS, is recognized.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Will the Senator yield for 10 seconds?

Mr. GRAMS. Yes.

Mr. WELLSTONE. A number of Republicans have spoken, four or five in a row. I ask unanimous consent that Senator HARKIN follow the Senator from Minnesota, Mr. GRAMS, and that I be allowed to follow him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator DOMENICI be added to the end of that list.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota is recognized.

Mr. GRAMS. Mr. President, I come to the floor this afternoon to discuss an amendment that I hope to offer later to the proposed Educational Opportunities Act. To get right to the needs of this amendment, it would permit States to fulfill the assessment requirements of this bill by testing students at the local district level, or at the classroom level, and with a nationally recognized academic test, such as the Iowa Test of Basic Skills, and also to provide school districts a choice of State-approved standards from which to teach their students.

This is an amendment that seeks to maintain more authority at the local level where decisions are best made. It would provide more flexibility for schools to choose their own assessments to meet State standards without losing any of the accountability needed to ensure students are achieving. Basically, it would offer schools an option on how they want to measure the academic standards for achievements of their students—not to have this cookie-cutter-type proposal out of Washington that says this is the only way it can be done but to allow some flexibility for States that might want to use a different measuring stick.

In Minnesota, the Federal requirements to implement a set of State standards and accompanying State assessments have resulted in a highly controversial State content standard called the ''profile of learning.'' Many parents in Minnesota have expressed to me their concern about the vague and indefinite nature of the profile standards and also the consequential decline of academic rigor in the classroom. Parents also object to some of the intrusive test questions that have been asked of the students. A poll taken a few months ago showed that only 9 percent of public school teachers support continuation of the profile as it is currently written in the State of Minnesota.

The students who visit my Washington office on school trips almost universally believe the time spent on fulfilling the profile requirements has shortchanged them from obtaining real academic instruction. Some of the assessments, entitled ''performance packages'' in Minnesota, can take from 3 to 6 weeks to complete, sacrificing some very valuable class time for students. The performance packages required under the profile are often assigned to groups of students, and inevitably some students end up pulling more of the weight than others. It is hard to see how this group system ensures that each student is assessed based upon his or her individual performance or effort.

I won't get into many particulars of the profile standards, but they, unfortunately, focus too much on politically fashionable outcomes and not enough on transmitting to students a core body of knowledge. For instance, one of the profile ''performance packages''—let me explain this to you—was for a student to ''violate a folkway,'' which means to do something odd or unexpected in a public place; and then they would have their partner come along with them who, in the background, would watch how people reacted and write down that reaction. I think it would be an understatement to say that a school project such as that would be of extremely questionable value, just as an example.

The Thomas P. Fordham Foundation, which publishes a review of State standards nationwide, stated that in the English portion of the profile ''a large number of standards are not specific, measurable, or demanding.''

We have another expert, a standards expert, Dianne Ravitch, who wrote the following about the profile:

> I will be candid because I don't have time to be diplomatic. In the area of social studies, the Minnesota standards are among the worst in the Nation. They are vague. They are not testable. I advise you to toss them out and start over.

A professor at one of the Minnesota State universities describing the profile wrote:

> The detail, the record keeping, the assessment for each individual is enough to make one's head spin. The time that will be devoted to paperwork will, of necessity, distract teachers from planning, preparation, reflection, working with students, and other essential tasks. I pity the poor teacher who tries to bring it off and any nonlinear-thinking student who falls victim to Minnesota-style results-based learning.

It is obvious that in Minnesota we have a real problem with education standards. In fact, the Minnesota House of Representatives voted last year to scrap the profiles completely, but unfortunately that bill was not adopted by the full legislature.

Our children's education is too important to be the subject of experimentation with the latest politically correct instructional fad. I want Minnesota students to excel, and I want to make sure Minnesota school districts have a choice of standards—again, not a cookie-cutter model from Washington or imposed by Washington to qualify for any funding. I believe Minnesota will adopt new standards and assessments, if not this year, then in the near future. I want to help ensure school districts are not forced to follow a fad, but that they have some options in how to assess their students' education.

Though the profile has not been replaced, there is a strong grassroots movement toward rigorous academic standards in Minnesota which has been embodied in legislation that creates an alternative academic standard that emphasizes very clear, rigorous standards, local control, and accountability to parents.

This State legislation has been entitled the ''North Star Standard,'' and it is the intent of the bill's sponsors to implement this standard as a local option so that local school districts can choose between the North Star Standard or the profile. They can stick with the new politically correct system or they can go to an academically rigorous system that allows students to learn more.

My amendment would clarify that there can be two sets of standards and assessments from which local school districts can choose. Again, that is all my amendment asks for. It says it would clarify that there could be two sets of standards and assessments from which local school districts could choose—again, not the one dictated standard of how to get it done but leaving some options and allowing at least

a second set of standards that parents and teachers could choose.

For districts choosing the North Star Standard, students may be assessed at the classroom or local district level, not the State level. To ensure true accountability, the North Star Standard sets up strict reporting requirements. Teachers would have to provide parents a complete syllabus, information on the curriculum, homework assignments, and testing. Thus, the parents would know what their students are learning and what their children are being tested on, protecting against the temptation to ''dumb down'' any of the tests to make things look better.

While academic rigor is currently being compromised in Minnesota through a system of standards and assessments that aren't challenging and involve time-consuming projects that take valuable time away from classroom instruction, it would be returned through local ''full disclosure'' requirements to parents. Local testing would be tied to the curriculum, and the testing would also include a nationally recognized test such as the Iowa Test of Basic Skills.

The North Star Standard would also create an alternative, State-level set of academic standards that are clear, unambiguous, and present what a student should know, without dictating a specific curriculum or how teachers are to teach that body of information. In other words, we don't want tests written and then teachers teaching to the tests. I believe this standard is closer to what was intended under the ESEA of 1994.

The theme of this reauthorization bill has been more State and local flexibility in exchange for accountability. I believe we can maximize that accountability if we leave it to local school boards and parents. The North Star Standard is an appropriate response to the shortcomings of the State-level standards and assessments experiment in Minnesota.

I firmly believe that nothing we do here in Congress should inhibit the efforts of citizens to reform their school systems in a manner they choose, and that they know what is best for their children.

Parents are the moving force behind development of the North Star Standard. These parents, some of which are current and former local school board members, feel passionately about the education of all children, and have carefully crafted a standard and assessment structure that they believe, and I believe, will improve the education of Minnesota students.

Again, this amendment is designed not to create a mold for one size fits all, but to allow states to have two sets of standards and assessments and to allow a local school district and teachers the opportunity to choose their own assessment that meets the outcomes we all want. I urge my colleagues to help my constituents restore the proud history of excellent educational achievement in the Minnesota public schools by supporting this amendment when I have the opportunity to offer it later this week.

Thank you very much, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senator GORTON be added to the list of Republicans who are to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMITH of Oregon). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, as we enter the 21st century, the American people have their eyes firmly focused on the future, and they know education is the key to that future. This morning's USA Today newspaper reported that of all the issues the American people care about or they want their Presidential candidate speaking about, education is No. 1. Eighty-nine percent rank it as the most important issue in determining their vote for President.

That is why this debate is so important. It has been 6 years since we had the elementary and secondary education bill on the floor and I am delighted that we are finally having this debate. I am hopeful it will be a full and open debate with amendments that address the broader issue of education in this country.

Yesterday, there was a lot of discussion about the failure of Federal education programs. We heard a lot of talk yesterday about how the achievement gap has widened and U.S. students are near the bottom of international assessments, teachers are not qualified, too many students can't read, and on and on. We heard all of these horror stories yesterday.

I wish to state at the outset, first of all, that, like so many of my colleagues, I have traveled around the world. I have visited education systems in other parts of the globe. I wouldn't trade one education system anywhere in the world for the public education system we have in America. I wouldn't trade this public education system we have in America for anything anywhere else in the world because we invest in public education so that every child, regardless of how rich, or how poor, no matter where that child is born or raised, has a chance to fulfill his or her dreams. It is not so in other countries.

You might say the math scores are higher here or there. But, then again, in some other education systems they take the brightest kids through testing and put them in mainstream schools. They may take other kids who maybe don't test as well and put them in technical schools. When it comes to some of these international assessments, some countries are only testing the kids who are the brightest.

We don't believe in that kind of a structured education system in America. We don't have one set of kids here, another set of kids here, and another set of kids here. We believe in universal education so that every child has the ability to learn, to grow, and to develop. Yet even kids with disabilities have the ability to learn, to grow, and to develop. We have expanded the concept of public education time and time again to include more under that umbrella.

When I was a kid growing up and going to public schools, you would never see a kid in a wheelchair in school, or a kid on a respirator, or someone who had a mental disability in a school, or a kid with Down's syndrome, for example. But today it is commonplace. And I say we are a better country because of it.

When my daughter was in public grade school recently there were kids in school with disabilities right in the classroom. I used to visit her in the classroom. I thought it was good for the kids with disabilities, and it is good for the kids without disabilities. It brings people together. You won't find that in very many foreign countries. Why don't talk about that as a source of pride in this country, and what we do for all of our kids in this country? Listening to the speakers yesterday you would think we had the worst education system in the world; that it is just the pits. I beg to differ.

We have great teachers, we have great schools, and we have great kids. We have come a long way in this country in making sure that universal education is the right for all.

Does that mean we don't have problems? Of course, we have problems to fix. Just as we opened the doors with kids with disabilities and said that you can't keep kids out of school, you can't keep kids out of school because of race, you can't keep kids out of school because of sex.

Again, I hear these terrible stories about schools. I wonder where the people are coming from who I heard speak so much yesterday. What do they want? Do they want to privatize all of American education? Do they want to have a system of education as some foreign countries have where the brightest kids at an early age when they are tested get put into special schools, and maybe kids who don't have the intellectual capacity of others are put in technical schools? They just learn a trade, and that is all they do. Is that what people want around here? If so, why don't they have the guts to get up and say so if they want our education system to be like some foreign countries, where their national governments, not local school districts control education.

After listening to the debate yesterday, you come to the conclusion that the Federal Government is solely responsible for public education in this country, and it is the Federal Government that is solely responsible for the failure of our schools.

Let's set the record straight. Right now, of all of the money that goes to elementary and secondary education in America, only 6 percent comes from the Federal Government.

That 6 percent of the money that comes to the Federal Government has ruined all of the kids in America, has ruined our schools. Forget that a lot goes for Title I reading and math programs, forget a lot of the Federal help goes to IDEA, Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, and other programs such as that. For some reason, that small amount, 6 percent, has ruined our schools. That is an odd case to make for those arguing that the Federal Government is to blame for this.

Second, education is only 2.3 percent of the Federal budget. Out of every $1 the Federal Government spends, only 2.3 cents goes for education.

I make the opposite argument. I think it ought to be more than that. I think on a national level we need more of a national commitment to our public schools. Because our investment in public education is so small—only 6 cents out of every dollar—we have to be careful where it goes.

First, we ought to make sure every child is educated in modern public schools connected to the Internet. Schools that have the best technology.

Second, we must make sure every child has an up-to-date teacher who is an expert in the subjects he or she is teaching.

Third, we must make sure every child has a chance to learn and be heard. You cannot do that in overcrowded classrooms. We need to make our class sizes smaller.

Fourth, we have to make sure children have a safe place to go during the hours between the end of the school day and the time their parents come home from work.

People talk about safety in schools. We are all concerned about safety in schools. However, we need to keep our focus on where the problem is. Schools are one of the safest places for our children, most of the problems happen after they leave school in the afternoon, in the evening, and on weekends.

We all decry the tragedy at Columbine, and tragedies at other schools. Those incidents capture our attention; they cry out for some kind of involvement and some kind of a solution. But keep in mind that only 1 percent of the violence done to kids is in school. We need to make sure we have an after school program to help keep these kids safe and secure.

Fifth, we have to continue to expand our help to local school districts to help kids with special needs in special education and for Title I reading and math programs so that students can master the basics.

Finally, we must demand accountability for our investments.

I think this is a clear, comprehensive, and accountable national education agenda.

But the pending legislation before the Senate does not establish this clear agenda. In fact, the bill retreats on our national commitment to education. It does not answer the tough questions. It simply says we are going to throw it back to the States; we will not provide any kind of leadership on the national level.

Finally, as has been said before by Senator KENNEDY, Senator DASCHLE, and others, this is the first time this reauthorization is coming to the floor as a partisan bill. The first time since the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was passed in the 1960s that we have not had a bipartisan bill on the floor. It came out of committee on a straight party line vote.

This bill gets an A for partisanship, but it gets an F for educational progress. The centerpiece is the Straight A block grant. It sends the dollars back to the States for any educational purpose they see fit.

As was stated in the committee, one of our Senators, Mr. GREGG on the other side, admitted this could mean private school voucher programs if the State has such a program. In return for the blank check, the State has to show improvements in student achievement after 5 long years. It is a risky proposal and will not guarantee any improvements in education.

We heard a lot of talk yesterday about the burden of filling out all these forms that schools have to fill out to get Federal grants. First we are told the Federal grants are not any good. Then we are told it is too burdensome. Do they want to make it easier or cut it out? We don't know the answer to that.

I have a Federal Class-Size Reduction Program application from the Marion Independent School District in Marion, IA. This is for class-size reduction. It is one page, two pages, three pages. Three pages is burdensome? Anyone could fill this thing out in no time flat. To hear some people on the other side talk, one would think it necessary to sit down for a whole week and hire consultants to complete this paperwork.

This administration, under the leadership of President Clinton and Vice President GORE, in reinventing government, have simplified and clarified a lot of the processes. To hear some of my colleagues talk about it, you would think we were back 20 or 30 years ago under the Reagan administration, or even before that, when you did have to fill out volumes and volumes of material.

Here is the bill, S. 2. We hear the talk on the Republican side about all the mandates, local control, and the reporting requirements. Here is an amendment that takes up a page, section 4304: Disclaimer On Materials Produced, Procured Or Distributed From Funding Authorized By This Act.

All materials produced, procured, or distributed, in whole or in part, as a result of Federal funding authorized under this Act shall have printed thereon—

(1) the following statement: ''This material has been printed, procured or distributed, in whole or in part, at the expense of the Federal Government. Any person who objects to the accuracy of the material, to the completeness of the material, or to the representations made within the material, including objections related to this material's characterization or religious beliefs, are encouraged to direct their comments to the Office of the United States Secretary of Education;

(2) the complete address of an office designated by the Secretary to receive comments from members of the public.

And it goes on. Every 6 months they have to prepare a summary of all of this.

And the Republicans are talking about simplifying? This requirement will be burdensome.

I want to talk about one issue on which I will offer an amendment, providing authorization for the national effort to modernize and make emergency repairs to our Nation's public schools. The conditions of our schools are well known.

In 1998, the American Society of Civil Engineers—not a political group the last time I checked—did a report card on the Nation's physical infrastructure, covering roads, bridges, mass transit, water, dams, solid waste, hazardous waste, and schools. The only subject to receive an F in their quality in terms of our national infrastructure were our schools. That is from the American Society of Civil Engineers.

We know that 74 percent of our schools, three out of four schools, were built before 1970 and they are over 30 years old. The average age is about 42 years right now. I was on the floor when the Senator from Arkansas was discussing the school he visited. The ceiling was falling in, rain was coming in, insulation was peeling off. It looks dismal. He talked about how there was exercise equipment in the school. I don't know about the exercise equipment, but I do know about the infrastructure, and he is right. There are schools like that in Arkansas and Iowa and all across this country. Many of these schools are in low-income areas where they do not have a very large property tax base so they are unable to generate the revenue they need to fix up their schools. This is a national problem, and it requires a national effort and a national solution.

It is a national disgrace that the nicest things our kids see as they are growing up are shopping malls, movie theaters, and sports arenas and some of the most run down things they see are the public schools they attend. What kind of message are we sending to our kids about how much we believe in their public education?

In 1994, there was a title XII that was added to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in that reauthorization. I had been instrumental in that, both from the authorizing end and also from the appropriation end, because I have long believed this is a national problem. Just as our roads and our bridges, our dams, and our water systems are all constructed, built, and maintained locally, we still provide a national input into those facilities.

I then tried, on the Appropriations Committee, to get money for Title XII. I have not been all that successful, I

must admit. I did get a pilot program which is showing that a federal investment in school facilities can make a big difference. A modest federal investment can make school safer by bringing them up to state and local fire codes. A modest federal investment can spur new construction projects as well.

Here is that report card that says our schools rate F in infrastructure. We know there are some $268 billion needed to modernize school facilities all over America. We know our local property taxpayers are hard pressed in many areas to increase their property taxes to pay for this. So that is why we need a national effort.

But this bill, S. 2—I can hardly lift it, it weighs so much—S. 2, the reauthorization, strikes out title XII. We put it in, in 1994. I remember it was not objected to on the Republican side. It was not objected to on the Democratic side. It had broad support in committee. It had broad support in the Congress. Now, for some reason, 6 years later when we have not even taken the first baby step to help modernize our schools on a national basis, the Republicans have taken it out—just excised it. I offered an amendment in committee to restore this important program, and I lost on a straight party line vote.

In the next day or so, whenever I have the opportunity, I will be offering an amendment to restore title XII. My amendment will reauthorize $1.3 billion to make grants and zero interest loans to enable public schools to make the urgent repairs they need so public schools such as the one talked about by my friend from Arkansas could use that money to fix the leaking roof, repair the electrical wiring, fix fire code violations.

From my own State, the Iowa State Fire Marshal reported that fires in Iowa schools have increased fivefold over the past several years, from an average of 20 in the previous decades to over 100 in the 1990s. Why is that? It is because these old schools, 31 percent of them built before World War II, have bad wiring. After all these years, they are getting short-circuits. Maybe they have tried to air-condition; they got a bigger load factor, and they are getting more and more fires all the time in our public schools.

This is something you will not believe, but 25 percent, one out of every four public schools in New York City, are still heated by coal. One out of every four public schools in the city of New York is heated by coal. Talk about pre-World War II.

I think there is a clear national need to help our school districts improve the condition of their schools for the health, the safety, and the education of our children. I hope the Republicans will do what they did in 1994 and support it again, broadly based, so we can have a national effort to provide funds. The President put $1.3 billion in his budget that would go out under title XII. Yet the Republicans have taken title XII completely out of the bill. So I am hopeful in the next day or two we can put it back in and authorize this money.

Having said all that, is everything in this bill absolutely bad? Not by a long shot. There are some really good things in that bill, and I want to talk about one of those. Right now, children, especially little kids, are subject to unprecedented social stresses coming about from the fragmentation of families, drug and alcohol abuse, violence they see every day either in person in the home or on the streets or on television or in movies, child abuse, and of course grinding poverty.

In 1988, 12 years ago, the Des Moines, IA, Independent School District recognized the situation and they began a program of expanded counseling services in elementary schools. They called it ''Smoother Sailing,'' and it operates on the simple premise: Get the kids early to prevent problems rather than waiting for a crisis.

As a result, the Des Moines School District more than tripled the number of elementary school counselors to make sure there is at least one well-trained professional guidance counselor in every single elementary school building in the Des Moines School District. In some there is more than one, but no school is without one. It started in 10 elementary schools. Forty-two elementary schools now have this program. The ratio is 1 counselor for every 250 students, as recommended by experts. The national figure for counselors for students in elementary school is one counselor for every 1,000 students—1 counselor for every 1,000 kids. There is no way 1 counselor can get to 1,000 kids. In Des Moines, we went down to 1 for every 250.

It is working. It has been a great success. Assessments of fourth- and fifth-grade students show they are better at solving problems, and the teachers tell us there are fewer fights and there is less violence on the playgrounds. It has worked. Smoother Sailing was a model for the Elementary School Counseling Demonstration Program, and I am pleased the program is reauthorized in S. 2.

We are discussing the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and I am hopeful we can make some changes in S. 2 to reflect our national priorities. I just spoke about one. I also serve on the Appropriations Committee, and my question is: How are we going to fund it? Mr. President, the budget resolution we adopted cuts nondefense discretionary spending by $7 billion.

I am working with Senator SPECTER, chairman of the education appropriations subcommittee, to find the money and do more than talk about these problems. We are going to have a lot of debate on it. The President submitted a budget that I think makes a good start at funding these programs—title I, after school programs, class-size reduction, school modernization, school technology. All of these are vitally important. But where is the money when the budget resolution cut our nondefense discretionary spending by $7 billion?

We will have more debate about that in the future. I thought I might give a heads up to my fellow Senators and say, it is all fine to authorize this, but when the crunch comes on money, let's step up to the bar and vote because we may need 60 votes. There will probably be a point of order, and we will need 60 votes. We will see then if Senators really want to invest in public education in this country. It is one thing to authorize it, but then sometime later this year we are going to have to step up and vote the money to solve these problems.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I thank Senator HARKIN for his statement. I am going to build on a couple points he has made.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator JOHN KERRY—in the order that has already been established—follow Senator GORTON. I believe Senator GORTON is last on the list, and Senator KERRY wants to be included in that list of speakers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, I have a sequence of thoughts I want to put forward, and I will not do this, hopefully, in a haphazard way. I say to Senator HARKIN, since he talked about appropriations, I want to talk about my State of Minnesota and the need for investment in some of these crumbling schools. He is right on the mark. I hear about that all the time.

I also want to talk about a wonderful book by Mike Rose called ''Possible Lives'' based upon his experience in classrooms and all the goodness he sees.

I agree with the very first point Senator HARKIN made today about what is going on makes sense. But on the appropriations, the Senator from Iowa is right on the mark. Every breed of politician likes to have their picture taken with children. Everybody is for education. Everybody is for the children. Everybody is for the young. They are the future. But it has become symbolic politics.

Frankly, I hear a lot of concern about children and education, but the question is whether or not we will dig into our pockets and make some investment. The Senator from Iowa is right on the mark.

When I listen to some of my colleagues, I hear them talk about a couple different points. First, I hear them say this piece of legislation represents a step forward and Senator TED KENNEDY somehow represents the past. I thought we were going to have a bipartisan bill, but this piece of legislation before us represents a great step backward. This is not about a step forward;

this is a great step backward. This legislation turns the clock back several decades and basically says no longer do we, as a nation, say we have a commitment to making sure vulnerable children—namely, homeless children; namely, migrant children—will, in fact, get a good education, or that we at least enunciate that as a national goal. We retreat from that in this legislation.

With all due respect, there is a reason that we, as the Senate and House of Representatives—the Congress—said we are going to make sure there are some standards, we are going to make sure we live up to this commitment, and that is because, prior to targeting this money with some clear guidance, these children, the most vulnerable children, were left behind.

Second, my understanding is the National Governors' Association has said, when it comes to title I, they want to keep it targeted. This particular piece of legislation is so extreme that it even gets away from the targeting of title I money.

Third, to go to Senator HARKIN's point about appropriations, when I hear my colleagues on the other side talk about how we want change, we want to close the learning gap, we want to make sure poor children do as well, that children of color do as well, this piece of legislation is the agent of change, and we are for change, change, change, the question I ask is: If that is the case, then—I said this the other day—why don't we get serious about being a player in prekindergarten?

With all due respect, most of K–12 is at the State level. As a matter of fact, if we are going to say—Senator HARKIN made this point—that education is not doing well and they are going to present this indictment of teachers and our educational system, remember that about 93, 94 percent of the investment is at the State level.

With all due respect to some colleagues on the floor, when I hear some of the bashing, either explicit or implicit, of education and teachers, I say to myself that some of the harshest critics of public education could not last 1 hour in the classrooms they condemn.

If we are serious about this, then why don't we make a real investment in pre-K? It is pathetic what is in this budget when it comes to investing in children before kindergarten. The learning gap is wide by kindergarten, and then those children fall further behind. We could make such a difference. We could decentralize it and get it down to the community level, and we could make a real difference. But no, that is not in this bill or any piece of legislation from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle.

Senator HUTCHINSON, a friend—we disagree, but we like each other—talked about how the bill, S. 2, provides title I money for all the children in the country. I do not get that. I do not know how it can. Right now, we have an appropriation that provides funding for—what, I ask Senator HARKIN—about 30 percent of the children that will be available? Fifty percent? I do not see in the budget proposal or in any appropriations bills that are coming from the Republican majority a dramatic or significant increase in that investment at all.

If my colleagues want to present a critique of what is going on, let me just give you some figures from my friend Jonathan Kozol who just sent me the Chancellor's 60-day report on New York City Public Schools. It is pretty interesting. In New York City, they are able to spend per year, per pupil, on average, $8,171. Fishers Island is $24,000, rounding this up; Great Neck, $17,000; White Plains, $16,000; Roslyn, $16,000; and other communities, $20,000, $21,000.

Mr. HARKIN. Is that per student?

Mr. WELLSTONE. Per student, two times and three times the amount.

Here is another interesting figure. This is median teacher salaries. In the Democratic proposal—I will be honest about it, I cannot help it. I do not think the administration's proposal is great. I do not think we should be talking about their proposal when it comes to early childhood development. I would like to see much more in education. But I think with what we have heard on the floor, I say to Senator HARKIN, is that the investment in rebuilding our crumbling schools, the focus on lowering class size, the focus on having good teachers and making sure we put money into professional development basically is eliminated.

I hear some of my colleagues—I think the Senator from Alabama—talking about how poor we are performing in mathematics. The Eisenhower program, a great professional development program—teachers in Minnesota love this program—is eliminated.

This is pretty interesting. For New York City and in surrounding counties: The median teacher salary in New York City is $47,345; the median teacher salary in Nassau County is $66,000; in County, it is $67,000; in Westchester, it is $68,400.

Jonathan Kozol can send me these figures because he wrote the book ''Savage Inequalities.'' But with all due respect to my colleagues, if you are concerned about the learning gap, if you are concerned about the tremendous disparity in opportunities of students in our country—and all too often students are able to do well or not do well because of income or race—then we would want to make sure we live up to the opportunity-to-learn standard, where every child has an opportunity to learn and do well.

If that was the case, we would be talking about the whole problem of financing, which is based so much on the wealth of the school district; we would be talking about incentives for the best students, and incentives for executives and people in other areas of life who are in their 50s who want to go into teaching, all of whom can go into teaching; we would be talking about a massive investment, the equivalent of a national defense act, when it comes to child care; we would be talking about afterschool programs; we would be talking about investing in the crumbling infrastructure of our schools.

I do not see it in this piece of legislation. I said it yesterday, and I will say it one more time: I do not see it in the Ed-Flex bill.

I said it last time, and I will say it again, that when I am in Minnesota and I am in cafes and I am talking to people, nobody has ever come running up to me saying: I need Ed-Flex. They do not even know what it is. But they sure talk about the holes in the ceilings or the inadequate wiring or the schools that do not have heating. They talk about how terrible it is that kids go into those schools. It tells those kids that we do not care about them. They sure talk about all these other issues.

I will conclude in a moment, but this is for the sake of further debate.

Mr. HARKIN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WELLSTONE. I am pleased to.

Mr. HARKIN. The Senator pointed out the disparity in teacher salaries and the amount of money spent per student. It raises in my mind this question, again, of why that is. Why is it? I ask the Senator, where is it in the Constitution of the United States that public education in America is to be funded by property taxes? Why is this so? I asked a rhetorical question. Obviously it is not in the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I say to my colleague, we have had some important litigation that I know he is familiar with, some really important Supreme Court decisions in the past on this question.

The challenge is this. The 14th amendment talks about equal protection under the law. I think many of us believe that when the education a child receives is so dependent upon the wealth or lack of wealth of the community he or she lives in, that that isn't equal protection under the law because a good education is so important to be able to do well and to fully participate in the economic and political life of our country.

So the answer is, it is extremely unfortunate that we rely so much on the property tax system. If my colleagues want to present a critique of public education, they ought to look back to the States.

I say to my colleague from Iowa, I love being a Senator. I do not mean this in a bashing way. But Washington, DC and the Senate is the only place I have ever been where when people talk about grassroots, they say: Let's hear from the Governors. They say: The grassroots is here. The Governors' Association has just issued a statement.

Boy, I tell you, I don't hear that in Minnesota or in any other State I have

been in. People tend to view the grassroots as a little bit more down to the neighborhood, the community level.

Mr. HARKIN. I thank the Senator for bringing up these points again. We tend to get into these debates, and we really forget what is at essence here. What is at the essence of our problem is the big disparity, as Jonathan Kozol has pointed out time and time again, between those who happen to be born and live in a wealthy area and those who are born and live in a poor area.

Mr. WELLSTONE. That is right.

Mr. HARKIN. It should not depend on the roll of the dice of where you were born as to what kind of school you attend.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I say to my colleague, I thank him for mentioning Jonathan Kozol because I love him. I believe in him. The last book he wrote—although he has another book that is now coming out—that was published—and my colleague may very well have read it—is called ''Amazing Grace: Poor Children and the Conscience of America.''

If you read that book, the sum total of that book is that any country that loved and cared about children would never let children grow up under these conditions and never abandon these children in all the ways we have. I say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, there is precious little, if anything—precious little; I do not want to overstate the case—in S. 2 that speaks to that question.

When you get to where the rubber meets the road, and the budget proposal we have and, therefore, the appropriations bills we will have, are we going to see any of the kind of investment that deals with any of these conditions which are so important in assuring that all the children in this country have a chance to succeed? The answer is no. The answer is no, no, no.

I will finish up because I see my colleague from New Mexico is on the floor. I know others want to speak.

Two final, very quick points. One, I want to speak to Senator HUTCHINSON's example. Again, he is not here. He is very good at making his arguments. I know he will have a counterpoint, so I am not going to present this as: You are wrong; you were inaccurate. But Senator HUTCHINSON came out with graphics about gym facilities, workout equipment. It looked like a Cybex system. He was basically saying: Here you have, in a school that has a decaying infrastructure, this beautiful workout facility; this is an outrage because basically this is what we have right now with this Federal bureaucracy which dictates, hey, this is where you can get the money.

I say that I know of no Federal grant program that requires any school to purchase exercise equipment. I do not know whether this was a part of an afterschool program or part of another program in which perhaps the school officials decided this is what they needed for the community. But that is a very different point.

But I want to make it clear—and Senator HUTCHINSON may be able to add to the RECORD and make it perfectly clear that what I have said is not perfectly clear—I do not have any knowledge —I wanted to ask him about this—of any Federal grant program that would require a school to purchase this equipment. I think that is important.

Finally, I have heard my colleagues talk about bureaucracy and all of the rest. I find it interesting that when I look at the opposition, and I see the National Association of Elementary School Principals or the National Association of Secondary School Principals, much less the American Federation of Teachers, the National Education Association, the Council of the Great City Schools—these people do not work at the Federal level; these people are down there in the trenches—the National Association of Secondary School Principals or the National Association of Elementary School Principals—we are talking about men and women who have a great deal of knowledge about what is working and what isn't working. I think that we might want to take heed of their opposition to this bill because we are not talking about bureaucrats; we are talking about teachers, about principals. I don't know where the PTA is. I think they are also in opposition.

So for the record, I will concede—and Senator DOMENICI is great in debate, and he will jump up and debate me—that the National PTA—and he says I am right—doesn't represent all the parents, and I concede that the teachers unions don't represent all the teachers, and I concede the Association of Secondary School Principals, or Elementary School Principals, don't represent all the principals at either level; but you have to admit that these people, these organizations, do represent a considerable number of principals. They do represent a lot of teachers. They do represent a lot of people who work there at the school level. I find it interesting that they oppose this bill. They don't see this bill as a great step forward for education or for the children they represent.

So for my colleague from New Mexico, after 30 seconds I will yield the floor. In that 30 seconds, I say to the majority leader, let's have at it. Let's have the amendments out here and let's have a good debate. Let's not fold after 2 or 3 days. This is a major bill. I remember, when I first came here, we had major bills out on the floor and we took 2 weeks, and we might have 60, 70, or 80 amendments. We worked from the morning until the evening. Let's do it.

I have a number of amendments that I think would make a difference for the children in my State and in other States. Other Senators have amendments. But, for gosh sakes, let's allow the Senate to be at its best and not insist that we have only a few amendments and that will be it, and then we basically shut this down. The people in the country want us to have the debate. I think it is important to do so. People also want to see some good legislation. This bill, in its present form, is not good legislation, in my view. I think it is fundamentally flawed. I don't think it represents anywhere close to the best of what we can do as a Senate.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWNBACK). The Senator from New Mexico is recognized.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, before the Senator leaves the floor, I will say this on a subject we will be together on. I understand that the parity for insurance purposes for the mentally ill in America bill—the Domenici-Wellstone bill for total parity—not some piece of parity, no discrimination of outreach, we are going to have a hearing soon, right?

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, we are going to have a hearing before the health committee. I think we both thank Senator JEFFORDS and we are ready to move it forward. It is great to have a chance to work with the Senator on this. I wish he wasn't wrong on every other issue.

Mr. DOMENICI. Some people will recognize that, even according to WELLSTONE, DOMENICI is right sometimes. I thank the Senator very much.

I wish to take a few minutes to speak now because I am not at all sure that tomorrow, or even the next day, I could speak to this issue, so I am going to do it tonight. I want to start by saying that it is really good for Americans—whoever watches C–SPAN, or whoever pays attention to what we are saying on the floor—to hear speeches about how we are going to improve education for every child in America, or even to hear speeches about the Federal Government needing to do more of what it has been doing, or speeches saying if we just paid attention and took care of things, all these children in America the education system would improve.

Let's be realistic, for starters. We don't pay for much of public education. Now, considering the tone of the arguments about what we ought to be doing for education and for all our children, one would never believe that we only pay for about 7 to 8 percent of what it costs to educate a child in the public schools of Pennsylvania, Minnesota, Iowa—I won't say New Mexico because we get about 9 percent, because we have a lot more children who are dependent upon the Federal Government in terms of military establishments, plus our Indian children. But let's make sure everybody knows that this great national debate on education is talking about 7 percent of what is used to fund the public schools of America in the 50 sovereign States.

Let's make sure we understand fundamentally the States—in some places counties, in other places cities—collect local taxes, in some cases property taxes, in other cases sales taxes, in other cases income taxes—not here in

Washington, but in the capital of Santa Fe, NM, or in the great State of Pennsylvania, or the State of Oregon or Washington—they collect the money, they have the programs, and they decide between the State, the legislature, the school districts, and in many places, commissioners of education, what to do with all the real money that is applied to the public education system and, thus, the students of America.

So it may shock some to know that education reform is occurring in the State capitals, at the education departments across America, and our debate is about a little, tiny margin of 7 to 8 or 8½ percent of what goes into each student. We are doing this in the context of trying to improve and help our public schools, because we have been greatly enhanced, as a nation, during past generations, when the public education system of America was the model for the world. What many of us are trying to do is take it back to the glory days when every student received a better education and the manifold problems that teachers experienced in the classrooms today were, in some way, alleviated so more of our children can learn.

In doing that, the issue is, for this little share that the Federal Government sends down to our school districts by way of special grants, hundreds of categorical programs, title I programs, which is $8 billion or $9 billion, all of those programs go down and help in some way in the total mix of dollars and programs that the cities and counties and States and commissioners of education put together.

The question is, Can we do better with our small amount of money than we have been doing? Let me assure the Senators that whichever side they are on on this bill, to reform the education system, which is reported out by our Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions, that this is one of their education functions—this bill, in essence—and it may shock people to know this—provides an opportunity to leave things just as they are. So for those on that side of the aisle, or perhaps one or two on our side of the aisle—I don't know—that say they want the Federal Government to continue to be involved in all these programs and to be telling everybody how to run them, so that 7 or 8 percent of the money generates 50 percent of the paperwork, we want that to continue. Just wait and read the bill in its entirety and if that is what you like, the school boards, the commissioners of education, or the Governors who run education in our States can decide to leave it just as it is.

Now, I can't understand how schoolteachers can be against an approach that says this is not working as well as it should. But if you like it, please understand this bill says you can keep having it like it is. That is why we call it a menu.

You get to look at a menu. If you went out to eat, you wouldn't like to have in front of you three items we have been having for 15 years. And our nutrition isn't working well, and our bodies aren't feeling well, but we get the same restaurant menu of the same three things. Wouldn't we like it if the menu added a few other things just to try?

This is a new approach only in that you can keep it as it is or you have another couple of choices.

What is wrong with some choice which might bring some innovation, which might cause us to do better with our 7 or 8 percent of education than we are doing, because it might let the States, the school districts, the education commissioners, and the principals meld our dollars into their needs in a better way.

If you want to keep it as it is, you can come down here and say: That is what I want; I am voting for this bill; and I sure hope my State keeps it as it is. Right? We sure hope whoever wants to say that, that we will keep the same menu we have been having, and we don't want to add to the menu, we don't want to add to the choice.

It is wonderful to be a Republican who can come to the floor and say: We don't think the menu we have been delivering to the schools of America with our 8 percent is a very good menu. It is not the best menu, and we are going to provide some additional items of choice.

I want to thank a few Senators for taking the early lead on this.

In that regard, I want to recognize Senator SLADE GORTON because he is the first one who came up with the idea, albeit it was a piece of education, to say let them choose down there, but if they don't want to choose, let them keep on doing what they are doing, but here is a new opportunity to handle those Federal dollars differently.

That imaginary, innovative, visionary idea has been expanded so now there are a number of really interesting choices that those who educate our children in our sovereign States can choose.

Essentially, if I went no further and did not explain the choices on this menu, I think I might have performed a minor service for those who are interested to find out that the bill we are talking about says the old menu doesn't work, let's try a new menu and put some new items on it—not mandatory, but that you can choose.

Let me tell you how poorly we do our job at the national level when we decide we are going to do more than that and we are going to put a little bit of money in and tell everybody what to do. Let me talk about special education for a minute.

Special education is an admirable commitment—in fact, some would think one of the greatest civil commitments that could be made in the field of education. The National Government began not many years ago to say you are going to educate children who are hard to educate, who are special education children, and special needs children. And we came along and said exactly how you should do it; if you want our money, you do it this way. The courts interpreted and told you in even more detail how you are going to do it. Lo and behold, we said we will pay for 40 percent and the States and localities will pay for 60 percent.

Is anyone interested tonight? Take out a piece of paper and write down your guess of this year as to how much we are paying of the 40 percent. If you think we must be paying 35 or 38, you are desperately wrong. We are currently paying 11 percent instead of the 40 percent to which we committed, and the years have passed us by.

If you run the school and you get Federal money, don't you think you would be a little bit upset if we came along and told you how to do it, and then we didn't give you the money but our law said we would give you the money?

I have to compliment a couple of Senators who have said the best thing we could do is put more money in special education so the schools wouldn't be paying so much for it, and that would loosen up money for them to do other things with. In particular, Senator JUDD GREGG has been a leader on that initiative.

It goes unnoticed because it is not very politically sexy, at least to the general public, to say we have increased the funding for special education by 4 or 5 percent in the last 3 or 4 years. That doesn't sound like coming to the floor and giving a speech about how we want to take care of every child in America, when we are only paying for 8 percent of the bill, and how we ought to be taking care of all those needs out there when the Government doesn't even try to take care of most of them.

We still have a commitment to 40 percent. We are only paying for 11 percent of that. We come along and have a bill, and people want more of the same. I think educators would like to try something different.

I congratulate the committee because they reported out a bill that has some very exciting items added to the menu. I suggest people can call it what they like in terms of trying to describe the new items on the menu. But I see it as an opportunity on the part of the constitutionally enfranchised leader in a State, whether it is a commissioner of education, or the legislature, or the Governor. This bill says you can collapse the strings, you can collapse the rigid boundaries in two different ways—at least two. One is an approach that is called Straight A's.

The Straight A's Program says there is an option for 15 States—not all of them, and they don't need to take it. But 15 States can opt for a State demonstration program. It will be for at least a 5-year commitment on the part of the Federal Government and up to—isn't that interesting?—13 big grant programs and little grant programs can be collapsed.

The thing that makes them rigid and makes them kind of a one-shoe-fits-all concept on education is that up to 13 can be collapsed. They can collapse five of them, if they choose, and leave the other eight as being as rigid as they currently are.

In that ability to collapse under Straight A's is an option to use title I money—our biggest program—in that manner along with other programs.

That is not going to be free to the school districts of America, nor to the principals and teachers, because commensurate with it is going to be an agreement on the part of the States. The States are going to agree, if they take this option, this added menu item, to a significant new standard of student achievement within their schools.

They are going to figure out a way locally to see if collapsing these programs and administering them differently helps the schools. We are going to say you can continue to do this if you have a plan to improve student achievement, which we choose to call accountability.

We also talk about the collapsing of the rigidity of the program—the rigid boundaries. We call that flexibility.

I think it is kind of better to say you are permitted to collapse the programs, administer them less rigidly, and require student achievement, and in return measure student achievement. But if you want to choose the Straight A's Program, my guess is that 15 States are going to run quickly to get it and it will be used by 15 States. In the end, they are going to be saying: Let's try this new thing. Let's see if we can collapse these programs and do a better job. The agreement with the Government will require that achievement occur at every level, including those covered by the current Title I program.

We have said if you do not want that menu item, because it is a pretty big step away from what we have, there is another one called Performance Partnerships which the Government permitted. You can collapse up to 13 programs, but that cannot include Title I, the program whereby we measure aid to schools based upon the number of poor children in the school.

What we are saying there is the Secretary of Education will still be able to determine the boundary and use of Title I money. That is a second option—collapsing up to 13. But the Secretary still keeps his finger on the Title I money. The Governors thought that would be a very good option, and we put that in. I don't see anything wrong with that.

Then we say for 10 States and 20 school districts, in exchange for new accountability, new agreements on student achievement, you can switch the current Title I funding from school based to a child-centered approach. Isn't that interesting? We are not interested in school-based education programs. That is just a mechanism for talking about an institution that educates children.

It seems to me what we are talking about is that all the programs should be child centered and we are going to give 10 States and 20 school districts the option to choose a new funding mechanism for Title I. Eight billion dollars is my recollection of the $14.6 billion we spend on elementary and secondary education. It is more than half. We are going to say for these few States and few school districts, you want to be bold? Want to enter into a student achievement agreement? In exchange for that, you get the opportunity to have Title I money follow the students.

I close by saying that the committee did another exciting thing. We are all concerned about improving teacher quality. Whether we have excellent teachers or not, I don't think we ought to pass judgment on the floor. We hear many of the schools are worried that teachers are not necessarily as highly qualified as the principals, the superintendents, the school boards, and the parents want them to be. We understand that is a major, major concern. We think part of it is because we don't have an adequate way of helping develop better teachers.

We have decided to have a new State teacher development grant program, with a substantially larger amount of money, about $2 billion for fiscal year 2001, that focuses on the long term and sustained development of teachers, and includes professional development for administrators and principals. There will be some who will come to the floor and say right now that we don't have all this in one pot of money. We have some very special programs—one is the Eisenhower program—that we want to leave alone. Why do we want to leave them alone? Shouldn't we give the States an option to say they don't need all that preciseness, if they want to use it in their school districts in their State to produce long-term benefits by way of teachers being better equipped to teach their subject matter?

There is much more to say and I will have printed the 13 programs that can be collapsed and made less than 13 in either the Straight A's or the performance partnership. I will include that list in the RECORD to be attached to my comments. Some of the attached lists are technical, but those in the education community who would be interested will know what the programs are.

Let me summarize. For those on the other side of the aisle who want to talk about education as if we are debating the funding of public schools in America, let's put it back where it belongs. We are debating funding 7 to 8 percent of the public education in America. That is all we provide. One would not guess it from the rhetoric about what we ought to get done with that 7 or 8 percent.

We will hear speeches that we ought to totally perfect the education system and take care of every child in America. What is the responsibility for the 93 percent of the dollars that come from the State or the county? They are doing that with that money.

First, we will say, if you want to keep the system, keep it. It is almost hard to understand how the other side and the President can get so worked up they won't pass this bill. Really, they could say to their constituents, we are so sure our programs of the past are good, we will vote for this bill and you can choose to go with a program of the past. The bill says that. If you want a program from the past, you can have it.

That is the debate. They want the programs of the past reiterated but we say, no, no, let's give you that choice and give you a few other new choices. The choices are exciting because we may find by entering into a multiyear student achievement agreement called accountability, where some flexibility is provided, that 7 or 8 percent might make a difference. It might be such that at the end of 5 years, using it that way by choice, you might really have an impact.

If we continue the way we are, we will produce a bill, or no bill, if the President insists on getting what he wants. I have not argued 1 second today about who will put the money in the program. We are probably going to put as much money in the program as the Democrats in the appropriations process. We will fund at very close to the same amount of dollars. Let's not get off on the side that the Republicans don't want to pay for education. We want to try a different approach.

There are some who will say to be different we want to offer a whole bunch of amendments for the Federal Government to do new things. We will tell them how to do things. We have been doing that and every 5 years we have another list, but it is the Federal Government's list of how to fix up our kids. However, if you look back, it isn't working. It is not the Federal dollar that is not working. We are just a little bit of the money. We ought to try to figure out how our little bit of the money can be the most helpful to those spending all the money—93 percent of the dollar in some cases. How can we help them do a better job? I think it is a shame if this bill and this concept gets defeated in the Senate because we don't want to try a new approach, or if we want to add to it a variety of measures not relevant to this education bill.

These are issues that must be debated. Some Members want to put them on this bill to either kill it or make us vote on issues not part of this. Whoever does that, the final judgment will be simple. If you kill this bill with this innovative approach of different items on the menu for our schools in America's sovereign States, if you kill that either by nonperformance or an outright vote against it and kill it, you have decided the Federal Government in all cases knows best and we ought to continue to tell our educators, superintendents, and commissioners of education precisely how they can help

their children with our dollars. No more, no less; do it our way.

I frankly believe, although I hate to say this in political tones, I think for the first time, in the case of this Senator—and I have been here awhile—we can debate this any way we want. We won't lose this debate. We win this, unless we let somebody pull the wool over our eyes about what we are trying to do, what we have been doing and just how much of the Federal money is involved versus the State and cities that we don't control— States, counties and school boards. I think everybody will understand we ought to permit innovation, not rigidity by dictating specifically how moneys ought to be used.

That is a little lengthy for tonight. Some people know it is not so lengthy for me. But it is the second speech I made today. I spoke about nuclear power with as much energy and enthusiasm as I did on this bill.

I am saying, as I leave the floor of the Senate, there are some very good Senators who will take over and I am satisfied will close out the day with some pretty good remarks about where we ought to be trying to move in lockstep with those who really want to change education at the local level, instead of walking along, kicking at them, telling them do it our way. I think we ought to walk along in some sort of lockstep by letting them have some real choice.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from the great State of Georgia.

Mr. COVERDELL. I hope the Senator from New Mexico knows we do not consider that a terribly long speech.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent the first four amendments in order to the bill be the following, and that they be first-degree amendments, offered in alternating fashion, and subject to second-degree perfecting amendments only, and that the second-degree amendments be relevant to the first-degree.

The amendments are as follows: Gorton, technical, Straight A's; Daschle, alternative; Abraham-Mack, merit pay-teacher testing; and Kennedy, teacher quality.

Both sides have agreed to this.

Mr. DOMENICI. What was the Kennedy amendment? I didn't hear the title.

Mr. COVERDELL. Teacher quality.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from the State of Washington.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, if there were a secret poll taken in this body to determine an MVP, Most Valuable Player, my own suspicion is that would be the Senator to whom my own vote would go, the senior Senator from New Mexico, who has just spoken to us with such eloquence. He manages to work thoughtfully on the widest range of issues of any Member of this body that I know. The minute the debate on the budget resolution, with which he is charged, is over, he is on to another subject, whether it is energy or national defense or education or Social Security. It is a privilege to be his colleague. It is a privilege to be his friend. It is also a little bit difficult at times because after his introduction to this bill, this Senator, even as an author of the bill, can do nothing to improve on the remarks of the Senator from New Mexico but maybe only to rephrase them slightly and offer his support for them.

I think what we gain from this debate, from what the Senator from New Mexico has said, what we heard from the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from New Hampshire and others, is that there may not have been another instance in the last half dozen years on any major subject—perhaps the Senator from New Mexico might agree with me, with perhaps the exception of the debate on welfare reform—in which the old and the new were so magnificently and so dramatically contrasted as are the new, fresh ideas, fresh approaches to this problem outlined in this bill and outlined by its supporters as opposed to the passionate defense of the status quo by so many on the other side.

The Senator presiding and the Senator from New Mexico will remember that was the essential division in the debate over welfare reform. We were told of all of the disasters that would take place if we dramatically reformed our welfare system. Now, a few years later, no one, for all practical purposes, can remember that he or she opposed that reform; it has been so magnificently successful.

Mr. President, I predict the same fate for this debate if, in fact, we are successful in carrying out the dramatic and innovative and constructive changes that are included in this bill.

We have heard basically two arguments from the other side of the aisle.

Mr. DOMENICI. Will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. GORTON. I will.

Mr. DOMENICI. As I indicated a while ago, I was planning to leave the floor. But my friend caught my attention when he, it seemed to me, wanted me to stay around. I have been around long enough to hear his kind remarks about me, and I thank him. Before I make a speech as I did tonight, I do try to understand what I am talking about. Sometimes I go back to my office after hearing something down here, or watching it, and say, I'll wait a week and really know something about this. But I think I do know something about this.

I was a teacher once. I can tell you things have changed very little. You talk about the disparity in the preparation of children. The one year I taught I had one class in mathematics. One half of the class could not add or subtract, and the other half of the class was doing algebra. This was a long time ago. I was 22 years old, so that is how long ago. Sunday I will be 68. We still have the same thing. We have a difficult job for teachers.

I think the Senator is correct. He is the one who offered the first bill to provide some choice instead of rigid, bound-up programs where, instead of walking together, we were kicking them to do it our way or not use our money. You were the starter, the charger of that, along with Senator BILL FRIST of Tennessee. A little bit of that expertise came about by accident out of the Budget Committee, on which you both serve. We had a task force, the Senator may recall. We asked the GAO—a very significant number of them worked with your staff and his staff on the Budget Committee and told you about the programs that were out there hanging around, but they wondered what they were doing. You provide the first opportunity to pull some together and collapse the rigidity. Right?

Mr. GORTON. Does the Senator from New Mexico remember the dramatic testimony that our Budget Committee task force took of the then-superintendant of public schools for Florida?

Mr. DOMENICI. Yes.

Mr. GORTON. To the effect that he had almost four times as many people in his office to manage the 8 or 10 percent of the money that came in from the Federal Government than he did to manage the 90 percent-plus of the money that came from the State government for education?

Mr. DOMENICI. Yes. That is right.

Mr. GORTON. That was a dramatic learning experience for this Senator and I think for the Senator from New Mexico as well, and really contributed magnificently to where we are today.

Mr. DOMENICI. I can also remember when you first thought about this idea. We were walking down one of the halls here and you were saying you didn't quite understand how you could get around all the opposition to trying something different. I think I pulled on your arm and said, ''Why don't you give them the option to leave it like it is?''

You are pretty quick. You never asked me again. But that has become the cornerstone, from your bill to this bill. For those who think what we are doing is really good and really right, that we are not trying to take it away. Right? Those people who say that is not enough, what must they be saying?

Mr. GORTON. They are saying, essentially—and we have heard it on the floor of the Senate in the last hour—that we cannot trust the school authorities in any State in the United States of America, or any school district in any one of those States, to make these decisions on their own without guidance from this body acting as a sort of supernational school board.

Mr. DOMENICI. Right.

Mr. GORTON. When it gets right down to it, that is what their position amounts to.

Mr. DOMENICI. Or they could be saying that if you give them the choice,

they will all take what the Republicans are offering here today.

Frankly, that is thought by some to be a very good argument against the bill, right? I think it is a very good argument in favor of it, I would think, if what we are doing is so good that under all circumstances a significant portion of the school districts and superintendents and commissioners of education would go down the same path for another 5 years.

Mr. GORTON. This Senator, for example, believes that if there is a shortcoming in this bill, it is that Straight A's is limited to 15 States only and not all the States in the country.

Mr. DOMENICI. I thank the Senator.

Mr. GORTON. I thank my friend from New Mexico. I will go back to what I see as two distinct currents of criticism from the other side.

The first of those is that if we have not reached the goals they set 35 years ago, 30 years ago, 20 years ago, 10 years ago, 5 years ago, we still have to keep running up against that same wall, and the reason we have not succeeded is that we have not imposed enough rules and regulations on schools all across the United States. So what we really need to do—they call it accountability—is to impose more rules and regulations on States and on school districts and on principals and teachers all across the United States to make sure they do exactly what we tell them to do.

I strongly suspect that any alternative they come up with will include dozens, if not hundreds, of additional rules and regulations to be imposed on our school districts.

There is a second element, a second part of their proposal, and that is if 12, 16, 74, 276 Federal education programs have not really done what they ought to have done, we need another half dozen programs. Again, in the last hour or so, we have heard of some new ways, some new Federal programs which we ought to authorize and on which we ought to spend money.

They make that proposition in spite of the dramatic point made by my friend from New Mexico that the most prescriptive of all of the Federal programs—the education for disabled act, the special education provisions—required us as long as almost 30 years ago to come up with 40 percent of the money. It is only in the last couple of years, with the efforts of Members on this side of the aisle, that it has cracked two digits and has reached 11 percent.

Instead of saying why don't we properly fund what we promised to fund in programs that carry with it a tremendous number of rules and regulations, why don't we do that? No, no, let's think of half a dozen new programs and let's not abolish any.

Now that I think of that last statement, I guess I have to amend it. They do want to abolish one, or at least the President wants to abolish one. He wants us to appropriate no money at all to the sole program in the present education bill which allows the States to spend the money on their own priorities without any controls from the Federal Government. It is a very modest part of our present education system—a very modest part. That is the only one the administration, and I suspect the other side, would just as soon abandon.

We, on the other hand, as the Senator from New Mexico points out, do not even go so far as to say we know everything, nothing is right with the present system, no one should be allowed to use it under any circumstances. Running from top to bottom through the proposal we have before this body right now is the right of any State's educational authorities who believe the present system is the best we can come up with to continue to follow it, to continue to use it, to continue to file all of the forms and abide by all of the rules and regulations of the present system.

All we are saying, modestly in some respects but I think quite dramatically in other respects, is that you are going to have a choice, education commissioners of the 50 States and, in many cases, the school districts of the several States; you can try a dramatic new system called Straight A's, or 15 of you—and I am very sorry it is only 15—can try a dramatic new program called Straight A's under which a dozen or a baker's dozen of the present education programs can be collapsed into a single program, rules and regulations thrown out, forms tossed, administrators turned into teachers, as long as you make a legal commitment to one single goal: The kids in your State will get a better education and you will prove it by achievement tests that you design and that you agree will show that improvement over a period of 3 to 5 years.

Accountability under the present system means you have filled out all the forms correctly, you have made absolutely certain that you have not spent a dollar that we have said ought to be spent on one purpose for another education purpose or for another student, no matter how well, how validly you have spent that dollar.

Accountability under our system means our kids are better educated, they are better fitted to deal with the world in the 21st century.

In describing that choice under Straight A's, my friend from New Mexico omitted only one element, but it is an important element. That element is that as against the form of accountability the other side wishes, punishment—you are going to lose your money; you are going to lose your ability to make your own choices; you are going to be fined; or you are going to get a bad audit—we offer a carrot. We say that if after 35 years in which we have failed to close the gap between underprivileged students who are entitled to title I support and the other more privileged students, if you close that gap by raising the achievement of the underprivileged students, you will get more money; you will get a reward; you will get a bonus.

They never thought of that in connection with the present program. We do. We do have to supply some discipline, some loss of ability to make your own choices for States that are miserable failures, but we think it every bit as important, perhaps more important, to provide a reward for those systems that do the job right.

I must confess that I have a reservation about our own proposal in this connection. We are demanding a great deal because we are demanding that States, in order to get Straight A's, agree to a contract under which the performance of their students will improve, and they sign that contract in order to get control over 5 or 6 or 7 percent of the money they are going to spend on their students, the really modest contribution made by the Federal Government.

I would feel a lot more comfortable in the form of accountability we have designed ourselves if the demands we make were more directly proportional to the amount of money we are putting into the system. Even so, I believe there are a minimum of 15 States that will jump at this opportunity to get the Federal bureaucrats off their backs and to say, as we are saying here: Let the decision about what is best for the education of our students be made, by and large, by the people who know their names—the parents, teachers, and principals, and above them, their superintendents and their elected school board members. Let's no longer claim that we in Congress, that people downtown in the Department of Education know all of the answers, and that one set of answers fits every school district, no matter how rural or how urban, no matter west or east or north or south in the United States of America.

This bill goes beyond just Straight A's for 15 States. It has, as the Senator from New Mexico described, performance partnership agreements, a modified form of Straight A's, a form that still retains some of the rules and regulations, more than I would like, but also provides a far greater degree of choice and policy-setting authority to our local school boards and to our States and does have two great advantages: One, it is strongly supported by the Governors—Republicans and Democrats—and, two, it is applicable to all of the States.

So, even at that level, some States will get three choices, and all will get two: Straight A's, performance partnership agreements, or the present system.

Beyond that, our proposal includes the Teacher Empowerment Act, which gives much more flexibility to the way in which we compensate our teachers, train our teachers, and determine what the requirements for those teachers are, and a very real degree of choice

with respect to title I, especially for failing schools, where instead of saying that title I is focused on schools and on systems, we will say, again, for those States and for those communities that wish to do so, title I will be focused on the individual students who are eligible, the underprivileged students who are eligible, so that they, and not the systems and not particular schools, will be the goals of title I.

Has the present title I been so successful that it cannot stand a change, even a change that offers an option to States and to individual school districts? That is what we hear from the other side of the aisle, that it would be terrible. We have 35-year-old reports cited concerning things that happened two generations ago as an argument against any kind of innovation today and as an argument for maintaining a system that, bluntly, has not worked, that has not worked at all.

At its most fundamental level, this is a debate about who knows best and who cares most: Members of this body and people working in the bowels of the Department of Education in Washington, DC, or those men and women all across the United States of America who are concerned about the future of their children, those men and women all across the United States of America who have dedicated their entire professional lives to providing that education for our children—their teachers and their principals and their superintendents—and those men and women across America who, in almost every case without compensation, have entered the political arena and have run for and have been elected to school boards in their various communities.

Our opponents of this bill say that none of these people should be trusted; only we should be trusted. We say we want to repose far more trust and confidence in those individuals all across the United States of America, we want to hold them accountable, but we want to hold them accountable on the basis of their results, and their results only.

That is what the debate will be about for the balance of this week and perhaps next week, as well.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a period for the transaction of morning business with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TRIBUTE TO MING CHEN HSU

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to a great American, Ming Chen Hsu. Last December, Ms. Hsu retired from the Federal Maritime Commission (FMC), where she served as a Commissioner for nine and one-half years. Ms. Hsu was first appointed to the Commission by President George Bush and confirmed by the Senate in 1990. She was reappointed and reconfirmed in October, 1991.

Many of my colleagues may not realize it, but the ocean shipping system is vital to international trade and is the underpinning for the international trade on which the vitality of our Nation's economy depends. A fair and open maritime transportation system creates business opportunities for U.S. shipping companies and provides more favorable transportation conditions for U.S. imports and exports. Ensuring a fair, open, competitive and efficient ocean transportation system is the mission of the FMC. The Commission has a number of important responsibilities under the shipping laws of the United States, including: the responsibility to ensure just and reasonable practices by the ocean common carriers, marine terminal operators, conferences, ports and ocean transportation intermediaries operating in the U.S. foreign commerce; monitor and address the laws and practices of foreign governments which could have a discriminatory or adverse impact on shipping conditions in the U.S. trades; and enforce special regulatory requirements applicable to carriers owned or controlled by foreign governments.

Mr. President, for almost a decade, Ms. Hsu played an active and important role in the life and decisions of the Commission. The Commission and the Nation have been fortunate in her service. During her tenure, Ms. Hsu's experience and judgment helped guide the Commission through a number of challenges and actions which will continue to shape the work of the Commission long after her retirement.

In 1998, the Congress passed and the President signed the Ocean Shipping Reform Act (OSRA), which amended the Shipping Act of 1984, the primary shipping statute administered by the FMC. As I have said before, the OSRA signaled a paradigm shift in the conduct of the ocean liner business and its regulation by the FMC. Where ocean carrier pricing and service options were diluted by the conference system and ''me too'' requirements, an unprecedented degree of flexibility and choice will result. Where agency oversight once focused on using rigid systems of tariff and contract filing to scrutinize individual transactions, the ''big picture'' of ensuring the existence of competitive liner service by a healthy ocean carrier industry to facilitate fair and open commerce among our trading partners will become the oversight priority. This week marks the one-year anniversary of the implementation of the Ocean Shipping Reform Act of 1998. It is most fitting that we take the time to remember the career of Ming Chen Hsu this week.

Mr. President, Ms. Hsu clearly recognized the important change in the business and regulation by the FMC of ocean shipping brought about by the Ocean Shipping Reform Act. During the Commission's consideration of regulations to implement OSRA, Ms. Hsu played a critical role in working with the other Commissioners and FMC staff to ensure that the regulations embodied the spirit of the new law. As she told a large gathering of shippers and industry representatives, ''This has been not only a long journey, but a long needed journey * * * With the passage of the Ocean Shipping Reform Act and the FMC's new regulations, I believe the maritime industry will be far less shackled by burdensome and needless regulations * * * I believe we can now look forward to an environment which gives you the freedom and flexibility to develop innovative solutions to your ever-changing ocean transportation needs.''

Ms. Hsu's wisdom and experience was also instrumental in helping the Commission navigate one the Commission's most difficult and highly-publicized actions in recent years. In 1998, the Commission took action against a series of restrictive port conditions in Japan. As a result of these conditions, both U.S. carriers and U.S. trade were burdened with unreasonably high costs and inefficiencies. Because of the Commission's action, steps were taken by Japan to initiate improvements to its port system. If ultimately realized, these improvements will substantially facilitate and benefit the ocean trade of both nations.

Mr. President, during her career at the Commission, Ms. Hsu led a number of Commission initiatives. Among others, in 1992 Ms. Hsu served at the request of then FMC Chairman Christopher Koch as Investigative Officer for the Commission's Fact Finding 20. Under her leadership, the Fact Finding held numerous hearings across the United States in an effort to examine and understand the experience of shippers associations and transportation intermediaries under the Shipping Act of 1984. Fact Finding 20 ultimately led to Commission efforts to ensure that shippers associations and transportation intermediaries received all of the benefits intended by Congress in enacting the 1984 Act.

Commissioner Hsu's service at the Federal Maritime Commission is just the most recent milestone in a remarkable life and career. A naturalized U.S. citizen, Ming Chen Hsu came as a student to the United States from her native Beijing, China. Prior to coming to the Commission, Ms. Hsu has had an extensive career in international trade and commerce in both the public and private sectors. She was a Vice President for International Trade for the RCA Corporation in New York, where she held a variety of executive positions in the areas of international marketing and planning. She played a pivotal role in gaining market access for RCA in China in the 1970's. She was appointed by former Governor Thomas H. Kean of New Jersey as Special Trade Representative and as Director of the State's Division of International Trade, a position she held from 1982 to 1990. In her positions with RCA and the

state of New Jersey, Ms. Hsu led over thirty trade missions to countries throughout the world.

Mr. President, Ms. Hsu has served on several U.S. Federal advisory committees, having been appointed by the President, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Commerce and the U.S. Trade Representative. She is a recipient of numerous awards including the Medal of Freedom and the Eisenhower Award for Meritorious Service. She is listed in Who's Who of America. Ms. Hsu is a founding member and director of the Committee of 100, an organization of prominent Chinese Americans and is a member of the National Committee on United States-China Relations. She also serves on the National Advisory Forum to the U.S. Holocaust Memorial.

Ms. Hsu is a Summa Cum Laude graduate of George Washington University and member of Phi Beta Kappa. At New York University, she was a Penfield Fellow for International Law. Ms. Hsu was the recipient of the George Washington Alumni Achievement Award in 1983 and holds several honorary degrees.

Mr. President, I congratulate Ming Chen Hsu on her exemplary career at the Federal Maritime Commission and salute her contributions to the ocean transportation industry. I add my voice to those who say ''thank you'' for her service to the Nation. And finally, I wish her smooth sailing in her future endeavors.

IMPORTANCE OF PRIVATE PROSECUTIONS

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, last week, during the debate on a proposed constitutional amendment to protect the rights of crime victims, Senator LEAHY made several lengthy statements challenging some of the facts set forth by supporters of the amendment, including myself. We responded to many of those arguments at the time—and, I believe, refuted them. I do want not burden the record now by repeating all our contentions or making new ones.

However, there is one argument that the Senator from Vermont made during the waning hours of debate on the amendment that I find particularly troubling. It involves the role of victims in criminal proceedings at the time our Constitution was written. Because I believe the Senator's comments contradict the clear weight of American history, I feel compelled to respond.

Here is the argument Senator LEAHY disputes: At the time the Constitution was written, the bulk of prosecutions were by private individuals. Typically, a crime was committed and then the victim initiated and then pursued that criminal case. Because victims were parties to most criminal cases, they enjoyed the basic rights to notice, to be present, and to be heard under regular court rules. Given the fact that victims already had basic rights in criminal proceedings, it is perhaps understandable that the Framers of our Constitution did not think to provide victims with protection in our national charter.

The Senator from Vermont tried to rebut this argument. Citing an encyclopedia article and a couple of law review articles, he claimed that, by the time of the Constitutional Convention, public prosecution was ''standard'' and private prosecution had largely disappeared.

Because Senator LEAHY's comments suggest that some confusion about this issue lingers among my colleagues, I would now like to provide some additional evidence demonstrating that private prosecutions had not only not largely disappeared in the late 18th century but in fact were the norm.

First, it is important to concede one point: some public prosecutors did exist at the time of the framing of the Constitution. Certainly, by then, the office of public prosecutor had been established in some of the colonies—such as Connecticut, Vermont, and Virginia. But just because some public prosecutors existed in the late 18th century does not mean that they played a major role or that public prosecution had supplanted private prosecution. In fact, criminal prosecution in 18th century English and colonial courts consisted primarily of private suits by victims. Such prosecutions continued in many States throughout much of the 19th century.

Thus, contrary to Senator LEAHY's suggestion that a ''system of public prosecutions'' was ''standard'' at the time of the framing of the Constitution, the evidence is clear that private individuals—victims—initiated and pursued the bulk of prosecutions before, during, and for some time after the Constitution Convention.

Let's look, for example, at the research of one scholar, Professor Allen Steinberg, who spent a decade sifting through dusty criminal court records in Philadelphia and wrote a book about his findings. Based on a detailed review of court docket books and other evidence, Professor Steinberg determined that private prosecutions continued in that city through most of the 19th century.

In Professor Steinberg's words, by the mid-19th Century, ''private prosecution had become central to the city's system of criminal law enforcement, so entrenched that it would prove difficult to dislodge. . . .''

Of course, Philadelphia was the city where the Constitution was debated, drafted, and adopted. And for decades it was our new nation's most populous city—and its cultural and legal capital as well.

It is difficult to reconcile the assertion that a ''system of public prosecutions'' was ''standard'' at the time of the Constitution Convention with historical research showing that, in the same city where the Convention was held, private prosecutions—inherited from English common law—continued to be ''standard'' through the mid-19th century.

It is not surprising that the Senator from Vermont would conclude that public prosecution had replaced private prosecution by the late 18th century. A cursory exam of historical documents might lead to such a conclusion, for the simple reason that documents regarding public prosecutors and public prosecutions (what few there were) are easier to find than documents regarding private prosecutions. As Stephanie Dangel has explained in the Yale Law Journal:

> [e]arly studies concentrating on legislation naturally over-emphasized the importance of the public prosecutor, since a private prosecution system inherited from the common law would not appear in legislation. Examinations of prosecutorial practice were cursory and thus skewed. The most readily accessible information relating to criminal prosecutions predictably concerned the exceptional, well publicized cases involving public prosecutors, not the vast majority of mundane cases, involving scant paperwork and handled through the simple procedures of private prosecution . . .

Dangel has summed up recent historical research into the nature of prosecution in the decades leading up to the framing of the Constitution as follows:

> First, private individuals, not government officials, conducted the bulk of prosecution. Second, the primary work of attorneys general and district attorneys consisted on non-prosecutorial duties, with their prosecutorial discretion limited to ending, rather than initiating or conducting, prosecutions.

Regarding the prevalence of private prosecution in the colonies, Dangel noted:

> Seventeenth and eighteenth century English common law viewed a crime as a wrong inflicted upon the victims not as an act against the state. An aggrieved victim, or interested party, would initiate prosecution. After investigation and approval by a justice of the peace and grand jury, a private individual would conduct the prosecution, sometimes with the assistance of counsel. . . . Private parties retained ultimate control, often settling even after grand juries returned indictments. Contemporaneous sources confirm the relative insignificance of public prosecutions in the colonial criminal system. Only five of the first thirteen constitutions mention a state attorney general, and only Connecticut mentions the local prosecutor. Secondary references are similarly rare. Finally, the earliest judicial decision voicing disapproval of private prosecution did not appear until 1849. No decision affirming public prosecutors' virtually unreviewable discretion appeared before 1883.

The historical evidence is clear: Because victims were parties to most criminal prosecutions in the late 18th century, they had basic rights to notice, to be present, and to participate in the proceedings under regular court rules. Today, victims are not parties to criminal prosecutions, and they are often denied these basic rights. Thus, a constitutional victims' rights amendment would restore some of the rights that victims enjoyed at the time the Framers drafted the Constitution and Bill of Rights.

If this historical evidence about prosecutions in the colonies is not enough, I would repeat a point Senator LEAHY

made himself last week: that in England, any crime victim had the right to initiate and conduct criminal proceedings all the way up to the middle of the 19th century. As we know from Senator BYRD's enlightening remarks last week, many of the rights and liberties of our Constitution—such as those for criminal defendants—have their roots in English history and the English constitution.

Given the fact, then, that virtually all the protections for criminal defendants in the Bill of Rights have English antecedents—including habeas corpus, trial by jury, due process, prohibition against excessive fines, and so on—it is hardly a stretch to think that the lack of rights for crime victims in the Bill of Rights would reflect an English antecedent as well: the long-established right of victims to prosecute crimes themselves.

Let me be clear: I do not support a return to the old system of private prosecution. My only point is that we can cogently explain why the Framers did not include a single word on behalf of crime victims in the Constitution. And, given the relatively recent development in the United States of a system of 100% public prosecution, we can offer strong reasons to restore basic rights for victims in our criminal justice system.

Just so there is no more confusion on this point, let us return to Professor Allen Steinberg, a legal historian who researched and wrote a 326-page book on prosecutions in 19th century Philadelphia—the most in-depth study of private prosecution in the United States.

Did Professor Steinberg find that public prosecution was ''standard'' in Philadelphia even decades after the Constitution and Bill of Rights were adopted, as Senator LEAHY suggests? No. In fact, he found that victims directly prosecuted crimes in Philadelphia until at least 1875.

The fact that Professor Steinberg's research is on Philadelphia is undeniably important. Not only did the Framers live in Philadelphia while debating and drafting the Constitution, but many had resided there earlier as well.

For example, James Madison—sometimes called the Father of our Constitution—was not only a delegate at the Philadelphia Convention, he served in the Continental Congress in Philadelphia from March 1780 through December 1783. I have little doubt that Madison knew that the bulk of criminal prosecutions in Philadelphia consisted of private prosecutions. Here is what Professor Steinberg writes about private prosecutions in Philadelphia:

> [T]he criminal law did have a central place in the everyday social life of mid-nineteenth-century Philadelphia. Private prosecution—one citizen taking another to court without the intervention of the police—was the basis of law enforcement in Philadelphia and an anchor of its legal culture, and this had been so since colonial times . . . Well past mid-century, private prosecution remained popular among a broad spectrum of ordinary Philadelphians. Familiar and frequent, it was rooted in a complex political and legal structure that linked political parties, courthouses, saloons and other centers of popular culture, real crime and dangerous disorder, and ordinary disputes and transgressions of everyday life . . . Through the process of private prosecution, the criminal courts of Philadelphia developed a distinctive set of practices and a culture that was remarkably resilient in the face of constant official hostility and massive social change. . . .

He continues:

> Private prosecution refers to the system by which private citizens brought criminal cases to the attention of court officials, initiated the process of prosecution, and retained considerable control over the ultimate disposition of cases—especially when compared with the two main executive authorities of criminal justice, the police and the public prosecutor . . . Private prosecution . . . [was] firmly rooted in Philadelphia's colonial past. [It was an] example[] of the creative American adaptation of the English common law. By the seventeenth century, private prosecution was a fundamental part of English common law. Most criminal cases in England proceeded under the control of a private prosecutor, usually a relatively elite person, and often through a private society established for that purpose.

Professor Steinberg concludes that before the second half of the 19th Century, private prosecutions were the ''dominant'' mode of criminal justice in Philadelphia. He explains how this system worked:

> When a person wanted to initiate a criminal prosecution, he or she went off to the nearest alderman's office, complained, and usually secured a warrant for the arrest of the accused. After the alderman's constable escorted the defendant to the office, the alderman conducted a formal hearing, and the process was underway. Most often, private prosecutors charged their adversaries with assault and battery, larceny, or some form of disorderly conduct. Well before 1850, aldermen and litigants established patterns of case disposition that would last through most of the century. Most criminal cases were fully disposed of by the alderman . . .

Professor Steinberg also notes that:

> [m]uch of the time, people used the criminal law in their private affairs in order to combat a perceived injustice or to assert basic rights they felt were violated. There was no better example of this than battered wives. Women regularly brought charges against men for assault . . .. Most often, . . . the batterer was punished in some manner . . . .

And what of the public prosecutor? Contrary to Senator LEAHY's suggestion that public prosecutors had consolidated control over prosecutions by the late 18th century, Professor Steinberg found that—even by the mid-19th Century—the Philadelphia public prosecutor did little more than act as a clerk to victims who were pursuing private prosecutions. Here is what Professor Steinberg found:

> One of the major reasons for the weakness of the court officials was the limited power of the public prosecutor. Most discretion was exercised by the magistrates and private parties, some by the grand and petit juries, and little by anyone else. As late as the mid-1860s, for example, jurists agreed that, despite their importance on the streets, the police had no role in ordinary criminal procedure. More importantly, the same was basically true for the district attorney. In an 1863 outline of criminal procedure, Judge Joseph Allison did not mention the police and gave no discretionary role to the district attorney in the ''usual and ordinary mode of procedure.'' . . . . The discretion of the private parties in criminal cases was not checked by the public prosecutor. Instead, the public prosecutor in most cases adopted a stance of passive neutrality. He was essentially a clerk, organizing the court calendar and presenting cases to grand and petit juries. Most of the time, he was either superseded by a private attorney or simply let the private prosecutor and his witnesses take the stand and state their case.

And the dominance of private prosecutions was certainly not unique to Philadelphia. Other legal historians who have sifted through court records have reached similar conclusions to Professor Steinberg.

In a 1995 article in the American Journal of Legal History, for example, Robert Ireland concluded that ''By 1820 most states had established local public prosecutors. . . . Yet, because of deficiencies in the office of public prosecutor, privately funded prosecutors constituted a significant element of the state criminal justice system throughout the nineteenth century.''

In a 1967 article in the New York University Law Review, William E. Nelson found that private prosecution was commonplace in a typical Massachusetts county between 1760 and 1810. Criminal trials, he writes, were ''in reality contests between subjects rather than contests between government and subject.''

And the list goes on: other scholars who have acknowledged the prevalence of private prosecution in the American colonies and fledgling United States include Richard Gasjins (Connecticut), Michael S. Hindus (Massachusetts and South Carolina), William M. Lloyd, Jr. (Pennsylvania), and Edwin Surrency (Philadelphia). Indeed, William F. McDonald notes in the American Criminal Law Review that a system of private prosecution was preferred by many around the time of the American Revolution because of a fear of tyranny associated with government prosecutors and because it was less expensive.

In the face of this overwhelming historical evidence that the bulk of prosecutions at the time of the Constitutional Convention were private, the Senator from Vermont suggested instead that public prosecutions were ''standard.'' He relied on several sources for that conclusion: a four-page article in a legal encyclopedia and a few law review article quotes, one lacking citation and the rest citing the same four-page encyclopedia article.

Of particular importance seems to be a quotation from an article in the Rutgers Law Review that asserted that ''[b]y the time of the Revolution, public prosecution in America was standard, and private prosecution, in effect, was gone.'' But reading closer, one finds that the support for this statement was none other than a statement in the oft-cited four-page encyclopedia

article that ''by the time of the American Revolution, each colony had established some form of public prosecution. . . .''

Again, however, we have seen that the mere existence of ''some form of public prosecution'' at the time of the American Revolution does not mean that public prosecution was ''standard.'' And it certainly does not mean that public prosecutors handled the bulk of prosecutions or had much a prosecutorial role. They did not. Rather, the weight of historical evidence on this subject—a subject which has been extensively researched and reviewed by some of our country's most distinguished legal historians and other scholars—suggests that private prosecutions were dominant.

Mr. President, I am glad to have the chance to correct the historical record on this point. I have the utmost respect for my distinguished colleague from Vermont and I thank him for his thoughtful remarks on the history of prosecution in this country. However, I believe that my main point stands: we need to restore rights that crime victims enjoyed at the time the Framers drafted the Constitution and Bill of Rights.

IN RECOGNITION OF NATIONAL NEUROFIBROMATOSIS MONTH

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize May as the National Neurofibromatosis month. Neurofibromatosis (NF) is a genetic disorder that causes tumors to grow along nerves throughout the body. These tumors can lead to a number of physical challenges including blindness, hearing impairment, or skeletal problems such as scoliosis or bone deformities. In addition to these physical challenges, over 60 percent of those diagnosed with neurofibromatosis are also faced with learning disabilities ranging from mild dyslexia and ADD to severe retardation.

Anyone's child or grandchild can have NF. This disease affects one in 4,000 children, making it more prevalent than cystic fibrosis and hereditary muscular dystrophy combined. NF equally affects both sexes and all racial and ethnic backgrounds. Although 50 percent of the cases are inherited, half are spontaneous with no family history.

It is an honor to stand before this body and recognize May as National Neurofibromatosis month. I would also like to take this opportunity to recognize the Missouri Chapter of The National Neurofibromatosis Foundation, Inc. and their efforts to provide support to those who suffer from NF as they strive towards a cure.

VICTIMS' RIGHTS AMENDMENT OPPOSITION

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, during the debate last week on the proposed constitutional amendment on victims' rights, a number of editorials and thoughtful essays were printed in the RECORD. Because of the way in which the Senate ended its consideration of S.J. Res. 3, I did not have an opportunity to include in the RECORD all such materials. Accordingly, I included additional materials yesterday and do so again today, in order to help complete the historical record of the debate. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD editorials from a number of sources around the country in opposition to the proposed amendment.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Philadelphia Inquirer, Apr. 22, 2000]

MISGUIDED BILL

Crime victims need justice and compassion, not the ability to usurp the rights of others.

If ever there was a likely booster for the cause of empowering crime victims, it's Bud Welch of Oklahoma City.

After his 23-year-old daughter, Julie, perished in the 1995 federal building bombing there, Mr. Welch recalls wanting to see the co-conspirators ''fried'' rather than tried in court.

But the latest push in Congress to enshrine a victims' bill of rights in the U.S. Constitution does not enjoy Bud Welch's support. Nor does it have the backing of numerous groups equally as concerned as Mr. Welch with seeking justice for victims.

The amendment's opponents include advocates for battered women, the families of murder victims—plus the nation's top state judges, civil-rights groups and veteran prosecutors.

All of them, whether knowingly or not, are heeding James Madison's wise directive that the Constitution be amended only on ''great and extraordinary occasions.''

This isn't one of those occasions.

These groups understand that the proposals before Congress would completely restructure federal and state criminal justice systems. As such, the victims' rights measure is dangerous to fundamental rights that protect all Americans. In the Oklahoma case that Mr. Welch knows so well, he cites the plea bargain that led to key testimony by an accomplice of Timothy McVeigh and Terry Nichols.

Had victims been able to contest that plea—as provided by the rights proposals in Congress—the case might have been more difficult to prosecute or might even have unraveled.

That's just a hint of the practical problems in according crime victims such rights as court-appointed counsel, a say in prosecution decisions, and the like. How could anyone think things are working so well in the nation's clogged criminal courts that they could handle this wrench tossed into the works?

There's a more fundamental problem, through, with giving crime victims a virtual place at the prosecutors's table.

It presumes the guilt of a person charged with a crime before the courts have spoken. With that, out the courtroom window goes a fair trail—and in comes a threat to all Americans' rights.

What crime victims are owed is compassion, the chance to seek compensation, consideration of the demands a trial places on their time and psyches, and a full measure of justice. That's the intent of victims' rights provisions already enshrined in law or state constitutions by all 50 states.

For instance, the Pennsylvania statute provides for notifying victims of court proceedings, allowing them to comment on—but not to veto—plea bargains, the right to seek restitution, and notification of post-conviction appeals and even convicts' escapes. These are good ideas that don't deprive rights.

Shame on Congress if it seriously considers a measure that could jeopardize the right to a fair trial. Ditto if the victims' rights cause is turned into just another cynical vehicle to make political hay—like the flag-burning nonsense.

The region's senators should not be party to that—no matter what their party.

[From the Providence Journal, Apr. 27, 2000]

THE QUALITY OF JUSTICE

Bud Welch, whose daughter Julie was one of the 168 victims of the bombing of the Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City five years ago, testified before the U.S. Senate Judiciary Committee against the proposed Victims' Rights Amendment to the Constitution. ''I was angry after she was killed that I wanted McVeigh and Nichols killed without a trial. I probably would have done it myself if I could have. I consider that I was in a state of temporary insanity immediately after her death. It is because I was so crazy with grief that I oppose the Victims' Rights Amendment.''

Mr. Welch is right. Giving the victims of crime the constitutional right to influence bail decisions and plea agreements would turn the principle of innocent until proven guilty, the foundation of the American system of justice embodied in our Bill of Rights, on its head. Other countries, notably France, are still striving to incorporate this principle into their legal codes. It would come as a shock to see the United States move away from it, a move that would be rightly perceived as a step backward into law's dark, despotic past—the days of an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth.

If that seems a hard indictment of an amendment that sounds so eminently reasonable and fair, consider the provision granting victims the right to a trial ''free of unreasonable delay.'' The very phrase should send chills down the spine. One person's ''expedited'' trial is another's ''legal lynching,'' to borrow Supreme Court Justice Clarence Thomas' phrase. And, like most amendments to the Constitution, there is no telling where this amendment would lead. Would an assault against a Ku Klux Klan member marching with thousands of co-bigots mean that the state has to notify and consult with every racist marcher ''victim'' in prosecuting the criminal?

The United States is a country that abhors the miscarriage of justice. It is, or should be, the key element of our national character. No one would contend that it is good that victims sometimes suffer further in the administration of justice, and proponents of this amendment, such as Mothers Against Drunk Driving, fight a noble cause in trying to protect the rights of victims in the justice system. But amendment the Constitution is not the way to do it. Victims' rights laws are on the books in 35 states, including Rhode Island. Strengthen and enforce these laws. That is the way to ensure all Americans, victims and accused, have a fair trial.

[From the Richmond Times-Dispatch, Apr. 16, 2000]

DIFFERENTLY SITUATED

Complaints about partisan rancor in Congress are commonplace. But sometimes it's even worse when Republicans and Democrats agree.

Take the resolution sponsored by Republican Senator John Kyl and Democrat

Dianne Feinstein. It proposes a victims' rights amendment to the Constitution guaranteeing a right to be notified of, attend, and testify at the defendant's trial. Thirty-three states already codify such protections, and there is little wrong with them. But an amendment would sully the Constitution with (to borrow a turn of phrase) a new indoor record for missing the point.

At a recent news conference supporting the proposed amendment, Mothers Against Drunk Driving president Millie Webb said, ''Many Americans don't realize that victims have no guaranteed rights under our current law,'' whereas ''the system caters to the rights of defendants.'' Such statements—with which many Americans, including 41 Senate co-sponsors of the Kyl-Feinstein resolution, would agree—reflect a cavernous lack of understanding regarding the machinery of justice in America.

That machinery exists for the very purpose of defending rights, such as the right to physical safety and the right to property. Legislatures pass laws forbidding assault, murder, theft, fraud, and a host of other crimes. Policemen patrol the streets to prevent those crimes. When a crime is committed and a victim created, police hunt down the likeliest suspect and arrest him.

Government attorneys then prosecute. The courts sit in judgment, impose prison time, and order restitution where appropriate. Corrections departments imprison—and sometimes execute—offenders, not only to punish them for the misdeed in question but also to prevent them from violating the rights of additional victims. This vast legislative, judicial, and executive machinery expends a great amount of time and energy to guarantee the rights of innocent citizens.

The procedural rights of defendants exist for a good reason. The right to trial by jury, the right to an attorney, the right to an appeal, the right not to have a confession beaten out of you—all are in place because a defendant stands in a markedly different position from a crime victim. The state wields its immense coercive power on behalf of the victim—and against the defendant.

Some mechanism is necessary to ensure that powerful machinery does not run out of control and crush someone it should not. Though they sometimes are abused, the constitutional protections guaranteed to a defendant are not catering to the guilty, but to the innocent. They exist to make sure the apparatus functioning on behalf of victims does not create another one, or several other ones. If sloppy law enforcement sends an innocent person to prison, then it leaves the real perpetrator free—to strike again.

[From the Seattle Post-Intelligencer, Apr. 21, 2000]

VICTIM AMENDMENT UNDOES PRIOR WORK

With the drive to enshrine its tenets in the U.S. Constitution, the victims' rights movement is in danger of undoing much of the good it has done.

Granted, the proposed amendment to the Constitution, which is scheduled for a vote Tuesday in the U.S. Senate, is emotionally appealing. If approved by Congress and ratified by three-fourths of the state legislatures, the amendment would, among other things, require that victims be notified of any court proceedings involving their accused assailants and be told of an offender's release or escape.

These provisions are fairly innocuous; others in the far-reaching proposal are not.

For example, the amendment would give victims the right to attend all public proceedings stemming from the crime. But there are compelling reasons for victim witnesses to be excluded from the courtroom except when they are testifying. Their presence could bias the testimony of other witnesses sympathetic to what the victims have endured, and on hearing other witnesses testify, victims might tailor their own testimony to minimize any inconsistencies.

Another new ''right'' would authorize victims to submit a statement at all public proceedings held to accept a negotiated plea. That risks the possibility of victims becoming equal partners with prosecutors in deciding when to plea-bargain cases. Therein lies the crux of our objections.

The government prosecutes crimes on behalf of the community, not just victims, even though victims routinely suffer the greatest toll. It is the community's best interests that should receive the highest consideration by prosecutors.

One surprising opponent of the amendment voiced his concerns simply: ''I think crime victims are too emotionally involved,'' said Bud Welch of Oklahoma City, whose daughter died in the bombing of the federal courthouse there.

Welch and his organization, Citizens for the Fair Treatment of Victims, are joined in opposing the proposal by the National Coalition Against Sexual Assault, the National Network to End Domestic Violence and Murder Victims' Families for Reconciliation.

Already, 32 states have passed victims' rights statutes or amendments to their state constitutions. This is how it should be, as the vast majority of crimes are prosecuted on the state level. It is far too radical a step to amend the federal Constitution for what is essentially a state matter.

All victims' rights run the risk of being diluted if this proposal becomes the 28th amendment to the U.S. Constitution. That should convince Washington's senators, Democrat Patty Murray and Republican Slade Gorton, to vote no Tuesday.

[From the South Bend Tribune, Apr. 27, 2000]

PROPOSED VICTIMS' RIGHTS AMENDMENT IS MISGUIDED

A proposed constitutional amendment to codify rights for crime victims may be sincere in intent, but it is misguided and should be defeated when the Senate votes today.

The most sacred tenet of the United States' system of justice says that all those accused are innocent until proven guilty. The Victims' Rights Amendment could jeopardize that constitutional protection by giving victims an active role in virtually every stage of prosecution, from plea bargaining to punishment and parole.

Under terms of the amendment, victims would be allowed to remain present in the courtroom throughout a trial, even if they are witnesses for the prosecution.

Crime victims deserve sympathy and support, but inserting them into the criminal justice system as proposed in this amendment is an invitation to substitute vengeance for justice. If Congress wants to establish a fund to help victims recover emotionally, physically and financially it should do so. It should not, however, seek to alter core principles of the law.

Congress is developing an annoying tendency to legislate by pandering to the public's feelings as a substitute for thoughtful consideration. Amending the Constitution may create many unintended consequences and should not be undertaken when there are other ways to reach the goal desired.

[From the St. Petersburg Times, Apr. 25, 2000]

A WRONG SET OF RIGHTS

The so-called Victims' Rights Amendment isn't all that it seems. Politically motivated, it would tilt cases in favor of prosecutors and strike a blow to constitutional guarantees of due process and fairness for the accused.

The Constitution was purposely made hard to amend to shield it from political whims, but that hasn't stopped Congress from trying to alter this great document. In this 106th Congress, at least 53 constitutional amendments have been introduced concerning every hot-button issue from flag burning to school prayer. The latest assault on individual rights is the so-called Victims' Rights Amendment, a wrongheaded attempt to give crime victims rights in criminal proceedings.

The amendment is popular because any measure that appears to favor victims over criminals is going to sail through Congress. But the amendment has more to do with political pandering than conscientious lawmaking. This helping hand for crime victims is really about tilting the balance in favor of prosecutors. It would substantially reduce the Constitution's guarantees of due process and fairness for the criminally accused.

While victims often complain that they are ignored or mistreated by the criminal justice system, there are fixes short of amending the Constitution. Florida, for example, has codified victims' rights in statute and made it part of the state Constitution. A caveat, though, prevents the exercise of victims' rights from interfering with the defendant's constitutional rights. But if the federal Constitution were amended, this key protection for defendants would be nullified.

Among the disturbing provisions, the Victims' Rights Amendment would give crime victims the right to be present at any public proceeding, to expect a trial free from unreasonable delay and to have their safety considered relative to a defendant's release from custody. While these measures don't sound excessive on their face, they could seriously handicap a defendant's right to a fair hearing.

For example, a victim who demands to sit in on every day of trial could also be a key witness to the crime. By listening to all other testimony, he could tailor his comments to avoid inconsistent statements—complicating the defense's job.

Similar problems arise in interpreting the victim's right to a quick resolution. A victim's demand for speed could truncate the defense attorney's time to prepare for trial, making it difficult to present a full defense. It is also unclear how the victim's right to a speedy resolution would impact the defendant's right of habeas corpus. Habeas claims of wrongful imprisonment sometimes comes many years after conviction.

Multiple concerns also are raised by the provision requiring that the safety of victims be considered before a defendant is released. At minimum, the accused could be denied reasonable bond, but the provision could also give the state the power to hold prisoners indefinitely after their prison terms based on some minimal showing of fear by the victim.

The amendment is scheduled to come up for action in the Senate this week, and if it passes by the two-thirds majority necessary, it's expected to fly through the House. The amendment would then need to be passed by three-fourths of state legislatures before becoming part of the Constitution. Florida's Republican Sen. Connie Mack has already signed on as a sponsor, but Democrat Bob Graham, as usual is waiting until the last minute to reveal his position.

What seems to elude amendment supporters is that the rights of defendants are not enshrined in the Constitution to protect criminals. They are there to ensure that those falsely accused by government get a fair trail. So really the Constitution already provides for victims' rights: victims of overzealous government prosecution, that is.

[From the Wichita Eagle, Apr. 27, 2000]

NOT AGAIN—VICTIM'S RIGHTS DON'T MERIT CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

There's no question that victims of crimes too often feel victimized a second time by the justice system. Look at the parents of the students killed at Columbine High School: Their frustration with the Jefferson County sheriff's department over access to videotape and records has rightly provoked multiple lawsuits—and compounded their grief.

But the instances in which victims are wronged by authorities hardly justify the ultimate legal remedy in America—an amendment to the Constitution.

That's the conclusion that once again should be reached by both the U.S. Senate, which moved ahead this week with debate on the proposed Victims' Rights Amendment, and the House, which has a similar measure pending in committee.

Supporters such as Sen. Dianne Feinstein, D-Calif., argue that the Constitution currently guarantees 15 rights to criminal defendants yet extends none to victims. They want to equalize the importance of defendant and victim, guaranteeing the latter the right to be present at court hearings, speak at sentencing, have a say in plea agreements, see the cases resolved quickly and seek restitution.

But the proposed amendment is rife with problems:

It would step on existing statutory and constitutional safeguards in 32 states, including Kansas.

It could end up conflicting with or compromising defendants' rights.

It lacks even the support of some advocacy groups such as Victim Services, which is focusing its resources and energy elsewhere.

And, as Senate Minority Leader Tom Daschle, D–S.D., noted, it ''is longer than the entire Bill of Rights.''

Authorities obviously need to do a better job respecting and enforcing existing state victims'-rights laws and taking pains not to treat victims like afterthoughts. But there are good reasons why the 11,000 attempts to amend the Constitution over the defining document's 213-year history have succeeded only 27 times. The plight of crime victims is heartrending, but it should be dealt with by appropriate laws, not by this kind of intensive meddling with the Constitution.

[From the Winston-Salem Journal, Apr. 27, 2000]

VICTIMS' RIGHTS

The victims of violent crimes and their loved ones often have reason to feel that they have fewer rights under the justice system than does the criminal. Many victims say that they feel victimized all over again by the time the court proceedings are done. Clearly there is much that ought to be done to ensure that courts and related offices treat victims with respect, compassion and efficiency. But a victims' rights amendment to the U.S. Constitution, under discussion this week in the Senate, is the wrong way to make those improvements.

It's a bad idea to amend the Constitution for a problem that could be handled by less sweeping and less permanent legislation. The Constitution has remained strong for more than 200 years precisely because the Founders did not address the details of every issue that might arise. It is unwise to amend it to deal with problems that can be addressed through less drastic means.

Even more important, the drive for a victims' rights amendment is based on a misunderstanding of the role of the criminal-justice system. The courts are set up to protect the rule of law and the greater interests of society, not to exact personal vengeance. When a criminal is sentenced to imprisonment or some other punishment, he is paying his debt to society, not to the victim. He is being punished for violating the rule of law that we all agree to as citizens for our mutual protection.

Advocates of an amendment argue that the Constitution establishes many rights of the accused, but none for victims. But the Constitution is designed to provide the protection of laws and fair and efficient justice for all. Crime victims are suffering because a law has been broken, and the function of the courts is to punish the lawbreaker. The rights of the accused are spelled out because defendants are in danger of having rights taken from them as punishment. Though the victims of crimes deserve public sympathy and support, they do not deserve special treatment by the legal system.

The move for victims' rights has arisen out of frustrations when the court system, far from giving victims special treatment, seems to disregard them. Among the rights in the proposed amendment would be notification of proceedings, speedier proceedings and notification of release or escape of an offender.

Some of these rights exist but aren't honored because of overcrowded courts and lack of staff. Those are problems that Congress and state legislatures can address without an amendment. They can also pass laws to make things more smooth and comfortable for victims and to give victims a voice in such proceedings as parole hearings. Some laws providing restitution are appropriate.

A constitutional amendment is not needed to achieve any of these worthy goals. Senators should make it clear that they support the goals but don't want to pursue them in the wrong way.

[From the Washington Times, May 2, 2000]

CONSTITUTIONAL PANDORA'S BOX

(By Debra Saunders)

Just when you thought that Congress was a totally craven institution full of pandering pols who would sell out the Constitution for a friendly story on Page 3 of the local paper, the Senate up and takes a stand on principle. An unpopular stand even.

I refer to a proposed Crime Victims' Amendment to the Constitution. Last week, Senate sponsors Dianne Feinstein, California Democrat, and Jon Kyl, Arizona Republican, pulled a vote on the measure because they didn't have the two-thirds vote needed for passage. Finally, some good news.

Of course, I support crime victims' rights, and the stated goals of the measure. The amendment, among other things, would give victims the right to be notified of legal proceedings where they would have a right to be heard, to be notified if a perp is released or escapes, and to weigh in on plea bargains.

As Mrs. Feinstein explained in a statement, ''The U.S. Constitution guarantees 15 separate rights to criminal defendants, and each of these rights was established by amendment to the Constitution. But there is not one word written in the U.S. Constitution on behalf of crime victims.''

I, for one, value that omission. The Founding Fathers wrote the document when being a victim was not a badge of honor. If it were written today in the decade of the victim, the Constitution probably would read like a 12-step pamphlet.

More importantly, while the Constitution does not pay homage to victims' rights per se, the entire process of prosecution, of using the government to exact punishment for wrongdoing against individuals, recognizes the government's responsibility to protect citizens from lawless individuals.

Of course, there have been some victim horror stories that give the measure legitimacy. One need look no further than Littleton, Colo., where authorities have sold videotapes of the bloodstained high-school shooting crime scene for $25. This is a true outrage, but it is best remedied by parents suing the daylights out of these cruel civil servants.

'Tis better to sue than to revamp the U.S. Constitution. Law enforcement generally is a local matter. A constitutional amendment then would give federal judges another excuse to butt in and tell local lawmen and women what to do. No thanks.

I'll add that because a constitutional amendment has so much force, and is so difficult to change, there must be a compelling reason to pass it, and lawmakers should have a clear idea of its effects.

But it's not clear how judges would interpret it. The American Civil Liberties Union's Jennifer Helburn argues that some judges, for example, could interpret the right of victims to ''be present, and to submit a statement' at all public legal proceedings to mean indigent victims would have a right to publicly funded legal representation.

The ACLU also warns the provision could ''allow victims to be present throughout an entire trial, even if they are going to be witnesses.'' A Senate aide explained a judge would determine whether victims could be present before testifying or could testify first, and then attend the rest of the trial. So, the provision could make life harder for prosecutors. Not good.

Legal writer Stuart Taylor Jr. of the National Journal worries that mandating victim output—even if it is not mandatory that prosecutors obey it—could scuttle plea bargain arrangements that might be unpopular but result in a better outcome than letting murderers walk free.

Sen. Fred Thompson, Tennessee Republican, warned that the measure is ''very, very disruptive in ways that there is no way we can possibly determine. We are opening up a Pandora's box.''

Except, last week, the Senate didn't open up Pandora's box. And in not opening the box, it nonetheless released one precious item: hope.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Monday, May 1, 2000, the Federal debt stood at $5,660,725,641,944.27 (Five trillion, six hundred sixty billion, seven hundred twenty-five million, six hundred forty-one thousand, nine hundred forty-four dollars and twenty-seven cents).

Five years ago, May 1, 1995, the Federal debt stood at $4,860,333,000,000 (Four trillion, eight hundred sixty billion, three hundred thirty-three million).

Ten years ago, May 1, 1990, the Federal debt stood at $3,082,585,000,000 (Three trillion, eight-two billion, five hundred eighty-five million).

Fifteen years ago, May 1, 1985, the Federal debt stood at $1,744,028,000,000 (One trillion, seven hundred forty-four billion, twenty-eight million).

Twenty-five years ago, May 1, 1975, the Federal debt stood at $516,680,000,000 (Five hundred sixteen billion, six hundred eighty million) which reflects a debt increase of more than $5 trillion—$5,144,275,641,994.27 (Five trillion, one hundred forty-four billion, two hundred seventy-five million, six hundred forty-one thousand,

nine hundred ninety-four dollars and twenty-seven cents) during the past 25 years.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO THE NAVY NURSES OF THE KOREAN WAR

● Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I am deeply honored to rise in tribute to over 3,000 courageous professional Navy Nurses of the Korean War, undaunted in the face of danger, who unselfishly answered the call of duty. They came from every corner of the nation. They came from all walks of life. They joined the Navy because they wanted to serve their country. They wanted to share their professional nursing skills and to care for those injured in body, mind and spirit.

The Navy nurses of the Korean War claim they did nothing special, they were just doing their job. But in the hearts of all who served with them, the doctors and the corpsmen, and their patients, Navy Nurses of the Korean War are true American heroes.

During the Korean War, whole blood could only be kept for eight days. Hospital ships were in Korean waters for weeks, months. Navy nurses gave their own blood for patient transfusions. Many aboard the hospital ship *Haven* were found to be anemic from giving so much of their blood for the injured.

Nurses worked around the clock during the mass casualties brought in from battles like Chosin Reservoir. Many times they worked 96 hours with just two hours of sleep in between swells of patients. Ever resilient and effervescent, Navy Nurses of the Korea War volunteered to assist orphanages in Inchon and Pusan caring for sick and wounded children. Severely injured children were brought back to hospital ships for surgery like having shrapnel removed from head wounds.

Nurses ventured into POW camps to ensure that children in these camps were treated and inoculated. Whether the nurses were stationed close to the fighting aboard hospital ships in Korean waters, at Naval Hospital Yokosuka, Japan, at other medical facilities in the Far East or on the home front, nurses were always there for their patients . . . their patients always came first.

Fifty years ago, Navy Nurses who served during the Korean War came home to quietly live their lives. For fifty years our nation has not known about this group of patriotic nurses who volunteered to serve our country. And they did it because they wanted to. They did it because they cared about our nation. They did it because they wanted to share their nursing skills. They did it because of their respect for life.

Let us not wait a day longer. Let us remember how these courageous, patriotic women answered the call of their country. And let us remember those Navy nurses who made it home in spirit only to live on in the hearts of family, friends and their fellow countrymen. Let us remember those Navy Nurses of the Korean War who are now in nursing homes and long-term care facilities. These nurses who once fought so valiantly to save the lives of their patients, now fight each day for their own survival.

Navy Nurses of the Korean War, you are forgotten no more. You shall remain in the hearts and spirits of all Americans. Let your story be told. Let your story be heard. Let your story be preserved in our history and remembered for decades to come. Your sacrifices and uncommon valor sparks the fire of patriotism, the foundation of our nation.

Navy Nurses of the Korean War, your unfaltering commitment of service to our country brings pride and honor to us. Mr. President, I ask my colleagues in the Senate to join me in remembering these quiet heroes—the Navy Nurses of the Korean War.

Navy Nurses of the Korean War . . . thank you from the bottom of our hearts. You are our heroes. You are forever remembered in the hearts and souls of your fellow countrymen. You are forever remembered in the history of our Nation.●

SALUTING ROGER DECAMP

● Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I rise to salute the achievements of a man who has dedicated most of his life to improving the quality and safety of Alaskan and Pacific Northwest seafood, and whose efforts have made a positive and permanent impact on America's food industry.

Roger DeCamp is by no means a household name. Roger has never sought recognition or fame. Yet it is not too much to say that he has made a profound contribution to the welfare of America's seafood consumers.

In just a few short weeks, Roger DeCamp will retire as the Director of the National Food Processors Association Northwest Laboratory, in Seattle, Washington.

In 1960, Roger joined the Association as a microbiology and processing engineer. In 1964, he moved to Seattle to become the head of the microbiology and thermal processing division at the Northwest facility, and in 1971, he became the assistant director for the entire facility. He has been the director since 1981.

Unlike some who achieve senior positions, Roger has not ceased his work ''in the trenches.'' He has remained accessible to anyone who needed his assistance, and as one of the most knowledgeable individuals in the world about seafood quality control and safety, his advice has been widely sought.

One of the major achievements in Roger's career has been the modernization and direction of the Canned Salmon Control Plan, which assures the safety and integrity of the millions and millions of pounds of canned salmon produced annually in Alaska, and which is shipped worldwide. Canned salmon is one of the United States' most successful seafood exports. That success owes a great deal to the control plan, which gives buyers everywhere the confident knowledge that American canned salmon is a wholesome and beneficial protein source.

Under Roger's direction, the Canned Salmon Control Plan, with participation from industry, the Food and Drug Administration, and the National Food Processors Association, received the Vice-Presidential Hammer award for its unique approach to meeting the highly complex, technical, and sometimes conflicting requirements of the industry and the government agencies that regulate it.

Roger has continually worked to modernize the practices and procedures of the industry, and has represented it with distinction in the development of regulatory guidelines at both the state and federal levels.

He provided much of the impetus and expertise that led to the development of new Alaska seafood inspection regulations, has counseled the Alaska Seafood Marketing Institute technical committee on seafood quality since its creation in 1981, and led the development of the Hazard Analysis/Critical Control Point approach to seafood processing. The latter revolutionized seafood safety requirements, and when put in place in Alaska, became the model on which later federal regulations were constructed for seafood products nationwide. This same technical approach is now being applied not just to seafoods, but to meats and other products as well.

Roger also has been active on international trade issues of critical importance to the seafood industry. Among other things, he played a crucial role in obtaining agreement on a method of certifying seafood for the European Union market without resorting to the imposition of new user fees on the industry.

Finally, it must be noted that the respect in which Roger is been held by both the industry and by government regulators has been key to the successful negotiation of scientific and technical agreements between the industry and the Food and Drug Administration, to the maintenance of a strong working relationship between them, and to the federal agency's willingness to work cooperatively on even the most complex and technical issues of food handling and safety.

In no small way, both his industry and his country owe a debt of thanks to Roger DeCamp.●

HONORING THE NEVADA KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS FOR NINETY YEARS OF SERVICE

● Mr. BRYAN. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize the Knights of Columbus of Nevada, which will be celebrating their 90th anniversary on May 10, 2000.

The history of the Knights of Columbus stretches back 118 years, when Father Michael J. McGivney founded the fraternal order in New Haven Connecticut on March 29, 1882. Since the order's founding, the Knights of Columbus have promoted the Catholic faith and have practiced the principles of charity, unity and fraternity.

When Father McGivney passed away in 1890, there were 5,000 Knights of Columbus located in 57 councils in New England. Today, the Knights of Columbus are the largest Catholic lay fraternal organization in the world and has 1.6 million members in the United States and twelve other nations around the world. Members of the organization and their families donate over $100 million to charities in addition to the 50 million hours of their own time that they volunteer each year.

Since May 10, 1910 in the State of Nevada, the Knights of Columbus have been committed to the highest ideals and principles of humanitarianism, and it gives me great pleasure to congratulate them on nine decades of volunteer service that has certainly enhanced and improved the quality of life for all Nevadans.

Mr. President, the members of the Knights of Columbus of Nevada, are truly deserving of recognition for their nearly century-long dedication to promoting the teachings of the Catholic Church, and for living those teachings by serving those in need in their community. I hope my colleagues will join me in offering congratulations to the Brother Knights and their families on the occasion of their 90th anniversary, and in wishing them continued success.●

HONORING VETERANS ADMINISTRATION NURSES

● Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, as we prepare to celebrate National Nurses Week during the week of May 6 through May 12, 2000, I would like to give special recognition to the dedicated nurses who serve the largest healthcare system in the world, the Veterans Health Administration. I rise today to recognize our Veterans Administration nurses for the critical care which they have provided throughout our nation's history and continue to provide today.

The first VA nurses served the needs of veterans of the Spanish-American War and World War I. In the 1930's, the VA Nursing Service was created, and employed 2,500 registered nurses. Throughout World War II, Korea, Vietnam, and the Persian Gulf War, VA nurses continued the tradition of outstanding service to our nation's veterans. The number of VA nurses has grown substantially, and today the Veterans Health Administration employs 34,000 registered nurses and 26,000 licensed practical nurses and nursing assistants, serving an average of 25 million outpatients and 1 million inpatients annually. The VA Nursing Service maintains its tradition of excellence by encouraging nurses to pursue higher education, and was a forerunner in introducing advanced employment and educational policies. These trained professionals work in a nationwide system of VA health facilities located throughout the continental United States and its territories.

I have been privileged to personally witness the hard work and dedication of Veterans Administration nurses. From 1946 until 1985, my mother served as a VA nurse at several hospitals including Aspinwall Veterans Hospital in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania and Butler Veterans Hospital in Butler, PA. As Chief of Nursing for 32 years, my mother can attest to the commitment which is typical of VA nurses everywhere. During times of low funding and limited staffing, VA nurses worked harder than ever to care for the needs of their patients. While my experience on the Senate Armed Services Committee has served as affirmation of the dedication of Veterans Administration nurses, it pales in comparison to the hard work and sacrifice that I personally witnessed as the son of a VA nurse.

As we celebrate National Nurses Week, it is imperative that we remember those who have faithfully served and continue to care for our Nation's veterans.●

TRIBUTE TO REVEREND JAMES A. SCOTT

● Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to Rev. James A. Scott on the occasion of his retirement as Pastor of the Bethany Baptist Church in Newark, NJ.

For more than three decades, Rev. James A. Scott has devoted his life to building a new legacy for the Bethany Baptist Church congregation and the Newark community. Since its founding in 1871, Bethany Baptist has evolved into an international network. The church's more than 2,000 members represent 22 different countries, including many in the Caribbean and Africa. Under Reverend Scott's leadership, Bethany Baptist helped establish a daughter church in Johannesburg, South Africa, and renovated a church in Cuba. The church also provides scholarship funds for students to attend the Moscow Baptist Seminary, and it educates primary students in Kenya.

Reverend Scott is not just building bridges to the international community, he is also playing a major role in the rebirth of Newark and surrounding areas. In the Roseville Avenue neighborhood, for example, Reverend Scott's church helped build 100 affordable homes. His church also helped build a community outreach building in Newark as well as the Newark-Bethany Christian Academy Day School.

These facilities have created a sense of stability and rootedness in their respective neighborhoods. Low-income families now have new housing options and new reasons to feel proud of where they live.

Reverend Scott's commitment to Newark is unsurpassed. I hope that Bethany Baptist Church will be inspired by his example to achieve even higher goals. I salute Reverend Scott on his retirement and wish him well.●

TRIBUTE TO GRACE WALSH

● Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, today I pay tribute to the memory of Grace Walsh of Eau Claire, WI, who passed away on Monday, April 24. I will remember Grace as a wonderful person and brilliant teacher, someone who taught me lessons in debate and in life that I have relied on so often throughout my career in public service.

Grace coached her debate team to six national championships at the University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire, where she co-founded the Speech Department and served as both a professor and director of forensics. During the summer of 1970 when I was still in high school, I was lucky enough to study debate with Grace at the Eau Claire Debate Institute. Grace was a consummate teacher who brought out the best in her students, and a fierce competitor who built a debating dynasty in Eau Claire. With warmth, wit, and a mastery of forensics, Grace quickly won her students' respect. While small in size, Grace was commanding in stature, thanks to her keen understanding of how to coach winning debaters. ''Always slip them the blade nicely,'' she told us.

Many years after I attended that summer debating program at Eau Claire, I saw Grace again. I gave a talk in Eau Claire after I won an upset victory in the Democratic primary in 1992, and who was in the front row but Grace Walsh, urging me again to ''slip them the blade nicely, Russell.'' She was still coaching me, and displaying a love of debate that made her a coaching legend in Wisconsin and around the country.

Grace passed away last week at the age of 89, but her spirit lives on through all those who knew her and had the opportunity to learn from her. As her student, I am grateful for her guidance, and as a Wisconsinite, I am proud of her many achievements. Her work did honor to our state, and I think it only fitting that we pause to honor and remember her here today.●

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Ms. Evans, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting a nomination which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

(The nomination received today is printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

A 6-MONTH PERIODIC REPORT ON THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO SIGNIFICANT NARCOTICS TRAFFICKERS CENTERED IN COLOMBIA—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 102

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 401(c) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1641(c), and section 204(c) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (IEEPA), 50 U.S.C. 1703(c), I transmit herewith a 6-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to significant narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia that was declared in Executive Order 12978 of October 21, 1995.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.
THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 2, 2000.*

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:55 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 3439. An act to require the Federal Communications Commission to revise its regulations authorizing the operation of new, low-power FM radio stations.

H.R. 3615. An act to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 to ensure improved access to the signals of local television stations by multichannel video providers to all households which desire such service in unserved and underserved rural areas by December 31, 2006.

H.R. 4199. An act to terminate the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

MEASURE REFERRED

The following bill was read the first and second times by unanimous consent and referred as indicated:

H.R. 4199. An act to terminate the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; to the Committee on Finance.

MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the first and second times, and placed on the calendar:

H.R. 3615. An act to amend the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 to ensure improved access to the signals of local television stations by multichannel video providers to all households which desire such service in unserved and underserved rural areas by December 31, 2006.

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–8711. A communication from the Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''BLS-LIFO Department Store Indexes-March 2000'' (Rev. Rul. 2000-25), received April 28, 2000; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–8712. A communication from the Office of the Inspector General, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Federal Health Care Programs; Fraud and Abuse; Statutory Exception to the Anti-Kickback Statute for Shared Risk Arrangements'' (RIN0991-AA91), received April 19, 2000; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–8713. A communication from the Office of the Inspector General, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Clarification of the Safe Harbor Provisions and Establishment of Additional Safe Harbor Provisions Under the Anti-Kickback Statute'' (RIN0991-AA46), received April 19, 2000; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–8714. A communication from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Analysis of the Impact on Welfare Recidivism of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 Child Support Arrears Distribution Policy Changes''; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–8715. A communication from the Health Care Financing Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Medicare Program; Prospective Payment System for Hospital Outpatient Services'' (RIN0938-AI56), received April 28, 2000; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–8716. A communication from the Employment Standards Administration, Office of Labor-Management Standards, Department of Labor transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Labor Organization Annual Financial Reports; Correction'' (RIN1215-AB29), received April 28, 2000; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–8717. A communication from the National Committee on Vital and Health Statistics transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Third Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of the Administrative Simplification Provisions of the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act''; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–8718. A communication from the President of the United States of America, transmitting, pursuant to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act of 1978, a report on efforts to prevent nuclear proliferation for the period of January 1, 1998 and December 31, 1998; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–8719. A communication from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Department of Commerce transmitting, pursuant to law, a report entitled ''Draft Operations Plan and Environmental Assessment for the Stabilization, Selective Recovery and Archaeological Investigation of the USS Monitor''; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–8720. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, an annual report relative to the extent to which Coast Guard regulations concerning oils, including animal fats and vegetable oils, carry out the intent of the Edible Oil Regulatory Reform Act; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–8721. A communication from the Administrative Office of the United States Courts transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report for calendar year 1999; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EC–8722. A communication from the Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Final Flood Elevation Determinations; 64 FR 1523; 01/11/99'', received April 28, 2000; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–8723. A communication from the Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations; 64 FR 53936; 10/05/99'' (FEMA Docket No. 7297), received April 28, 2000; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–8724. A communication from the Division of Corporate Finance, Securities and Exchange Commission transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Use of Electronic Media'' (RIN3235–AG84), received April 28, 2000; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–8725. A communication from the Office of Foreign Assets Control, Department of the Treasury transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Iranian Transactions Regulations: Licensing of Imports of, and Dealings in, Certain Iranian-Origin Foodstuffs and Carpets'' (31 CFR Part 560), received April 28, 2000; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–8726. A communication from the Division of Investment Management, Securities and Exchange Commission transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Custody of Investment Company Assets Outside of the United States'' (RIN3235–AH55), received April 28, 2000; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–8727. A communication from the Emergency Oil and Gas Guaranteed Loan Board transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Emergency Oil and Gas Guaranteed Loan Program; Conforming Changes'' (RIN3003–ZA00), received April 27, 2000; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–8728. A communication from the Emergency Steel Guaranteed Loan Board transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Emergency Steel Guaranteed Loan Board; Conforming Changes'' (RIN3003–ZA00), received April 27, 2000; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–8729. A communication from the Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''List of Communities Eligible for the Sale of Flood Insurance; 64 FR 20090; 04/14/2000'' (FEMA Docket No. 7730), received April 27, 2000; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC–8730. A communication from the Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Accrual Method Exception for Qualifying Small Taxpayers'' (Rev. Proc. 2000–22), received April 26, 2000; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–8731. A communication from the Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Indirect Food Additives: Adhesives and Components of Coatings'' (98F–0675), received April 27, 2000; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC–8732. A communication from the Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Osteopathic Medical Oncology'', received April 27, 2000; to the Committee on Finance.

EC–8733. A communication from the Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting, pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act, a report relative to certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract in the amount of $50,000,000 or more to the United Arab Emirates; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EC–8734. A communication from the Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''West Virginia Regulatory Program'' (SPATS No. WV–080–FOR), received April 28, 2000; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–8735. A communication from the Office of Procurement and Assistance Management, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Acquisition Letter; Small Business Programs'' (AL 2000–02), received April 28, 2000; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–8736. A communication from the Office of Procurement and Assistance Management, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Acquisition Regulation: Financial Management Clauses for Management and Operating (M&O) Contracts'' (RIN1991–AB02), received April 28, 2000; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–8737. A communication from the Office of Procurement and Assistance Management, Department of Energy, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Acquisition Regulations: Mentor-Protege Program'' (RIN1991–AB45), received April 28, 2000; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

EC–8738. A communication from the Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''List of Approved Spent Fuel Storage Casks: TN–68 Addition'' (RIN3150–AG30), received April 28, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–8739. A communication from the Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Energy Compensation Sources for Well Logging and Other Regulatory Clarifications—10 CFR Part 39'' (RIN3150–AG14), received April 19, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–8740. A communication from the Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''List of Approved Spent Fuel Storage Casks: Holtec HI–STORM 100 Addition'' (RIN3150–AG31), received April 28, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–8741. A communication from the Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''NRC Enforcement Policy'', received April 27, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–8742. A communication from the Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''List of Approved Spent Fuel Storage Casks: VSC–24 Revision'' (RIN3150–AG36), received April 28, 2000; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC–8743. A communication from the 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 ''Pyridate; Pesticide Tolerance'' (FRL # 6550–9), received April 25, 2000; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

EC–8744. A communication from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting, the annual report of the Maritime Administration for fiscal year 1999; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–8745. A communication from the National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce transmitting, pursuant to the Atlantic Tunas Convention Act of 1975, the 2000 annual report regarding Highly Migratory Species; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–8746. A communication from the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Framework 33 to the Northeast Multispecies Fishery Management Plan'' (RIN0648–AN51), received April 27, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–8747. A communication from the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Framework Adjustment 32 to the Northeast Multispecies Fishery Management Plan'' (RIN0648–AK79), received April 27, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–8748. A communication from the Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher Vessels Using Trawl Gear in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands'', received April 27, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–8749. A communication from the Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety of Uninspected Passenger Vessels Under the Passenger Vessel Safety Act of 1993 (PVSA) (USCG–1999–5040)'' (RIN2115–AF69), received May 1, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–8750. A communication from the Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Drawbridge Regulations; Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway, Mile 1021.9 and 1022.6, Palm Beach, FL (CGD07–00–037)'' (RIN2115–AE47) (2000–0024), received May 1, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–8751. A communication from the Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Drawbridge Regulations; Sacramento River, CA (CGD11–00–002)'' (RIN2115–AE47) (2000–0025), received May 1, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–8752. A communication from the Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety/Security Zone Regulations; Sunken Vessel JESSICA ANN, Cape Elizabeth, ME (CGD01–00–120)'' (RIN2115–AA97) (2000–0007), received April 27, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–8753. A communication from the Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Drawbridge Regulations; Merrimack River, MA (CGD01–99–029)'' (RIN2115–AE47) (2000–0023), received April 27, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC–8754. A communication from the Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled ''Safety/Security Zone Regulations; San Juan Harbor, PR (COTP San Juan 00–013)'' (RIN2115–AA97) (2000–0008), received May 1, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The following petitions and memorials were laid before the Senate and were referred or ordered to lie on the table as indicated:

POM–486. A resolution adopted by the Senate of the General Assembly of the State of Iowa relative the Rock Island Arsenal; to the Committee on Armed Services.

SENATE RESOLUTION NO. 107

Whereas, the facilities of the Rock Island Arsenal employ several thousand people; reflect a greatly enhanced physical plant, machine tool inventory, and data processing capabilities; and comprise one of the largest weapons manufacturing arsenals in the world; and

Whereas, the Rock Island Arsenal has proven capable of producing many weapons systems at a lower cost than producers of such systems in the private sector; and

Whereas, the Defense Megacenter-Rock Island, located at the Rock Island Arsenal, has the significant ability to furnish a full range of automation services, including business, tactical, and logistical systems support; and

Whereas, the communities in the states of Illinois and Iowa which are located in the vicinity of the Rock Island Arsenal recognize and appreciate the contribution which the Rock Island Arsenal makes to the economic vitality and stability of the region; Now therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate, That the United States Department of Defense, the United States Army, and the United States Congress are urged to place production work at the Rock Island Arsenal, and to consider increased utilization of the Arsenal's facilities, so that the capabilities of the Rock Island Arsenal, and economic vitality of the surrounding region, may be utilized to the fullest extent possible; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this Resolution be sent to the President of the United States, the United States Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Army, the Commander of Headquarters of the Army Materiel Command, the President, Majority Leader, and Minority Leader of the United States Senate, the Speaker, Majority Leader, and Minority Leader of the United States House of Representatives, and to members of the Illinois and Iowa congressional delegations.

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. LAUTENBERG:

S. 2493. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to deter the smuggling of tobacco products into the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER:

S. 2494. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide compensation and benefits to children of female Vietnam veterans who were born with certain birth defects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BREAUX:

S. 2495. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on stainless steel rail car body shells; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BREAUX:

S. 2496. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on stainless steel rail car body shells; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MCCAIN (for himself and Mr. LIEBERMAN):

S. 2497. A bill to provide for the development, use, and enforcement of an easily recognizable system in plain English for labeling violent content in audio and visual media products and services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. MOYNIHAN (for himself, Mr. COCHRAN, and Mr. FRIST):

S. 2498. A bill to authorize the Smithsonian Institution to plan, design, construct, and equip laboratory, administrative, and support space to house base operations for the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory Submillimeter Array located on Mauna Kea at Hilo, Hawaii; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. LAUTENBERG:

S. 2493. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to deter the smuggling of tobacco products into the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

TOBACCO SMUGGLING ERADICATION ACT OF 2000

Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Tobacco Smuggling Eradication Act.

When Congress last debated tobacco legislation, Big Tobacco raised the specter of rampant smuggling to defeat the legislation. Of course, the public only found out recently that Big Tobacco itself is a major player in the smuggling game. A tobacco company executive recently pleaded guilty to money laundering charges in a case involving nearly $700 million worth of cigarettes on the Canadian black market. Although the company denies knowledge of the scheme, they clearly profited from it.

The best way to address smuggling concerns is to prevent any large-scale smuggling problem from arising in the first place. The Tobacco Smuggling Eradication Act contains several common-sense provisions to combat smuggling of tobacco products, and associated tax evasion.

The bill will require unique serial numbers on all tobacco product packages manufactured or imported into the United States, and will require all packages bound for export to be marked for export. Under current law, export-bound products that re-enter the U.S. too often avoid tax assessment, and are sold at discount, in competition with products on which taxes have been paid. Likewise, re-imported products under current law often evade counting for purposes of the multistate settlement, and thus cheat Americans twice—once in avoidance of tax, and again in avoidance of MSA assessment.

The bill would require retailers to maintain tobacco-related records, which may consist simply of ordinary business records. This provision would ensure that invoices for tax-paid tobacco products match sales, and that the retailer is not an outlet for product on which tax has not been paid.

The bill also would require wholesalers to keep records on the chain of custody of tobacco products. This requirement already exists for manufacturers, exporters, and importers. This requirement needs to be strengthened in order to ensure that product marked for export is not diverted back into the domestic market without appropriate taxes having been collected.

In addition, the bill would amend the Contraband Cigarette Trafficking Act, which assists states in enforcing and collecting their excise taxes, by lowering the threshold of jurisdiction to 30,000 cigarettes (from 60,000) and expanding it to cover other tobacco products. Federal law should ensure that states have the necessary tools to stop interstate bootleggers who routinely move tons of tobacco products from low-tax states to higher-tax states.

Mr. President, this is important legislation which would crack down on bootleggers and black marketeers. I urge my colleagues to support this bill. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2493

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 ''Tobacco Smuggling Eradication Act of 2000''.

TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO INTERNAL REVENUE CODE OF 1986

SEC. 101. AMENDMENT OF 1986 CODE.

Whenever in this title an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

SEC. 102. IMPROVED MARKING AND LABELING.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (b) of section 5723 (relating to marks, labels, and notices) is amended—

(1) by striking '', if any,'' and

(2) by adding at the end the following: ''Such marks, labels, and notices shall include marks and notices relating to the following:

''(1) IDENTIFICATION.—The Secretary shall promulgate regulations that require each manufacturer or importer of tobacco products to legibly print a unique serial number on all packages of tobacco products manufactured or imported for sale or distribution. Such serial number shall be designed to enable the Secretary to identify the manufacturer or importer of the product, and the location and date of manufacture or importation. The Secretary shall determine the size and location of the serial number.

''(2) MARKING REQUIREMENTS FOR EXPORTS.—Each package of a tobacco product that is exported shall be marked for export from the United States. The Secretary shall promulgate regulations to determine the size and location of the mark and under what circumstances a waiver of this paragraph shall be granted.''.

(b) SALES ON INDIAN RESERVATIONS.—Section 5723 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsections:

''(f) SALES ON INDIAN RESERVATIONS.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of the Interior, shall promulgate regulations that require that each package of a tobacco product that is sold on an Indian reservation (as defined in section 403(9) of the Indian Child Protection and Family Violence Prevention Act (25 U.S.C. 3202(9)) be labeled as such. Such regulations shall include requirements for the size and location of the label.

''(g) DEFINITION OF PACKAGE.—For purposes of this section, the term 'package' means the innermost sealed container irrespective of the material from which such container is made, in which a tobacco product is placed by the manufacturer and in which such tobacco product is offered for sale to a member of the general public.''.

SEC. 103. WHOLESALERS REQUIRED TO HAVE PERMIT.

Section 5712 (relating to application for permit) is amended by inserting '', wholesaler,'' after ''manufacturer''.

SEC. 104. CONDITIONS OF PERMIT.

Subsection (a) of section 5713 (relating to issuance of permit) is amended to read as follows:

''(a) ISSUANCE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A person shall not engage in business as a manufacturer, wholesaler, or importer of tobacco products or as an export warehouse proprietor without a permit to engage in such business. Such permit shall be issued in such form and in such manner as the Secretary shall by regulation prescribe, to every person properly qualified under sections 5711 and 5712. A new permit may be required at such other time as the Secretary shall by regulation prescribe.

''(2) CONDITIONS.—The issuance of a permit under this section shall be conditioned upon the compliance with the requirements of this chapter and the Contraband Cigarette Trafficking Act (28 U.S.C. chapter 114), and any regulations issued pursuant to such statutes.''.

SEC. 105. RECORDS TO BE MAINTAINED.

Section 5741 (relating to records to be maintained) is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(a) IN GENERAL.—'' before ''Every manufacturer'',

(2) by inserting ''every wholesaler,'' after ''every importer,'',

(3) by striking ''such records'' and inserting ''records concerning the chain of custody of the tobacco products and such other records'', and

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

''(b) RETAILERS.—Retailers shall maintain records of receipt of tobacco products, and

such records shall be available to the Secretary for inspection and audit. An ordinary commercial record or invoice shall satisfy the requirements of this subsection if such record shows the date of receipt, from whom tobacco products were received, and the quantity of tobacco products received.''.

SEC. 106. REPORTS.

Section 5722 (relating to reports) is amended—

(1) by inserting ''(a) IN GENERAL.—'' before ''Every manufacturer'', and

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

''(b) REPORTS BY EXPORT WAREHOUSE PROPRIETORS.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—Prior to exportation of tobacco products from the United States, the export warehouse proprietor shall submit a report (in such manner and form as the Secretary may by regulation prescribe) to enable the Secretary to identify the shipment and assure that it reaches its intended destination.

''(2) AGREEMENTS WITH FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS.—Notwithstanding section 6103 of this title, the Secretary is authorized to enter into agreements with foreign governments to exchange or share information contained in reports received from export warehouse proprietors of tobacco products if—

''(A) the Secretary believes that such agreement will assist in—

''(i) ensuring compliance with the provisions of this chapter or regulations promulgated thereunder, or

''(ii) preventing or detecting violations of the provisions of this chapter or regulations promulgated thereunder, and

''(B) the Secretary obtains assurances from such government that the information will be held in confidence and used only for the purposes specified in clauses (i) and (ii) of subparagraph (A).

No information may be exchanged or shared with any government that has violated such assurances.''.

SEC. 107. FRAUDULENT OFFENSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (a) of section 5762 (relating to fraudulent offenses) is amended by striking paragraph (1) and redesignating paragraphs (2) through (6) as paragraphs (1) through (5), respectively.

(b) OFFENSES RELATING TO DISTRIBUTION OF TOBACCO PRODUCTS.—Section 5762 is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (b) as subsection (c),

(2) in subsection (c) (as so redesignated), by inserting ''or (b)'' after ''(a)'', and

(3) by inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsection:

''(b) OFFENSES RELATING TO DISTRIBUTION OF TOBACCO PRODUCTS.—It shall be unlawful—

''(1) for any person to engage in the business as a manufacturer or importer of tobacco products or cigarette papers and tubes, or to engage in the business as a wholesaler or an export warehouse proprietor, without filing the bond and obtaining the permit where required by this chapter or regulations thereunder;

''(2) for an importer, manufacturer, or wholesaler permitted under this chapter intentionally to ship, transport, deliver, or receive any tobacco products from or to any person other than a person permitted under this chapter or a retailer, except a permitted importer may receive foreign tobacco products from a foreign manufacturer or a foreign distributor that have not previously entered the United States;

''(3) for any person, except a manufacturer or an export warehouse proprietor permitted under this chapter to receive any tobacco products that have previously been exported and returned to the United States;

''(4) for any export warehouse proprietor intentionally to ship, transport, sell, or deliver for sale any tobacco products to any person other than a permitted manufacturer or foreign purchaser;

''(5) for any person other than an export warehouse proprietor permitted under this chapter intentionally to ship, transport, receive, or possess, for purposes of resale, any tobacco product in packages marked pursuant to regulations issued under section 5723, other than for direct return to a manufacturer or export warehouse proprietor for repacking or for re-exportation;

''(6) for any manufacturer, export warehouse proprietor, importer, or wholesaler permitted under this chapter to make intentionally any false entry in, to fail willfully to make appropriate entry in, or to fail willfully to maintain properly any record or report that such person is required to keep as required by this chapter or the regulations promulgated thereunder; and

''(7) for any person to alter, mutilate, destroy, obliterate, or remove any mark or label required under this chapter upon a tobacco product held for sale, except pursuant to regulations of the Secretary authorizing relabeling for purposes of compliance with the requirements of this section or of State law.

Any person violating any of the provisions of this subsection shall, upon conviction, be fined as provided in section 3571 of title 18, United States Code, imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both.''.

(c) INTENTIONALLY DEFINED.—Section 5762 is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(d) DEFINITION OF INTENTIONALLY.—For purposes of this section and section 5761, the term 'intentionally' means doing an act, or omitting to do an act, deliberately, and not due to accident, inadvertence, or mistake, regardless of whether the person knew that the act or omission constituted an offense.''.

SEC. 108. CIVIL PENALTIES.

Subsection (a) of section 5761 (relating to civil penalties) is amended—

(1) by striking ''willfully'' and inserting ''intentionally'', and

(2) by striking ''$1,000'' and inserting ''$10,000''.

SEC. 109. DEFINITIONS.

(a) EXPORT WAREHOUSE PROPRIETOR.—Subsection (j) of section 5702 (relating to definition of export warehouse proprietor) is amended by inserting before the period the following: ''or any person engaged in the business of exporting tobacco products from the United States for purposes of sale or distribution. Any duty free store that sells, offers for sale, or otherwise distributes to any person in any single transaction more than 30 packages of cigarettes, or its equivalent for other tobacco products as the Secretary shall by regulation prescribe, shall be deemed an export warehouse proprietor under this chapter''.

(b) RETAILER; WHOLESALER.—Section 5702 is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(q) RETAILER.—The term 'retailer' means any dealer who sells, or offers for sale, any tobacco product at retail. The term 'retailer' includes any duty-free store that sells, offers for sale, or otherwise distributes at retail in any single transaction 30 or less packages, or its equivalent for other tobacco products.

''(r) WHOLESALER.—The term 'wholesaler' means any person engaged in the business of purchasing tobacco products for resale at wholesale, or any person acting as an agent or broker for any person engaged in the business of purchasing tobacco products for resale at wholesale.''.

SEC. 110. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by this title shall take effect on January 1, 2000.

TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO THE CONTRABAND CIGARETTE TRAFFICKING ACT

SEC. 201. AMENDMENTS TO THE CONTRABAND CIGARETTE TRAFFICKING ACT.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 2341 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), by striking ''60,000'' and inserting ''30,000'';

(2) in paragraph (4), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(3) in paragraph (5), by striking the period and inserting a semicolon; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

''(6) the term 'tobacco product' means cigars, cigarettes, smokeless tobacco, and pipe tobacco (as such terms are defined in section 5701 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986); and

''(7) the term 'contraband tobacco product' means a quantity of tobacco product that is equivalent to or more than 30,000 cigarettes as determined by regulation, which bear no evidence of the payment of applicable State tobacco taxes in the State where such tobacco products are found, if such State requires a stamp, impression,or other indication to be placed on packages or other containers of product to evidence payment of tobacco taxes.

(b) UNLAWFUL ACTS.—Section 2342 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by inserting ''or contraband tobacco products'' before the period;

(2) by striking subsection (b) and inserting the following:

''(b) It shall be unlawful for any person—

''(1) knowingly to make any false statement or representation with respect to the information required by this chapter to be kept in the records or reports of any person who ships, sells, or distributes any quantity of cigarettes in excess of 30,000 in a single transaction or tobacco products in such equivalent quantities as shall be determined by regulation, or

''(2) knowingly to fail to maintain records or reports, alter or obliterate required markings, or interfere with any inspection, required under this chapter, with respect to such quantity of cigarettes or other tobacco products.''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(c) It shall be unlawful for any person knowingly to transport tobacco products under a false bill of lading or without any bill of lading.''.

(c) RECORDKEEPING.—Section 2343 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by inserting after ''transaction'' the following: '', or, in the case of other tobacco products an equivalent quantity as determined by regulation,'';

(B) by striking ''60,000'' and inserting ''30,000''; and

(C) by striking the last sentence and inserting the following: ''Except as provided in subsection (c) of this section, nothing contained herein shall authorize the Secretary to require reporting under this section.'';

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking ''60,000'' and inserting ''30,000''; and

(B) by inserting after ''transaction'' the following: '', or, in the case of other tobacco products an equivalent quantity as determined by regulation,''; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(c)(1) Any person who ships, sells, or distributes cigarettes or tobacco products for resale in interstate commerce, whereby such cigarettes or tobacco products are shipped into a State taxing the sale or use of such cigarettes or tobacco products or who advertises or offers cigarettes or tobacco products for such sale or transfer and shipment shall—

''(A) first file with the tobacco tax administrator of the State into which such shipment is made or in which such advertisement or offer is disseminated, a statement setting for the person's name, and trade name (if any), and the address of the person's principal place of business and of any other place of business; and

''(B) not later than the 10th of each calendar month, file with the tobacco tax administrator of the State into which such shipment is made a memorandum or a copy of the invoice covering each and every shipment of cigarettes or tobacco products made during the previous calendar month into such State; the memorandum or invoice in each case to include the name and address of the person to whom the shipment was made, the brand, and the quantity thereof.

''(2) The fact that any person ships or delivers for shipment any cigarettes or tobacco products shall, if such shipment is into a State in which such person has filed a statement with the tobacco tax administrator under paragraph (1)(A) of this subsection, be presumptive evidence that such cigarettes or tobacco products were sold, shipped, or distributed for resale by such person.

''(3) For purposes of this subsection—

''(A) the term 'use' in addition to its ordinary meaning, means consumption, storage, handling, or disposal of cigarettes or tobacco products; and

''(B) the term 'tobacco tax administrator' means the State official authorized to administer tobacco tax laws of the State.''.

(d) PENALTIES.—Section 2344 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (b), by inserting ''or (c)'' after ''section 2342(b)''; and

(2) in subsection (c), by inserting ''or contraband tobacco products'' after ''cigarettes''.

(e) STATE JURISDICTION NOT AFFECTED.—Section 2345 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by inserting ''or tobacco product'' after ''cigarette''; and

(B) by inserting '', tobacco products,'' after ''cigarettes''; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by inserting ''or tobacco product'' after ''cigarette''; and

(B) by inserting '', tobacco products,'' after ''cigarettes''.

(f) REPEAL.—The Act entitled ''An Act to assist States in collecting sales and use taxes on cigarettes'', approved October 19, 1949 (15 U.S.C. 375 et seq.) is repealed.

(g) CIVIL FORFEITURE.—Section 981(a)(1)(C) of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking ''or 1344'' and inserting ''1344, or 2344''.

By Mr. ROCKEFELLER:

S. 2494. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide compensation and benefits to children of female Vietnam veterans who were born with certain birth defects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

CHILDREN OF FEMALE VIETNAM VETERANS' BENEFITS ACT OF 2000

Mr. ROCKEFELLER. Mr. President, I introduce, on behalf of myself and Senator MURRAY, legislation that would aid the children born with birth defects to female Vietnam veterans. This legislation, the Children of Female Vietnam Veterans' Benefits Act of 2000, is long overdue. As we commemorate the 25th anniversary of the end of the war, it is a particularly appropriate time for passage of this important legislation.

Women played a critical role in Vietnam. As nurses, they provided lifesaving care to the wounded and comfort to the dying. Their compassion and selflessness is legendary. Others served in countless other ways, as clerks, mapmakers, photographers, air traffic controllers, Red Cross and USO workers, and other volunteer roles. Their support was crucial to the war effort.

Last year, the VA completed study on women Vietnam veterans which concluded that there was a ''statistically significant increase in birth defects'' in their children. VA generally does not have the legal authority to provide health care and compensation to the children of veterans, except in the case of spina bifida.

The legislation we are sponsoring would apply to children of women Vietnam veterans born with birth defects, other than spina bifida, which resulted in permanent physical or mental disability, except for certain birth defects determined by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to result from genetics, birth injury, or fetal or neonatal infirmities with well-established causes. The benefits would include health care, vocational rehabilitation services, and financial compensation, depending on the degree of disability.

In closing, I emphasize that the health care and benefits provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs play a crucial role in supporting the healing process I spoke of earlier. While no amount of remuneration can ever truly compensate for bodily injury and emotional trauma, we have the responsibility to provide the tools for coping and to ease the difficulties of daily life. I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

This bill will provide health care and compensation to the children of women Vietnam veterans who were born with permanently disabling birth defects. Though they have waited 25 years for this acknowledgment, this legislation has the ability to significantly improve the lives of women veterans and their disabled children. These women and children have endured incredible and ongoing hardships for this country, and their significance must be realized. We can no longer ignore the responsibility the government owes to women veterans.

This bill has its origin in a study the Department of Veterans Affairs did on women Vietnam veterans. In response to the concerns of many women Vietnam Veterans, Congress required that VA perform a comprehensive study of any long-term adverse health effects that may have been suffered by these women. This mandate led to three separate but related epidemiologic studies of women Vietnam-era veterans: 1) a post Vietnam service mortality follow-up; 2) an assessment of psychologic health outcomes; and 3) a review of reproductive health outcomes. This particular study, released in 1999, analyzed the reproductive outcomes of over 4000 women Vietnam veterans, compared with 4000 women Vietnam-era veterans.

The study revealed that the risk of a woman Vietnam veterans having a child with birth defects was significantly elevated, even after adjusting for age, demographic variables, military characteristics, and smoking and alcohol consumption of the mothers. Upon review of the resulting conclusions, the VA study's task force recommended that the Secretary seek statutory authority to provide health care and other benefits to the offspring of women veterans with birth defects. Secretary West approved of this recommendation. The tragic realization of the birth defects present in so many of the children of women Vietnam veterans brings light to a situation that cries out not only for our sympathy, but for an acceptance of governmental responsibility and action.

VA does not have the authority under current law to provide health care or other benefits to the children of women Vietnam veterans disabled from birth defects other than spina bifida. Thus, the enabling legislation that I introduce today is absolutely necessary in order to address the compelling needs of these children.

Currently, VA has the authority to compensate and aid veterans, and the dependents of these veterans, for disease or injury to the veteran due to service. Millions of veterans, from every branch of the Armed Forces, have been helped by this benefit. These small amounts of compensation can in no way fully redress the physical and psychological injuries that war has caused these veterans, their children, and their spouses. But it does serve to assist these veterans to live active and fulfilled lives, and it would assist with making up for lost income over the years, due to the injuries. However, no benefits have been extended to the children of veterans, for their own harm.

In 1996, VA was given special authority to provide benefits and compensation to the children of Vietnam veterans for their own disease associated with their parent's service—for those children born with spina bifida. The legislation I am introducing today is modeled after that ground breaking spina bifida legislation. We owe that same debt to the children born with birth defects to women Vietnam veterans. My cosponsors and I believe that providing this assistance to children disabled by birth defects associated with their mother's military service would be a fitting extension of the principle of providing benefits for disabilities that are incurred or aggravated as a result of service on active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States.

I am seeking to aid the children of women Vietnam veterans who have been tragically affected by birth defects. These women fought for their country, and served this Nation with honor and courage. They volunteered to be placed in harm's way, without knowledge of what effects their service may bring later. Many were nurses who cared for wounded soldiers, and offered enormously important support services to all those in active duty. Indeed, these women provided such an incredible nursing service to injured soldiers that less than 2% of all treated casualties during the war died. These women saw death and disease, and they experienced their own forms of disillusionment with the war. These women

fought on the front lines; they were not kept away in safe places during the conflict.

Further, I want to add that these women performed a service for women who have been in any way involved in the Armed Forces since then, by contributing to the changes in the military structure of the 1970s and since. Women performed critically important roles during the Vietnam war. Their ongoing contributions were recognized as altogether essential. Disastrously, some of their children have suffered because their mothers were so courageous, and it is time for them to begin to be repaid for that suffering.

Though long overdue perhaps, now is a particularly appropriate time for passage of this important legislation. As we celebrate the 25th anniversary of the end of the Vietnam War, we must remember the women Vietnam veterans who served this country so well, all those years ago. These women paid for their service not only with their own bodies, but too often with the bodies of their children who were born years later. It is my opinion that this legislation is late in coming, but there is no time like the present. As we take these recent months to remember the Vietnam War, I can think of no more fitting time than this for this bill. After all, though the fighting in Vietnam came to an end 25 years ago, the consequences of that fighting are still dramatically present.

At the heart of this legislation, this bill would apply to children of women Vietnam veterans born with birth defects, other than spina bifida, which resulted in permanent physical or mental disability, except for birth defects determined by the Secretary of Veterans' Affairs to result from familial disorders, birth-related injuries, or fetal or neonatal infirmities with well-established causes.

The legislation authorizes VA to provide or reimburse a contractor for health care delivered to the disabled children for the birth defect and associated conditions. This health care would include home, hospital, nursing home, outpatient, preventative, habilitative, rehabilitative and respite care. It also includes pharmaceuticals and supplies required by the birth defect, such as wheelchairs, if appropriate.

The legislation also provides compensation from the VA to the children at four payment levels. The benefits would be for $100, $214, $743, and $1,272, per month, depending upon the severity of the child's disability. Future cost-of-living adjustments would be based on the Consumer Price Index, just as other veterans and Social Security benefits are adjusted.

This bill also authorizes VA to furnish the disabled children with important vocational rehabilitation services. The services would include: VA design of a training plan that is individually designed, accounting for the individual needs of the child; placement and post-placement services, personal and work adjustment training. It may also include education at an institution of higher learning. The programs would generally run 24 months, but if necessary, the Secretary may extend the program for an additional 24 months.

This legislation would be effective one year after the date of enactment, in order to allow time for regulations to be established. VA estimates that the costs for this legislation would be approximately $25 million over five years.

In conclusion, I believe that we must help the children born with disabling birth defects associated with their mother's service in Vietnam. It is the logical extension of our policy to provide benefits for disabilities that result from service. It's the compassionate thing to do—to ensure that these children have the health care and other benefits they need to survive. As a nation, it is our unwavering responsibility to deal with all the consequences of war, not just the easy and obvious ones.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill fact sheet be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2494

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 ''Children of Female Vietnam Veterans' Benefits Act of 2000''.

SEC. 2. BENEFITS FOR THE CHILDREN OF FEMALE VIETNAM VETERANS WHO SUFFER FROM CERTAIN BIRTH DEFECTS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 18 of title 38, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new subchapter:

''SUBCHAPTER II—CHILDREN OF FEMALE VIETNAM VETERANS BORN WITH CERTAIN BIRTH DEFECTS

''§ 1811. Definitions

''In this subchapter:

''(1) The term 'child', with respect to a female Vietnam veteran, means a natural child of the female Vietnam veteran, regardless of age or marital status, who was conceived after the date on which the female Vietnam veteran first entered the Republic of Vietnam during the Vietnam era (as specified in section 101(29)(A) of this title).

''(2) The term 'covered birth defect' means each birth defect identified by the Secretary under section 1812 of this title.

''(3) The term 'female Vietnam veteran' means any female individual who performed active military, naval, or air service in the Republic of Vietnam during the Vietnam era (as so specified), without regard to the characterization of the individual's service.

''§ 1812. Birth defects covered

''(a) IDENTIFICATION.—Subject to subsection (b), the Secretary shall identify the birth defects of children of female Vietnam veterans that—

''(1) are associated with the service of female Vietnam veterans in the Republic of Vietnam during the Vietnam era (as specified in section 101(29)(A) of this title); and

''(2) result in the permanent physical or mental disability of such children.

''(b) LIMITATIONS.—(1) The birth defects identified under subsection (a) may not include birth defects resulting from the following:

''(A) A familial disorder.

''(B) A birth-related injury.

''(C) A fetal or neonatal infirmity with well-established causes.

''(2) The birth defects identified under subsection (a) may not include spina bifida.

''(c) LIST.—The Secretary shall prescribe in regulations a list of the birth defects identified under subsection (a).

''§ 1813. Benefits and assistance

''(a) HEALTH CARE.—(1) The Secretary shall provide a child of a female Vietnam veteran who was born with a covered birth defect such health care as the Secretary determines is needed by the child for such birth defect or any disability that is associated with such birth defect.

''(2) The Secretary may provide health care under this subsection directly or by contract or other arrangement with a health care provider.

''(3) For purposes of this subsection, the definitions in section 1803(c) of this title shall apply with respect to the provision of health care under this subsection, except that for such purposes—

''(A) the reference to 'specialized spina bifida clinic' in paragraph (2) of such section 1803(c) shall treated as a reference to a specialized clinic treating the birth defect concerned under this subsection; and

''(B) the reference to 'vocational training under section 1804 of this title' in paragraph (8) of such section 1803(c) shall be treated as a reference to vocational training under subsection (b).

''(b) VOCATIONAL TRAINING.—(1) The Secretary may provide a program of vocational training to a child of a female Vietnam veteran who was born with a covered birth defect if the Secretary determines that the achievement of a vocational goal by the child is reasonably feasible.

''(2) Subsections (b) through (e) of section 1804 of this title shall apply with respect to any program of vocational training provided under paragraph (1).

''(c) MONETARY ALLOWANCE.—(1) The Secretary shall pay a monthly allowance to any child of a female Vietnam veteran who was born with a covered birth defect for any disability resulting from such birth defect.

''(2) The amount of the monthly allowance paid under this subsection shall be based on the degree of disability suffered by the child concerned, as determined in accordance with a schedule for rating disabilities resulting from covered birth defects that is prescribed by the Secretary.

''(3) In prescribing a schedule for rating disabilities under paragraph (2), the Secretary shall establish four levels of disability upon which the amount of the monthly allowance under this subsection shall be based.

''(4) The amount of the monthly allowance paid under this subsection shall be as follows:

''(A) In the case of a child suffering from the lowest level of disability prescribed in the schedule for rating disabilities under this subsection, $100.

''(B) In the case of a child suffering from the lower intermediate level of disability prescribed in the schedule for rating disabilities under this subsection, the greater of—

''(i) $214; or

''(ii) the monthly amount payable under section 1805(b)(3) of this title for the lowest level of disability prescribed for purposes of that section.

''(C) In the case of a child suffering from the higher intermediate level of disability prescribed in the schedule for rating disabilities under this subsection, the greater of—

''(i) $743; or

''(ii) the monthly amount payable under section 1805(b)(3) of this title for the intermediate level of disability prescribed for purposes of that section.

''(D) In the case of a child suffering from the highest level of disability prescribed in the schedule for rating disabilities under this subsection, the greater of—

''(i) $1,272; or

''(ii) the monthly amount payable under section 1805(b)(3) of this title for the highest level of disability prescribed for purposes of that section.

''(5) Amounts under subparagraphs (A), (B)(i), (C)(i), and (D)(i) of paragraph (4) shall be subject to adjustment from time to time under section 5312 of this title.

''(6) Subsections (c) and (d) of section 1805 of this title shall apply with respect to any monthly allowance paid under this subsection.

''(d) GENERAL LIMITATIONS ON AVAILABILITY OF BENEFITS AND ASSISTANCE.—(1) No individual receiving benefits or assistance under this section may receive any benefits or assistance under subchapter I of this chapter.

''(2) In any case where affirmative evidence establishes that the covered birth defect of a child results from a cause other than the active military, naval, or air service in the Republic of Vietnam of the female Vietnam veteran who is the mother of the child, no benefits or assistance may be provided the child under this section.

''(e) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall prescribe regulations for purposes of the administration of the provisions of this section.''.

(b) ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.—That chapter is further amended by inserting after subchapter II, as added by subsection (a) of this section, the following new subchapter:

''SUBCHAPTER III—ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

''§ 1821. Applicability of certain administrative provisions

''The provisions of sections 5101(c), 5110(a), (b)(2), (g), and (i), 5111, and 5112(a), (b)(1), (b)(6), (b)(9), and (b)(10) of this title shall apply with respect to benefits and assistance under this chapter in the same manner as such provisions apply to veterans' disability compensation.

''§ 1822. Treatment of receipt of monetary allowance on other benefits

''(a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, receipt by an individual of a monetary allowance under this chapter shall not impair, infringe, or otherwise affect the right of the individual to receive any other benefit to which the individual is otherwise entitled under any law administered by the Secretary.

''(b) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, receipt by an individual of a monetary allowance under this chapter shall not impair, infringe, or otherwise affect the right of any other individual to receive any benefit to which such other individual is entitled under any law administered by the Secretary based on the relationship of such other individual to the individual who receives such monetary allowance.

''(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, a monetary allowance paid an individual under this chapter shall not be considered as income or resources in determining eligibility for or the amount of benefits under any Federal or Federally-assisted program.''.

(c) REPEAL OF SUPERSEDED MATTER.—Section 1806 of title 38, United States Code, is repealed.

(d) REDESIGNATION OF EXISTING MATTER.—Chapter 18 of that title is further amended by inserting before section 1801 the following:

''SUBCHAPTER I—CHILDREN OF VIETNAM VETERANS BORN WITH SPINA BIFIDA''.

(e) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—(1) Sections 1801 and 1802 of that title are each amended by striking ''this chapter'' and inserting ''this subchapter''.

(2) Section 1805(a) of such title is amended by striking ''this chapter'' and inserting ''this section''.

(e) CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.—(1)(A) The chapter heading of chapter 18 of that title is amended to read as follows:

''CHAPTER 18—BENEFITS FOR CHILDREN OF VIETNAM VETERANS''.

(B) The tables of chapters at beginning of that title, and at the beginning of part II of that title, are each amended by striking the item relating to chapter 18 and inserting the following new item:

''18. Benefits for Children of Vietnam Veterans ..... 1801''.

(2) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 18 of that title is amended—

(A) by inserting after the chapter heading the following:

''SUBCHAPTER I—CHILDREN OF VIETNAM VETERANS BORN WITH SPINA BIFIDA'';

(B) by striking the item relating to section 1806; and

(C) by adding at the end the following:

''SUBCHAPTER II—CHILDREN OF FEMALE VIETNAM VETERANS BORN WITH CERTAIN BIRTH DEFECTS

''1811. Definitions.
''1812. Birth defects covered.
''1813. Benefits and assistance.

''SUBCHAPTER III—ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

''1821. Applicability of certain administrative provisions.
''1822. Treatment of receipt of monetary allowance on other benefits.''.

(f) APPLICABILITY.—(1) Except as provided in paragraph (2), the amendments made by this section shall take effect on the first day of the first month beginning more than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(2) The Secretary of Veterans Affairs shall identify birth defects under section 1822 of title 38, United States Code (as added by subsection (a) of this section), and shall prescribe the regulations required by subchapter II of that title (as so added), not later than the effective date specified in paragraph (1).

(3) No benefit or assistance may be provided under subchapter II of chapter 18 of title 38, United States Code (as so added), for any period before the effective date specified in paragraph (1) by reason of the amendments made by this section.

FACT SHEET

BACKGROUND

In 1999, VA released an epidemiological study on women Vietnam veterans which found a ''statistically significant increase in birth defects'' in the children of women Vietnam veterans, particularly moderate to severe birth defects. The reproductive outcomes of over 4,000 Vietnam women veterans were compared with 4,000 Vietnam-era women veterans.

VA currently has authority to compensate veterans and dependents for disease or injury of the veteran due to service. VA was given special authority in 1996, to provide benefits to children of Vietnam veterans for their own disease resulting from their parent's service—for those children born with spina bifida

LEGISLATION

This bill would apply to women Vietnam veterans' children born with birth defects (other than spina bifida) which result in permanent physical or mental disability, except for birth defects determined by the Secretary of VA to result from familial disorders, birth-related injuries, or fetal or neonatal infirmities with well-established causes.

This bill is modeled after the 1996 spina bifida legislation.

It authorizes VA to provide or reimburse a contractor for health care delivered to the disabled children for the birth defect and associated conditions. This health care would include home, hospital, nursing home, outpatient, preventative, habilitative, rehabilitative and respite care. It also includes pharmaceuticals and supplies required by the birth defect, such as wheel chairs, if appropriate.

It provides compensation from the VA to the children at four payment levels. The benefits would be for $100, $214, $743, and $1,272, depending upon the severity of the disability. Future cost of living adjustments would be indexed and based on the Consumer Price Index, just as other veterans' and Social Security benefits are adjusted.

This bill also authorizes VA to furnish the disabled children with vocational rehabilitation services. The services would include: VA provision of a training plan that is individually designed, accounting for the individual needs of the child; placement and post-placement services; and personal and work adjustment training. It may also include education at an institution of higher learning. The programs will generally run 24 months, but if necessary, the Secretary may extend the program for an additional 24 months.

The legislation would be effective one year after the date of enactment, in order to allow time for regulations to be established.

VA estimates that the costs for this legislation would be approximately $25 million over five years.

By Mr. MOYNIHAN (for himself, Mr. COCHRAN, and Mr. FRIST):

S. 2498. A bill to authorize the Smithsonian Institution to plan, design, construct, and equip laboratory, administrative, and support space to house base operations for the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory Submillimeter Array located on Mauna Kea at Hilo, Hawaii; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

LEGISLATION TO AUTHORIZE THE SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION TO CONSTRUCT A BASE FACILITY IN HILO, HAWAII

• Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I am pleased to introduce today, with Senator COCHRAN and Senator FRIST, legislation to authorize the construction of a base facility structure in Hilo, Hawaii, to house the staff and laboratory operations of the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory's Submillimeter Array (SMA) atop the summit of the ancient volcano Mauna Kea.

The advanced SMA is an array of eight moveable radio telescope antennas. Its combined images can produce high-resolution detail 50 times sharper than those achieved by any telescopes currently making observations at these wavelengths. Ultimately, this telescope array will be used to study a host of astronomical objects and phenomena emitting images in the submillimeter

range, the narrow band of radiation between radio and infrared waves, a portion of the electromagnetic spectrum largely unexplored from the ground. Using the latest technology, the array will be able to probe the murky clouds of the Milky Way where stars are born, peer into the hearts of exploding galaxies, study cool faint objects of our own Solar System, and explore other great questions in astronomy, gaining insight into the processes and cataclysmic forces involved in the ultimate formation and evolution of stars, planets and galaxies.

Like the innovative Chandra X-ray Observatory, which is now sending back stunning images from space, essentially all of the Submillimeter Array's equipment was designed and prototyped at the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory's facilities in Cambridge, Massachusetts. And, just as the Smithsonian collaborates with NASA on the groundbreaking Chandra project, it collaborates with the Institute of Astronomy and Astrophysics of the Academia Sinica of Taiwan on the advanced SMA.

On September 29, 1999, by tracking and observing 230 gigahertz (230 billion cycles per second) of radiation from Mars, Venus, Saturn, and Jupiter, SMA scientists made their first test observation—thereby achieving the submillimeter equivalent of ''first light''—and took a critical step in the ultimate success of this project. This is but yet another milestone in the history of the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory (SAO). Founded in 1890 by Secretary Samuel Langley as a center for ''the new astronomy,'' where one might study the physical nature of astronomical bodies as well as their positions and motions, SAO pioneered studies of the relationship between the solar and terrestrial phenomena. In the earliest days of the Space Age, SAO established and operated a worldwide network of satellite-tracking stations, including one on the island of Maui, and developed experiments for some of the first orbiting space observatories. Today, SAO, the Smithsonian unit with the largest budget, is headquartered—in a partnership with Harvard University—in Cambridge, Massachusetts. At that facility more than 300 scientists are engaged in a broad program of astronomy, astrophysics, and earth and space sciences supported by Federal appropriations, Smithsonian trust funds, Harvard University funds, and contracts and grants. In addition to the Submillimeter Array in Hawaii, SAO maintains a major data-gathering facility at the Whipple Observatory near Tucson, Arizona and operates the Oak Ridge Observatory in Massachusetts.

The legislation I am introducing today authorizes the Smithsonian to plan, design, construct, and equip approximately 16,000 square feet of laboratory, administrative, and support space at the base of Mauna Kea, replacing inadequate, temporary leased space. It further authorizes an appropriation of $2,000,000 in fiscal year 2001 and $2,500,000 in fiscal year 2002. This is a very modest investment to ensure the continuation of the scientific achievement and research excellence that have been a tradition at the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory for 110 years.

I urge the speedy passage of this legislation and ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 2498

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

SECTION 1. FACILITY AUTHORIZED.

The Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution is authorized to plan, design, construct, and equip laboratory, administrative, and support space to house base operations for the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory Submillimeter Array located on Mauna Kea at Hilo, Hawaii.

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution to carry out this Act, $2,000,000 for fiscal year 2001, and $2,500,000 for fiscal year 2002, which shall remain available until expended.●

● Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, I am pleased to join my colleague, the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN) and fellow Smithsonian Institution Board Regent in introducing the legislation authorizing a permanent base facility structure at Hilo, Hawaii for the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory Submillimeter Array.

The Submillimeter Array is part of the world-class web of major data-gathering facilities of the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory. Other facilities are located in Arizona and its headquarters in Massachusetts. Together these facilities support some of the world's most advanced studies and discoveries in astronomy, astrophysics, earth and space science.

This legislation will authorize the planning, design, construction and outfitting of the necessary laboratory and other operational space for the array of radio telescope antennas installed atop the ancient volcano, Mauna Kea. Funding is authorized in the amount of $2,000,000 for Fiscal Year 2001 and $2,500,000 for Fiscal Year 2002. The new base station will replace a current system of rented, overcrowded space shared with astrophysical operations of other organizations and countries.

Mr. President, I am proud of the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory 110-year history and its reputation around the world. Its work and discoveries are considered to be some of the most significant of the Twentieth Century. From the first orbiting space observatories to the newest images of our galaxy, the Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory has worked independently and collaborated with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to explore and explain the wonders of the universe.

I hope the Senate will work quickly to pass this legislation so the work of the Submillimeter Array can proceed.●

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS—MAY 1, 2000

S. 636

At the request of Mr. REED, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. L. CHAFEE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 636, a bill to amend title XXVII of the Public Health Service Act and part 7 of subtitle B of title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to establish standards for the health quality improvement of children in managed care plans and other health plans.

S. 818

At the request of Mr. DEWINE, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 818, a bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to conduct a study of the mortality and adverse outcome rates of medicare patients related to the provision of anesthesia services.

S. 961

At the request of Mr. BURNS, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. KOHL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 961, a bill to amend the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act to improve shared appreciation arrangements.

S. 1142

At the request of Ms. MIKULSKI, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1142, a bill to protect the right of a member of a health maintenance organization to receive continuing care at a facility selected by that member, and for other purposes.

S. 1526

At the request of Mr. ROCKEFELLER, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CLELAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1526, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax credit to taxpayers investing in entities seeking to provide capital to create new markets in low-income communities.

S. 1691

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the names of the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. SMITH) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE) were added as cosponsors of S. 1691, a bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to authorize programs for predisaster mitigation, to streamline the administration of disaster relief, to control the Federal costs of disaster assistance, and for other purposes.

S. 1810

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from Texas (Mrs. HUTCHISON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1810, a bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify and improve veterans' claims and appellate procedures.

S. 1900

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1900, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit to holders of qualified bonds issued by Amtrak, and for other purposes.

S. 2003

At the request of Mr. JOHNSON, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of 2003, a bill to restore health care coverage to retired members of the uniformed services.

S. 2270

At the request of Mr. THOMAS, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 2270, a bill to prohibit civil or equitable actions from being brought or continued against manufactures, distributors, dealers, or importers of firearms or ammunition for damages resulting from the misuse of their products by others, to protect gun owner privacy and ownership rights, and for other purposes.

S. 2287

At the request of Mr. L. CHAFEE, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2287, a bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to authorize the Director of the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences to make grants for the development and operation of research centers regarding environmental factors that may be related to the etiology of breast cancer.

S. 2408

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the names of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. ABRAHAM) and the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. LIEBERMAN) were added as cosponsors of S. 2408, a bill to authorize the President to award a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to the Navajo Code Talkers in recognition of their contributions to the Nation.

S. 2414

At the request of Mr. WELLSTONE, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. TORRICELLI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2414, a bill to combat trafficking of persons, especially into the sex trade, slavery, and slavery-like conditions, in the United States and countries around the world through prevention, through prosecution and enforcement against traffickers, and through protection and assistance to victims of trafficking.

S. 2417

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BOND), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL), and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) were added as cosponsors of S. 2417, a bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to increase funding for State nonpoint source pollution control programs, and for other purposes.

S. 2459

At the request of Mr. COVERDELL, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. L. CHAFEE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2459, a bill 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.

S. CON. RES. 60

At the request of Mr. FEINGOLD, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 60, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that a commemorative postage stamp should be issued in honor of the U.S.S. *Wisconsin* and all those who served aboard her.

S. CON. RES. 98

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 98, a concurrent resolution urging compliance with the Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction.

S. CON. RES. 104

At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 104, a concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress regarding the ongoing prosecution of 13 members of Iran's Jewish community.

S. RES. 294

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CLELAND) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 294, a resolution designating the month of October 2000 as ''Children's Internet Safety Month.''

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS—MAY 2, 2000

S. 459

At the request of Mr. BREAUX, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CONRAD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 459, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the State ceiling on private activity bonds.

S. 796

At the request of Mr. DOMENICI, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. BENNETT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 796, a bill to provide for full parity with respect to health insurance coverage for certain severe biologically-based mental illnesses and to prohibit limits on the number of mental illness-related hospital days and outpatient visits that are covered for all mental illnesses.

S. 1145

At the request of Mr. LEAHY, the name of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1145, a bill to provide for the appointment of additional Federal circuit and district judges, and for other purposes.

S. 1155

At the request of Mr. ROBERTS, the names of the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CRAPO) and the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1155, a bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to provide for uniform food safety warning notification requirements, and for other purposes.

S. 1922

At the request of Mr. KERREY, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HELMS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1922, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax credit for modifications to inter-city buses required under the American with Disabilities Act of 1990.

S. 1941

At the request of Mr. DODD, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1941, a bill to amend the Federal Fire Prevention and Control Act of 1974 to authorize the Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to provide assistance to fire departments and fire prevention organizations for the purpose of protecting the public and firefighting personnel against fire and fire-related hazards.

S. 1987

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1987, a bill to amend the Violence Against Women Act of 1994, the Family Violence Prevention and Services Act, the Older American Act of 1965, and the Public Health Service Act to ensure that older women are protected from institutional, community, and domestic violence and sexual assault and to improve outreach efforts and other services available to older women victimized by such violence, and for other purposes.

S. 2044

At the request of Mr. CAMPBELL, the names of the Senator from Vermont (Mr. JEFFORDS), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. GRAMS), and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. ASHCROFT) were added as cosponsors of S. 2044, a bill to allow postal patrons to contribute to funding for domestic violence programs through the voluntary purchase of specially issued postage stamps.

S. 2057

At the request of Mr. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HELMS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2057, a bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit the use of electronic measurement units (EMUs).

S. 2061

At the request of Mr. BIDEN, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2061, a bill to establish a crime prevention and computer education initiative.

S. 2070

At the request of Mr. FITZGERALD, the names of the Senator from North

Carolina (Mr. EDWARDS) and the Senator from Maine (Ms. SNOWE) were added as cosponsors of S. 2070, a bill to improve safety standards for child restraints in motor vehicles.

S. 2183

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2183, a bill to ensure the availability of spectrum to amateur radio operators.

S. 2265

At the request of Mrs. HUTCHISON, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2265, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to preserve marginal domestic oil and natural gas well production, and for other purposes.

S. 2274

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the names of the Senator from Maryland (Ms. MIKULSKI), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES) and the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) were added as cosponsors of S. 2274, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to provide families and disabled children with the opportunity to purchase coverage under the Medicaid program for such children.

S. 2330

At the request of Mr. ROTH, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2330, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the excise tax on telephone and other communication services.

S. 2363

At the request of Mr. CRAPO, the name of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. HELMS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2363, a bill to subject the United States to imposition of fees and costs in proceedings relating to State water rights adjudications.

S. 2394

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. LAUTENBERG) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2394, a bill to amend title XVII of the Social Security Act to stabilize indirect graduate medical education payments.

S. 2399

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2399, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to revise the coverage of immunosuppressive drugs under the Medicare Program.

S. 2413

At the request of Mr. CAMPBELL, the names of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CLELAND), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. MCCONNELL) and the Senator from Missouri (Mr. ASHCROFT) were added as cosponsors of S. 2413, a bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to clarify the procedures and conditions for the award of matching grants for the purchase of armor vests.

S. 2429

At the request of Mr. JEFFORDS, the name of the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. REED) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2429, a bill to amend the Energy Conservation and Production Act to make changes in the Weatherization Assistance Program for Low-Income Persons.

S. 2435

At the request of Ms. SNOWE, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BOND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2435, a bill to amend part B of title IV of the Social Security Act to create a grant program to promote joint activities among Federal, State, and local public child welfare and alcohol and drug abuse prevention and treatment agencies.

S. 2443

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. WELLSTONE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2443, a bill to increase immunization funding and provide for immunization infrastructure and delivery activities.

S. 2444

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. WELLSTONE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2444, a bill to amend title I of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, the Public Health Service Act, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require comprehensive health insurance coverage for childhood immunization.

S. 2459

At the request of Mr. COVERDELL, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BOND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2459, a bill 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.

S. 2487

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. HOLLINGS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2487, a bill to authorize appropriations for Fiscal Year 2001 for certain maritime programs of the Department of Transportation.

S. 2492

At the request of Mr. DOMENICI, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2492, a bill to expand and enhance United States efforts in the Russian nuclear complex to expedite the containment of nuclear expertise that presents a proliferation threat, and for other purposes.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES ACT

COLLINS AMENDMENTS NOS. 3104–3106

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Ms. COLLINS submitted three amendments intended to be proposed by her to the bill (S. 2) to extend programs and activities under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 3104

On page 657, strike lines 6 through 8.

AMENDMENT NO. 3105

On page 653, strike lines 12 through 22.

On page 657, line 21, insert ''that are consistent with part A of title X and'' after ''purposes''.

On page 665, strike lines 16 through 18, and insert the following:

''To the extent that the provisions of this part are inconsistent with part A of title X, part A of title X shall be construed as superseding such provisions.

On page 846, line 15, strike ''and''.

On page 846, between lines 15 and 16, insert the following;

''(E) part H of title VI; and''.

On page 846, line 16, strike ''(E)'' and insert ''(F)''.

AMENDMENT NO. 3106

On page 292, strike line 17 and all that follows through page 293, line 4, and insert the following:

''(d) COORDINATION AND CONSULTATION.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—A recipient of funds under this subpart, to the extent possible, shall coordinate projects assisted under this part with appropriate activities of public and private cultural agencies, institutions, and organizations, including museums, arts education associations, libraries, and theaters.

''(2) COORDINATION.—In carrying out this subpart, the Secretary shall coordinate with the National Endowment for the Arts, the Institute of Museum and Library Services, the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, VSA Arts, and the National Gallery of Art.

''(3) CONSULTATION.—In carrying out this subpart, the Secretary shall consult with agencies and entities described in paragraph (2) as well as other Federal agencies or institutions, arts educators (including professional arts education associations), and organizations representing the arts (including State and local arts agencies involved in arts education).

''(4) SPECIAL RULE.—In carrying out paragraph (3), the Secretary shall ensure that an individual who has a pending application for financial assistance under this section, or who is an employee or agent of an organization that has a pending application, does not serve as a consultant to the Secretary for purposes described in paragraph (3).

AMENDMENTS NOS. 3107–3108

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. SANTORUM submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill, S. 2, supra; as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 3107

At the end of title XI, insert the following:

PART ___—INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES EDUCATION ACT

SEC. ___. IDEA.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This section may be cited as the ''Growing Resources in Educational Achievement for Today and Tomorrow Act'' (GREATT IDEA Act).

(b) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this section to more than double the Federal funding authorized for programs and services under part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1411 et seq.).

(c) AMENDMENTS TO THE INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES EDUCATION ACT.—

(1) ASSISTANCE FOR EDUCATION OF ALL CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES.—Section 611(j) of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1411(j)) is amended to read as follows:

''(j) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For the purpose of carrying out this part, other than section 619, there are authorized to be appropriated—

''(1) $6,230,469,900 for fiscal year 2001;

''(2) $7,779,800,800 for fiscal year 2002;

''(3) $9,714,403,800 for fiscal year 2003;

''(4) $12,130,084,000 for fiscal year 2004; and

''(5) $15,146,471,000 for fiscal year 2005.''.

(2) GENERAL PROVISIONS.—Part A of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 608. MAINTENANCE OF EFFORT.

''A State utilizing the proceeds of a grant received under this Act shall maintain expenditures for activities carried out under this Act for each of fiscal years 2001 through 2005 at least at a level equal to not less than the level of such expenditures maintained by such State for fiscal year 2000.''.

AMENDMENT NO. 3108

On page 922, after line 18, add the following:

PART D—UNIVERSAL SERVICE FOR SCHOOLS AND LIBRARIES

SEC. 11401. SHORT TITLE.

This part may be cited as the ''Neighborhood Children's Internet Protection Act''.

SEC. 11402. NO UNIVERSAL SERVICE FOR SCHOOLS OR LIBRARIES THAT FAIL TO IMPLEMENT A FILTERING OR BLOCKING SYSTEM FOR COMPUTERS WITH INTERNET ACCESS OR ADOPT INTERNET USE POLICIES.

(a) NO UNIVERSAL SERVICE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 254 of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 254) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(l) IMPLEMENTATION OF INTERNET FILTERING OR BLOCKING SYSTEM OR USE POLICIES.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—No services may be provided under subsection (h)(1)(B) to any elementary or secondary school, or any library, unless it provides the certification required by paragraph (2) to the Commission or its designee.

''(2) CERTIFICATION.—A certification under this paragraph with respect to a school or library is a certification by the school, school board, or other authority with responsibility for administration of the school, or the library, or any other entity representing the school or library in applying for universal service assistance, that the school or library—

''(A) has—

''(i) selected a system for its computers with Internet access that are dedicated to student use in order to filter or block Internet access to matter considered to be inappropriate for minors; and

''(ii) installed on such computers, or upon obtaining such computers will install on such computers, a system to filter or block Internet access to such matter; or

''(B)(i) has adopted and implemented an Internet use policy that addresses—

''(I) access by minors to inappropriate matter on the Internet and World Wide Web;

''(II) the safety and security of minors when using electronic mail, chat rooms, and other forms of direct electronic communications;

''(III) unauthorized access, including so-called 'hacking', and other unlawful activities by minors online;

''(IV) unauthorized disclosure, use, and dissemination of personal identification information regarding minors; and

''(V) whether the school or library, as the case may be, is employing hardware, software, or other technological means to limit, monitor, or otherwise control or guide Internet access by minors; and

''(ii) provided reasonable public notice and held at least one public hearing or meeting which addressed the proposed Internet use policy.

''(3) LOCAL DETERMINATION OF CONTENT.—For purposes of a certification under paragraph (2), the determination regarding what matter is inappropriate for minors shall be made by the school board, library, or other authority responsible for making the determination. No agency or instrumentality of the United States Government may—

''(A) establish criteria for making such determination;

''(B) review the determination made by the certifying school, school board, library, or other authority; or

''(C) consider the criteria employed by the certifying school, school board, library, or other authority in the administration of subsection (h)(1)(B).

''(4) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This subsection shall apply with respect to schools and libraries seeking universal service assistance under subsection (h)(1)(B) on or after July 1, 2001.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Subsection (h)(1)(B) of that section is amended by striking ''All telecommunications'' and inserting ''Except as provided by subsection (l), all telecommunications''.

(b) STUDY.—Not later than 150 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the National Telecommunications and Information Administration shall initiate a notice and comment proceeding for purposes of—

(1) evaluating whether or not currently available commercial Internet blocking, filtering, and monitoring software adequately addresses the needs of educational institutions;

(2) making recommendations on how to foster the development of products which meet such needs; and

(3) evaluating the development and effectiveness of local Internet use policies that are currently in operation after community input.

SEC. 11403. IMPLEMENTING REGULATIONS.

Not later than 100 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Federal Communications Commission shall adopt rules implementing this part and the amendments made by this part.

CHARLES M. SCHULZ CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL

FEINSTEIN AMENDMENT NO. 3109

Mr. GORTON (for Mrs. FEINSTEIN) proposed an amendment to the bill (H.R. 3642) 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; as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) Charles M. Schulz was born on November 26, 1922, in St. Paul, Minnesota, the son of Carl and Dena Schulz.

(2) Charles M. Schulz served his country in World War II, working his way up from infantryman to staff sergeant and eventually leading a machine gun squad. He kept morale high by decorating fellow soldiers' letters home with cartoons of barracks life.

(3) After returning from the war, Charles M. Schulz returned to his love for illustration, and took a job with ''Timeless Topix''. He also took a second job as an art instructor. Eventually, his hard work paid off when the *Saturday Evening Post* began purchasing a number of his single comic panels.

(4) It was in his first weekly comic strip, ''L'il Folks'', that Charlie Brown was born. That comic strip, which was eventually renamed ''Peanuts'', became the sole focus of Charles M. Schulz's career.

(5) Charles M. Schulz drew every frame of the ''Peanuts'' strip, which ran 7 days a week, since it was created in October 1950. This is rare dedication in the field of comic illustration.

(6) The ''Peanuts'' comic strip appeared in 2,600 newspapers around the world daily until January 3, 2000, and on Sundays until February 13, 2000, and reached approximately 335,000,000 readers every day in 20 different languages, making Charles M. Schulz the most successful comic illustrator in the world.

(7) Charles M. Schulz's television special, ''A Charlie Brown Christmas'', has run for 34 consecutive years. In all, more than 60 animated specials have been created based on ''Peanuts'' characters. Four feature films, 1,400 books, and a hit Broadway musical about the ''Peanuts'' characters have also been produced.

(8) Charles M. Schulz was a leader in the field of comic illustration and in his community. He paved the way for other artists in this field over the last 50 years and continues to be praised for his outstanding achievements.

(9) Charles M. Schulz gave back to his community in many ways, including owning and operating Redwood Empire Ice Arena in Santa Rosa, California. The arena has become a favorite gathering spot for people of all ages. Charles M. Schulz also financed a yearly ice show that drew crowds from all over the San Francisco Bay Area.

(10) Charles M. Schulz gave the Nation a unique sense of optimism, purpose, and pride. Whether through the Great Pumpkin Patch, the Kite Eating Tree, Lucy's Psychiatric Help Stand, or Snoopy's adventures with the Red Baron, ''Peanuts'' embodied human vulnerabilities, emotions, and potential.

(11) Charles M. Schulz's lifetime of work linked generations of Americans and became a part of the fabric of our national culture.

SEC. 2. CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL.

(a) AWARD AUTHORIZED.—The President is authorized to award posthumously, on behalf of the Congress, a gold medal of appropriate design to Charles M. Schulz in recognition of his lasting artistic contributions to the Nation and the world.

(b) DESIGN AND STRIKING.—For the purpose of the award 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 under section 2 at a price sufficient to cover the costs of the medals, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, 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 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.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a legislative hearing has been scheduled before the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

The hearing will take on Tuesday, May 9, 2000, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, DC.

The purpose of this hearing is to receive testimony on S. 1756, the National Laboratories Partnership Improvement Act of 1999; and S. 2336, the Networking and Information Technology Research and Development for Department of Energy Missions Act.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record should send two copies of their testimony to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, 364 Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC, 20510–6150.

For further information, please call Trici Heninger or Bryan Hannegan at (202) 224–7875.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Committee on Indian Affairs will meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, May 10, 2000, at 9:30 a.m., to conduct a hearing on draft legislation to reauthorize the Indian Health Care Improvement Act. A business meeting to mark up pending legislation will precede the hearing-agenda to be announced. The hearing will be held in the committee room, 485 Russell Senate Building.

Those wishing additional information may contact Committee staff at 202/224–2251.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS, HISTORIC PRESERVATION, AND RECREATION

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Subcommittee on National Parks, Historic Preservation, and Recreation of the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources. The purpose of this hearing is to receive testimony on S. 1357, a bill to amend the Act which established the Saint-Gaudens National Historic Site, in the State of New Hampshire, by modifying the boundary and for other purposes; S. 1617, a bill to promote preservation and public awareness of the history of the Underground Railroad by providing financial assistance, to the Freedom Center in Cincinnati, Ohio; S. 1670, a bill to revise the boundary of Fort Matanzas National Monument, and for other purposes; S. 2020, a bill to adjust the boundary of the Natchez Trace Parkway, Mississippi, and for other purposes; S. 2478, a bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a theme study on the peopling of America, and for other purposes; and S. 2485, a bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to provide assistance in planning and constructing a regional heritage center in Calais, Maine.

The hearing will take place on Thursday, May 11, 2000, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, DC.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record should send two copies of their testimony to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, SD–364 Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC 20510–6150.

For further information, please contact Jim O'Toole or Kevin Clark of the Committee staff at (202) 224–6969.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATER AND POWER

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that an oversight hearing has been scheduled before the Subcommittee on Water and Power.

The hearing will take place on Wednesday, May 17, 2000, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, DC.

The purpose of this hearing is to conduct oversight on the operation, by the Bureau of Indian Affairs, of the Flathead Irrigation Project in Montana.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record should send two copies of their testimony to the Subcommittee on Water and Power, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, 364 Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC 20510–6150.

For further information, please call Trici Heninger, Staff Assistant, or Colleen Deegan, Counsel, at (202) 224–8115.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON WATER AND POWER

Mr. SMITH of Oregon. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that a legislative hearing has been scheduled before the Subcommittee on Water and Power.

The hearing will take place on Tuesday, May 23, 2000, at 2:30 p.m., in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, DC.

The purpose of this hearing is to receive testimony on S. 740, a bill to amend the Federal Power Act to improve the hydroelectric licensing process by granting the Federal Regulatory Commission statutory authority to better coordinate participation by other agencies and entities, and for other purposes.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record should send two copies of their testimony to the Subcommittee on Water and Power, Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, United States Senate, 364 Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, DC 20510–6150.

For further information, please call Trici Heninger or Bryan Hannegan at (202) 224–7875.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Environment and Public Works be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, May 2, 10 a.m., Hearing Room (SD–406), to examine successful State environmental programs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Relations be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, May 2, 2000, at 2 p.m., to hold a hearing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Indian Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Tuesday, May 2, 2000, at 10 a.m., to conduct a hearing on S. 2350, Duchesne City Water Rights Conveyance Act and S. 2351, Shivwits Band of the Paiute Tribe of Utah Water Rights Settlement Act. The hearing will be held in the committee room, 485 Russell Senate Building.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Committee on Aging be authorized to meet on May 2, 2000, from 10 a.m.–1 p.m., in Dirksen 562 for the purpose of conducting a hearing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATIVE OVERSIGHT AND THE COURTS

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Administrative Oversight and the Courts be authorized to meet to conduct a hearing on Tuesday, May 2, 2000, at 9:30 a.m., in 106 Dirksen.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ANTITRUST, BUSINESS RIGHTS, AND COMPETITION

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Antitrust, Business Rights, and Competition be authorized to meet to conduct a hearing on Tuesday, May 2, 2000, at 2 p.m., in 226 Dirksen.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EMERGING THREATS AND CAPABILITIES

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet at 4:30 p.m., on Tuesday, May 2, 2000, in executive session, to mark up the FY 2001 Defense authorization bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT OF GOVERNMENT MANAGEMENT, RESTRUCTURING, AND THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management, Restructuring and the District of Columbia be authorized to meet on Tuesday, May 2, 2000, at 10 a.m., for a hearing on ''The Effectiveness of Federal Employee Incentive Programs.''

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PERSONNEL

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Personnel of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet at 2:30 p.m., on Tuesday, May 2, 2000, in executive session, to mark up the FY 2001 Defense authorization bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it so ordered.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON READINESS AND MANAGEMENT SUPPORT

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support of the Committee on Armed Services be authorized to meet at 3:30 p.m., on Tuesday, May 2, 2000, in executive session, to mark up the FY 2001 Defense authorization bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it so ordered.

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that privileges of the floor be granted to the following members of my staff: Jim Beirne, Howard Useem, Betty Nevitt, Colleen Deegan, Trici Heninger, Kristin Phillips, Brian Malnak, and Kjersten Scott.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Kristine Svinicki of my staff, a congressional fellow, be allowed access to the floor for the duration of debate on the nuclear waste legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the privilege of the floor be granted to the following member of my staff: Melissa Crookes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. HARKIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Lynn Kinzer, a fellow in my office, be granted floor privileges during consideration of S. 2.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOTICE—PERSONAL FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE

Financial Disclosure Reports required by the Ethics in Government Act of 1978, as amended and Senate Rule 34 must be filed no later than close of business on Monday, May 15, 2000. The reports must be filed with the Senate Office of Public Records, 232 Hart Building, Washington, DC 20510. The Pubic Records office will be open from 8 a.m. until 6 p.m. to accept these filings, and will provide written receipts for Senators' reports. Staff members may obtain written receipts upon request. Any written request for an extension should be directed to the Select Committee on Ethics, 220 Hart Building, Washington, DC 20510.

All Senators' reports will be made available simultaneously on Wednesday, June 14. Any questions regarding the availability of reports should be directed to the Public Records office (224–0322). Questions regarding interpretation of the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 should be directed to the Select Committee on Ethics (224–2981).

ORDER FOR STAR PRINT—S. 2443

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that S. 2443 be star printed with the changes that are at the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AWARDING A GOLD MEDAL TO CHARLES M. SCHULZ

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Banking Committee be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 3642, and that the Senate then proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3642) 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.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

AMENDMENT NO. 3109

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, Senator FEINSTEIN has a substitute amendment at the desk, and I ask for its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The Senator from Washington [Mr. GORTON], for Mrs. FEINSTEIN, proposes an amendment numbered 3109.

The amendment is as follows:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) Charles M. Schulz was born on November 26, 1922, in St. Paul, Minnesota, the son of Carl and Dena Schulz.

(2) Charles M. Schulz served his country in World War II, working his way up from infantryman to staff sergeant and eventually leading a machine gun squad. He kept morale high by decorating fellow soldiers' letters home with cartoons of barracks life.

(3) After returning from the war, Charles M. Schulz returned to his love for illustration, and took a job with ''Timeless Topix''. He also took a second job as an art instructor. Eventually, his hard work paid off when the *Saturday Evening Post* began purchasing a number of his single comic panels.

(4) It was in his first weekly comic strip, ''L'il Folks'', that Charlie Brown was born. That comic strip, which was eventually renamed ''Peanuts'', became the sole focus of Charles M. Schulz's career.

(5) Charles M. Schulz drew every frame of the ''Peanuts'' strip, which ran 7 days a week, since it was created in October 1950. This is rare dedication in the field of comic illustration.

(6) The ''Peanuts'' comic strip appeared in 2,600 newspapers around the world daily until January 3, 2000, and on Sundays until February 13, 2000, and reached approximately 335,000,000 readers every day in 20 different languages, making Charles M. Schulz the most successful comic illustrator in the world.

(7) Charles M. Schulz's television special, ''A Charlie Brown Christmas'', has run for 34 consecutive years. In all, more than 60 animated specials have been created based on ''Peanuts'' characters. Four feature films, 1,400 books, and a hit Broadway musical about the ''Peanuts'' characters have also been produced.

(8) Charles M. Schulz was a leader in the field of comic illustration and in his community. He paved the way for other artists in this field over the last 50 years and continues to be praised for his outstanding achievements.

(9) Charles M. Schulz gave back to his community in many ways, including owning and operating Redwood Empire Ice Arena in Santa Rosa, California. The arena has become a favorite gathering spot for people of all ages. Charles M. Schulz also financed a yearly ice show that drew crowds from all over the San Francisco Bay Area.

(10) Charles M. Schulz gave the Nation a unique sense of optimism, purpose, and

pride. Whether through the Great Pumpkin Patch, the Kite Eating Tree, Lucy's Psychiatric Help Stand, or Snoopy's adventures with the Red Baron, ''Peanuts'' embodied human vulnerabilities, emotions, and potential.

(11) Charles M. Schulz's lifetime of work linked generations of Americans and became a part of the fabric of our national culture.

SEC. 2. CONGRESSIONAL GOLD MEDAL.

(a) AWARD AUTHORIZED.—The President is authorized to award posthumously, on behalf of the Congress, a gold medal of appropriate design to Charles M. Schulz in recognition of his lasting artistic contributions to the Nation and the world.

(b) DESIGN AND STRIKING.—For the purpose of the award 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 under section 2 at a price sufficient to cover the costs of the medals, including labor, materials, dies, use of machinery, 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 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.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be agreed to, the bill be read a third time and passed, the amendment to the title be agreed to, 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 amendment (No. 3109) was agreed to.

The bill (H.R. 3642), as amended, was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: ''To authorize the President to award posthumously 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.''

FAIR ACCESS TO JAPANESE TELECOMMUNICATIONS FACILITIES AND SERVICES

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Finance Committee be discharged from consideration of S. Res. 275, and the Senate then proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 275) expressing the sense of the Senate regarding fair access to Japanese telecommunications facilities and services.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution and preamble be agreed to en bloc, that the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating thereto be printed in the RECORD, with no intervening action.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 275) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

The resolution, with its preamble, reads as follows:

S. RES. 275

Whereas the United States has a deep and sustained interest in the promotion of deregulation, competition, and regulatory reform in Japan;

Whereas new and bold measures by the Government of Japan regarding regulatory reform will help remove the regulatory and structural impediments to the effective functioning of market forces in the Japanese economy;

Whereas regulatory reform will increase the efficient allocation of resources in Japan, which is critical to returning Japan to a long-term growth path powered by domestic demand;

Whereas regulatory reform will not only improve market access for United States business and other foreign firms, but will also enhance consumer choice and economic prosperity in Japan;

Whereas a sustained recovery of the Japanese economy is vital to a sustained recovery of Asian economies;

Whereas the Japanese economy must serve as one of the main engines of growth for Asia and for the global economy;

Whereas the Governments of the United States and Japan reconfirmed the critical importance of deregulation, competition, and regulatory reform when the 2 Governments established the Enhanced Initiative on Deregulation and Competition Policy in 1997;

Whereas telecommunications is a critical sector requiring reform in Japan, where the market is hampered by a history of laws, regulations, and monopolistic practices that do not meet the needs of a competitive market;

Whereas as the result of Japan's laws, regulations, and monopolistic practices, Japanese consumers and Japanese industry have been denied the broad benefits of innovative telecommunications services, cutting edge technology, and lower prices that competition would bring to the market;

Whereas Japan's significant lag in developing broadband and Internet services, and Japan's lag in the entire area of electronic commerce, is a direct result of a noncompetitive telecommunications regulatory structure;

Whereas Japan's lag in developing broadband and Internet services is evidenced by the following: (1) Japan has only 17,000,000 Internet users, while the United States has 80,000,000 Internet users; (2) Japan hosts fewer than 2,000,000 websites, while the United States hosts over 30,000,000 websites; (3) electronic commerce in Japan is valued at less than $1,000,000,000, while in the United States electronic commerce is valued at over $30,000,000,000; and (4) 19 percent of Japan's schools are connected to the Internet, while in the United States 89 percent of schools are connected;

Whereas the disparity between the United States and Japan is largely caused by the failure of Japan to ensure conditions that allow for the development of competitive networks which would stimulate the use of the Internet and electronic commerce;

Whereas leading edge foreign telecommunications companies, because of their high level of technology and innovation, are the key to building the necessary telecommunications infrastructure in Japan, which will only be able to serve Japanese consumers and industry if there is a fundamental change in Japan's regulatory approach to telecommunications; and

Whereas deregulating the monopoly power of Nippon Telegraph and Telephone Corporation would help liberate Japan's economy and allow Japan to take full advantage of information technology: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the appropriate officials in the executive branch should implement vigorously the call for Japan to undertake a major regulatory reform in the telecommunications sector, the so-called ''Telecommunications Big Bang'';

(2) a ''Telecommunications Big Bang'' must address fundamental legislative and regulatory issues within a strictly defined timeframe;

(3) the new telecommunications regulatory framework should put competition first in order to encourage new and innovative businesses to enter the telecommunications market in Japan;

(4) the Government of Japan should ensure that Nippon Telegraph and Telephone Corporation (NTT) and its affiliates (the NTT Group) are prevented from using their dominant position in the wired and wireless market in an anticompetitive manner; and

(5) the Government of Japan should take credible steps to ensure that competitive carriers have reasonable, cost-based, and nondiscriminatory access to the rights-of-way, facilities, and services controlled by NTT, the NTT Group, other utilities, and the Government of Japan, including—

(A) access to interconnection at market-based rates;

(B) unrestricted access to unbundled elements of the network belonging to NTT and the NTT Group; and

(C) access to public roads for the installation of facilities.

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF CONGRESS THAT THE GOVERNMENT OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA SHOULD IMMEDIATELY RELEASE RABIYA KADEER, HER SECRETARY, AND HER SON

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 514, S. Con. Res. 81.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the concurrent resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 81) expressing the sense of the Congress that the Government of the People's Republic of China should immediately release Rabiya Kadeer, her secretary, and her son, and permit them to move to the United States if they so desire.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the concurrent resolution.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the amendments to the preamble be agreed to, and the preamble, as amended, be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and any statements relating to this resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 81) was agreed to.

The amendments to the preamble were agreed to.

The preamble, as amended, was agreed to.

The concurrent resolution, with its preamble, as amended, reads as follows:

S. CON. RES. 81

Whereas Rabiya Kadeer, a prominent ethnic Uighur from the Xinjiang Uighur Autonomous Region (XUAR) of the People's Republic of China, her secretary, and her son were arrested on August 11, 1999, in the city of Urumqi;

Whereas Rabiya Kadeer's arrest occurred outside the Yindu Hotel in Urumqi as she was attempting to meet a group of congressional staff staying at the Yindu Hotel as part of an official visit to China organized under the auspices of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Program of the United States Information Agency;

Whereas Rabiya Kadeer's husband Sidik Rouzi, who has lived in the United States since 1996 and works for Radio Free Asia, has been critical of the policies of the People's Republic of China toward Uighurs in Xinjiang;

Whereas Rabiya Kadeer was sentenced on March 10 to 8 years in prison ''with deprivation of political rights for two years'' for the crime of ''illegally giving state information across the border'';

Whereas the Urumqi Evening Paper of March 12 reported Rabiya Kadeer's case as follows: ''The court investigated the following: The defendant Rabiya Kadeer, following the request of her husband, Sidik Haji, who has settled in America, indirectly bought a collection of the Kashgar Paper dated from 1995–1998, 27 months, and some copies of the Xinjiang Legal Paper and on 17 June 1999 sent them by post to Sidik Haji. These were found by the customs. During July and August 1999 defendant Rabiya Kadeer gave copies of the Ili Paper and Ili Evening Paper collected by others to Mohammed Hashem to keep. Defendant Rabiya Kadeer sent these to Sidik Haji. Some of these papers contained the speeches of leaders of different levels; speeches about the strength of rectification of public safety, news of political legal organisations striking against national separatists and terrorist activities etc. The papers sent were marked and folded at relevant articles. As well as this, on 11 August that year, defendant Rabiya Kadeer, following her husband's phone commands, took a previously prepared list of people who had been handled by judicial organisations, with her to Kumush Astana Hotel [Yingdu Hotel] where she was to meet a foreigner'';

Whereas reports indicate that Ablikim Abdyirim was sent to a labor camp on November 26 for 2 years without trial for ''supporting Uighur separatism,'' and Rabiya Kadeer's secretary was recently sentenced to 3 years in a labor camp;

Whereas Rabiya Kadeer has 5 children, 3 sisters, and a brother living in the United States, in addition to her husband, and Kadeer has expressed a desire to move to the United States;

Whereas the People's Republic of China stripped Rabiya Kadeer of her passport long before her arrest;

Whereas reports indicate that Kadeer's health may be at risk;

Whereas the People's Republic of China signed the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights on October 5, 1998;

Whereas that Covenant requires signatory countries to guarantee their citizens the right to legal recourse when their rights have been violated, the right to liberty and freedom of movement, the right to presumption of innocence until guilt is proven, the right to appeal a conviction, freedom of thought, conscience, and religion, freedom of opinion and expression, and freedom of assembly and association;

Whereas that Covenant forbids torture, inhuman or degrading treatment, and arbitrary arrest and detention;

Whereas the first Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights enables the Human Rights Committee, set up under that Covenant, to receive and consider communications from individuals claiming to be victims of violations of any of the rights set forth in the Covenant; and

Whereas in signing that Covenant on behalf of the People's Republic of China, Ambassador Qin Huasun, Permanent Representative of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations, said the following: ''To realize human rights is the aspiration of all humanity. It is also a goal that the Chinese Government has long been striving for. We believe that the universality of human rights should be respected . . . As a member state of the United Nations, China has always actively participated in the activities of the organization in the field of human rights. It attaches importance to its cooperation with agencies concerned in the U.N. system . . .'': Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That Congress calls on the Government of the People's Republic of China—

(1) immediately to release Rabiya Kadeer, her secretary, and her son; and

(2) to permit Kadeer, her secretary, and her son to move to the United States, if they so desire.

AMERICAN INSTITUTE IN TAIWAN FACILITIES ENHANCEMENT ACT

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 519, H.R. 3707.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 3707) to authorize funds for the construction of a facility in Taipei, Taiwan suitable for the mission of the American Institute in Taiwan.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment to strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''American Institute in Taiwan Facilities Enhancement Act''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds that—

(1) in the Taiwan Relations Act of 1979 (22 U.S.C. 3301 et seq.), the Congress established the American Institute in Taiwan (hereafter in this Act referred to as ''AIT''), a nonprofit corporation incorporated in the District of Columbia, to carry out on behalf of the United States Government any and all programs, transactions, and other relations with Taiwan;

(2) the Congress has recognized AIT for the successful role it has played in sustaining and enhancing United States relations with Taiwan;

(3) the Taipei office of AIT is housed in buildings which were not originally designed for the important functions that AIT performs, whose location does not provide adequate security for its employees, and which, because they are almost 50 years old, have become increasingly expensive to maintain;

(4) the aging state of the AIT office building in Taipei is neither conducive to the safety and welfare of AIT's American and local employees nor commensurate with the level of contact that exists between the United States and Taiwan;

(5) AIT has made a good faith effort to set aside funds for the construction of a new office building, but these funds will be insufficient to construct a building that is large and secure enough to meet AIT's current and future needs; and

(6) because the Congress established AIT and has a strong interest in United States relations with Taiwan, the Congress has a special responsibility to ensure that AIT's requirements for safe and appropriate office quarters are met.

SEC. 3. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated the sum of $75,000,000 to AIT—

(1) for plans for a new facility and, if necessary, residences or other structures located in close physical proximity to such facility, in Taipei, Taiwan, for AIT to carry out its purposes under the Taiwan Relations Act; and

(2) for acquisition by purchase or construction of such facility, residences, or other structures.

(b) LIMITATIONS.—Funds appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) may only be used if the new facility described in that subsection meets all requirements applicable to the security of United States diplomatic facilities, including the requirements in the Omnibus Diplomatic Security and Anti-Terrorism Act of 1986 (22 U.S.C. 4801 et seq.) and the Secure Embassy Construction and Counterterrorism Act of 1999 (as enacted by section 1000(a)(7) of Public Law 106–113; 113 Stat 1501A–451), except for those requirements which the Director of AIT certifies to the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate are not applicable on account of the special status of AIT. In making such certification, the Director shall also certify that security considerations permit the exercise of the waiver of such requirements.

(c) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Amounts appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) are authorized to remain available until expended.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee substitute be agreed to, 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 committee amendment in the nature of a substitute amendment was agreed to.

The bill (H.R. 3707), as amended, was read the third time and passed.

EXPRESSING THE SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT THE UNITED STATES SHOULD REMAIN ACTIVELY ENGAGED IN SOUTHEASTERN EUROPE TO PROMOTE LONG-TERM PEACE

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 521, S. Res. 272.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 272) expressing the sense of the Senate that the United States should remain actively engaged in southeastern Europe to promote long-term peace, stability, and prosperity; continue to vigorously oppose the brutal regime of Slobodan Milosevic while supporting the efforts of the democratic opposition; and fully implement the Stability Pact.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations, with an amendment to strike all after the resolving clause and insert in lieu thereof the following:

Whereas the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's (NATO's) March 24, 1999 through June 10, 1999 bombing of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia focused the attention of the international community of southeastern Europe;

Whereas the international community, in particular the United States and the European Union, made a commitment at the conclusion of the bombing campaign to integrate southeastern Europe into the broader European community;

Whereas there is an historic opportunity for the international community to help the people of southeastern Europe break the cycle of violence, retribution, and revenge and move towards respect for minority rights, establishment of the rule of law, and the further development of democratic governments;

Whereas the Stability Pact was established in July 1999 with the goal of promoting cooperation among the countries of southeastern Europe, with a focus on long-term political stability and peace, security, democratization, and economic reconstruction and development;

Whereas the effective implementation of the Stability Pact is important to the long-term peace and stability in the region;

Whereas the people and Government of the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia have a positive record of respect for minority rights, the rule of law, and democratic traditions since independence;

Whereas the people of Croatia have recently elected leaders that respect minority rights, the rule of law, and democratic traditions;

Whereas positive development in the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and the Republic of Croatia will clearly indicate to the people of Serbia that economic program and integration into the international community is only possibly if Milosevic is removed from power; and

Whereas the Republic of Slovenia continues to serve as a model for the region as it moves closer to European Union and NATO membership: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved,

That the Senate—

(1) welcomes the tide of democratic change in southeastern Europe, particularly the free and fair elections in Croatia, and the regional cooperation taking place under the umbrella of the Stability Pact;

(2) recognizes that in this trend, the regime of Slobodan Milosevic is ever more an anomaly, the only government in the region not democratically elected, and an obstacle to peace and neighborly relations in the region;

(3) expresses its sense that the United States cannot have normal relations with Belgrade as long as the Milosevic regime is in power;

(4) views Slobodan Milosevic as a brutal indicted war criminal, responsible for immeasurable bloodshed, ethnic hatred, and human rights abuses in southeastern Europe in recent years;

(5) considers international sanctions an essential tool to isolate the Milosevic regime and promote democracy, and urges the Administration to intensify, focus, and expand those sanctions that most effectively target the regime and its key supporters;

(6) supports strongly the efforts of the Serbian people to establish a democratic government and endorses their call for early, free, and fair elections;

(7) looks forward to establishing a normal relationship with a new democratic government in Serbia, which will permit an end to Belgrade's isolation and the opportunity to restore the historically friendly relations between the Serbian and American people;

(8) expresses the readiness of the Senate, once there is a democratic government in Serbia, to review conditions for Serbia's full reintegration into the international community;

(9) expresses its readiness to assist a future democratic government in Serbia to build a democratic, peaceful, and prosperous society, based on the same principle of respect for international obligations, as set out by the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) and the United Nations, which guide the relations of the United States with other countries in southeastern Europe;

(10) calls upon the United States and other Western democracies to publicly announce and demonstrate to the Serbian people the magnitude of assistance they could expect after democratization;

(11) recognizes the importance of opposition mayors in Serbia, and encourages the effort of the Administration to include such mayors in the humanitarian and democratization efforts of the United States in Serbia; and

(12) recognizes the progress in democratic and market reform made by Montenegro, which can serve as a model for Serbia, and urges a peaceful resolution of political differences over the abrogation of Montenegro's rights under the federal constitution.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the committee amendment be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

Mr. GORTON. I ask unanimous consent the resolution, as amended, be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, and that any statements relating to this resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 272), as amended, was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

APPOINTMENTS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276h–276k, as amended, appoints the following Senators as members of the Senate Delegation to the Mexico-U.S. Interparliamentary Group Meeting during the Second Session of the 106th Congress, to be held in Puebla, Mexico, May 5–7, 2000: The Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI), and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS).

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, MAY 3, 2000

Mr. GORTON. 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 Wednesday, May 3. I further ask consent that on Wednesday, 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 a period of morning business until 11 a.m., with Senators speaking for up to 5 minutes each, with the following exceptions: Senator WELLSTONE, or his designee, 9:30 a.m. to 10:15 a.m.; Senator THOMAS, or his designee, 10:15 a.m. to 11 a.m.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GORTON. I further ask unanimous consent that following morning business the Senate resume consideration of S. 2, under the previous agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM

Mr. GORTON. For the information of all Senators, on Wednesday there will be a period of morning business until 11 a.m. Following morning business, the Senate will resume consideration of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Under the previous order, there will be four amendments debated during tomorrow's session, and therefore Senators can expect votes throughout the day. As previously announced, the Senate will not meet on Friday in order to accommodate the Democratic retreat.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GORTON. 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, following the remarks of Senator SCHUMER.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GORTON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLARD). Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I wish to say a few words as we embark on debating ESEA. I hope not to be very long. First, I am glad we are debating this bill, because education is such an important issue to America as we move into the 21st century. We have moved into an economy that is based on ideas. Alan Greenspan put it best. He said that high value is added no longer by moving things—when you make a car with moving things, such as putting in a carburetor here or brakes there—but, rather, by thinking things. All the new technology, such as the Internet, information systems, allow an idea to be transported quickly and inexpensively, which gives ideas so much more power.

In that kind of society, we can't afford to have an educational system that is even second. As we all know, our education system, at least elementary and secondary, isn't even in the top 10. If we want to stay the leading economic power of the world, which I think we all do, we have to make our educational system better.

In the past, the Federal Government has stayed away from education. I argue that there is a national imperative for us to be more involved, not to dictate to the localities what they have to do—that has been a mistake this Government has entered into far too much in the past—but certainly to help and aid in education.

I note that education in America is funded by the property tax, by and large. That is the least popular tax in America, and it puts a real cap on what can be done. Education is done locally, and so there isn't too much ability, when you have thousands and thousands of school districts, to have people think beyond the day-to-day need of providing teaching and other educational services in schools.

The need of the Federal Government to be involved with resources and just as important, if not more important, taking ideas and helping spread them, ideas that have worked in one corner of the country but don't spread to the rest of the country because it is not a capitalistic system—usually we spread ideas because somebody makes money by doing that, but that doesn't happen in public education—is vital.

So when the Federal Government says we should have higher standards, that is a good thing. I believe and I agree with those who believe in higher standards. I don't believe in social promotion. If you are reading at a third-grade level, you should not be in the seventh grade. I agree with my conservative friends in that regard. But I think my more liberal friends are right in that we have to help keep the bar high, and conservatives are right about that, but we ought to help people get over that bar. If education were completely left up to each locality, that probably would not happen. The bar would not be set high enough and the effort to help people get over the bar might not be forthcoming. So, in my judgment at least, we need more Federal involvement. I think the American people share that judgment. From the data I have seen, that is pretty clear.

Another problem we face is that our system is probably going to be under more stress, not less, in the future. The number of people enrolled is expected to increase by 11 percent. The schools age; the same exact school was in better shape in 1990 than in the year 2000. I have recently visited school districts, fairly affluent ones, on Long Island where the facilities were simply a mess. They had been built during the baby boom in the fifties, sixties, and seventies, and, quite frankly, even those rather affluent districts didn't have the money to fix the schools. They were sort of a mess; they were not great places to look at. Paint was peeling from some of the ceilings.

Most importantly an area I have chosen to focus on, which we will talk a little bit about, is the fact that we are going to have a crisis in teaching. We don't today, but we will in the next 5 or 10 years because so many of our teachers are over 50 years old and they are going to retire. Quite frankly, many of the new teachers who take their place are not up to speed, or at least not of the same quality as the old teachers.

When we have a starting salary of $26,000, which we do for teachers in America, and the private sector can pay double that, particularly in certain areas such as math and science and technology, we are not going to be getting the best.

In the past, we had captive audiences with cohorts of groups who would teach in the 1930s and 1940s. There were lots of Depression babies. ''Go get a civil service job so you will never risk that horrible feeling of being unemployed and unable to provide for your family.'' In the 1950s and 1960s, women taught; they didn't have other opportunities.

I had so many great teachers when I went through New York public schools.

The last cohort which is now retiring in large numbers is my generation—I am 49—the Vietnam war generation, as you may recall. Young men were given a draft exemption if they taught and hundreds of thousands did. They made very fine teachers. But we don't have those captive audiences, so we have a crisis in having quality teaching.

I will be talking more about that when we do our Democratic amendment. I am happy to have the Inspired Scholarship Program as part of it. We will talk, hopefully, about other amendments that are on this floor, including some of mine which would allow teachers, if they taught for 5 years, to forgo repaying their student loans—we would provide a test in math and science—to give teachers a $4,000-a-year stipend so they would continue teaching. We have some true excellence. I will be talking about all of those later.

What I would like to talk about now is just two things, one on this bill. I truly pray that the majority leader will not cut off debate quickly. We have debated education. We debate it only once every 5 years. The last time we did I believe was in 1994—6 years ago. Originally it was 5.

In the area where about 37 percent of Americans consider the most important thing the Federal Government can do, to have a 1- or 2-day debate really doesn't make much sense. It doesn't live up to what this body is about, which is helping people in need.

To say that because we passed Ed-Flex—a nice program but really rather minor in what it does, and only one new State has joined since we passed again the bill last year, or earlier this year—and to say that educational savings accounts, which I believe the President might veto, but even if he does not, don't deal with the hard-core issues of higher standards, better teachers, better classrooms, and smaller class size—to say, having done those two things, that we have done enough and sort of wash our hands of it and walk away would be nothing short of disgraceful. Yet that is the talk.

We should be debating amendments that will make our schools better. There are lots of them. Some of the proposals will pass; many will fail. To have that debate not only helps educate America but it also helps educate each of us. It helps educate one another of us and helps us come to consensus because I believe we will not wait 5 years to do another education bill. I believe within the next 2 or 3 years the crisis, which is looming largely on the horizon now, will be so upon us; whether the new President is AL GORE or George W. Bush, we will be talking about education with frequency. We had better get used to it, and we shouldn't delay that now.

A number of us have gotten together and agreed to do an amendment about school safety dealing with guns. We don't want to have 20, 30, or 40 amendments. There is no attempt whatsoever to delay or bog down this bill. We want to see this bill moved and passed. But school safety is an important issue.

The fact that so many of us believe strongly in gun control and have come together and put together one amendment which will be offered by the Senator from New Jersey, Mr. LAUTENBERG, who has been such a leader on this issue, is no attempt to divert us or to slow this bill down. If we wanted to do that, we would have asked for many amendments.

If the majority leader, in his wisdom, should decide to pull the bill because there is that one amendment, I think most Americans would believe we really do not want to debate education and that it was just an excuse.

The second thing I would like to talk about a little bit is the block grant,

which is really the main debate we will be having.

Is the Federal Government going to be involved in education and just giving the money unfettered—how I would characterize it—to the States or to the school districts or, rather, we should say: Here is a need and here is some money; We are not forcing you to use it; This is not a mandate; But if you want the money, you have to meet certain rules, certain standards, and apply under certain standards.

The greatest area I have experience with in this realm is the issue of crime. We tried the block grant route with crime. It was a fiasco. Governor after Governor, locally-elected official after locally-elected official—the LEA program, the law enforcement assistance grant, a block grant devised by Jimmy Carter and certainly supported by many Democrats—just wasted the money.

We had instances of a tank being purchased by one State. I think it was in the State of Indiana where the Governor purchased an airplane under LEA so he could fly to Washington to discuss crime issues. Money was wasted.

A few short years after LEA was passed and the money was appropriated, it was withdrawn with its tail between its legs. That issue could be repeated in education. I wasn't around. I was actually in high school when we passed the block grants in 1965. Again, this was done by Democrats. Imagine it is 1965—it was a Congress that was overwhelmingly Democrat—and the same thing that happened to crime happened in education; money was just wasted.

Here is an example. There were blank checks: $35,000 was spent on band uniforms, $2,200 was spent on football uniforms, $63,000 was spent to purchase 18 portable swimming pools, and $16,000 was spent on construction of two lagoons for sewage disposal.

Do we want to repeat that? Do we want to see that kind of waste and patronage when we give a locality money? They don't have to sweat to raise the taxes for it. They are getting free money, and we say, basically, spend it on what you want. It is a formula for disaster. That is what it seems we are headed towards. It is just incredible to me.

There is an even deeper point, which is this:

We are all critical of our present educational system. We say it is not working the way it should. Instead of changing, instead of trying to improve it, instead of saying here are ways, such as reducing class size, or making classrooms better, or having better teachers, or having standards, or having some accountability, we just give the money to the very same school districts we criticize and say: Do whatever you want with it. It is illogical.

The only way there should be a block grant is if we think the school districts are doing a great job and simply don't have enough money.

That is not a conservative argument. You hear more of that from the liberals. Yet the conservatives in this body are supporting block grants—no standards, little accountability, no direction, spend it on what you wish. I am utterly amazed.

I think there are a lot of good debates we can have. I understand the desire to keep schools locally controlled. But a block grant, a formula for waste, and much of it going to the Governors so that money doesn't even trickle down?

If you ask the American people if they prefer a block grant or prefer tethered money to reduce class size, or to raise standards, or to improve the quality of teachers, there is no question what they would desire.

I hope my colleagues will listen to the debate we are going to have on this bill. As I said before, I hope it is a fulsome debate. I hope it is a long debate. We cannot spend time on any issue that is more important than education.

I hope they will look at the proposals I have brought forward to improve teachers. They are not ideological. Some involve tax breaks, some involve raising standards. I hope we will decide that the role of the Federal Government should be to raise the bar—because enough localities have not—and help people get over that bar rather than just give them a sack of coins and say, ''Do what you will.''

I look forward to this debate. I think it is one of the most important we can have.

I yield the floor.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate stands in adjournment until 9:30 a.m., Wednesday, May 3, 2000.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 7:21 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, May 3, 2000, at 9:30 a.m.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate May 2, 2000:

THE JUDICIARY

JAMES EDGAR BAKER, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE A JUDGE OF THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE ARMED FORCES FOR THE TERM OF FIFTEEN YEARS TO EXPIRE ON THE DATE PRESCRIBED BY LAW, VICE WALTER T. COX, III, TERM EXPIRED.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

IN COMMEMORATION OF HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL DAY MAY 2, 2000

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 2000

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I commend Yom Hashoah, Holocaust Martyrs' and Heroes' Remembrance Day, which memorializes the six million Jews murdered during World War II.

This somber anniversary is a tribute to the memory of the victims of the Holocaust, the heroism of those who fought back, and the strength of those who survived. A national holiday in Israel, Yom Hashoah is also commemorated across this country.

I strongly believe that we must act on our promise to ''never forget'' by acting on our responsibility to teach future generations about the lessons of the Holocaust. As we prepare our children for a new century, we must instill in them the tolerance and compassion to prevent the greatest terror of the past century from ever being repeated in the next. The legacy of the survivors of the Holocaust and of those who perished will only live on if we educate people about this history.

It was only last month that British Courts exonerated historian Deborah Lipstadt of the libel charges brought by a Holocaust denier. Although the decision reaffirmed that Holocaust denial is false history and Nazi sympathy, it is unfortunate that such attempts to distort and trivialize the Holocaust abound. The release of the Eichmann diaries as evidence used in the trial only further establishes the reality of the Holocaust and the dangers of those who seek to deny it.

Today is an opportunity to recommit ourselves to stand against anti-Semitism, discrimination, and intolerance in all forms, at home and abroad. We reflect upon the murder of 6 million innocent Jewish men, women and children, and the systematic destruction of families and vibrant communities. We reestablish our determination to confront the past, and our dedication to perpetuating the memory of those who suffered.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 290, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2001

SPEECH OF

HON. CASS BALLENGER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 2000

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be able to vote today for the final version of the congressional budget for fiscal year 2001 (H. Con. Res. 290). Again, I wish to congratulate my colleagues on the House Budget Committee and their counterparts in the other body for their hard work in crafting a fiscal year 2001 budget and pushing it to passage ahead of schedule.

First, this congressional budget keeps a lid on runaway federal spending. For the second year in a row, this budget devotes the entire Social Security surplus, totaling $161 billion in fiscal year 2001, to a lock box to prevent it from being used to finance other government programs. And, it proposes the creation of a $40 billion reserve fund over five years to be used to reform Medicare and provide prescription drug coverage for Medicare beneficiaries who need it. Simultaneously, it allows us to continue to pay down the public debt (a trillion dollars of it over five years), making it possible to eliminate the entire public debt by 2013.

In addition, the Republican budget proposal calls for tax cuts of up to $150 billion over five years, including the elimination of the marriage penalty. It also contains tax relief for small businesses, phases out the estate or 'death' tax, establishes tax incentives for educational assistance and tax relief associated with pending health care reform legislation.

Finally, I am pleased to report that the Republican budget increases spending for primary and secondary education, including Pell Grants (which we have increased by about 50% since we assumed control of Congress in 1995); national defense and programs to support our military men and women; transportation; and veterans programs. In response to many of my constituents' concerns, it also decreases foreign aid expenditures. Again, I believe this budget fulfills my commitment to 10th District citizens to support budget reforms and fiscally responsible spending.

RADIO BROADCASTING PRESERVATION ACT OF 2000

SPEECH OF

HON. JOSEPH R. PITTS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 13, 2000

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3439) to prohibit the Federal Communications Commission for establishing rules authorizing the operation on new, low power FM radio stations:

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 3439, the Radio Broadcasting Preservation Act, because it protects the interests of all parties affected by low-power FM.

I have several small and independent broadcasters in my district. They provide important services to communities in Lancaster and Chester Counties, PA. Unfortunately, the FCC Low-Power FM rule threatens these broadcasters and many like them across the country.

While the intentions of the FCC are good, its policy is bad. The FCC's low-power FM policy does not provide adequate safeguards against broadcasting interference.

Do we really want to increase the burden for these small and independent stations, many of which are already struggling to stay on the air? I think not.

For this reason, we need to pass H.R. 3439 and protect FM station license holders in small, rural markets where there are already limited opportunities for stations to sell the advertising that covers operating expenses.

H.R. 3439 makes sure we take a hard look at the consequences of low-power FM by requiring the FCC to conduct an economic impact study of low-power FM on existing broadcasters, with an emphasis on minority and small-market broadcasters. This bill also requires the FCC to properly conduct tests to prevent broadcast interference.

I thank my colleague, Mr. OXLEY, for introducing this important bill. We must ensure all parties affected by low-power FM—existing small and independent broadcasters, public radio stations, and radio listeners—are given the consideration they deserve.

PROJECT EXILE: THE SAFE STREETS AND NEIGHBORHOODS ACT OF 2000

SPEECH OF

HON. LEE TERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 2000

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4051, ''Project Exile: The Safe Streets and Neighborhoods Act of 2000.'' Project Exile adopts a zero-tolerance for federal gun crimes, with federal, state and local law enforcement and prosecutors working hand-in-hand to prosecute each and every firearms violation. This program imposes stringent and serious consequences on armed criminals by demonstrating that prosecution and punishment provides for deterrence and prevention. We need to send a real clear message to criminals who abuse our Second Amendment. Project Exile is a positive step in the direction to reduce firearm related crime in America by providing a five-year mandatory minimum sentence, with no eligibility for parole, for anyone who uses or carries a firearm in the commission of a violent crime, drug trafficking crime or for any convicted felon found to be in possession of a firearm.

Project Exile is one of the most aggressive, creative and innovative crime control plans ever initiated. Since its inception in Richmond, Virginia, in 1997, Project Exile has produced overwhelmingly successful results; the Project has put more than 200 armed criminals behind bars; one violent gang responsible for many Richmond murders has been eliminated; the rate of gun carrying by criminals has been cut nearly in half; and the armed robbery rate for 1998 has declined 29 percent. This is just one state with significant examples of how the implementation of Project Exile has decreased gun-related crimes. It has proved to be so effective that Project Exile has expanded to

other areas such as Rochester, New York and Philadelphia and other areas are considering adopting the same approach. Project Exile needs to be applied on a federal level and not just on a state level. We cannot comprise American families and their safety by just denying felons access to guns. We must do more. We must effectively enforce gun laws.

We cannot be sure that our criminal justice system is doing all that it can do to keep guns out of the hands of violent felons if these felons are not consistently being prosecuted for their crimes. Our focus needs to be criminal control and not gun control. It is about time we take proactive measures to protect law-abiding citizens from becoming the victims of violent gun crimes. I urge my colleagues to vote for Project Exile.

A TRIBUTE TO THE HUMAN SPIRIT OF MR. JOHN FRIDLEY

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 2000

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, today I praise the human spirit. We have become a cynical nation. It has become cliche to say that a good person is hard to find. I don't believe that for one minute. I meet good people everyday. On this occasion, I would like to commend Mr. John Fridley, of New Baden, Illinois.

John is a member of the Wesclin Community Unit School Board, the Kaskaskia Special School District Board and on the advisory board at Belleville Area College as well as active in his church. John also is a member of the Year 2000 Allocations panel for the United Way of Metro East. This father and grandfather, former teacher and retired member of the U.S. Air Force, now works as a civilian at Scott Air Force Base. By all indications, John is a success.

He credits has sense of civic duty and volunteerism to his father, who instilled in young John what you owe your services to the community where you live. Mr. Fridley is a dynamic leader and an inspiration to all of us in the 20th District of Illinois.

TRIBUTE TO ECKERD CORPORATION

HON. JAMES T. WALSH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 2000

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize a very important player in the war against drugs in our nation. The Eckerd Corporation has for many years now sponsored a Drug Quiz Show that reaches over 30,000 middle school students in New York State. This program teaches students important lessons about the dangers of substance abuse in a creative 'game show' format. In years past, the Eckerd Corporation has received recognition awards from the Department of Justice, the Department of Health and Human Services, and New York State Governor George Pataki. I believe that the local efforts of the Eckerd Corporation are in line with the company's national campaign, and I believe that the Eckerd Corporation deserves to be recognized for its long-standing commitment to the Drug Quiz Show format.

Finals for this year's competition are scheduled to take place on Monday, May 8th, 2000 in Syracuse, New York. I would like to thank the coordinators of the event, especially Executive Director, Ms. Susan Meidenbauer, the Eckerd Corporation, the students, the schools, the parents, and administrators who are so supportive of this outstanding and exciting opportunity to educate young and old about the dangers of substance abuse.

A TRIBUTE TO THE CHARLES CITY HIGH SCHOOL MUSIC DEPARTMENT

HON. JIM NUSSLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 2000

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, today I pay tribute to the Charles City High School Music Department for its selection as a GRAMMY Signature School for the second time in as many years.

I would like to congratulate the students of the Charles City High School band, choir and orchestra. They are one of only 100 schools to be recognized in the country this year, and one of the three from Iowa. With this achievement, they have demonstrated that they have the ability and the desire to be assets and role models in their community and the great state of Iowa.

This award is given to schools that are dedicated to advancing music and arts-based education by the GRAMMY Foundation, a nonprofit arm of the National Academy of Recording Arts and Sciences (NARAS). The recipients of this award are determined on the basis of a scoring system applied by an advisory committee made up of members of the musical industry.

I also congratulate the directors of the three music departments at the school; the Director of Bands, Jim Jurgensen, the Director of Vocal Music, Larry Michehl, and the Director of Orchestras, Nancy Western as well as Principal Jon Nordaas and the entire faculty at Charles City High School. Without their guidance and support, and that of the entire community, this prestigious recognition would not have been possible.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to and congratulating the Charles City High School Music Department for the outstanding achievement of receiving the NARAS GRAMMY Signature School Award.

TRIBUTE TO EDWARD DEEB AND HARVEY WEISBERG

HON. SANDER M. LEVIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 2000

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 7, 2000 a dinner will be held under the sponsorship of American Arab and Jewish Friends, a program of the National Conference for Community and Justice (NCCJ). The NCCJ is an organization founded to improve understanding and friendship between the Arab and Jewish communities.

The dinner honors two exceptionally distinguished citizens of Michigan, Edward Deeb and Harvey Weisberg.

Ed Deeb has been a leader in the food industry for almost forty years, currently serving as President and CEO of the Michigan Food & Beverage Association, Chairman of the Eastern Market Merchants Association and head of the Michigan Business and Professional Association. His commitment to community is demonstrated through his continuing coordination of the Metro Detroit Youth Day and his service in numerous organizations in a variety of capacities, among them the Salvation Army, United Way Community Services, Boys & Girls Clubs of Southeast Michigan.

Harvey Weisberg also has had a distinguished career in the food industry, playing a leading role in the retail business in Michigan. He has long been actively involved in improving the lives of those who live in Metro Detroit. He is a National Commissioner and a member of the Michigan Anti-Defamation league of B'nai B'rith, serves on the boards of the Jewish Welfare Federation, United Jewish Charities, Hillel Day School, United Hebrew Schools and the American-Israel Chamber of Commerce. Harvey had recently become involved with the Children's Sports For Peace Organization, which is planning to build sports facilities in Israel, Gaza City and other Arab cities.

It has been my pleasure to know Ed Deeb and Harvey Weisberg during their decades of professional and community work. I admire their efforts to create broader understanding between the Arab-American and Jewish communities in Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Edward Deeb and Harvey Weisberg. It is very fitting that they be honored for their endeavors. May they help to stimulate further efforts to foster meaningful dialogue about major challenges and opportunities.

TAX LIMITATION CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

SPEECH OF

HON. LEE TERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 12, 2000

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the H.J. Res. 94, the Tax Limitation Constitutional Amendment. I would first like to thank my distinguished colleague from Texas, Representative PETE SESSIONS for sponsoring this overdue piece of legislation. This legislation of which I am cosponsor, requires any tax increase passed by Congress to be supported by more than a simple majority. The Tax Limitation Amendment states that any tax increase must pass by a two-thirds vote of Congress.

Taxes are the most fundamental means of pricing out the government, and yet few taxpayers understand the price that they pay when members of Congress pass tax increases by a simple majority. Currently, 14 states require tax limitation standards, which have caused tax and spending decreases while increasing employment and economic

expansion. Why not implement a tax limitation standard on the federal level so that this same effect can be felt by all Americans?

There are a number of important issues which require a two-thirds vote by Congress such as amending the Constitution, overriding a Presidential veto; two events which clearly require the parties of Congress to come to a consensus. The decision to increase taxes is an important issue and it too should require more than a majority, it should require a consensus.

When Congress votes yes to increase taxes, it has an effect on everyone. When I was elected to represent the second district of Nebraska, one of my priorities was to fight against any and all attempts by the federal government to take more money away from my constituents. Last year many of my colleagues and I voted to cut $792 billion dollars in taxes for hard-working Americans, a great effort which was vetoed by the President. Unfortunately, we had no hope of overriding the Presidents veto because we could not muster the two-thirds votes necessary from the House. Any attempt by members of Congress to cut taxes is put in jeopardy by the Presidents ability to veto. We should require any increase in taxes to receive overwhelming support of Congress—a two-thirds vote.

Many of the major tax increases levied on Americans have passed without a two-thirds vote. In 1982, Congress passed the Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act which cost the taxpayer $214 billion dollars without a two-thirds vote; Congress passed the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1987 totaling $40 billion dollars without a two-thirds vote; Congress passed the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1989 for $25 billion dollars without a two-thirds vote; Congress passed the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990 for a whopping $137 billion dollars without a two-thirds vote. Finally, Congress passed one of the largest tax increases in American history, the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 for $275 billion dollars by 1 vote not a two-thirds vote. I believe that I have made my point. If you are going to send Americans a tax bill, you better have the support from two-thirds of Congress.

The economy of the United States is at a fiscally sound level, but our taxes remain to be the highest they have been since World War II. As Congress, our main goal is to keep our economy sound and contribute to the current prosperity. Preventing future tax increases will help us in this mission. One way to accomplish this is to require a two-thirds vote from Congress before making a decision that could alter our lives.

Federal tax laws have numerous unintended consequences on Americans. Congress needs to make decisions in the best interest of Americans by ensuring that any federal tax increase is supported by more than just a simple majority. I urge my colleagues to vote yes on this bill.

A TRIBUTE TO MS. SHIRLEY SCHMITT

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 2000

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, today I honor Ms. Shirley Schmitt, who is the fifth-grade teacher at St. Jacob Elementary School. Shirley was named the school Recycling Coordinator of the Year, otherwise known as the ''Recycling Queen'' because of her creative ways of cleaning up the world around her.

As a former teacher, I know that you have to be inventive to grab and then maintain the kid's attention. Her recycling program is much more than separating glass and plastic, she makes it fun. Let me share with you some of Shirley's ideas: using pencil shavings as mulch or using 6 pack plastic rings along with a shish-kabob stick to make flowers.

When you are creative in the classroom, and make projects fun, you dare a child to dream. That is the magic of teaching. Thank you Shirley.

TRIBUTE TO MS. AMANDA NODINE

HON. JAMES T. WALSH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 2000

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I received a letter two weeks ago from a constituent, The Honorable Lucille Craine, who is supervisor of the town of Victory, New York which is in my district. Included in the letter was an essay, written by Amanda Nodine, a thirteen-year-old student who attends Red Creek Central School. Amanda's essay, titled ''Our Flag, Why Should We Respect It?'', has received various acclamations, including recognition by the Wolcott Elk Lodge and other American Legion organizations.

I am very proud of Amanda for her patriotism and loyalty to our country. She exhibits discipline, sensitivity, and love for her country while also representing her school and her community. I am equally proud of Red Creek High School, the parents, and administrators who are so supportive of this outstanding young citizen.

I have included her essay for the record.

OUR FLAG, WHY SHOULD WE RESPECT IT?

(By Amanda Nodine)

The American Flag has many reasons why it should be respected. Yet many people don't understand the meanings of the American flag.

Many Americans fought for our country risking their lives. People died so they could save our country. The soldiers wanted all of us to be free now, in the future, and back then. The American flag shows honor and support for the people who fought, died, and suffered, all for our country.

The flag has many meanings. The flag symbolizes independence, freedom, justice, America, and democracy. The flag has 50 white stars on a navy blue background, and 13 alternating red and white stripes. The 13 strips represent the original 13 colonies. It has 50 stars for all of the 50 states. The flag's colors are red, white, and blue. Red standing for heroism, zeal, and faith; white for hope, purity, and cleanliness of life; and blue the color of heaven, in honor of God, loyalty, sincerity, justice, and truth.

We show patriotism when we salute the flag, fly it on/at important events, government buildings, schools, American legions, Elks Clubs, and other important buildings.

Without our flag we wouldn't be a free country. We could be owned by another country and ruled by one too.

The flag should be respected because it is an important monument and also because it symbolizes the freedom of our country. Respect the American flag!

TRIBUTE TO MR. THOMAS MILLER OF MERIDIANVILLE, ALABAMA

HON. ROBERT E. (BUD) CRAMER, JR.

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 2000

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, I pay tribute to Mr. Thomas Miller of the Madison County Sheriffs Department. Mr. Miller goes above and beyond the duties of a public servant. Mr. Miller works the night shift with the Sheriff's Department, but still finds time to lead a group of Tiger Scouts.

Mr. Miller has dedicated himself to this group of eager young men and has taught them by example about a life of citizenship and patriotism. The Tiger Scouts respect Mr. Miller and the job he does everyday to protect them and their families, often without proper recognition or gratitude.

I wish to take this opportunity to thank him for his exemplary role as a leader in our community. Children in this country need more role models like Mr. Miller. I believe that this honor is fitting for someone who has given so much of himself for this community and this nation.

I want to wish Mr. Miller and his family best wishes and express to him my gratitude on behalf of the United States Congress for his selfless work with the Tiger Scouts in our community.

A CELEBRATION OF INTERNATIONAL GUIDE DOG DAY

HON. CONSTANCE A. MORELLA

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 2000

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, on April 26, thousands of individuals around the world will celebrate International Guide Dog Day. This day was brought to my attention last November, when I received a letter from a constituent of mine, Ms. Christine de Angeli. She is a junior at St. Andrew's Episcopal School in Potomac, MD, and has spent a great deal of time as a foster puppy raiser. She believes that having sight is a gift, and feels that it is important for her to donate her time toward improving mobility for those with visual impairments. At her urging, the State of Maryland will issue a Governor's Proclamation recognizing International Guide Dog Day.

Christine is currently raising her second dog guide puppy. Often when she is out with the puppy, she encounters people who are unaware of the opportunity to become a foster puppy raiser, oftentimes they are very interested in learning more about how they can help. These volunteers are great ambassadors for our country's dog guide program.

Just by happenstance Mr. Speaker, a new staff person in my office is a dog guide user. Watching her work her dog guide on the Metro, in meetings, and around the office has given me a much greater appreciation for the value of these dog guides and how they enable one to keep working despite the loss of vision.

Ms. de Angeli feels strongly that in this country we should have a day to recognize the work of dog guides, their handlers, the families, and many organizations such as the Lions Club that support dog guide schools.

Dog guides change the lives of people who are blind or have low vision. Training dog guides takes both volunteer time and private donations of funds. The average cost to successfully train a blind person and their dog guide is about $25,000. Dog guide organizations rely on foster puppy raisers to raise future dog guides from the age of eight weeks until they start their formal guide training at 18 months. As International Guide Dog Day is acknowledged, many more families will become award of the opportunity to be foster puppy raisers and will hopefully contribute time and energy to help their fellow citizens.

I salute these selfless individuals and marvelous animals for their contributions to our society.

TRIBUTE TO JOSEPH HOJNICKI, MEMBER OF THE CENTURY OF THE MINQUADALE FIRE COMPANY

HON. MICHAEL N. CASTLE

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 2000

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I, as a member of the Congressional Fire Service Caucus, honor and pay tribute to a leader in the firefighting community—Joseph Hojnicki of the Minquadale Fire Company. Joseph Hojnicki is an outstanding, dedicated and caring Delawarean with an abundance of accomplishments in this field. On behalf of myself and the citizens of the First State, I would like to honor this outstanding individual and extend to him our congratulations on being chosen Minquadale Fire Company's Member of the Century.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the volunteer fire service in Delaware. It has been my privilege to have had the opportunity on many occasions to speak about this institution on the floor of the House of Representatives. These unselfish men and women provide their communities with essential volunteer public service. The volunteer fire service is as old as our nation. Benjamin Frankin was our first volunteer fire chief. It is tradition in the volunteer fire service for these men and women to not seek praise for what they do as volunteer firefighters. However, it is my privilege to praise Joseph Hojnicki, a man who has devoted the better part of his life to the volunteer fire service.

Today, I recognize Joseph Hojnicki of the Minquadale Delaware Fire Company. On Saturday, April 29, during the Seventy-fifth Annual Banquet of the Minquadale Fire Company, Joseph Hojnicki was named Member of the Century. He has provided more than 50 years of service to his community and the State of Delaware. He has done so in a manner that brings great distinction to the Minquadale community.

Family, friends and fellow firefighters can now take a moment to truly appreciate the world of difference Joseph Hojnicki has brought to the firefighting community. He has served for many years as Fire Chief and then President of the Minquadale Fire Company. He later earned a statewide reputation in Delaware for his service as President of the New Castle County Volunteer Firemen's Association and the Delaware Volunteer Firemen's Association. Today, while past the age of seventy, Joseph Hojnicki continues to respond to fire service calls to protect his community.

Joseph Hojnicki believes in young people. His firm yet friendly manner has influenced and encouraged young men and women to become involved in the fire service. For many it was an alternative to the street and possibly getting into trouble. Joseph Hojnicki's leadership and guiding hand helped create many fine firefighters and officers while he taught civic responsibility to two generations of Minquadale's youth. Mr. Speaker, with his wife Irene at his side, the Hojnicki family proudly and unselfishly contributes everyday to the quality of life at home in their community and our entire state.

As Minquadale celebrates their Diamond Anniversary, I join with them as they honor and pay tribute to a man whom they have called their ''greatest member.'' His selfless commitment to the cause of volunteer firefighters will have a permanent place in Delaware's volunteer fire service history. I am proud to call Joseph Hojnicki my friend.

TRIBUTE TO COMMAND SGT. MAJ. DAVID B. RABON

HON. ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 2000

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, the Creed of the Noncommissioned Officer says, in part, ''I will strive to remain tactically and technically proficient. I am aware of my role as a Noncommissioned officer. I will fulfill my responsibilities inherent in that role. All soldiers are entitled to outstanding leadership; I will provide that leadership. I know my soldiers and will always place their needs above my own . . .'' These words certainly seem to be the sentiments of the many men and women of my home island who have distinguished themselves in all branches of military service. Indeed, military men from Guam have won praises for their loyalty, their patriotism, their commitment to duty, and their dedication to the mission for more than 300 years.

In the 17th century, when the Spaniards recruited men from Guam as sailors in the Spanish fleet; in World Wars I and II, when the American military worked shoulder to shoulder with Guamanians both as civilian volunteers and uniformed personnel; in the Korean war and the Vietnam conflict; in other conflicts with American involvement since then; and most recently, in the Persian Gulf war, the record established and maintained by military men and women from Guam is a long and very proud one. This continues today.

As we enter the new millennium, another son of Guam is carrying on the tradition. It gives me great pride to say that the new commandant of the U.S. Army Aviation Center Noncommissioned Officer Academy at Fort Rucker, AL, is Command Sgt. Maj. David B. Rabon, the son of Jesus Bontugan and Rosa Benavente Rabon. Born in my home village of Sinajana on August 15, 1949, Sergeant Major Rabon enlisted in the U.S. Army in 1972, attended basic training at Fort Ord, CA, and advanced individual training [AIT] at Aberdeen Proving Grounds, MD, graduating from the AIT as an aircraft fire control repairman. In the 27 years he has spent in the Army, Sergeant Major Rabon has held numerous positions of leadership including squad leader; unit nuclear biological and chemical NCO; battalion aviation maintenance NCOIC; platoon sergeant; company first sergeant; service school instructor; service school branch chief; battalion and brigade command sergeant major.

Sergeant Major Rabon's awards and decorations include the Legion of Merit, the Meritorious Service Medal with One Oak Leaf Cluster, the Army Commendation Medal, the Army Achievement Medal with One Oak Leaf Cluster, the Good Conduct Medal 9th Award, the National Defense Service Medal w/Star, the Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal, the Armed Forces Service Medal, the Non-Commissioned Officer Professional Development Ribbon with numeral ''4'', the Army Service Ribbon, the Overseas Service Ribbon with numeral ''4'', the NATO Medal, the Master Aircraft Crewman Badge, the Air Assault Badge, and the Honorable Order of St. Michael Bronze award.

Command Sergeant Major Rabon's long and distinguished military career was made possible by the support of his wife, Barbara, and their children, David Jr. and Jennifer. The Command Sergeant Major's family bore the difficulties and accepted the challenges posed to military dependents. The Rabon's sacrifices were compounded by the misfortune of losing their son in a motorcycle accident while the family was stationed in Germany in 1995. The loss of a child is most difficult but worse when one is far from home and family.

The Rabons have held together. Without a doubt, the family's unity and strength, in addition to traditional values and the Command Sergeant Major's guidance, have enabled them to endure. The Rabons have been continually dedicated to serving the communities they have come in contact with through the Command Sergeant Major's service. Command Sergeant Major Rabon, himself, has taken special interest in coordinating Asian Pacific American activities.

As the Command Sergeant Major's military career nears conclusion, he and his wife have made plans to retire to Fort Walton Beach, FL. They look forward to living near their daughter, Jennifer, who is a special agent for the Department of Defense at Eglin Air Force Base.

Once again, to Command Sgt. Maj. David Rabon, his wife, Barbara, and daughter, Jennifer, I send best wishes from the people of Guam. It is well known that NCO's are ''the backbone of the Army,'' the leaders of soldiers, I can think of no finer teacher of leadership than a good leader like Command Sgt. Maj. David Rabon. Guam is proud of him and he is a great representative of what our people can do.

THREE GIANTS OF THE LAW

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 2000

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, criticism of both public and private institutions

is a vital part of democracy, but there are times when we as a society err on the side of excessive negativism, with the danger that the important contributions institutions make to the quality of our life can be overlooked.

An example of this is the current mood of ridiculing the legal profession. In the welter of legitimate criticisms that are made in the media and elsewhere about mistakes that lawyers make, the extraordinarily important role that lawyers play in fighting for some element of fairness in our society is sometimes lost.

In the Boston Globe on Monday, April 17, Professor Charles Ogletree, Jr. of Harvard Law School published an eloquent and thoughtful essay about the role of three of his former Harvard Law School colleagues who, tragically, all passed away last month.

Professor Ogletree's moving tribute to Gary Bellow, Abram Chayes and James Vorenberg serves two important purposes. First, it highlights the valuable work all three of these very dedicated, highly talented public spirited men did to make our society a fairer one. And in doing that, Professor Ogletree also highlights how the law at its best—and each of these three men represented that ideal—enhances the quality of our life as a civilized people.

It is entirely appropriate that Professor Ogletree wrote this article, because he embodies the tradition and moral leadership through the practice and teaching of law that these three extraordinary men exemplified. Because it is important that we as public policy makers strive constantly to vindicate the values that Gary Bellow, Abe Chayes and Jim Vorenberg worked so hard for during their lifetimes, because Charles Ogletree so well conveys this point, I submit his article to be printed in the RECORD.

[From the Boston Globe, Apr. 17, 2000]

Giants of Law

(By Charles J. Ogletree, Jr.)

Three giants in the legal education reform movement died this past week. Gary Bellow, Abram Chayes, and James Vorenberg have left indelible marks on the profession and have been instrumental in initiating reform that will continue to have an impact well into the 21st century.

While they are known for being scholars and gifted teachers at Harvard Law School, their contributions are much broader, and they have touched the lives of generations.

Although they spent more than 30 years as exceptional teachers, they spent an equal amount of time as public interest advocates. Bellow is known for his remarkable string of acquittals as a public defender in Washington. He represented Cesar Chavez and the migrant farm workers in California as they fought to reduce the use of life-threatening pesticides and to press for a livable wage. Bellow's success drew the wrath of then-Governor Ronald Reagan. His work ultimately led to severe restrictions on the type of cases that legal service attorneys could accept in representing poor people.

Vorenberg's ground-breaking work as a Watergate prosecutor was an important affirmation of the principle that no person is above the law and today is a marker for public prosecutors functioning as public servants.

Chayes over the past two years represented the nation of Namibia before the International Court of Justice. He also represented Kosovo refugees in an action claiming that government-led forces engaged in genocide, war crimes, and human-rights violations.

Their work in the courtrooms of the nation and the world, however, does not adequately illustrate their lasting contributions to our legal system. Bellow pioneered the clinical legal education movement in the early 1970s. His idea was that, with new constitutional changes requiring that indigents accused of criminal violations receive free attorneys, well-trained and energetic law students could serve in this effort. As a result of his vision, thousands of law students have provided quality legal representation to poor people in civil and criminal cases throughout Massachusetts and the nation.

Bellow's casebook, ''Lawyering Process,'' is the seminal clinical legal education textbook used today. It took the unprecedented approach of using social science literature and empirical research to explain the complexities of the legal process, and it is unparalleled in its breadth and depth.

Chayes was a pioneer in the field of international law, human rights advocacy, and peaceful conflict resolution. He began teaching and writing in these areas shortly after World War II and served as an adviser and consultant to several American presidents, including John Kennedy during the Cuban missile crisis. He helped policy makers realize that our salvation as a nation is inextricably tied to our willingness to see world progress as a global challenge, with cooperation and conciliation as an integral element. Chayes trained many foreign lawyers, including some who have returned to their countries and implemented democratic reforms that facilitated unfettered elections, economic productivity, and the protection of minority rights, without compromising principles of national sovereignty. His effort over the past 50 years stands as a testament that one person, fully committed to democracy and peace, can make a difference.

Vorenberg's impact influenced not only legal education but also law reform in communities nationally. His commitment to justice and equality started early as he witnessed his father and grandfather hiring black employees at Gilchrist's, the Boston department store, during a time when few accepted the principle of hiring minorities. He also quietly influenced improved relationships between law enforcement officials and minority communities.

While Vorenberg's role in developing the Kerner Commission Report is well known, his role in creating the Center for Criminal Justice at Harvard Law School to help eliminate distrust between police and minority community members is less publicized. He convened meetings of some of the nation's police chiefs in the early 1970s and had them examine ways to address crime control, while respecting the individual liberties of an increasingly diverse population.

While it was not called community policing then, Vorenberg's efforts were designed to make police chiefs implement programs that helped them to better understand the communities they served, and to work with clergy, community leaders, and youth, to prevent crime. Former police chiefs like Lee P. Brown, of Houston and New York, Joe McNamara of Santa Clara, Calif., and Thomas Gilmore, the first African-American sheriff in Lowndes County, Ala., credit their visits to Harvard and consultations with Vorenberg and others for the success in vastly improving police and community relations following the turbulence of the 1980s.

The lasting impact of Vorenberg's work with police chiefs can be seen in the success of cities like Boston and San Diego, and it offers a blueprint for innovation in turbulent cities like New York and Los Angeles.

The accomplishments of these three giants cannot be adequately recounted without acknowledging the significant contributions of their spouses and partners, talented women in their own right. Jeanne Charn was with Bellow every step of the way in creating the Hale and Dorr Legal Services Center over the last two decades, and she now serves as director of the center, providing legal assistance to a bilingual and the multicultural population of poor people in Massachusetts.

Antonia Chayes joined her husband in resolving international disputes and advising foreign leaders through the Conflict Management Group, an internationally recognized dispute resolution institute that continues to help world leaders and nongovernmental organizations.

Betty Vorenberg traveled the world with her husband promoting individual liberty and civil rights, particularly for women and children, while also playing an active role in the juvenile justice reform movement in Massachusetts.

The love of the law and passion for teaching the next generation of social engineers was evident even in their final moments. Vorenberg was fatally stricken after teaching one of his classes, and Bellow suffered heart failure en route to class. These educators were the epitome of humility and selflessness. There will not be three like them to pass this way again.

HUGH T. MURRAY FAMILY

HON. JAMES V. HANSEN

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 2000

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a letter from my constituent, Iola B. Murray, regarding an error in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 19, 1971. To correct the historical record for her family I include the statement as it should have appeared at that time.

HUGH T. MURRAY FAMILY

Mr. MCKAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to pay special tribute to the Hugh T. Murray family of West Point, Utah, for special achievement in the field of Scouting. The Murrays have set an outstanding example for all of us with each of the family's six sons achieving the Eagle Scout award and with the four youngest receiving this award on the same night at a special court of honor.

Dean, 19; Paul, 17; David, 16; and Joel, 13, were presented with their Eagle awards on the night of June 27 of this year with two older Eagle Scout brothers, John, 25, and Thomas, 23, participating in the special ceremony. In this day and age of the dropout, it is heartening to see young men who still care—young men who see value in religion, family life and in serving their community. I pay tribute to the Murray family and to the scouting program for the sense of responsibility it provides for young men in America today.

The Murrays have been blessed with eight fine children including two daughters, Mabel Ann and Julie Kay. It was a goal of the entire family to see that all six sons become Eagle Scouts and this goal was reached when the four youngest sons received their individual Eagle awards at the same time.

The six Eagle Scouts of the Murray family have all been actively engaged in school, church, and community activities. Twenty-five-year-old John recently received his master's degree in electrical engineering from Brigham Young University. He was a member of the National Honor Society, a high school athlete and has served a mission for

his church. He is married to Bonnie Hart and has a year old son.

Twenty-three-year-old Thomas is a senior at Weber State College. He too has served a mission for his church and has served in student government while in college. He is leader of an Explorer Post and took his young men to the National Explorer Olympics where they won the basketball title.

Nineteen-year-old Dean is now serving on a mission for the Latter-day Saints Church and was attending Weber State College prior to that church call. He participated in athletics in high school and in college and has worked with young men in scouting and athletics. He played on the Explorer Olympics national champion basketball team.

Seventeen-year-old Paul is now a senior at Clearfield High School where he lettered in wrestling and track. He has been active in scouting and church work. He also played on the National Explorer Olympics basketball championship team.

Sixteen-year-old David is a junior at Clearfield High School where he is actively engaged in sports. He has also been a leader in church activities and in scouting and was also on the Explorer Olympics national champion basketball team. He has been president of his Venturer and Explorer posts.

Thirteen-year-old Joel is the youngest of the six brothers and a ninth grader at North Davis Junior High School. He enjoys sports and scouting and is now a patrol leader. He has been an active leader in his church and has won several awards.

I am happy to call to the attention of the Members of the House the accomplishments of the Murray family. I would like to commend Mr. and Mrs. Hugh Murray for the outstanding example they have set, as parents, for all of us. And I also commend the Murray sons and daughters for their genuine interest and involvement in church, school, and community.

RECOGNIZING RABBI MARC SCHNEIER AND THE FOUNDATION FOR ETHNIC UNDERSTANDING

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 2000

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the contribution of The Foundation for Ethnic Understanding, under the strong leadership of Rabbi Marc Schneier. The Foundation has over the past ten years worked to highlight the need for strengthening relations between Jewish-Americans and African-Americans. In doing so, the Foundation has reminded Americans of the strength that comes from sharing our similarities as well as our differences, while reminding us all of the pain endured by our nation during the Civil Rights Movement, and the ultimate success of those efforts.

On April 4th, the 32nd anniversary of the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., members of Congress and leaders of both the African-American and Jewish-American communities gathered in the halls of Congress to pay tribute to the legacy of Dr. King. Even as we paid tribute to this hero of the Civil Rights Movement, we joined the Foundation for Ethnic Understanding in honoring two members of Congress, my colleagues, Congresswoman NITA LOWEY from New York and Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON-LEE from Texas. Both of these leaders deserve our greatest admiration for their commitment to ensuring that justice and liberty will prevail within our nation.

Mr. Speaker, Rabbi Schneier, The Foundation for Ethnic Understanding, and Representatives LOWEY and JACKSON-LEE deserved to be honored for keeping the memory and dream of Dr. King alive. Together, they have—while perhaps less dramatically, but with equal success—challenged the system of segregation that has now given way to a better America.

CELEBRATING THE 65TH BIRTHDAY OF JEREMIAH ''DERRY'' HEGARTY

HON. THOMAS M. BARRETT

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 2000

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on April 18th, 2000, family, friends and admirers gathered to celebrate the 65th birthday of Jeremiah ''Derry'' Hegarty, as well as his 35-year love affair with his community, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

I have known Derry Hegarty for many years, and it is hard to recall a more engaging personality. He came to this country from Drinagh East, County Cork, Ireland in 1965 and became Purchasing Manager for a local manufacturing company. Just seven years later, he purchased a pub on Milwaukee's west side. It didn't take long for the entrepreneurial Irishman to put his stamp on the place.

He transformed this small corner tavern into something closer to what he remembered from home. Slowly and surely, Derry's became a virtual community center. It is a place to go for the opening of the baseball season. It is a comfortable and entertaining spot to watch a Green Bay Packer game. Friends gather here spontaneously. Groups and organizations hold their meetings here. It is the site of receptions, fundraisers and election night parties. It is a very popular location, and its popularity can be traced to a factor more important than tasty food and refreshing beverages. Derry's is Derry.

Behind this mild mannered, soft spoken and friendly man is an individual of surprising extremes. If you were to poll the people who know him best, you would hear nothing moderate . . . nothing halfway. You would hear of his seemingly tireless efforts on behalf of his church. You would be told of his enormous generosity of time and spirit in helping to bring Milwaukee's Irish Cultural and Heritage Center to life. You would hear of his fierce loyalty to his friends and their causes.

Just as Derry's is far more than a simple corner pub, Derry himself is well more than a seasoned proprietor. He is a counselor. He is an advisor. He is a civic leader. He is a philanthropist. He is a confidant.

He is one more thing, I think, that is even more important than all of those. He is a friend.

They say that the ancient Norman invaders of Ireland became ''more Irish than the Irish.'' Derry Hegarty is more a Milwaukeean than most who were raised here. He is entwined in our history and has made his mark on our future.

Happy Birthday, Derry, and thank you.

DESIREA HOLTON RECEIVES GOLD AWARD

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 2000

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to recognize the accomplishment of one of Colorado's youth, Desirea Holton. Desirea is a member of Senior Girl Scout Troop 81 in Delta, Colorado. On May 20, 2000, ceremonies will take place to honor Ms. Holton's achievement of earning the Girl Scout Gold Award.

The Girl Scout Gold Award is the highest award possible for a Girl Scout to earn. In order to earn the award, a Girl Scout must meet five requirements, all of which promote community service, personal and spiritual growth, positive values, and leadership skills. Desirea's project, ''Hair Today: Gone Tomorrow,'' encompasses all of those things. Her project brought community awareness to the issue of juvenile hair loss. Desirea developed an informational brochure, which she distributed to local salons in an effort to increase hair donations. She also organized a day where individuals interested in donating their hair could receive a free haircut and styling.

It is with this, Mr. Speaker, that I say congratulations to Desirea Holton on her achievement. Due to Ms. Holton's dedicated service, it is clear that Colorado is a better place.

IN HONOR OF THE ANNUAL BAYONNE HOLOCAUST REMEMBRANCE DAY OBSERVANCE

HON. ROBERT MENENDEZ

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 2000

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Annual Bayonne Holocaust Remembrance Day Observance.

This is not just a day to remember the tragedy of the Holocaust, it is also a day to celebrate the special commitment the Jewish community has to its heritage and the preservation of Jewish identity.

The ceremony will feature speaker Norman Salsitz, a Holocaust survivor himself. He was born in Kolbuszowa, Poland, the youngest of nine children. During the war, he was confined to a ghetto and three labor camps, escaping on several occasions, and eventually commanding a Jewish partisan group in southern Poland. Later, he joined the Polish army and rose to the rank of colonel.

Germans murdered Norman Salsitz's mother and sisters, and their husbands and children. He witnessed the shooting of his father. These tragic events have contributed to his unwavering commitment to the Jewish community and its legacy.

For many years, Norman Salsitz has participated in numerous and diverse Jewish organizations, such as Israeli Bonds, United Jewish Appeal, and Jewish Fighters and Partisans. He is an executive board member of the National Federation of Holocaust Survivors. He has authored two books: Against All Odds: A Tale of Two Survivors, co-authored by his wife; and A Jewish Boyhood in Poland: Remembering Kolbuszowa.

Proclamations will be made by Mayor Joseph V. Doria, Jr., the honorary chairman of the event. This year's event is dedicated to the memory of Colonel Anthony Podbielski, a longtime and active member of the committee.

I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring the annual Holocaust Remembrance Day Observance; and I ask that we, too, remember the Holocaust.

HONORING DR. FRANKLIN E. KAMENY AND THE GAY AND LESBIAN ACTIVISTS ALLIANCE OF WASHINGTON, D.C.

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 2000

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, today I recognize two Washington, D.C. institutions that have been in the forefront of the lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgendered civil rights movement, and that I have the distinct honor and pleasure of representing in this body: the Gay and Lesbian Activists Alliance of Washington, D.C. (GLAA), the oldest continuously active gay and lesbian rights organization in the United States and its charter member, Dr. Franklin E. Kameny.

Since its founding in April 1971, GLAA has been a respected and persistent advocate in District politics tirelessly asserting equal rights and social equality for lesbians and gay men living in the city. In the last two years, its advocacy with the city government helped reestablish an independent Office of Human Rights and the Citizen Complaint Review Board; implementation of a unique identifier system for reporting cases of HIV/AIDS to help to protect the privacy of people who test positive for HIV; and the establishment of an antiharassment policy by the District of Columbia Public Schools.

On April 27, GLAA held its 29th Anniversary Reception honoring the year 2000 recipients of its Distinguished Service Awards: Steve Block of the American Civil Liberties Union/National Capital Area; Jeffrey Berman of the Public Defender Service; local and international gay activist Barrett L. Brick; Food and Friends; Dr. Patricia Hawkins, Associate Director of the Whitman Walker Clinic; and Jessica Xavier, a local and national transgendered activist. GLAA also celebrated Frank Kameny's 75th Birthday.

Dr. Kameny's resume reflects the history of the gay and lesbian movement in the District of Columbia. He remains an indefatigable and outspoken gay activist. Dr. Kameny holds a BS in Physics from Queens College and an M.A. and a Ph.D. in Astronomy from Harvard University.

In 1957, Dr. Kameny began an 18-year struggle to end the civil service ban on the federal employment of gay men and lesbians that achieved success in 1975 and was recently formalized by President Clinton with Executive Order 13087. In 1961, Dr. Kameny founded the Mattachine Society of Washington, the first local gay and lesbian organization in the District. The following year, he initiated the ongoing effort to lift the ban on gay men and lesbians in the military.

By 1962, Dr. Kameny had become the nationally recognized authority on security clearances for lesbians and gay men. His efforts resulted in lifting of the absolute ban on gay and lesbian security clearances in 1980, which President Clinton made formal with Executive Order 12968. In 1965, Dr. Kameny organized the first lesbian and gay demonstration at the White House; and a year before the ''Stonewall Rebellion'' in New York City in 1968, he coned the slogan ''Gay Is Good.''

In 1971, Dr. Kameny ran for Congress in the District of Columbia, the first openly gay person to seek such an office in the country. His campaign committee became the nucleus of the Gay and Lesbian Activists Alliance of Washington, D.C. He subsequently helped draft the D.C. Human Rights Law, one of the strongest civil rights laws in the country, which codified gay and lesbian civil rights in the District.

Dr. Kameny's 10 year fight to have homosexuality removed from the American Psychiatric Association's classification as a mental illness succeeded in 1973. He was a founding member of the National Gay and Lesbian Task Force (1973), the Gay Rights National Lobby (1975), which ultimately became the Human Rights Campaign, and the Gertrude Stein Democratic Club (1976).

Dr. Kameny became D.C.'s first openly gay municipal appointee when Mayor Washington appointed him to the Human Rights Commission (1975). He drafted the legislation which repealed the D.C. Sodomy Law in 1993.

Dr. Kameny continues to be a revered and effective activist. He lectures, writes, and testifies on behalf of gay and lesbian issues. He has become the institutional memory of D.C.'s gay and lesbian rights movement.

I ask the House to join me in congratulating the Gay and Lesbian Activists Alliance and Dr. Franklin E. Kameny.

HONORING DR. WILLIAM LARKIN

HON. GERALD D. KLECZKA

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 2000

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I honor Dr. William Larkin, who is retiring as superintendent of the Greenfield, Wisconsin School District after 40 years as an educator.

Dr. Larkin began his career as a classroom teacher. Through his hard work, and genuine concern for his students, he became an assistant principal, then junior high school principal, and high school principal. He spent 10 years as assistant superintendent for Milwaukee Public Schools, before becoming superintendent of the Monona Grove School District, and finally superintendent of the Greenfield School District, where he has served for the last 7 years.

But Bill's commitment to education was not confined to the classroom or the superintendent's office. Besides working as an associate professor at the University of Wisconsin-Stout, Dr. Larkin has contributed his considerable talents to the North American International Baccalaureate Board of Directors, the College Board of Academic Affairs Board, and the College Board of School-University Partnership Board.

Dr. Larkin's diligence in making the world around him a better place has taken many forms over the years. In his spare time, he has shown his dedication to his community as Greenfield Chamber of Commerce President, and as chair of the North Central Association Evaluation team for the Department of Defense in South Korea, England, and the Netherlands.

And so it is my great pleasure to join with his family and friends, as well as all of the students whose lives he has touched, in wishing Dr. William Larkin a long, happy, and well-deserved retirement.

TRIBUTE TO DANNY COLLINS

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 2000

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this moment to recognize an exceptional man, Danny Collins. Despite challenges, Danny overcame many of them and for 11 years has been a skillful weaver at Mountain Valley Textiles. I have known Danny for over 30 years and can attest to what a fine individual he is. Danny's work ethic and his strength stand out in our community. Although Danny now faces another challenge with the loss of his beloved father, Bud, Danny will pull through. Danny's family is strong and supportive and very, very proud of Danny.

The retiring of Denver Bronco's great quarterback, John Elway, motivated Danny to create several mementos to say good-bye to John Elway and sent them to John's family. All of the items have the number seven on them and are orange, blue and white. Danny was proud of his work in honor of Mr. Elway.

It is with this, Mr. Speaker, that I say thank you to Danny Collins, a wonderful human being. His talent and love of life brings him many admirers.

IN HONOR OF MARY ANN ROSWAL ON HER RETIREMENT AFTER 35 YEARS OF TEACHING

HON. ROBERT MENENDEZ

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 2000

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, today I honor Mary Ann Roswal on her retirement after 35 years of teaching.

It is said that teaching another something of value takes compassion, understanding and patience; and absent these virtues, the simple process of imparting knowledge can become strained and cumbersome, leaving both teacher and pupil estranged, unable to truly learn from each other. In honoring Mary Ann Roswal today, I honor the virtues that allow teachers to become great teachers.

For 35 years, Mary Ann Roswal taught English at Union Hill High School in Union City, New Jersey. And for 35 years, she touched the lives of her students in a way that her years of dedication cannot measure. As my teacher, she imparted to me the knowledge that language is a profound tool for understanding the world, and a necessary instrument in realizing one's full potential as a human being. I am proud to say that I learned this then; I accept this now; and I have done my best to impart this to others.

It is with great honor that I remember the lessons of yesterday—the lessons taught, and those who taught them. It is my history, and I am thankful that Mary Ann Roswal made it a history worth remembering, worth honoring.

Today, I ask that my colleagues join me as I honor a great teacher I admire and respect.

A TRIBUTE TO STUDENTS FROM MCALLEN MEMORIAL HIGH SCHOOL

HON. RUBEN HINOJOSA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 2000

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, on May 6–8, 2000 more than 1200 students from across the United States will be in Washington, DC to compete in the national finals of the We the People . . . The Citizen and the Constitution program. I am proud to announce that the class from McAllen Memorial High School from McAllen will represent the state of Texas in this national event. These young scholars have worked diligently to reach the national finals, and through their experience have gained a deep knowledge and understanding of the fundamental principles and values of our constitutional democracy.

The names of the students are: Melinda Acuna, Cassie Baumeister, Paul Bongat, Amy Booth, Emily Dyer, Brandon Garcia, Gabriela Gonzalez, Amber Hausenfluck, Jason Jarvis, Kyle Jones, Anita Manoharan, Suleima Mohamed, Taylor Mohel, George Morgan, Raquel Pacheco, Angela Perez, Blythe Selman, Matt Sheinberg, Jane Springmeyer, Veronica Vela, Summer West. I would also like to recognize their teacher, LeAnna Morse, whose tireless efforts have contributed greatly to the success of the class.

The We the People . . . The Citizen and the Constitution program is the most extensive educational program in the country developed specifically to educate young people about the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. The three-day national competition is modeled after hearings in the United States Congress. These hearings consist of oral presentations by high school students before a panel of adult judges. The students testify as constitutional experts before a panel of judges representing various regions of the country and a variety of appropriate professional fields. The students' testimony is followed by a period of questioning by the simulated congressional committee. The judges probe students for their depth of understanding and ability to apply their constitutional knowledge.

Administered by the Center for Civic Education, the We the People . . . program has provided curricular materials at upper elementary, middle, and high school levels for more than 26.5 million students nationwide. The program provides students with a working knowledge of our Constitution, Bill of Rights, and the principles of democratic government. Members of Congress and their staff enhance the program by discussing current constitutional issues with students and teachers and by participating in other educational activities.

The class from McAllen Memorial High School is currently conducting research and preparing for the upcoming national competition in Washington, DC. I wish these young ''constitutional experts'' the best of luck at the We the People . . . national finals, and my staff and I look forward to greeting them when they visit Capitol Hill.

INTRODUCTION OF THE OMNIBUS DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TAX INCENTIVE RECOVERY ACT OF 2000

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 2000

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Omnibus District of Columbia Tax Incentive Recovery Act. Congress was out of session on the day of the deadline for filing federal taxes, when I had wanted to introduce the D.C. Tax Package. Therefore, on the first day the House returns, I introduce the Omnibus District of Columbia Tax Incentive Recovery Act. The legislation builds on federal tax incentives Congress has already passed here to produce market-induced residential and business stability and growth. This bill is necessary to assure even the sustained stability, let alone real economic growth, that still eludes the District economy and the city government. This federal tax package gives the city the tools it needs to produce a self-sufficient economy. After the financial collapse of the 1990s, and as the control board passes from the scene, the Congress has an obligation to help the city do what is necessary to increase its own economic output on its own.

The city does not have that capacity today. Ominously, the District lacks the essential safety valve of other large cities—a state to fall back on in times of economic downturn. The economic forecasters agree that D.C. has reached the height of its economic output for this period and will experience four straight years of declining economic output after 2001, largely because its economic boost has come primarily from temporary construction jobs and from jobs held primarily by commuters. The surpluses that brightened the city's hopes have already declined: 1997, $185 million; 1998, $445 million, an artificial increase resulting from one-time federal contributions; 1999, $105 million. The District's top two private sectors—hotels and health care—actually lost jobs, and retail continues to shrink. The city's unemployment rate is 5.7% compared with 3.0% in Maryland and 2.7% in Virginia. This picture resembles other large cities in the United States. However, none survives on city-generated revenues alone, nor could it do so. State assistance is necessary not only to meet current expenses, but also to make up for sharply diminished tax bases in every major American city.

The District is not requesting similar subsidies or federal financial assistance. We believe that the federal tax credit incentive approach already approved by Congress that is already having substantial success here is the key to permanent stability. Tax credits leverage the private sector rather than the government to do the job of growing the economy and return many times the revenue foregone by the federal government.

The Omnibus Tax Package I am introducing today has four parts. They are: (1) the District of Columbia Non-Resident Tax Credit Act that would cost commuters nothing but would fairly spread the cost of the services used by federal and other employees, who return to the suburbs untaxed the overwhelming majority of the income earned here; (2) the District of Columbia City-Wide Enterprise Zone Act, to spread to all neighborhoods and businesses tax incentives that have brought substantial benefits to communities but with the unintended effect of affording an unfair and arbitrary advantage to some neighborhoods and businesses over their competitors; (3) the District of Columbia Economic Recovery Act, affording a progressive 15% flat tax to residents in order to draw and maintain taxpayers; and (4) the District of Columbia $5,000 Homebuyer Credit Act, to make permanent the tax incentive that is largely responsible for new homebuyers and for maintaining and attracting taxpayers to the city.

TITLE I: THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA NON-RESIDENT TAX CREDIT ACT

Not only do suburbanites carry home two-thirds of all the income generated in the District. They leave behind most of the damage that occurs to many services, especially roads and other infrastructure, while making free use of many of the same services that D.C. taxpayers can obtain only by paying for them. Large cities generally recoup at lease some of these service costs in order to avoid overwhelming the tax base of cities, which are far less prosperous than the regional areas where suburban service users reside.

For years, the District has sought some reimbursement for the heavy toll in services commuters use. Neither the obvious unfairness, nor even the city's insolvency and increasing need for reimbursement for the services provided, has produced any change.

The District's future economic prospects necessitate a fresh look at how to assure that the city gets its fair share of revenue in a region experiencing large and sustained growth while its core city does not generate sufficient revenue to assure its economic viability. The matter is no longer only a home rule issue or a services issue. Today, it is a fundamental needs issue to assure a viable capital.

The city gave up the federal payment in return for a takeover of state functions as the only way out of its insolvency. The old federal payment was almost never increased and, therefore, declined in value each year. A flat payment was a seriously antiquated and obsolete way for the federal government to meet its financial responsibility to help maintain a capital city. The 1997 Revitalization Act provides an automatic increase by assuming at least some of the most costly and fastest rising state costs. In spite of the splendid national economy, without the Revitalization Act takeover of some state costs, D.C. would still be insolvent, the city would not have an investment grade bond rating, and the control board would not be on its way out.

The tax credit is necessary because even the substantial relief afforded by the Revitalization Act has not left the District able to support itself in the long run. The cold reality is that neither the present robust economy nor the District's own exemplary efforts are doing enough, or can do enough, to assure a permanent recovery.

Three reasons account for this dilemma: (1) There simply are not enough taxpaying residents and businesses here now; it will take many years to make up for the shortfall, and the sufficient business and residential growth

may not occur at all if incentives to make the city more competitive with the suburbs are not enacted; (2) expenditures are inexorably rising faster than revenues; and (3) years of disinvestment in the services provided to residents and especially children, in infrastructure and in basic neighborhood amenities require immediate and substantial funds to hold and attract businesses and residents.

The new tax credit approach we offer today has the twin advantage of greater efficiency and greater reliance on approaches already sanctioned by Congress: (1) Congress has already approved tax credits for the District and increasingly uses tax credits nationally as a tool; (2) a federal tax credit is the fairest way to recoup the cost of services because most of the commuters are federal employees, most of the services rendered to non-residents are due to the federal presence, and most of the land taken off the tax rolls is federal land; (3) a tax credit would spread the obligations of securing a viable economy in the nation's capital to the entire country; (4) the tax credit is set at 2%, the average of non-resident taxes in the country; and (5) a standard commuter tax, other taxes, or other subsidies, are all politically impossible today, while the region has always supported the federal payment, a federal solution.

The tax credit would net the District $400 million the first year, and, unlike the flat federal payment would automatically rise every year because incomes increase every year. The take-home pay of commuters would not change because the 2% of their salary that would otherwise go to the federal government would instead transfer to the D.C. government (thereby also eliminating any new administrative burden).

TITLE II: DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CITY-WIDE ENTERPRISE ZONE

Several extraordinarily valuable enterprise zone tax benefits constitute the major financial tools that have been used for business revival and new commercial and office construction in the city. Among the most successful have been the wage tax credit allowing an employer a 20% credit for the first $15,000 of an employee's income if that employee is a D.C. resident. This credit not only helps attract and retain businesses, it also helps to correct the severe imbalance that allows two-thirds of the jobs in the city to go to commuters. Another new benefit, the elimination of capital gains altogether, is expanding and creating businesses in many city neighborhoods and downtown. The success of zero capital gains has already led the Senate to make this provision city-wide. A third tax incentive, tax exemption for up to $15 million in bonds, is fueling much of the construction boom the city is experiencing, and construction alone accounts for the major portion of the increased economic output of the District today.

However, because the District is small and compact, multiple enterprise zones have had unintended effects. High income university students with little personal income have brought Georgetown and Foggy Bottom businesses within the zone, but businesses in struggling areas of Ward 5 do not qualify. This title would eliminate an unearned advantage that forces competition among our already depleted pool of businesses instead of between those in and outside of the District.

The solution is to designate the District of Columbia itself an enterprise zone. Only this solution will erase indefensible distinctions that tear neighborhoods apart and help some D.C. businesses, neighborhoods and residents over others that are similarly situated. The citywide zone solution also draws upon the criterion of poverty already in the law because the present law requires a 20% residential zone poverty rate for businesses to receive the tax benefits, and a 10% poverty rate to qualify for capital gains tax elimination. Since the poverty rate for the District is 22%, it makes sense to use the city-wide poverty rate to designate the entire city an enterprise zone.

The $5,000 Homebuyer Tax Credit was always citywide and has proved so successful that the Senate has tried to raise the income limit (see below). The citywide success of the Homebuyer Credit shows highly effective tax breaks can and should be used to encourage the economy throughout the city.

TITLE III: D.C. ECONOMIC RECOVERY ACT (DCERA)

As valuable as the tax credits the District has achieved are, it is the one that the city has not yet achieved that has consistently provoked the greatest excitement and would have the greatest effect. There is general agreement that the 15% Progressive Flat Tax (PFT) would promote a dramatic increase in residents and would stop taxpayer flight altogether. A residential increase in indispensable to the survival of this city. The control board conservatively estimates the need for an increase of 100,000 residents to support city government services unattainable under present conditions.

The 15% progressive flat tax works this way: After affording sharp increases in the traditional standard deduction and personal exemption, a uniform rate of 15% would be applied progressively up the income scale to reduce a resident's tax liability—from approximately 80% reduction to a one-third reduction in taxes owed, depending on income. The lower the income, the greater the tax reduction. The DCERA would take 50% of D.C. residents off of the tax rolls altogether. The uniform rate also would rescue the remaining taxpayers from bracket creep, and assure that income increases resulting from the tax cut are not then significantly taxed away.

I first introduced the Progressive Flat Tax in the 104th Congress. I remain persistent not only because of the city's continuing and serious taxpayer deficit, but particularly because of the strong support I have received for the PFT from congressional leadership. They include Senate Majority Leader TRENT LOTT (R–MS), who sponsored the first-ever D.C. town meeting in the Senate and Senator CONNIE MACK (R–FL), Chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, and other members, who remain strong supporters of the PFT.

TITLE IV: THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA $5000 HOMEBUYER CREDIT ACT

This title would make permanent the $5,000 Homebuyer Credit, perhaps the most successful economic stimulus in the city's history. It is chiefly responsible for stemming the flight that almost destroyed the city's tax base during the 1980s and during the financial crisis and insolvency of the 1990s. The credit offers significant evidence that a tightly targeted tax incentive can have a major turn around effect on a specific problem confronting a city.

The credit has been so successful that we have recommended that states do the same for the many large cities that are rapidly losing taxpayers. In its first year, despite the city's financial problems and damaged reputation, the credit made the District first in home sales increases in the United States. According to an independent study by the Greater Washington Research Center, 70% of D.C. homebuyers have used the credit, and 51% purchased homes because of the credit.

Last Year, the Senate was so impressed with the Homebuyer Credit results that it increased the income limits for joint filers from $130,000 to $180,000. The limit for individual filers is $90,000. This increase was passed by the House and Senate, but no omnibus tax bill was enacted last year. Nevertheless, the Senate action demonstrates congressional acknowledgment of the effectiveness of tax credits in general and of the $5,000 homebuyer credit in particular. Fannie Mae has converted the credit into up-front money towards the purchase of a home, affording the credit significantly greater value to the individual.

The $5,000 homebuyer credit proved itself so quickly and so well that I have been able to get it repeatedly extended by Congress. The credit is similar to the PFT in its magnet effect. Until the PFT is enacted, the $5,000 credit is minimally necessary if the city is to have any chance of increasing its still small and depleted tax base. The credit has proved itself so definitively that to get the full effect, it should be enacted permanently.

TRIBUTE TO LUE IDA HILL

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 2000

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I commend the 100th birthday of Lue Ida Hill from Swanton, Ohio. This remarkable woman lives a life that celebrates every day as a gift, every sunrise as the herald of new opportunities.

When Mrs. Hill referred to her centennial birthday as ''just another day'', she does so not to comment on the routine of life, the monotony of ''just another day'', she sets an example to us all that everyday, indeed, every moment, ought to be a cause for celebration. For by celebrating, we give thanks for the blessings bestowed upon us by God.

Mrs. Hill has never known what most of us call retirement, for she continues to keep herself busy by helping her neighbors and bringing joy to those around her. With a bow in her hair, a tradition she began while working as a butcher, she was careening about her home in a motorcycle sidecar just months before her birthday.

Lue Ida is a first class woman from a first class community. She's never stopped working, whether it was at the farm helping out with the plowing or mending shirts for Arizona State University students. She's done it all with a gracious and genuine smile. Now, with 68 grandchildren, great-grandchildren, and great-great-grandchildren, Lue Ida keeps the fellow residents of the Harborside Healthcare Facility hopping. There, they refer to her as a social butterfly, playing cards and chatting with her friends and neighbors.

If only we could all be half the ''butterfly'' Lue Ida is. Bringing happiness to those around us, joy to our loved ones, and recognizing the gift of what we have instead of complaining for what we don't.

Our entire community wishes to extend its warmest and most caring congratulations to Lue Ida Hill on the attainment of her 100th year. Few Americans reach this incredible life pinnacle. May God bless Lue Ida and keep her as America and the world move toward the new millennium. She is a legendary teacher to us all.

FRIENDS OF MUSTANGS RECEIVES THE ''MAKING A DIFFERENCE'' AWARD

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 2000

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to recognize an exceptional group, the Friends of the Mustangs group, who were honored by the Bureau of Land Management with the ''Making a Difference'' award. The BLM selected the Friends of the Mustangs group because of their dedication to Colorado and to its outdoors.

For the past 17 years, the Friends of the Mustangs group have volunteered and managed the BLM's Little Book Cliffs Wild Horse Area. There, they saved the BLM over $20,000 by volunteering over 2,500 hours, maintained the grounds, fixing fences and trails. They also performed pre-adoption inspections. As a result, the Friends of the Mustangs group has played an integral role in managing wild horses.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious why the Friends of the Mustangs group was chosen for the ''Making a Difference'' award. I think we owe them a debt of gratitude for their service and dedication to Colorado and to its outdoors.

HONORING MR. DONALD ALMQUIST

HON. GERALD D. KLECZKA

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 2000

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, I honor my friend, Mr. Donald Almquist, who is retiring after serving on the School Board in Greenfield, Wisconsin for 23 years. Don was the School Board president for eight years, and has also served as vice-president, and as treasurer.

After retiring from a lengthy career in the Marine Corps, Don settled down in Greenfield where he has been an outstanding member of the community ever since. His work with such civic organizations as the Greenfield Lions Club, Greenfield Historical Society, American Legion, Boy Scouts of America, Greenfield Little League, and Vietnam Veterans of America have helped to make his community a better place to live.

Over the past 23 years, Don has left his mark on the quality of education in Greenfield. He has initiated many programs for Greenfield students including a school breakfast program, and a Junior ROTC program. He was also instrumental in beginning the filming of School Board meetings for cable television broadcasting.

Though this is his second retirement, Don will certainly have no trouble keeping himself busy. While he will no longer be a member of Greenfield's school board, he will continue his public service as the city's 4th district alderman, and president of the Common Council. He will also remain active in the Lion's Club, as well as the Education Scholarship Foundation, and a number of other community organizations.

Don has received many awards from the Greenfield Lion's Club including: The President's Award, the Governor's Award, and the Melvin Jones Fellow Award. He was also honored with the 1996 Achievement Award as one of Wisconsin's Outstanding Vietnam Veterans.

And so it is my great pleasure to extend my gratitude to my good friend Donald Almquist for his years of service, and my congratulations to him and his wife, Beverly, on a well deserved retirement.

IN HONOR OF THE UNITED CEREBRAL PALSY OF HUDSON COUNTY EIGHTH ANNUAL ''OUTSTANDING ACHIEVEMENT AWARD'' DINNER DANCE

HON. ROBERT MENENDEZ

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 2000

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, today I honor the United Cerebral Palsy of Hudson County Eighth Annual ''Outstanding Achievement Award'' Dinner Dance.

Since 1951, United Cerebral Palsy (UPC) of Hudson County has had one mission: ''To advance the independence, productivity, and full citizenship of people with disabilities.'' At UPC of Hudson County, this is more than a mission, it is a cerebral way of life. And the annual ''Outstanding Achievement Award'' honors those who have truly embraced this way of life, giving of themselves in a profoundly selfless and compassionate manner.

This year there are three such individuals, and I am proud to honor them as well. I honor them for their compassion; I honor them for their dedication; and I applaud them for what they have done for people with disabilities.

Henry Sanchez, Migdalia Viole, and Vincent J. Bottino where chosen by UPC of Hudson County to receive the ''Outstanding Achievement Award'' because they exemplify the strength of character and sense of purpose necessary to become outstanding community leaders. Hudson County has benefited enormously from their very special contribution to the community.

I ask my colleagues to join me as I honor these extraordinary individuals for their unparalleled commitment to bettering the lives of people with disabilities. Congratulations to this year's ''Outstanding Achievement Award'' winners.

BLOOMFIELD CITIZENS COUNCIL AWARDS

HON. WILLIAM J. COYNE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 2000

Mr. COYNE. Mr. Speaker, today I honor a number of Pittsburgh residents who will be honored on May 6 with Bloomfield Citizens Council Awards. Every year, the Bloomfield Citizens Council presents these awards as a way of recognizing members of the community who have made a significant contribution to the quality of life in Bloomfield. I would like to take this opportunity to mention the 2000 award recipients and commend them for their efforts to make Bloomfield a better place to live.

For their hard work, commitment, and enormous amount of volunteer time given for the love of the community and its children, members of the Immaculate Conception School Parent Teacher's Guild are receiving the Mary Cercone Outstanding Citizens Award. The members of the Guild being honored include: Nick and Amy Balestra, Tammy Bruno, Nancy Cherico, Beverly Helwich, Craig and Rosina Koziell, Janet Langer, Larry Lordeon, Frank and Renee Magliocco, Faye Parker, Ray Polk, Crystal Scullion, and Antionette Surmacy. This group of people is a symbol of the family values and the rich heritage of the Bloomfield community.

As president of the Immaculate Conception Christian Mothers for 38 years, Ann Scuilli has earned the Neighborhood Loyalty Award. She has demonstrated a sincere dedication to the betterment of Bloomfield with the unselfish giving of her personal time and willingness to work with others as a true team player.

Patrick McGonigle is the 2000 recipient of the Community Commitment Award for this consistent willingness to assist the Bloomfield Citizens Council in its efforts to work for the betterment of Bloomfield. He has given his time to promoting the Bloomfield Halloween Parade and the Bloomfield Preservation Center.

This year, the Extra Mile Award is given to Jolene Owens. She has given a decade of service to the Bloomfield Citizens Council. She has improved the BCC through her constant willingness to volunteer and by successfully accomplishing every task she is assigned.

For her heroic actions in entering a burning building to alert the second and third floor tenants of a life-threatening fire, Mary Gratta is the recipient of the Heroism Award. She risked her own life in the interest of saving others.

Nick and Amy Balestra have won the Keeping Christ in Christmas Award for their front yard display of a large handmade manger.

For their creative Christmas decorations that added beauty to the community, George and Eleanor Sciullo are receiving the Most Outstanding and Completely Decorated Home Award.

Russell and Leah Carlisle are given the Most Creative Design Award for their balanced, colorful Christmas decorations.

The recipients of this year's Bloomfield Citizens Council awards have all made significant contributions to the quality of life in Bloomfield and deserve recognition for their efforts. I commend them all, as well as the Bloomfield Citizens Council, for their dedication to their community.

NEW FUNCTIONING DEMOCRACY IN INDEPENDENT STATES OF THE FORMER SOVIET UNION

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 2000

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, functioning democracy in the newly emerging independent states of the former Soviet Union requires setting up new political institutions and developing the means of conducting the people's business. As we have seen in many of these countries, this is proving to be a challenge beyond the patience and political will of their leaders, particularly given the harsh economic conditions throughout the region. More often than not, responsible economic policies represent, in the short term, even greater hardships for the people whose support is essential if democracy and market economy are to be sustained in these countries.

In Ukraine this challenge was put to test earlier this year when the Verkhovna Rada, Ukraine's parliament, was confronted with a serious political crisis over the selection of the Speaker and other leadership positions. The Leftist forces, though in the minority, have managed to control the parliament for the past 18 months, thwarting the majority's efforts to implement President Kuchma's legislative agenda.

A vivid description of how the leftist speaker, Oleksandr Tkachenko, thwarted the majority and the subsequent developments that lead to his ouster are provided in a report by the U.S.-Ukraine Foundation. In Update on Ukraine, February 24, 2000, Markian Bilynskj writes.

Until January 21, the final day of the fourth parliamentary session, the Rada was presided over by a chairman whose political ambitions and sense of indispensability were matched only by his limitations. Oleksandr Tkachenko had been elected essentially by default 18 months earlier as elements within the Rada and beyond fought to prevent the chairmanship from falling into the hands of anyone harboring presidential ambitions. His eventual, somewhat surprise decision to run brought about a further politicization of the legislative process and was the principal reason behind the Rada's growing ineffectiveness. Tkanchenko's final unabashed identification with the communist candidate—a fitting conclusion to what can only be described as a parody of an election campaign—represented an abandonment of any pretense at impartiality and irreversibly undermined his credibility as Rada chairman. At the same time, President Leonid Kuchma's re-election altered the broader political context within which the Rada had to operate to such an extent that Tkachenko was transformed from a largely compromise figure into an anachronism.

After the December election, President Kuchma's administration joined with the pro-reform majority to challenge Speaker Oleksandr Tkachenko and his Communist-Left forces and succeeded in electing a new Speaker and many of the leadership positions in the Rada. The result is a newly constituted parliament with a majority now occupying key positions that is capable of responding to President Kuchma and Prime Minister Yuschenko's reform agendas.

I would like to submit for the record and bring to the attention of my colleagues an interview with Griority Surkis, a prominent, businessman and member of the Rada.

IT'S TIME FOR TRANSPARENCY

(By Grigoriy Surkis)

It would be desirable if our Parliament did not have deep divisions between the majority and minority factions; however this is not possible due to deep-rooted ideological divisions in the country.

Former Speaker Tkachenko, leader of the Communists in the Rada, demonstrated his inability to work out a compromise even when the majority announced a willingness to work cooperatively with Communist leaders on a legislative program.

By the way, leaders of the Ukraine Communists should learn a lesson from their Russian counterparts, who recently made a deal with the pro-government factions in organizing the Duma and distributing assignments among party leaders. They have a difficult time understanding that Communist authoritarianism does not exist in post-Soviet societies, nor is it as strong after eight years of democracy.

However, it remains to be seen how the pro-government block in Russia will get the Communist Speaker of the Duma to act on progressive legislation and actually achieve results. I sincerely wish that this arrangement will work so that the people of Russia benefit from progressive changes that will improve living standards that make for a better society.

In my opinion, Ukraine has chosen the right path. In parliament, we formed a majority bloc by uniting the ''healthy'' forces who were committed to reform legislation. This is necessary to ensure speedy action on a range of progressive proposals to deal with the problems of our pension system, taxes, and the criminal and civil code. This will help us to clean house in the Rada and institute badly needed changes that, in the past, impeded our efforts to confront these needs.

Is compromise possible? Let's think about it. We want our people to live in a new environment but there are some who want to pull us back to the old Soviet system. To go back is to lose hope and confidence in our ability to improve our situation. The reformers want a government that will enable people to own property while the Communists want people to be the property of the state. We believe that the Constitution is the basic law, but they still believe the ''Party'' is the supreme authority.

Finally, in a democracy it is acceptable to have a compromise, which is how people work out their differences. But the old guard distrusts working with what they see as the ''bourgeois'' and reject efforts to resolve differences amicably. So we are not talking about compromise in terms of confronting the issues and resolving differences, but the Communists see any negotiations with reformers as selling out or imposing a kompromat on us. I am reminded of the words of the great Golda Meir, who was born in Kiev, who once said: ''We want to live. Our neighbors want to see us dead. I am afraid that this does not leave any space for compromise''.

The problem would not be so serious if we were talking only about Parliament. However, we are talking about society as a whole. The Leftists seem committed to destroying the Rada, the one institution that ensures representation of the people in government decision making. Perhaps they do not know about Abraham Lincoln's statement that a house divided cannot succeed and that their intransigence will prevent democracy from taking root in Ukraine. Everyone knows what happens to the person if his right leg makes two steps forward and the left remains rooted in the same spot.

I want to stress again that after the 1999 presidential election, it became obvious that a divided parliament with a Communist as Speaker would prove unacceptable and only serve to obstruct the reform agenda of the government. Had the Communists prevailed, they would have taken the country down the back road of political fatalism. Yet there are some who worry that the unfairness of winners hides the guilt of losers. I can only say that if the Leftists had won the election, we would not be asking these questions.

I am afraid that if the majority had allowed a Communist to remain as Speaker, it would have proved to be a temporary solution, similar to what will happen with the Duma. In the United States, it is possible for the Republicans to control the Congress and the other party to have the Presidency. This is possible because America has 200 years of experience working within democratic system.

Our country does not have time to wait. For us, every day without enacting and implementing laws is a huge setback for a country that must accomplish so much in a critically short time. The majority knows that it is impossible to form a parliament without the opposition, and it is our intention to treat proposals from the opposition seriously. We have assumed political responsibility that gives us an opportunity to cooperate with the newly re-elected president who bears the main responsibility for society as a whole.

We recognize that it is the president who must provide the leadership and direct the institutions of government. Throughout the years of Ukraine's independence, there is not a single case when the three branches of power simultaneously worked together on behalf of Ukrainian citizens. Today we must take responsibility and are ready to be accountable for our actions.

Once again, we do not have time. The majority of Ukrainian citizens spoke very clearly in the recent election of giving President Kuchma a new four-year term. By this vote, they rejected the Communist Party and the idea of turning back to the old system where freedom and human rights did not exist.

The Communists, of course, feel threatened by the new democratic forces and their reform agenda. They do not want to relinquish power and recognize that a new generation of intelligent and resourceful leaders is taking charge. That is the promise of democracy and, if given a chance to succeed, the future of Ukraine in the new millennium.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 2000

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, due to flu, I unavoidably missed 8 votes on April 13th. If I had been present, I would have voted as follows:

''Yes'' on the Journal (rollcall No. 123).

''No'' on the Rule to the Budget Resolution (No. 124).

''No'' on the Budget Resolution because it sets up unworkable appropriations caps and cuts vital domestic spending too deeply (No. 125).

''Yes'' on the Rangel motion to recommit the Date Certain Tax Code Replacement Act (No. 126).

''No'' on the Date Certain Tax Code Replacement Act (No. 127). To say one is going to end a tax system without spelling out what the replacement will be is economic nonsense and, if anyone actually believed this nonsense, would lead to tremendous financial instability.

''Yes'' on the Rural Local Broadcast Signal Act (No. 128).

''Yes'' on Mr. BARRETT'S amendment to the Radio Broadcasting Preservation Act (No. 129), and

''No'' on passage of the Radio Broadcasting Preservation Act (No. 130).

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 2000

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, on April 13, 2000, this Member inadvertently voted ''aye'' on rollcall vote 127 on final passage of H.R. 4199, the Date Certain Tax Code Replacement Act. This Member is opposed to the bill and intended to vote ''no'' on final passage as his statement at that time on H.R. 4199 reflected his opposition to the bill.

IN TRIBUTE TO MAYOR BILL LEWIS OF ENNIS, TEXAS

HON. MARTIN FROST

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 2000

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I pay tribute to a fellow Texan who is both a longtime personal friend and an outstanding civic leader in the 24th Congressional District, Mayor Bill Lewis of Ennis, Texas.

Mayor Lewis will be honored this Friday by his home community and many friends for more than 30 years as a dedicated public servant. He has recently announced his intention to retire after this term as mayor, opting to spend more time with his family.

He spent a quarter century in Oak Cliff, where he worked with and retired from TU Electric long before it had that name. His office was in the same building as mine more than two decades ago, so we were business neighbors who became friends. He was a man of endless energy in the Oak Cliff community affairs for 23 years serving an endless array of charitable and public organizations.

When he retired from TU, he and his wife moved back to her childhood home, the city of Ennis. And although retired from business life, Bill continued the strong tradition of public service that has made him one of the most respected men I know. He has tirelessly served his community as a strong and active advocate, as mayor and in countless other capacities.

Service has indeed been a key word in the life of Bill Lewis, whether in his business career, as a charity worker, a chamber volunteer, on the battlefields of World War II, or a father in his local Dad's Club. The organizations which have benefited from Bill Lewis' dedication are too many to mention individually.

As we honor him in advance of his retirement as mayor, I am extremely proud that this man who has been a friend to so many is also a friend of mine.

GIRL SCOUT GOLD AWARD 2000

HON. RAY LaHOOD

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 2000

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to salute outstanding young women who are being honored with the Girl Scout Gold Award by Girl Scouts-Kickapoo Council in Peoria, Illinois. They are Elizabeth Liddell of Girl Scout Troop #1000, Ann Schwingel of #301, Wendy Matheny of #581, Melissa Eman of #581, and Melody Blanch of #4. They are being honored on May 7, 2000 for earning the highest achievement award in U.S. Girl Scouting. The Girl Scout Gold Award symbolizes outstanding accomplishments in the areas of leadership, community service, career planning, and personal development. The award can be earned by girls aged 14–17 or in grades 9–12.

Girl Scouts of the U.S.A., an organization serving over 2.5 million girls, has awarded more than 20,000 Girl Scout Gold Awards to Senior Girl Scouts since the inception of the program in 1980. To receive the award, a Girl Scout must earn four interest project patches, the Career Exploration Pin, the Senior Girl Scout Leadership Award, and the Senior Girl Scout Challenge, as well as design and implement a Girl Scout Gold Award project. A plan for fulfilling these requirements is created by the Senior Girl Scout and is carried out through close cooperation between the girl and an adult Girl Scout volunteer.

As members of Girl Scouts-Kickapoo Council, Elizabeth, Ann, Wendy, Melissa, and Melody began working toward the Girl Scout Gold Award in 1996 and 1997. They completed various projects: Elizabeth built a short nature trail for a local elementary school, Ann organized games to be played during inclement weather, Wendy helped to make youth more aware of daily injustices and how they can respond, Melissa repaired and reorganized the books in the Kickapoo Council lending library and Melody rebuilt the fitness trail at the local Girl Scout camp. I believe all of these girls should receive the public recognition due them for their significant service to their community and their country.

IN HONOR OF BAYONNE ELKS LODGE NO. 434 STUDENTS OF THE MONTH

HON. ROBERT MENENDEZ

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 2000

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the students selected as Bayonne Elks Lodge No. 434 Students of the Month.

Each year, the Bayonne Elks Lodge No. 434 selects students from a group of applicants to participate in Bayonne Elks Youth Day. On this day, young students from around the Bayonne community are provided a unique opportunity to interact with local government.

Students take on the role of a government official, and under the guidance of that official, learn the process by which local government functions. This is an excellent chance to reward hard working students for their commitment to academics, while providing them with useful knowledge for their future as community leaders.

Today, I commend the Bayonne Elks Lodge for its commitment to our youth and for its support and recognition of young student's achievements in the classroom, reaffirming and strengthening the students' character and resolve.

I congratulate the students who have achieved this great success, and I look forward to a future in which the next generation proudly takes on the responsibility and commitment of public service.

I ask my colleagues to please join me in honoring the Bayonne Elks Lodge No. 434 Students of the Month, on their special day.

RED HILL COUNCIL RECEIVES THE ''MAKING A DIFFERENCE'' AWARD

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 2000

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to recognize an exceptional group, the Red Hill Council, who was honored by the Bureau of Land Management with the ''Making a Difference'' award. The BLM selected the Red Hill Council group because of their dedication to Colorado and to its outdoors.

The Red Hill Council is comprised of volunteers, neighbors and community partners. Their mission is to aid the BLM in preserving several aspects of the Red Hill area. For over two years, the Council has held public discussions, conducted assessments and overseen volunteer programs. They have raised over $80,000 in contributions from the community.

Mr. Speaker, it is obvious why the Red Hill Council was chosen for the ''Making a Difference'' award. I think we owe them a debt of gratitude for their service and dedication to Colorado and to its outdoors.

TRIBUTE TO RABBI ISAIAH ZELDIN

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

HON. BRAD SHERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 2000

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, we are greatly honored today to pay tribute to Stephen S. Wise Temple which will, on Sunday evening, May 21st, celebrate its 36th Anniversary. This anniversary has special significance in the Jewish faith. The Hebrew letter chai represents the number 18 and means ''life.'' Thirty-six, then—is a Double Chai or ''double-life'' and an event of great importance.

Also on that evening, another event of great importance will be celebrated: the 80th birthday of the founder of Stephen S. Wise Temple, the distinguished scholar and nationally respected teacher, Rabbi Isaiah Zeldin.

In the short span of 36 years, Stephen S. Wise Temple has grown into the largest Jewish congregation in the West and the second-largest Jewish congregation in the world. It is both a caring and active congregation and a renowned center for spiritual, cultural and educational studies. On its beautiful campus in the hills above West Los Angeles, is found—in addition to the temple—a dynamic elementary school, a unique Jewish community high school and a religious institute, all highly acclaimed for the excellent education they offer. They represent one of the greatest legacies of Rabbi Zeldin—the origination of Reform Judaism's day school programs in Los Angeles.

It is hard to overstate the vision and the commitment that led Rabbi Seldin to build such an extraordinary facility. This complex of eleven buildings on an 18-acre site carved out of a mountain which serves more than 3,000 families is a true testament to his hard work, his dedication, his visionary guidance, his strong sense of community and his great interest in training young people in the traditions of their religion as well as the knowledge of the world.

Upon Rabbi Zeldin's graduation from the Cincinnati School of Hebrew Union College, he became the assistant rabbi of the largest Reform congregation in New Jersey. He spent the next several years serving as a spiritual leader at various congregations and, in 1964, founded the Stephen S. Wise Temple. He is the former president of the San Fernando Valley Synagogue Council, the American Zionist Federation of Southern California, the Pacific Association of Reform Rabbis and the American Zionist Council. On a personal note, Rabbi Zeldin did a wonderful job of officiating at the bat mitzvah of Lindsey Berman.

We are very proud, Mr. Speaker, to ask that our distinguished colleagues join us in congratulating Stephen S. Wise Temple on its Double Chai Anniversary, and in extending our gratitude and appreciation to Rabbi Isaiah Zeldin for his enormous accomplishments and his tremendous contributions to the Jewish community of Los Angeles. We wish him many happy returns.

PHILADELPHIA'S LIVELY ARTS GROUP FOUNDER RETIRES AFTER 25 YEARS

HON. CHAKA FATTAH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 2000

Mr. FATTAH. Mr. Speaker, this year the Lively Arts Group bids farewell to its founding director, Naomi Klein, who is retiring after 25 years of service.

The Lively Arts Group is unique as the nation's only nonprofit cultural arts touring organization since its founding in 1975 by Naomi Klein. Since then Mrs. Klein has conducted an average of 50 adult-education and cultural-arts tours each year, totaling 1,250 tours in her 25 years. Mrs. Klein has personally guided more than 62,000 Philadelphia area residents throughout our country to major museums, orchestra concerts, theater, ballet and opera performances, historic houses, mansions, villages and gardens. For many of these travelers, especially those with physical disabilities, it has been their eye-opening and mind-opening introduction to the various cultural arts, which they have subsequently pursued and enjoyed independently.

At the same time, these group visits have provided a new outreach audience, additional new members and support for these cultural organizations and institutions. Directors of Philadelphia's museums and cultural institutions have served as the Lively Arts Group's Advisory Board, lending their prestige and professional knowledge to these tours.

The Lively Arts Group adventures have spread Philadelphia's reputation for its cultural-minded citizens throughout the country and abroad and continues into its next century on the principles and highest standards of arts-education and community service created in 1975 by its founder, Naomi Klein.

IN RECOGNITION OF BROOKLYN CHINESE-AMERICAN ASSOCIATION'S FOURTH ANNIVERSARY OF AVENUE U SENIOR AND COMMUNITY CENTER

HON. NYDIA M. VELAZQUEZ

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 2000

Ms. VELAZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, today I recognize the Brooklyn Chinese-American Association's Avenue U Senior and Community Center on its fourth anniversary.

Gillian Anderson once said ''Be of service * * * there is nothing that harvests more of a feeling of empowerment than being of service to someone in need.'' This need is met everyday for the members of the Avenue U Senior and Community Center.

In just 4 years, the Center has enrolled more than 1,600 members, serving more than 150 senior members daily. It offers daily meals, social service information, referral and case management, medical and health-related workshops and screenings, monthly birthday celebrations, ESL, citizenship, music, dancing and arts and crafts classes, field trips, as well as other recreational activities.

The Center additionally is involved in coordinating community events such a town hall meetings, assisting senior members with their meeting housing needs, promoting voter registration and educating the community about the importance of exercising their voting rights.

President John F. Kennedy once said the definition of happiness is ''the full use of your powers along lines of excellence.'' Members of the Avenue U Senior and Community Center understand this happiness and I wish them and members of the Brooklyn Chinese-American Association continued success and best wishes this anniversary.

SUPPORTING THE FULL FUNDING OF THE INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES EDUCATION ACT

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 2000

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4055, the IDEA Funding Act.

I am happy that this Congress has finally decided to vote on substantive legislation that puts our children first. Hopefully, this vote is an indication of this Congress' national commitment to our children in the upcoming reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA).

Over 25 years ago, Congress promised to pay 40 percent of the national average per pupil expenditure of all children with disabilities. However, the government has never funded more than 12.6 percent. This lack of funding has placed severe strains on local school district's budgets.

Today's vote provides the necessary financial resources to help our local school districts to provide a first rate education to students with disabilities as well as freeing up resources to be used for the education of other students.

Although it has taken 25 years for the Congress to seriously address this funding issue, the fact that there is a funding formula has made Congress accountable to providing these funds. Educators have been able to point out that Congressional funding for IDEA has fallen far short from what was promised to each disabled student. This link between program funding and the student provides Congress with an accurate measure of the amount of increased funding that is necessary to keep up with the inflationary increases in a student's education.

This fact should not be lost when we debate and vote on the reauthorization of ESEA later this year. There have been many bills introduced that would break the connection of Federal funding to each student by block granting these programs. The effect of creating block grants in such programs as title I will result in fewer poor children receiving the adequate funds to provide them a good education.

I ask my colleagues in the majority to remember the pressures that have caused Congress to vote on this bill today and how much its passage will positively impact the education of disabled children throughout the United States, I urge them to remember this when they vote on the reauthorization of ESEA.

IN HONOR OF ''TERTULIAS DE ANTANO'' (''GET TOGETHER OF YESTERDAY'')

HON. ROBERT MENENDEZ

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 2000

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, today, I honor ''Tertulias de Antano'' (''Get Together of Yesterday'') for its contribution to the Cuban-American community of West New York.

''Tertulias de Antano'' came into existence 22 years ago because one woman, Lidia Gil-Ramos, who came to America in 1965 as a Cuban refugee, had the desire to ''help make the elderly happy and help them take part in local life.'' She founded the program and volunteers her time as program coordinator.

''Tertulias de Antano'' has helped Cuban elderly within the Cuban-American community of West New York, New Jersey to escape the disconnect and loneliness often experienced by immigrant communities.

In describing the work of a small group of volunteers dedicated to helping the Cuban elderly, Gil-Ramos said: ''We work for love, not for profit.'' ''Tertulias de Antano'' does not receive any government funds—only private donations are accepted. However, this has not

prevented the organization from achieving success. I attribute the success of this wonderful organization to the hard work and dedication of Lid Gil-Ramos and her equally dedicated staff of volunteers.

Today, it is my great pleasure to honor ''Tertulias de Antano'' and everyone who has helped integrate the Cuban elderly community into American society. I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring them as well.

TOWN OF HOTCHKISS CELEBRATES 100 YEARS

HON. SCOTT McINNIS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 2000

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a moment to congratulate the Town of Hotchkiss on celebrating 100 years. On May 6, 2000, the 920 citizens have set the day aside for festivities and celebration. There will be a parade, contests for the kids and adults, food, prizes and more.

On March, 19, 1900, papers were filed to make Hotchkiss a legally incorporated Colorado municipality. On May 7, 1900, they received notice from the State of Colorado that the State had accepted the petition and charter for the Town of Hotchkiss, whose population at the time was less than 300. The new town was named after Enos Throop Hotchkiss who had led the first party of settlers into the valley in 1881. George and William Duke, Fred Simonds and Ed Hanson were the towns ''speculators'' or ''subdivision developers.'' They owned many of the businesses in the town.

It is with this, Mr. Speaker, that I say thank you to the Town of Hotchkiss for their many contributions to the State of Colorado. I would like to wish the Town of Hotchkiss Happy 100th Birthday!

A TRIBUTE TO RABBI AMIEL WOHL

HON. NITA M. LOWEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 2000

Mr. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I express my great admiration for Rabbi Amiel Wohl, a remarkable spiritual leader and great American who this year retires from twenty-seven years of service to Temple Israel of New Rochelle.

A man of high principle, moving eloquence, and tireless energy, Rabbi Wohl has touched countless lives in Westchester County through his work at Temple Israel and his contributions to a variety of civic organizations.

Under Rabbi Wohl's leadership, Temple Israel has built on its already rich history and reinforced its reputation as a vibrant center of religious observance and civic activism. Rabbi Wohl's support for new programs and his introduction of additional opportunities for worship have enabled congregants to enrich their spiritual lives and achieve a closer connection to their neighbors.

Rabbi Wohl has earned a reputation as an outstanding communicator, whose radio broadcasts touch thousands beyond the walls of Temple Israel and invite Jews and non-Jews alike to reflect on the ethical and moral precepts which guide our lives. He has been especially supportive of important Jewish institutions and organizations such as the Westchester Jewish Conference, B'nai B'rith, the Zionist Organization of American, the Anti-Defamation League, the Westchester Board of Rabbis, and UJA/Federation.

Rabbi Wohl's commitment to achieving harmony among religious, racial, and ethnic groups has been just as impressive. He helped found the Inter-Religious Council of New Rochelle, serves as Co-President of the Coalition for Mutual Respect, which encourages dialogue between Jews and African-Americans, and enjoys close relationships with community leaders representing a variety of traditions.

Rabbi Amiel Wohl's extraordinary stature and unique personal example will remain sources of inspiration to his congregants and fellow New Rochelleans for many years to come. I am proud to call Rabbi Wohl a friend and pleased to join in wishing him a joyous and rewarding retirement.

IN RECOGNITION OF YOM HASHOAH—THE ANNUAL DAY OF REMEMBRANCE

HON. E. CLAY SHAW, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 2000

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask that this House, and indeed, our nation pause on this Yom Hashoah—the Day of Remembrance—to remember the Six Million Jewish Men, Women and Children who perished during the Holocaust in the last century. While there were many positive legacies of the twentieth century, the Holocaust stands out as one of the most negative, shameful legacies—a legacy that must never be forgotten.

I believe it is appropriate to mark this first Yom Hashoah of the Twenty-first Century with appropriate recognition. As one of the statues that stands as a vigilant sentinel outside of the National Archives here in Washington, D.C. is inscribed ''What's Past is Prologue.'' Without our nation's efforts to ensure that this tragedy is remembered by remembering each of its victims, such a tragedy could happen again.

Therefore, as Chairman of the Florida Congressional Delegation, I am proud to join Florida governor Jeb Bush is recognizing today, Tuesday, May 2, 2000, as a ''Day of Tolerance'' in our State. The promotion of tolerance for Florida citizens of all races, religions and ethnicities on this solemn day will be a small tribute to the memory of those Holocaust victims—victims of the Shoah—that are not here today to enjoy the dawn of this new century.

CHRIS AND JANE BREISETH HONORED

HON. PAUL E. KANJORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 2000

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I pay tribute to my good friends Chris and Jane Breiseth from my District in Pennsylvania. This week, the Breiseths are being honored with the Distinguished Community Service Award by the Wilkes-Barre Society of Fellows, Anti-Defamation League (ADL). I am pleased and proud to have been asked to participate in this event, which is honoring such a well-respected and well-liked couple.

Dr. Christopher Breiseth will retire as president of Wilkes University in July 2001, after 17 years, the second-longest presidential term in the institution's history. He has been an extraordinary president of Wilkes University, bringing significant growth to the institution during a challenging period for all private institutions of higher education. He not only established the School of Pharmacy and oversaw the construction of numerous new buildings on the Wilkes campus, but he also maintained a warm, caring atmosphere that encouraged students to thrive.

During his tenure, the university has experienced unprecedented growth in its fundraising, programmatic and campus development initiatives. He led the institution to its 1989 designation as a university by the Pennsylvania Board of Education, a recognition of the breadth of Wilkes's programs and curricula at the undergraduate and graduate level.

Under Chris's leadership, the Wilkes campus has been transformed into a cohesive academic environment, with several buildings constructed or remodeled for student residence, study and recreation. Curricular enhancements include the 1994 creation of the School of Pharmacy, which will graduate its first class of Doctors of Pharmacy on May 20.

Chris's legacy extends to his tireless efforts as a community leader. His awards and involvements are too numerous to list them all. Personally, I developed enormous respect and appreciation for him from countless hours working together on the creation of the Earth Conservancy, a unique organization formed to reclaim thousands of acres of mine-scarred land in the Wyoming Valley. There were many difficult moments during the early days of the Earth Conservancy, and Chris Breiseth put himself at significant personal and professional risk to make our dream a reality. He continues to serve as chairman of the board and has helped to develop the Earth Conservancy into a respected and important asset for the community.

Mr. Speaker, Jane Morehouse Breiseth is a highly educated community activist in her own right. Educated at prestigious Cornell University, she earned a Bachelor's in Comparative Literature, then earned her Master's in Education there in 1967. She is certified to teach Language Arts and Social Studies in several states. Jane has taught in several schools over her career and was a study skill specialist, worked on a quality of life survey project and was assistant to the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare.

Since coming to Northeastern Pennsylvania, Jane has continued her civic involvement. She has worked with the Family Service Association, Hospice St. John, Luzerne County Women's Conference, and the Northeast Philharmonic Society, to name just a few.

The Breiseths are active members of First Presbyterian Church in Wilkes-Barre and the parents of three fine young women, Abigail, Erika, and Lydia.

Mr. Speaker, when the Breiseths came to Northeastern Pennsylvania, they truly made it

their home, volunteering their time and energy to many worthwhile projects and community activities. The area is enriched by their presence and I am extremely proud and honored to be among their many friends. I sent my sincere best wishes as they accept this prestigious award and I look forward to their continued involvement in the community for years to come.

HELEN STAIRS THEATER

HON. JOHN L. MICA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 2000

Mr. MICA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate the City of Sanford, Florida and its citizens for their successful renovation and restoration of the former Ritz Theater, to be renamed the Helen Stairs Theater, which will celebrate its grand opening on Saturday, May 6, 2000. The theater, located in the historic district of Sanford, has celebrated a storied past, and its restoration promises the citizens of Sanford the opportunity to transform an icon of another age into a community facility with a bright new future.

Originally known as the Milane Theater, the Helen Stairs Theater was first constructed in 1923 by the Milane Amusement Company as part of a broad expansion in downtown Sanford. The theater design is indicative of a building style that began appearing in the United States in the 1850s based on European models of opera houses. Motion picture expansion in the early twentieth century led to a boom in the construction of new theaters with over twenty-five thousand theaters located across the United States by 1916. The technical sophistication achieved in theater construction during this period remains unparalleled in the history of American architecture. The Helen Stairs Theater epitomizes the tremendous boom and amazing achievements made during this period and is a visual testimony to the rich history and beauty of Sanford, Florida.

The Milane Amusement Company, led by President Frank Miller and Vice President Edward Lane, built the theater as a profit-enterprise. They had acquired the site from the former Star Theater, and movie house that had been abandoned for a number of years, with the intention of creating a new theater that would be capable of accommodating seven hundred patrons. Construction of the new theater began in November of 1922, and was completed in July of 1923 for a mere $80,000. Editors of the Sanford Daily Herald proclaimed the building as ''a much needed asset in the City Substantial,'' and claimed that ''this city now has a real theater and one of which the city can feel proud.'' The theater opened on August 2, 1923 to rave reviews.

Over the next few years there were management changes, the sale of the theater to Frank and Stella Evans in 1933, and in 1936, the theater was renamed the Ritz Theater. The Ritz continued to thrive through the years featuring mostly picture shows, but also including some live performances, and became an integral part of the history of Sanford. During the 1960s, the theater attendance declined, and in 1978, the Ritz closed after failing to compete with the new multiplex theaters. The theater stood vacant until 1984 when it was reopened as the Showtime Cantina. Four years later the theater was again closed and remained vacant until the mid-1990s when it was acquired by the Ritz Community Theater Project, Inc., under the leadership of Helen Stairs. The group began renovating the theater in 1999, and it was renamed in honor of Helen Stairs whose determination and dedicated effort has resulted in its restoration.

I congratulate and thank Helen Stairs, her husband Carl and family, and all of those who joined with her in the effort to restore this historic treasure. On behalf of the Central Florida U.S. Congressional Delegation, we salute the tremendous effort that made this community project a reality.

FEDERALIZATION OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 2000

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, the April issue of the Phyllis Schlafly Report contains a penetrating analysis of education issues that now confront Congress.

I hope my colleagues will give this material the careful attention it deserves.

[From the Phyllis Schlafly Report, April 2000]

WHY THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS ARE BEING FEDERALIZED

Congress is about to pass legislation that will federalize every local school district and spell the end of local and state control of America's public school classrooms. Mindful of Ronald Reagan's words, ''You can't control the economy without controlling the people,'' Bill and Hillary Clinton have found the way to control the economy by controlling America's schoolchildren.

The plan started with the passage of Bill Clinton's two 1994 laws, the Goals 2000 Act and the School-to-Work Act, and we were moved further in the same direction with his Workforce Investment Act of 1998. Now, with the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), H.R. 2/S.2, the Clintons are about to complete the nationalization of the public school classroom.

This massive education bill is the eighth successive five-year plan to increase academic achievement by providing ''compensatory education'' grants to schools with high concentrations of low-income children. It is more ambitious and comprehensive than the Clintons' discredited 1994 health care plan.

A holdover from Lyndon Johnson's Great Society legislation, the ESEA has already spent more than $116 billion. According to the Federal Government's five-year $29 million longitudinal study concluded in 1997, the ESEA failed to achieve its objectives.

Unable to make the argument that ESEA, with its current price tag in excess of $10 billion per year, will raise academic achievement of poor children, the Clintons designed this ''stealth'' legislation with very different objectives. Pretending to ''educate to high standards,'' ESEA mandates that all 50 states agree to implement a one-size-fits-all education plan. (Sec. 1001(a)(1))

How? The bill calls for mandated ''statewide'' minimum competencies for all children.'' That's code language for the disastrous and discredited Outcome Based Education (OBE). (Sec. 1111(B)(4)(A,B))

OBE (also called performance-based education) is measured by ''criterion referenced tests'' that assess students against a low threshold of achievement (formerly associated with the letter grade ''D''), rather than by ''norm referenced tests'' which measure how well students master a body of knowledge in comparison with other students (such as the ACT, SAT, GRE, Iowa Basic, and Stanford Achievement tests).

ESEA's purpose is to tie schools to the floor of minimum achievement rather than to the ceiling of educational excellence and possibilities. The oft-repeated phrase ''all children will learn'' really means that all children will be taught only the low level of learning that is actually reached by all children.

The term ''minimum competencies'' doesn't sell well to parents and the taxpaying public, so as linguistic bait-and-switch occurs through the bill. ''Standards'' means minimum levels, ''accountability'' means accountability to the U.S. Department's of Education and Labor, ''integrated curriculum'' means integrating of training into the school day, and ''local control'' means control only over implementing the nonacademic job-training system but not over standards, content or testing.

Not only does ESEA force OBE and criterion referenced testing on every local school district in the nation, ESEA cements into place the goals of nationalized curriculum, nationalized testing and national teacher certification, which were envisioned in the 1994 Goals 2000 Act. ESEA also continues the radical changes required by the 1994 School-to-Work Act to guide schools away from a knowledge-based system and toward training for Jobs selected by local Workforce boards.(Sec. 1111. Sat Plans)

School-to-work is the Clintons vision of controlling the economy. Students will be pigeon-holed into jobs to serve the best interests of the local economy as decided by the bureaucrats, not into careers chosen by the student.

''But,'' Congress proclaims, ''the Goals 2000 and School-to-Work laws are sun setting!'' Nothing could be further from the truth.

While those laws are about to expire, all 50 states adopted them and ESEA requires that states certify they have adopted ''challenging content standards and challenging student performance standards * * * with aligned assessments.'' That is bureaucratic jargon for continuing the 1994 Goals 2000/School-to-Work mandates.(Sec. 1111)

ESEA has already moved far in the legislative process because Congress was hoodwinked by the bills doublespeak language and only now is beginning to understand that the Goals 2000 and School-to-Work laws have morphed into ESEA. If ESEA passes in its current form, every public school district will be forced to continue implementation of the revolutionary restructuring required by the 1994 laws.

ESEA is not stand-alone legislation but works in tandem with other federal, state and local programs to mesh curriculum, graduation requirements and public funds into state-filed, federally-approved Unified Plans under the Workforce Investment Act. Under the guise of education ''reform,'' all traditional public school curriculum, testing and teaching methods are being replaced with a job training system modeled after failed socialized economies in Europe.

ESEA will fulfill Bill and Hillary Clinton''s dream of national economic planning fed by a federalized workforce training system domiciled in the public schools. ESEA is the capstone of their plan to restructure our American system away from free enterprise,

academic achievement in schools, and the freedom of individuals to select their future occupations.

CLINTON''S PLAN FOR EDUCATION AND THE ECONOMY

The following graphic, distributed by the Minnesota Department of Children, Families and Learning (DCFL), explains how School-to-Work is a government plan to interlock public school ''reform'' of curriculum with workforce preparation (job training) and economic development (national economic planning). This official state publication states that the School-to-Work mission is ''to create a seamless system of education and workforce preparation for all learners, tied to the needs of a competitive marketplace.''

School-to-Work means that the mission of the public schools is no longer to educate children to be all they can be, but instead to train students to take entry-level jobs as needed by the global economy. The different motivations of several special interests perfectly mesh in School-to-Work: the Clinton Administration economic gurus (Marc Tucker, Ira Magaziner and Robert Reich) who say they want America to imitate the German school-to-workforce system, the Clinton Administration education activists (particularly the teachers unions and Education Department bureaucrats) who want to control the school system, and the multinational corporations that seek a poorly-educated but well-trained labor force willing to work for low wages to compete with low-paid workers in the Third World.

The master plan to federalize education and tie it into the workforce originated with the now infamous ''Dear Hillary'' letter written on November 11, 1992 by Marc Tucker, president of the National Center on Education and the Economy (NCEE). It lays out a plan ''to remold the entire American system'' into ''a seamless web that literally extends from cradle to grave and is the same system for everyone,'' coordinated by ''labor market boards at the local, state and federal levels'' where curriculum and ''job matching'' will be handled by counselors ''accessing the integrated computer-based program.''

Rep. Bob Schaffer (R–CO) correctly analyzed this letter as ''a blueprint for a German model of education that would be forced upon the people of America.'' He said this ''moves the country toward a government-owned centralized education system from kindergarten past college.'' He placed this letter in the Congressional Record on September 25, 1998. It is most easily accessible on Eagle Forum''s website: http//www.eagleforum.org.

A TRIBUTE TO AMERICAN NURSES DURING NATIONAL NURSES WEEK

HON. WILLIAM O. LIPINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 2000

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to pay tribute to a remarkable group of dedicated health professionals—the 2 million+ registered nurses in the United States.

These outstanding men and women, who work hard to save lives and maintain the health of millions of individuals, will celebrate National Nurses Week from May 6–12, 2000. Registered nurses will be honored by hosting or participating in several events such as rallies, childhood immunizations, community health screenings, publicity efforts, dinners, receptions and hospital events. I believe that any American who has ever been cared for by a nurse should join in the celebration of National Nurses Week.

Modern nursing has been traced to Florence Nightingale's efforts during the Crimean War of the mid-19th century. Exactly 100 years after Nightingale's methods were first used, National Nurses Week was first observed from October 11–16, 1954. National Nurses Day and Week was eventually moved to May to include Florence Nightingale's birthday, which is May 12th.

Using this year's theme: ''Nurses—Keeping the Care in Health Care,'' the American Nurses Association (ANA) and its 53 constituent associations will highlight the diverse ways in which registered nurses, the largest health care profession, are working to improve health care for Americans. Thankfully, the efforts of nurses are being widely acknowledged. According to the Gallup Poll's 1999 ''Honesty and Ethics'' survey, nursing ranked #1 of 45 among the most respected professions.

Mr. Speaker, I will salute America's nurses during the week of May 6–12, 2000. I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

END RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION IN INDIA

HON. EDOLPHUS TOWNS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 2000

Mr. TOWNS. Mr. Speaker, the persecution of Christians and other religious minorities in India continues. Now even an ally of the ruling party has spoken out against it.

Newsroom, a website devoted to religious news, reported that the Trinamool Congress, a party in coalition with the ruling BJP, demanded the banning of Bajrang Dal, a militant Hindu nationalist organization. The Bajrang Dal is affiliated with the Vishwa Hindu Parishad (VHP), which in turn is part of the RSS, a Fascist organization that is the parent organization of the BJP.

Dara Singh, the person India has arrested in connection with the murder of missionary Graham Staines and his two young sons, has been linked to the Bajrang Dal. Christians have been subjected to three attacks in Uttar Pradesh in two weeks. On Good Friday, members of the Bajrang Dal attacked members of the House of Worship, a Christian church in Agra. Uttar Pradesh also has a law prohibiting Muslims from building new mosques or converting any building into a mosque without government permission. In the state of Orissa, religious conversions are banned without government permission.

In Haryana on April 22, three nuns were attacked by a Hindu fundamentalist. One, Sister Anandi, remains in Holy Family Hospital in serious condition. No one has been arrested for this crime.

The militant Hindu fundamentalists who carried out these acts are allies of the Indian government. The government itself has killed over 200,000 Christians in Nagaland, over a quarter of a million Sikhs, more than 65,000 Kashmiri Muslims since 1988, and tens of thousands of others. It holds tens of thousands of political prisoners without charge or trial. Some of them have been held for over 15 years. This is unacceptable.

America is the bastion of freedom in the world. It is our responsibility to do what we can to ensure freedom for all people. We should cut off India's aid until it learns to respect human rights. The government must stop killing religious and ethnic minorities. It must also punish strongly those who kill and do other acts of violence in the government's behalf. Amnesty International, which has not been allowed to enter India to investigate human rights abuses since 1978, must be allowed to come into the country. Until then, no American money should go to India.

We should also put this Congress on record in support of democracy in South Asia by calling for a free and fair plebiscite, under international supervision, to decide the political future of Khalistan, Kashmir, Nagaland, and all the other nations occupied by India. These steps are the best way to bring freedom to all the people of South Asia.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit the Newsroom article into the RECORD. I urge my colleagues to read it.

BAJRANG DAL BAN SOUGHT AFTER PRE-EASTER ATTACKS ON CHRISTIANS IN INDIA

NEW DELHI, 25 April 2000 (Newsroom)—Allies of the Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP), which leads India's coalition government, this week demanded that the BJP ban a militant group of Hindu nationalists and dismiss the BJP-led Uttar Pradesh state government in the wake of recent attacks against Christians.

The call by the Trinamool Congress, an ally in the BJP-led National Democratic Alliance headed by Prime Minister Atal Bihari Vajpayee, to ban the Bajrang Dal and dismiss Uttar Pradesh Chief Minister Ram Prakash Gupta and his government stunned BJP leaders.

Leaders from the Trinamool Congress and from the opposition Congress and Samajwadi parties blasted the BJP for failing to control the Hindu nationalist group that many blame for the spate of violent incidents directed toward religious minorities in the last two years.

The Bajrang Dal, a militant Hindu organization affilated with the Vishwa Hindu Parishad (World Hindu Council) and linked to several attacks on Christians, believes it has a duty to promote the Hindu religion and Hindutva—Hinduness—in India. Dara Singh, who is accused of masterminding the murders of Australian missionary Graham Staines and his two sons last year, has been linked to the Bajrang Dal, although the group denies he is a member.

Sudip Bandopadhyay of the Trinamul Congress and Yerram Naidu, Tulugu Desam party leader, demanded that security be provided to Christians and other religious minorities wherever possible, especially in states like Uttar Pradesh where there have been three violent attacks against Christians in the last two weeks.

Madhavrao Scindia, deputy leader of the Congress Party in the Lok Sabha (the lower house of Parliament), said the government should put a stop to incidents like those reported in Uttar Pradesh and Haryana this month. He demanded a response from Home Affairs Minister Lal Kishen Advani, who is considered a friend of most of India's Hindu nationlist groups and is the second most powerful man in India after Vajpayee. ''Groups close to the BJP must be reined in as they are vitiating communal peace,'' Scindia said.

Opposition Samajwadi party leader Mulayam Singh Yadav, who once headed the

defense ministry, said that militant Hindu groups pose a greater danger than the actions of religious minorities. ''Majority communalism poses a greater danger compared to minority communalism,'' he said. Members of the Hindu group Shiv Sena tried to heckle him while he addressed members of Parliament.

During a two-day BJP national executive meeting in the Uttar Pradesh town of Lucknow, Vajpayee chastised Uttar Pradesh Chief Minister Ram Prakash Gupta over his state's handling of attacks on Christian missionaries in Mathura. Vajpayee reportedly said the state should have dispatched police to assess the situation and instill confidence among the Christian community. He also asked the state government to explain its position on the controversial religious places bill, which prohibits Muslims from building mosques or converting an existing building into a mosque without government permission.

Bajrang Dal national coordinator Surendra Kumar Jain said last month that his group was fighting to construct a temple for Ram in Ayodhya in Uttar Pradesh. The extremist group also once demanded that the federal government declare Pakistan an enemy state.

Referring to the attacks against Christians, Jain said that ''missionaries consider Hindus a soft target. Even the words 'soft target' were used in the missionary literature. However, now the Hindus have woken up. We are no more a soft target for their unholy activities. We appreciate missionary services, but only when the object is service and not conversion.''

Monday's confrontation in parliament followed three attacks against Christians in Uttar Pradesh in the last two weeks. Members of the House of Worship, one of India's fastest-growing church groups headquartered in the southern state of Hyderabad, were attacked by suspected Bajrang Dal activists on the outskirts of Agra, site of the Taj Mahal, police said. The Good Friday attack on the 14-member preaching team from Hyderabad in the BJP-ruled state came a week after a Catholic priest and three nuns were attacked in a school. It was the seventh attack reported in the state in less than 100 days.

The Bajrang Dal complained to state police that the Hyderabad group was trying to convert villagers by offering them money, a charge church authorities deny. In a counter complaint the victims reported that a mob of 20 to 30 people attacked the van in which they were traveling and tried to burn the vehicle. The group returned to Hyderabad where the main church, Hebron Church, is located. The church, also known as the Indigenous Society of Churches in India, is one of the fastest growing in the country with mainly new converts as members. It was founded by a Punjabi Sikh agricultural engineer, Bakht Singh, in the 1920s. Bakht Singh is 99.

Three Catholic nuns on their way to attend midnight Mass in Rewari in neighboring Haryana state were attacked Saturday night by a man riding a scooter. It was the third attack on Christians reported in the past three months in this wheat-rich state. One nun, Sister Anandi, remains in Holy Family Hospital in serious condition. The other two nuns suffered minor injuries. Police so far have made no arrests.

John Dayal, convener of the United Christian Forum for Human Rights, said in a prepared statement that ''this attack was part of the series of ongoing attacks on Christians and their institutions.''

THE SAFE AND SUCCESSFUL SCHOOLS ACT OF 2000

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 2000

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, today I introduce the Safe and Successful Schools Act of 2000. It will help modernize our public schools by providing grants and loans for up to 8,300 renovation projects in high-need school districts. It will continue the highly successful class size reduction program by helping communities hire an additional 20,000 highly qualified teachers. It will boost investments in quality after-school and summer school programs advocated by the President. It will help us close the digital divide that currently leaves too many poor children and their teachers behind. It will bolster safe and drug free school programs, and strengthen programs to reduce hate crimes by children.

ESEA is our nation's flagship education partnership with local communities. It provides vital assistance to the most vulnerable, educationally challenged children in America. Until this Congress, the ESEA had enjoyed a rich and enduring history of bipartisanship.

Unfortunately, Senate and House Republicans have been highly partisan and divisive. At the beginning of the ESEA process, we urged Republicans to work in a bipartisan way. Instead, they proceeded in a highly partisan manner and created havoc throughout the reauthorization process. In the House, they carved up the ESEA into seven disjointed pieces—hoping to bolster their devastating public image and terrible performance on education.

Today, the ESEA process is in shambles. Straight A's, the Republican education block grant bill, has a veto threat pending and has no chance of becoming law. Their Teacher Empowerment bill has a veto threat pending because of its gratuitous attack and block granting of the Clinton Class Size Reduction Act. Conservative Republican Members are blocking floor action on two other ESEA bills, Even Start and Impact Aid. And the one major bipartisan bill, H.R. 2, has been sharply and publicly attacked by reactionary Republican Members of the Education and Workforce Committee.

Republicans repeatedly refused to work with Democrats to craft the pending ESEA bill, H.R. 4141, and voted in mass to defeat 52 of 54 amendments offered by Democratic Members. The bill passed out of committee is a legislative disaster. Every major education group opposes the bill. The President will probably veto it.

Because the Republicans have decided to play politics with America's school children, they have placed in jeopardy passage of this comprehensive Federal aid program to education. If the Republicans leave town this year without enacting the ESEA, it would be the first time that the program has permanently lapsed in its 35-year history.

I urge the Republican leadership to stop playing politics with our nation's school children, and pass ESEA legislation that can bring urgent relief and assistance to our public schools this year.

THE DEMOCRATIC AGENDA: DEMONSTRATING A NATIONAL COMMITMENT TO OUR NATION'S PUBLIC SCHOOLS

THE SAFE AND SUCCESSFUL SCHOOLS ACT OF 2000

Helping Communities Repair and Modernize Unsafe Schoolhouses

Communities across the country are struggling to address critical needs to build new schools and renovate existing one. One-third of all public schools—about 25,000 schools—need extensive repair or replacement. A recent survey documented over $250 billion dollars of unmet school modernization funding need.

The Safe and Successful Schools Act of 2000 authorizes $1.3 billion annually to help communities make emergency school renovations such as repairing roofs, fixing dangerous electrical wiring and plumbing, bringing schools into compliance with fire safety codes, undertaking asbestos removal or abatement, and removing lead-based paint. The Act will support up to 8,300 renovation projects in high-poverty, high-need school districts that have little or no capacity to fund urgent repairs over the next five years.

Reducing Class Sizes/Smaller Schools

Research shows that class size reduction in the early grades is one of the most direct and effective ways to boost student academic achievement, especially among populations of disadvantaged children. Smaller class sizes ensure that every child receives personal attention, gets a solid foundation for further learning, and learns to read independently by the end of the third grade. The Safe and Successful Schools Act of 2000 continues the Clinton/Clay class size reduction program that is helping communities hire and pay for 100,000 new, fully qualified teachers.

The Act also reauthorizes the Small, Safe and Successful High Schools program, which helps high schools to create smaller, safer learning environments. Research has shown that the size of a school and the number of its students greatly impact children's ability to learn and the likelihood that violence may occur.

Accountability for Results

The bill requires schools reducing class sizes to hire only fully qualified teachers. The bill strengthens ESEA technology programs by focusing on the achievement of performance indicators and the correlation between technology and improved student achievement. The Act requires school safety and drug abuse prevention programs to be based on sound research, and strengthens reporting and eligibility criteria for the Title VI program, increasing program accountability.

Providing Safe After-School Learning Opportunities for Students

Extended learning programs reduce juvenile crime by providing a wide range of education, social, mentoring, and counseling services to help improve student behavior, including services relating to violence prevention and conflict resolution. Recent research has demonstrated that extended learning programs help improve student achievement in reading and math, and reduce truancy and dropout rates.

The Safe and Successful Schools Act more than doubles our investment to $1 billion, in the 21st Century Community Learning Centers program. This program enables schools to stay open longer, providing safe and educational after-school opportunities for some 700,000 school age children in rural and urban communities each year, and vital social health, and educational services for their families.

Providing Safe and Drug Free Schools/Keeping Guns Out of Our Schools

America's students cannot be expected to learn to high standards if they are threatened by drugs and violence. There is a high level of concern by parents and students about school safety and violence caused in part by the tragic shootings at Columbine High School and other schools in the past two years.

The legislation will increase funding for the Safe and Drug Free Schools Act, and enhance its accountability and performance through the adoption of research-based programs. It also authorizes the Secretary of Education to set aside $5 million annually to fund strong, community-based hate crime prevention activities.

The bill requires school districts, with a history of suspensions and expulsions for gun violence or possession, to work with law enforcement agencies to promote the use of child safety locks.

Lastly, the bill provides new, additional support for school-based alternative education programs to address the educational needs of students who are suspended or expelled from school. This authority will increase the safety of both our schools and communities by ensuring that discipline and violence problems leading to suspensions and explusions do not spill over into the community.

Recruiting and Maintaining High Quality Teachers

The Safe and Successful Schools Act of 2000 requires all teachers to become certified or fully licensed, and have knowledge of the subjects they teach. The bill creates a ''Parent Right to Know'' requirement to ensure that parents are made aware of the professional qualifications and expertise of their children's teacher. It also includes a provision requiring that parents be notified when their child is being taught by an underqualified or substitute teacher for more than two consecutive weeks.

It also authorizes $50 million to help high-poverty school districts attract and retain teachers and principals through better pay. To become eligible, schools would have to undertake rigorous peer review of every teacher, improve systems to remove low-performing teachers, and provide intensive support to give the opportunity for all teachers to succeed.

Expanding Access to Education Technology/ Closing the Digital Divide

Technology in the schools can substantially improve student learning, classroom management, the professional development of teachers, and assessment of student progress. Most importantly, strong school technology programs report significant impact on gains in student achievement in reading, writing, and mathematics. Technology has its greatest impact with low-income and rural students as well as with expanding opportunities for girls. Unfortunately, the ''digital divide'' still separates the technology haves and the technology have-nots—leaving our most disadvantaged children without vital knowledge and tools to compete with their more advantaged peers.

The Safe and Successful Schools Act of 2000 increases the Federal commitment to technology and closing the digital divide. The Act provides $500 million for the Technology Literacy Challenge Fund program, to help the most disadvantaged school districts to provide educators with sustained, high quality training to integrate technology in their classrooms and provide students with the latest access to advantaged technology resources. The Act creates a $50 million Go Girls program to help encourage the ongoing interest in girls in science, mathematics and technology, and prepare girls to pursue undergraduate and graduate degrees and careers in science, mathematics, or technology. The bill will provide new support for restructuring teacher education programs so that new teachers are proficient in the use of educational technologies and can integrate technology throughout their instructional practices. Lastly, it also creates new initiatives to develop and expand cutting edge technologies to improve teaching and learning, and to establish community technology centers in the neediest communities.

HONORING THE LOS ANGELES VETERANS RESOURCE CENTER

HON. STEVEN T. KUYKENDALL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 2000

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, today I recognize a very important organization, the Los Angeles Veterans Resource Center. The Vet Center is currently celebrating its twentieth year of providing services to local veterans.

For twenty years the Los Angeles Veterans Resource Center has provided outstanding service to our nation's veterans and their families. The Vet Center Program was established in 1979 out of recognition that a significant number of Vietnam era vets were still experiencing readjustment problems. Vet Centers are community based and part of the United States Department of Veterans Affairs. They provide a number of important programs and services to assist veterans, particularly those suffering from Post Traumatic Stress Disorder.

I thank the staff and volunteers of the Los Angeles Veterans Resource Center for the invaluable services they have provided to community veterans over the past 20 years. As a veteran of the Vietnam War, I thank them for their contributions. You have touched the lives of many. The veteran community of Los Angeles is grateful for your services. I wish you continued success.

TAXPAYER BILL OF RIGHTS 2000

SPEECH OF

HON. XAVIER BECERRA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 11, 2000

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Speaker, today I support H.R. 4163, the ''Taxpayer Bill of Rights 2000.'' Last month when the House Ways and Means Committee considered this bill, I raised concerns about the apparent lack of oversight of State taxing authorities that use Federal tax return information.

This bill recognizes breaches of taxpayer confidentiality at the State level and contains a provision to require that States conduct on-site reviews of all contractors receiving Federal tax return information. However, this bill does not address instances in which state agencies may have inappropriately disclosed Federal tax information. In a recent study on taxpayer confidentiality, the Joint Committee on Taxation found that ''[A]lmost all of the surveyed State taxing authorities reported some discrepancy of one type or another [in their efforts to safeguard tax return information].''

I have personally heard stories from taxpayers about how my state's taxing authority, the California Franchise Tax Board (FTB), has misused and inappropriately disclosed Federal tax information. Some examples include making IRS tax returns public without the consent of the taxpayer and using the threat of disclosure as a tool to try to force taxpayers into concessions. I have even been told that the State's training materials encourage misuse of penalties and other types of inappropriate behavior.

In my current position on the House Ways and Means Committee, I plan to do my utmost to ensure that States like my State of California are fully accountable for the privacy of its citizens. I hope to work with other Members of Congress to improve H.R. 4163 by requiring more safeguards and oversight of State taxing authorities' use of Federal tax information.

TRIBUTE TO CHIEF WARRANT OFFICER JOHN W. SCOTT, JR.

HON. NICK LAMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 2000

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, today I wish to recognize the outstanding service to our Nation of Chief Warrant Officer John W. Scott, Jr., the commanding officer of Coast Guard Station Sabine Pass, Texas, who will be relieved of command on May 5, 2000, as he retires after 31 years in the Coast Guard. Throughout his career, he exemplified the Coast Guard's core values of Honor, Respect, and Devotion to Duty. He is a highly respected leader who is renowned for his commitment to the Coast Guard men and women serving under his command.

Chief Warrant Officer Scott has lived the multi-mission character of the Coast Guard. Very early in his career, he had to face the stark reality that the Coast Guard is an armed force when he was assigned to serve on a patrol boat in Vietnam. His career is also ripe with examples of dedicated services to the mariner. He served many tours ensuring the safety of maritime commerce by maintaining aids to navigation in our critical waterways. Additionally, he operated and commanded boats, cutters and shore stations that rescued people in distress, responded to environmental threats and maritime disasters, and ensured the security of our ports. Moreover, he enforced federal laws that enhanced vessel safety, deterred unlawful activity that threatened our national security, and brought those that had violated our laws to justice.

Over the past four years while he has been in command of Coast Guard Station Sabine Pass, I have seen firsthand the remarkable results of his efforts. During this period, Chief Warrant Officer Scott directed over 700 search and rescue cases that resulted in saving the lives of 400 people. He directed numerous maritime law enforcement missions to deter and intercept illegal narcotics and other contraband destined for Southeast Texas shores. He initiated operations that preserved our valuable natural resources and fisheries in the Gulf of Mexico. He achieved these results by instilling his vision of excellence in his crew,

and through the seamless integration of active duty and reserve Coast Guard personnel into a cohesive team. At the same time, he also managed a comprehensive shoreside modernization project to rehabilitate several existing station buildings and to construct new waterfront facilities that will ensure the Coast Guard remains a robust part of the Sabine community for the foreseeable future.

Mr. Speaker, Chief Warrant Officer Scott dedicated his life to our Coast Guard men and women and our Nation. I am extremely honored that he and his wife, Judy, have decided to remain in Southeast Texas after his retirement. I ask my colleagues to join me in commending Chief Warrant Officer Scott, an individual who has stood Semper Paratus—Always Ready—for the past 31 years to answer our Nation's call.

RECOGNIZING PROFESSOR KENNETH T. PALMER

HON. JOHN ELIAS BALDACCI

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 2000

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Speaker, today I pay tribute to Professor Kenneth T. Palmer of the Department of Political Science at my alma mater, the University of Maine. I was fortunate to study under Professor Palmer, and learned many a lesson in politics from him.

Today, I want to thank him for one of the extra-curricular responsibilities he has taken on in addition to his teaching. For 31 years, Professor Palmer has coordinated the University of Maine's Washington Congressional Internship Program, which has been a rich source of interns for the Maine Congressional Delegation since 1958.

Ken Palmer has played a crucial role in the program's success. His oversight of the selection has helped to guarantee high quality interns who have made important contributions to our offices.

Approximately 150 University of Maine students have taken part in the program since its inception. I have been fortunate to have the assistance of 5 able University of Maine interns during my tenure here. Two of them have gone on to join my staff, which speaks highly of the caliber of students Professor Palmer has selected to participate.

I am told that many former interns report that the five months they spent in Washington constituted the most significant learning experience in their undergraduate careers. Graduates of the program have distinguished themselves in various careers, especially law, business, and public service.

Recently, Ken Palmer announced that he will be stepping down from his post and handing the reins over to another professor. He leaves large shoes to fill.

I am pleased to congratulate Professor Palmer on all that he has achieved with the Congressional Internship Program. He has set a fine example for other academic institutions to follow.

HONORING CHARLES F. RYAN

HON. STEVEN R. ROTHMAN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 2000

Mr. ROTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I honor a longtime friend and colleague, Charles F. Ryan, who will be inducted as President of the Bergen County Bar Association Friday, May 5, 2000. This is another milestone in Chuck's outstanding career, which is distinguished by his constant dedication to using his expertise in the law to improve the lives of people throughout Bergen County, New Jersey.

After serving three years of active duty in the United States Marine Corps where he rose to the rank of Sergeant, Chuck pursued a Bachelor's Degree at the University of Notre Dame. Chuck then came home to New Jersey, where he earned his law degree at Rutgers University.

Ever the activist, Chuck involved himself in the Young Lawyers Section of the Bergen County Bar Association, first as a member and later as its president. For four years, Chuck also co-edited the Young Lawyer Section's publication, Hearsay. The success of Hearsay led the Bergen County Bar Association to establish its own newspaper, Barrister, for which Chuck has been a valued contributor and author of the ''Family Law/Around the Courthouse'' column.

One common denominator in Chuck's work is that he constantly strives to expand access to the legal system and make it work better for those involved. Chuck represented the Bergen County Bar Association for five years on the Board of Directors of Bergen County Legal Services, and helped develop the Legal Services Board's annual Pro Bono Award Program which recognizes the contributions to the public good made by lawyers and law firms in the Bergen County.

In this same vein, Chuck founded the Alternatives to Domestic Violence Lawyers Referral Panel 14 years ago, and he remains a coordinator on the panel to this day. Chuck gathered lawyers from throughout Bergen County practicing matrimonial law, with particular experience and knowledge in the area of domestic violence, to provide emergency consultation and representation to victims of domestic violence. These lawyers agree to accept no fees, or work on a sliding-scale fee, according to the ability of the client to pay. With this expertise, the Bergen County Bar Association tapped Chuck two years ago to establish and co-chair the Bergen County Domestic Violence Pro Bono Lawyers Project, which has recruited and trained 89 lawyers to represent domestic violence victims. Fittingly, Chuck was honored last year by both the New Jersey State Senate and the New Jersey General Assembly for his tireless efforts on behalf of victims of domestic violence.

Though these accomplishments testify to Chuck's efforts in the professional arena, he is also an active member of the Bergen County community. Chuck is married and is the father of four children, and works in both private practice and as a prosecutor in Park Ridge, New Jersey. He is a former Commander of the Midland Park/Wyckoff Veterans of Foreign Wars Post 7086, and is Director of the Midland Park Chamber of Commerce. Chuck has also been a coach on the Midland Park Soccer, Little League Baseball, Little League Softball, and Girls Basketball teams, and has served as a guest lecturer on family law at Montclair State College and Rutgers Law School.

Mr. Speaker I have been fortunate to know and work with Chuck Ryan for the past 20 years and I am proud to count him as a dear friend. I wish him the best of luck on his induction as President of the Bergen County Bar Association, and expect him to thrive in that position as he has in every other task he has taken on in his life.

TRIBUTE TO JANET R. HENKE

HON. GRACE F. NAPOLITANO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 2000

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct honor and great pleasure today to recognize the extensive service of the Honorable Janet R. Henke to the people of the City of Whittier. Janet Henke has long been an active and dedicated member of the community and for the past eight years has served as a member of the Whittier City Council, including one two-year term as mayor from 1996 to 1998.

Councilwoman Henke has a long history of involvement in education and the arts. Through the Whittier Presbyterian Church, she served as a youth choir director for twenty-two years, starting in 1960, and as the preschool music director for seven years. From 1977 to 1986, Mrs. Henke worked for the Montebello Unified School District.

Janet Henke's community service has included serving as a program chair of the PTA; Ruling Elder of the Whittier Presbyterian Church; member of the Friends of the Whittier Hills; Co-Vice-President and President of the Whittier Area Education Study Council; President of the Shelters Right Hand; and as a director on the boards of the YMCA, Rio Hondo Temporary Home and the Los Angeles County Sanitation Districts.

For sixteen years from 1973 to 1989, Mrs. Henke served as a trustee on the Whittier City School Board. She served as vice president of the board for three years and another three years as president. Mrs. Henke's recognized commitment to education was further evidenced by being elected four times, from 1978 to 1985, to serve in the Delegate Assembly of the California School Board Association.

Mr. Speaker, it takes dedicated individuals who are committed to serving their community—individuals like Janet R. Henke—to build strong, vibrant, livable towns and cities. The people of Whittier are indeed fortunate to have enjoyed the benefits of decades of generous public service by this outstanding American and leader. I am proud of my friendship with Janet, and extend to her the best wishes for every continued happiness and fulfillment.

ENACTMENT OF THE CHILDREN'S ONLINE PRIVACY PROTECTION ACT

HON. JAY INSLEE

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 2, 2000

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, today I recognize the enactment of the Children's Online Privacy Protection Act (COPPA). The Act requires operators of World Wide Web sites to obtain verifiable parental consent before collecting, using, or disseminating information about children under 13 years of age.

Representing a Congressional District which contains many of the world leaders in E-Commerce has given me a first hand opportunity to view the importance of privacy online. Consumers will not partake in business online without full assurance that their personal information will remain private. Though children are frequently more Web adept than their parents, they often lack the judgment and experience to deal with requests for their personal information, especially those request made from strangers. COPPA gives notice to both Web sites and parents of their responsibilities to protect children's privacy.

The Children's Online Privacy Protection Act prohibits unfair and deceptive acts in connection with the collection and use of personal information from and about children on the Internet. It will serve to enhance parental involvement in a child's online activities, protect the privacy of children in the online environment, maintain the security of children's personal information collected online and limit the collection of this information without parental consent. Failure to follow the guidelines of the Act will result in fines in excess of $10,000 and the possible closure of the Web site.

This act directly follows the five core principles of privacy protection, set forth by the FTC, which represent 'fair information practices': (1) Notice/Awareness; (2) Choice/Consent; (3) Access/Participation; (4) Integrity/Security; and (5) Enforcement/Redress. While the online industry has made great strides in protecting consumer privacy online, we need government intervention to assure the privacy of children.

A March 1998 FTC survey of 212 commercial children's Web sites found that while 89 percent of the sites collected personal information from children, only 24 percent posted privacy policies and only one percent required parental consent for the collection or disclosure of children's information. No parent would allow their child to wander the streets giving out their personal information to strangers, yet the aforementioned survey illustrates that this occurred continually over the World Wide Web prior to COPPA. With COPPA we have taken one large step towards putting parents back in charge of their children's personal information online.

We must continue to encourage parents to become involved in their children's online activities. Though the Web contains wonderful resources, there are also people online who prey on children and COPPA presents a useful tool to stop this from happening. COPPA provides one important part of the solution to ensuring children's privacy and safety online, parental involvement and filtering tools such as Net Nanny can provide others. Net Nanny, one of the many high-tech firms found inside of my district, offers software that allows parents to regulate their children's online activities. Software of this sort lets parents choose the sites their children can visit, further bolstering parental control over their children's privacy.

COPPA may impose an increased cost on commercial children's Web sites, but these sites must realize that ensuring children's privacy is an essential part of their business. COPPA will provide an incentive to the industry to self-regulate, through self-regulatory watch dog groups such as BBBOnLine, TrustE and the Children's Advertising Review Unit of the Council of Better Business Bureaus, so as to ward off future government intervention in the industry.

As a strong advocate of personal privacy, whether in the realm of banking and financial transactions or the World Wide Web, we must assure consumers that they have full control over their personal information. With no Constitutional protections over the sharing of personal information to third parties, in both the financial world and online, Acts such as COPPA and the Banking Privacy Act (H.R. 1929), which I introduced, are necessary safeguards of our privacy. Americans have a right to privacy in regards to their personal information, and I recognize the Children's Online Privacy Protection Act as enhancing this right.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate sustained the President's Veto of S. 1287, Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S3201–S3273

Measures Introduced: Six bills were introduced, as follows: S. 2493–2498. **Page S3258**

Measures Passed:

Charles M. Schulz Gold Medal Award: Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs was discharged from further consideration of H.R. 3642, to authorize the President to award posthumously 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 the bill was then passed, after agreeing to the following amendment proposed thereto: **Pages S3268–69**

Gorton (for Feinstein) Amendment No. 3109, in the nature of a substitute. **Pages S3268–69**

Japanese Telecommunications: Committee on Finance was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 275, expressing the sense of the Senate regarding fair access to Japanese telecommunications facilities and services, and the resolution was then agreed to. **Page S3269**

Release of Rabiya Kadeer: Senate agreed to S. Con. Res. 81, expressing the sense of the Congress that the Government of the People's Republic of China should immediately release Rabiya Kadeer, her secretary, and her son, and permit them to move to the United States if they so desire. **Pages S3269–70**

American Institute in Taiwan Facilities Enhancement Act: Senate passed H.R. 3707, to authorize funds for the construction of a facility in Taipei, Taiwan suitable for the mission of the American Institute in Taiwan, after agreeing to a committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. **Page S3270**

Southeastern Europe Peace Promotion: Senate agreed to S. Res. 272, expressing the sense of the Senate that the United States should remain actively engaged in southeastern Europe to promote long-term peace, stability, and prosperity; continue to vigorously oppose the brutal regime of Slobodan Milosevic while supporting the efforts of the democratic opposition; and fully implement the Stability Pact. **Page S3271**

Veto—Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act: By 64 yeas to 35 nays (Vote No. 88), two-thirds of the Senators voting not having voted in the affirmative, S. 1287, to provide for the storage of spent nuclear fuel pending completion of the nuclear waste repository, upon reconsideration, was rejected, the veto of the President was sustained. **Pages S3201–30**

Subsequently, Lott motion to reconsider the vote by which S. 1287, upon reconsideration, failed of passage over veto of the President, was entered. **Page S3229**

Elementary and Secondary Reauthorization: Senate continued consideration of S. 2, to extend programs and activities under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. **Pages S3230–48**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for certain amendments to be proposed to the bill. **Page S3246**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the bill on Wednesday, May 3, 2000. **Page S3271**

Appointment:

Mexico-U.S. Interparliamentary Group Meeting: The Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 276h–276k, as amended, appointed the following Senators as members of the Senate Delegation to the Mexico-U.S. Interparliamentary Group Meeting during the Second Session of the 106th Congress, to be held in Puebla, Mexico, May 5–7, 2000: Senators Murkowski and Sessions. **Page S3271**

Messages From the President: Senate received the following message from the President of the United States:

Transmitting, pursuant to law, a 6-month periodic report relative to the national emergency with respect to significant narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs. (PM–102) **Pages S3255–56**

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nomination:

James Edgar Baker, of Virginia, to be a Judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Armed Forces for the term of fifteen years to expire on the date prescribed by law. **Page S3273**

Messages From the President: **Pages S3255–56**

Messages From the House: **Page S3256**

Measures Referred: **Page S3256**

Measures Placed on Calendar: **Page S3256**

Communications: **Pages S3256–57**

Petitions: **Page S3257**

Statements on Introduced Bills: **Pages S3258–63**

Additional Cosponsors:

May 1 **Pages S3263–64**

May 2 **Pages S3264–65**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S3265–67**

Notices of Hearings: **Page S3267**

Authority for Committees: **Pages S3267–68**

Additional Statements **Pages S3254–55**

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S3268**

Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—88) **Page S3229**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 9:33 a.m., and adjourned at 7:21 p.m., until 9:30 a.m., on Wednesday, May 3, 2000. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S3271.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

AUTHORIZATION—DEFENSE

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Emerging Threats and Capabilities approved for full committee consideration those provisions, which fall within the jurisdiction of the subcommittee, of proposed legislation authorizing appropriations for fiscal year 2001 for military activities of the Department of Defense.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Personnel approved for full committee consideration those provisions, which fall within the jurisdiction of the subcommittee, of proposed legislation authorizing appropriations for fiscal year 2001 for military activities of the Department of Defense.

AUTHORIZATION—DEFENSE

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support approved for full committee consideration those provisions, which fall within the jurisdiction of the subcommittee, of proposed legislation authorizing appropriations for fiscal year 2001 for military activities of the Department of Defense.

SUCCESSFUL STATE ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee concluded oversight hearings on State environmental success stories and environmental protection program improvements, focusing on the EPA's relationship with States, enforcement, funding, inspections, administration, land recycling and brownfields, data management, non-point source runoff, technology, and the ECOS/EPA Regulatory Innovation Agreement, after receiving testimony from W. Michael McCabe, Acting Deputy Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency; Peter F. Guerrero, Director, Environmental Protection Issues, Resources, Community, and Economic Development Division, General Accounting Office; R. Lewis Shaw, South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control, Columbia, and Robert W. Varney, New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services, Concord, both on behalf of the Environmental Council of the States (ECOS); James M. Seif, Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection, Harrisburg; Brent C. Bradford, Utah Department of Environmental Quality, Salt Lake City; Lynn Scarlett, Reason Public Policy Institute, Los Angeles, California; and Erik D. Olson, Natural Resources Defense Council, and Jason S. Grumet, Northeast States for Coordinated Air Use Management, both of Washington, D.C.

INTER-AMERICAN CONVENTION AGAINST CORRUPTION

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded hearings on Inter-American Convention Against Corruptions (''the Convention''), adopted and opened for signature at the Specialized Conference of the Organization of American States (OAS) at Caracas, Venezuela, on March 29, 1996. The Convention was signed by the United States on June 27, 1996, at the twenty-seventh regular session of the OAS General Assembly meeting in Panama City, Panama (Treaty Doc. 105–39), after receiving testimony from Alan Larson, Under Secretary of State for Economic,

Business and Agricultural Affairs; and Ambassador William T. Pryce, Council of the Americas, Nancy Zucker Boswell, Transparency International USA, and Lucinda A. Low, Inter-American Bar Association, on behalf of the American Bar Association, all of Washington, D.C.

FEDERAL EMPLOYEE INCENTIVE PROGRAMS

Committee on Governmental Affairs: Subcommittee on Oversight of Government Management, Restructuring and the District of Columbia concluded hearings to examine the effectiveness of Federal employee incentive programs in achieving high employee performance, focusing on recruitment and retention, monetary incentives, work scheduling, leave flexibility, awards, motivation, and issues relating to information technology, after receiving testimony from Roberta L. Gross, Inspector General, National Aeronautics and Space Administration; Henry Romero, Associate Director, Workforce Compensation and Performance, Office of Personnel Management; Michael Brostek, Associate Director, Federal Management and Workforce Issues, General Government Division, General Accounting Office; and Colleen M. Kelley, National Treasury Employees Union, Washington, D.C.

LA BELLA MEMORANDUM

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Administrative Oversight and the Courts held hearings to examine Department of Justice activities about alleged improprieties during the 1996 Presidential campaign cycle, focusing on the LaBella Memorandum, receiving testimony from Charles LaBella, former Chief, Department of Justice Campaign Finance Task Force.

Hearings recessed subject to call.

AIRLINE COMPETITION

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Antitrust, Business Rights, and Competition concluded hearings to examine issues dealing with the state of competition in the deregulated airline industry and the application of related antitrust laws, after receiving testimony from Alfred E. Kahn, Cornell University Department of Economics, Ithaca, New York; Steven A. Morrison, Northeastern University Department of Economics, Boston, Massachusetts; Donald J. Carty, American Airlines, Inc., Dallas, Texas; Robert R. Ferguson III, Midway Airlines Corporation, Morrisville, North Carolina; and Bill La Macchia, Jr., Sun Country Airlines, Mendota Heights, Minnesota.

WATER RIGHTS

Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee concluded hearings on provisions of S. 2350, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey to certain water rights to Duchesne City, Utah, and S. 2351, to provide for the settlement of the water rights claims of the Shivwits Band of the Paiute Indian tribe of Utah, after receiving testimony from Senator Bennett; David J. Hayes, Deputy Secretary of the Interior; Mayor Kim Hamlin, Duchesne, Utah; Craig Smith, Nielsen and Senior, and Darin Bird, Utah Department of Natural Resources, both of Salt Lake City, Utah; Mayor Daniel D. McArthur, and Ron Thompson, Washington County Water Conservancy District, both of St. George, Utah; and Glenn Rogers, Shivwits Band of Paiute Indians of Utah, Santa Clara.

SOCIAL SECURITY FRAUD

Special Committee on Aging: Committee concluded hearings to examine the vulnerability of the Social Security Representative Payee Program, focusing on solutions to prevent and detect representative payee abuses, after receiving testimony from Susan M. Daniels, Deputy Commissioner, Disability and Income Security Programs, and James G. Huse, Jr., Inspector General, both of the Social Security Administration; Betty Byrd, Martinsburg, West Virginia; and Theresa King, an incarcerated witness.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Bills Introduced: 18 public bills, H.R. 4346–4363; 1 private bill, H.R. 4364; and 4 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 313–314 and H. Res. 486–487, were introduced. **Pages H2409–10**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 673, to authorize the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to make grants to the Florida Keys Aqueduct Authority and other appropriate agencies for the purpose of improving water quality throughout the marine ecosystem of the Florida Keys, amended (H. Rept. 106–592);

H.R. 1106, to authorize the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to make grants to State agencies with responsibility for water source development for the purpose of maximizing available water supply and protecting the environment through the development of alternative water sources, amended (H. Rept. 106–593);

H.R. 2957, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to authorize funding to carry out certain water quality restoration projects for Lake Pontchartrain Basin, Louisiana, and for other purposes, amended (H. Rept. 106–594);

H.R. 855, to amend the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act of 1972 relating to the dumping of dredged material in Long Island Sound, amended (H. Rept. 106–595);

H.R. 1237, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to permit grants for the national estuary program to be used for the development and implementation of a comprehensive conservation and management plan, to reauthorize appropriations to carry out the program, amended (H. Rept. 106–596);

H.R. 3313, to amend section 119 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to reauthorize the program for Long Island Sound, amended (H. Rept. 106–597);

H.R. 2647, to amend the Act entitled "An Act relating to the water rights of the Ak-Chin Indian Community" to clarify certain provisions concerning the leasing of such water rights (H. Rept. 106–598);

H.R. 3577, to increase the amount authorized to be appropriated for the north side pumping division of the Minidoka reclamation project, Idaho (H. Rept. 106–599);

H. Res. 482, providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules (H. Rept. 106–600);

H. Res. 483, providing for consideration of H.R. 673, to authorize the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to make grants to the Florida Keys Aqueduct Authority and other appropriate agencies for the purpose of improving water quality throughout the marine ecosystem of the Florida Keys (H. Rept. 106–601);

H. Res. 484, providing for consideration of H.R. 2957, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to authorize funding to carry out certain water quality restoration projects for Lake Pontchartrain Basin, Louisiana (H. Rept. 106–602); and

H. Res. 485, providing for consideration of H.R. 1106, to authorize the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to make grants to State agencies with responsibility for water source development for the purpose of maximizing available water supply and protecting the environment through the development of alternative water sources (H. Rept. 106–603). **Page H2409**

Speaker Pro Tempore: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he designated Representative Biggert to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H2345**

Recess: The House recessed at 12:54 p.m. and reconvened at 2:00 p.m. **Page H2348**

Private Calendar: On the call of the Private Calendar, the House passed S. 452, for the relief of Belinda McGregor. Subsequently, agreed to dispense with further business on the Private Calendar. **Page H2349**

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure Communications: Read letters from Chairman Shuster wherein he forwarded copies of resolutions approved or adopted by the committee on April 11—referred to the Committee on Appropriations. **Page H2349**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Lauding Federal Workforce for Y2K Computer Preparations: H. Con. Res. 300, recognizing and commending our Nation's Federal workforce for successfully preparing our Nation to withstand any catastrophic Year 2000 computer problem disruptions (agreed to by a yea and nay vote of 409 yeas with none voting "nay", Roll No. 131); **Pages H2350–53, H2375**

Prohibiting Restrictive Hiring Requirements in Federal Contracts for Information Technology Personnel: H.R. 3582, to restrict the use of mandatory minimum personnel experience and educational requirements in the procurement of information technology goods or services unless sufficiently justified; **Pages H2353–57**

Golden Spike/Crossroads Heritage Area: H.R. 2932, amended, to authorize the Golden Spike/Crossroads of the West National Heritage Area (passed by a yea and nay vote of 400 yeas to 9 nays, Roll No. 132). Agreed to amend the title;

Pages H2357–58, H2375–76

Hmong Veterans' Naturalization Act: H.R. 371, amended, to expedite the naturalization of aliens who served with special guerrilla units in Laos;

Pages H2359–62

Appointment of Alan G. Spoon as Regent of the Smithsonian Institution: S.J. Res. 40, providing for the appointment of Alan G. Spoon as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution—clearing the measure for the President;

Page H2364

Appointment of Manuel L. Ibanez as Regent of the Smithsonian Institution: S.J. Res. 42, providing for the reappointment of Manuel L. Ibanez as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; and **Pages H2364–65**

American Indian Tribal Colleges and Universities Program Improvements: H.R. 3629, amended, to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to improve the program for American Indian Tribal Colleges and Universities under part A of title III.

Pages H2365–67

Suspensions—Proceedings Postponed: The House completed debate on the following motions to suspend the rules. Further proceedings were postponed until Wednesday, May 3.

Continued Submission of Endangered Species Reports: S. 1744, to amend the Endangered Species Act of 1973 to provide that certain species conservation reports shall continue to be submitted;

Pages H2358–59

Memorial Honoring Disabled Veterans: H.R. 1509, to authorize the Disabled Veterans' LIFE Memorial Foundation to establish a memorial in the District of Columbia or its environs to honor veterans who became disabled while serving in the Armed Forces of the United States; and

Pages H2362–64

Commending Charter Schools: H. Con. Res. 310, supporting a National Charter Schools Week.

Pages H2367–74

Presidential Message—National Emergency re Narcotics Traffickers: Read a message from the President wherein he transmitted his periodic report on the national emergency with respect to narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia—referred to the Committee on International Relations and ordered printed (H. Doc. 106–232). **Page H2374**

Recess: The House recessed at 4:38 p.m. and reconvened at 6:00 p.m. **Page H2374**

Senate Messages: Messages received from the Senate appear on page H2345.

Referrals: S. 397 was referred to the Committee on Science; S. 408, S. 1218, S. 1629, S. 1694, S. 1705, S. 1727, S. 1778, S. 1797, S. 1849, S. 1892, and S. 1910 were referred to the Committee on Resources; S. 1836 was referred to the Committee on Commerce; and S. 1946 was referred to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Pages H2398–99

Quorum Calls—Votes: Two yea and nay votes developed during the proceedings of the House today and appear on pages H2374 and H2374–75. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 12:30 p.m. and adjourned at 9:54 p.m.

Committee Meetings

LABOR-HHS-EDUCATION APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education held a hearing on Children and Environmental Health. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the Department of Health and Human Services: Kenneth Olden, M.D., Director, National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences, and Duane Alexander, M.D., Director, National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, both with NIH; and Richard Jackson, Director, National Center for Environmental Health, Centers for Disease Control; Ramona Trovato, Director, Office of Children's Health Protection, EPA; and public witnesses.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION APPROPRIATIONS

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Military Construction approved for full Committee action the Military Construction appropriations for fiscal year 2001.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Installations and Facilities approved for full Committee action, as amended, H.R. 4205, National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001.

LAKE PONTCHARTRAIN BASIN RESTORATION ACT

Committee on Rules: The Committee granted, by voice vote, an open rule providing 1 hour of debate on

H.R. 2957, Lake Pontchartrain Basin Restoration Act of 1999. 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 Transportation and Infrastructure 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 authorizes the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to accord priority in recognition to Members who have pre-printed their amendments in the Congressional Record. The rule allows the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to postpone votes during consideration of the bill and to reduce voting time to five minutes on a postponed question if the vote follows a fifteen minute vote. Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit, with or without instructions. Testimony was heard from Chairman Shuster and Representative Vitter.

FLORIDA KEYS WATER QUALITY IMPROVEMENTS ACT

Committee on Rules: The Committee granted, by voice vote, an open rule providing 1 hour of debate on H.R. 673, Florida Keys Water Quality Improvements Act of 1999. 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 Transportation and Infrastructure 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 authorizes the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to accord priority in recognition to Members who have pre-printed their amendments in the Congressional Record. The rule allows the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to postpone votes during consideration of the bill and to reduce voting time to five minutes on a postponed question if the vote follows a fifteen minute vote. Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit, with or without instructions. Testimony was heard from Chairman Shuster and Representative Vitter.

ALTERNATIVE WATER SOURCES ACT

Committee on Rules: The Committee granted, by voice vote, an open rule providing 1 hour of debate on H.R. 1106, Alternative Water Sources Act of 1999. 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 Transportation and Infrastructure 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 authorizes the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to accord priority in recognition to Members who have pre-printed their amendments in the Congressional Record. The rule allows the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole to postpone votes during consideration of the bill and to reduce voting time to five minutes on a postponed question if the vote follows a fifteen minute vote. Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit, with or without instructions. Testimony was heard from Chairman Shuster and Representative Vitter.

MOTIONS TO SUSPEND RULES

Committee on Rules: The Committee granted, by voice vote, a rule providing that suspensions will be in order at any time on the legislative day of Wednesday, May 3, 2000. The rule provides that the object of any motion to suspend the rules will be announced from the floor at least one hour prior to its consideration. The rule provides that the Speaker or his designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or his designee on the object of any suspension considered under this resolution. Finally, the rule provides that H. Res. 469 is laid on the table.

NEW PUBLIC LAWS

(For last listing of Public Laws, see DAILY DIGEST, *p. D398)*

H.R. 1231, to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain National Forest lands to Elko County, Nevada, for continued use as a cemetery. Signed April 28, 2000. (P.L. 106–187)

H.R. 2368, to assist in the resettlement and relocation of the people of Bikini Atoll by amending the terms of the trust fund established during the United States administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. Signed April 28, 2000. (P.L. 106–188)

H.R. 2862, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to release reversionary interests held by the United States in certain parcels of land in Washington County, Utah, to facilitate an anticipated land exchange. Signed April 28, 2000. (P.L. 106–189)

H.R. 2863, to clarify the legal effect on the United States of the acquisition of a parcel of land in the Red Cliffs Desert Reserve in the State of Utah. Signed April 28, 2000. (P.L. 106–190)

H.R. 3063, to amend the Mineral Leasing Act to increase the maximum acreage of Federal leases for sodium that may be held by an entity in any one State. Signed April 28, 2000. (P.L. 106–191)

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, MAY 3, 2000

Senate

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Defense, to hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2001 for the Department of Defense, 9:30 a.m., SD–192.

Committee on Armed Services: Subcommittee on Strategic, closed business meeting to mark up those provisions, which fall within the jurisdiction of the subcommittee, of proposed legislation authorizing appropriations for fiscal year 2001 for military activities of the Department of Defense, 9:30 a.m., SR–232A.

Subcommittee on Airland, closed business meeting to mark up those provisions, which fall within the jurisdiction of the subcommittee, of proposed legislation authorizing appropriations for fiscal year 2001 for military activities of the Department of Defense, 11 a.m., SR–222.

Subcommittee on SeaPower, closed business meeting to mark up those provisions, which fall within the jurisdiction of the subcommittee, of proposed legislation authorizing appropriations for fiscal year 2001 for military activities of the Department of Defense, 2 p.m., SR–232A.

Full Committee, closed business meeting to mark up proposed legislation authorizing appropriations for fiscal year 2001 for military activities of the Department of Defense, 3 p.m., SR–222.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: to hold hearings to examine issues dealing with the Boston Central Artery Tunnel, 9:30 a.m., SR–253.

Committee on Indian Affairs: business meeting to mark up S. 1767, to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to improve Native Hawaiian education programs; S. 1929, to amend the Native Hawaiian Health Care Improvement Act to revise and extend such Act; S. 1967, to make technical corrections to the status of certain land held in trust for the Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians, to take certain land into trust for that Band; and H.R. 2484, to provide that land which is owned by the Lower Sioux Indian Community in the State of Minnesota but which is not held in trust by the United States for the Community may be leased or transferred by the Community without further approval by the United States, 2 p.m., SR–485.

Committee on Rules and Administration: to hold hearings on S. 1747, to amend the Federal Election Champaign Act of 1971 to exclude certain Internet communications from the definition of expenditure, 9:30 a.m., SR–301.

House

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Legislative, to mark up fiscal year 2001 appropriations, 10:30 a.m., H–144 Capitol.

Committee on Banking and Financial Services, hearing on H.R. 4209, Bank Reserves Modernization Act of 2000, 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Commerce, Subcommittee on Telecommunications, Trade, and Consumer Protection, hearing on the following bills: H.R. 4202, Internet Services Promotion Act of 2000; and H.R. 1291, Internet Access Charge Prohibition Act of 1999, 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Education and the Workforce, Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, hearing on Open Shops in the 21st Century Workplace, 2 p.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Workforce Protections, hearing on The Fair Labor Standards Act: White Collar Exemptions in the Modern Workplace, 10:30 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Government Reform, to continue hearings on "White House E-Mails: Mismanagement of Subpoenaed Records, Day Three and Day Four", 10 a.m., 2154 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, Drug Policy and Human Resources, hearing on "Why Have Recommended Reforms to Protect People Who Participate in Medical Research Been Ignored?" 2 p.m., 2247 Rayburn.

Committee on International Relations, hearing on International Efforts to End Discrimination Against Women, 10 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Resources, Subcommittee on Forests and Forest Health, hearing on the following bills: S. 439, to amend the National Forest and Public Lands of Nevada Enhancement Act of 1988 to adjust the boundary of the Toiyabe National Forest, Nevada; S. 1374, Jackson Multi-Agency Campus Act of 1999; H.R. 3657, to provide for the conveyance of a small parcel of public domain land in the San Bernardino National Forest in the State of California; H.R. 3817, to redesignate the Big South Trail in the Comanche Park Wilderness Area of Roosevelt National Forest in Colorado as the "Jaryd Atadero Legacy Trail"; and H.R. 4226, Black Hills National Forest and Rocky Mountain Research Station Improvement Act, 10 a.m., 1334 Longworth.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, Subcommittee on Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation, oversight hearing on the Ocean Shipping Reform Act, 10 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Committee on Ways and Means, to continue hearings on the U.S.-China bilateral Trade Agreement and the Accession of China to the WTO, 10 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, executive, hearing on Iraq, 1 p.m., H–405 Capitol.

Joint Meetings

Joint Committee on Taxation: to hold hearings to review the strategic plans and budget of the IRS, 9:30 a.m., SD–215.

Next Meeting of the **SENATE**

9:30 a.m., Wednesday, May 3

Senate Chamber

Program for Wednesday: After the recognition of two Senators for speeches and the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond 11 a.m.), Senate will continue consideration of S. 2, Elementary and Secondary Education Reauthorization.

Next Meeting of the **HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

10 a.m., Wednesday, May 3

House Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Consideration of Suspensions:

1. H. Con. Res. 295, Human rights violations and political oppression in the Socialist Republic of Vietnam;
2. H. Res. 464, International recognition of Israel's Magen David Adom Society and its symbol the Red Shield of David;
3. H. Con. Res. 304, Human rights violations in the Republic of Belarus;
4. H.R. 3879, Sierra Leone Peace Support Act;
5. H. Res. 449, Congratulating the people of Senegal on the success of the electoral process;
6. S. 2323, Worker Economic Opportunity Act ;
7. H.R. 4055, IDEA Full Funding Act of 2000;
8. H.R. 1729, Designating the ''Pamela B. Gwin Hall'' Federal Building;
9. H.R. 1405, Designating the ''Donald J. Pease Federal Building'';
10. H.R. 1901, Designating the ''Kika de la Garza United States Border Station'';
11. H.R. 3069, Southeast Federal Center Public-Private Development Act; and
12. H.R. 3313, Long Island Sound Restoration Act;

Consideration of H.R. 2957, Lake Pontchartrain Basin Restoration Act (open rule, one hour of debate).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Baldacci, John Elias, Maine, E615
Ballenger, Cass, N.C., E597
Barrett, Thomas M., Wisc., E602
Becerra, Xavier, Calif., E614
Bereuter, Doug, Nebr., E608
Berman, Howard L., Calif., E608
Castle, Michael N., Del., E600
Clay, William (Bill), Mo., E613
Coyne, William J., Pa., E606
Cramer, Robert E. (Bud), Jr., Ala., E599
Fattah, Chaka, Pa., E609
Frank, Barney, Mass., E600
Frost, Martin, Tex., E608
Hansen, James V., Utah, E601
Hinojosa, Ruben, Tex., E604
Hyde, Henry J., Ill., E611
Inslee, Jay, Wash., E616
Kanjorski, Paul E., Pa., E610
Kaptur, Marcy, Ohio, E605, E607
Kleczka, Gerald D., Wisc., E603, E606
Kuykendall, Steven T., Calif., E614
LaHood, Ray, Ill., E608
Lampson, Nick, Tex., E614
Levin, Sander M., Mich., E598
Lipinski, William O., Ill., E612
Lowey, Nita M., N.Y., E610
McInnis, Scott, Colo., E602, E603, E606, E608, E610
Menendez, Robert, N.J., E602, E603, E606, E608, E609
Mica, John L., Fla., E611
Morella, Constance A., Md., E599
Napolitano, Grace F., Calif., E615
Norton, Eleanor Holmes, D.C., E603, E604
Nussle, Jim, Iowa, E598
Pitts, Joseph R., Pa., E597
Rothman, Steven R., N.J., E615
Shaw, E. Clay, Jr., Fla., E610
Sherman, Brad, Calif., E608
Shimkus, John, Ill., E598, E599
Stark, Fortney Pete, Calif., E607, E609
Terry, Lee, Nebr., E597, E598
Towns, Edolphus, N.Y., E602, E612
Underwood, Robert A., Guam, E600
Velazquez, Nydia M., N.Y., E609
Walsh, James T., N.Y., E598, E599
Waxman, Henry A., Calif., E597, E608

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.