



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 146

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, JULY 24, 2000

No. 97

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,
July 24, 2000.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JUDY BIGGERT to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

J. DENNIS HASTER, *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, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 208. An act to amend title 5, United States Code, to allow for the contributions of certain rollover distributions to accounts in the Thrift Savings Plan, to eliminate certain waiting-period requirements for participating in the Thrift Savings Plan, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 4810) "An Act to provide for reconciliation pursuant to section 103(a)(1) of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2001."

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2812. An act to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide a waiver of the oath of renunciation and allegiance for naturalization of aliens having certain disabilities.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 19, 1999, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to not to exceed 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to not to exceed 5 minutes.

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

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

Our God and Savior, at times we seem to be like sheep gone astray. Yet here we are now gathered together. Called by Your voice, make us attentive to Your word. Being restless in our world, grant us Your peace.

Gathered as representatives of the people in this Nation, we ask You to be present in our midst. We come here to serve Your purpose today.

We pledge ourselves to serve Your people that they may see themselves as one Nation held by You and guided by Your spirit. For You are the shepherd and guardian of our souls, 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 her approval thereof.

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. GIBBONS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair desires to make an announcement.

On July 24, 1998, at 3:40 p.m., Officer Jacob J. Chestnut and Detective John W. Gibson of the United States Capitol Hill Police were killed in the line of duty defending the Capitol against an intruder armed with a gun.

At 3:40 p.m. today, the Chair will recognize the anniversary of this tragedy by observing a moment of silence in their memory.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO ATTEND THE FUNERAL OF THE LATE SENATOR PAUL COVERDELL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 558, the Chair announces the Speaker's appointment of the following Members of the House to the committee to attend the funeral of the late Paul Coverdell:

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H6721

Mr. LEWIS, Georgia;
 Mr. HASTERT, Illinois;
 Mr. BISHOP, Georgia;
 Mr. COLLINS, Georgia;
 Mr. DEAL, Georgia;
 Mr. KINGSTON, Georgia;
 Mr. LINDER, Georgia;
 Ms. MCKINNEY, Georgia;
 Mr. BARR, Georgia;
 Mr. CHAMBLISS, Georgia;
 Mr. NORWOOD, Georgia;
 Mr. ISAKSON, Georgia; and
 Mr. GRAHAM, South Carolina.

PROTECTING SOCIAL SECURITY FOR ALL AMERICANS

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Madam Speaker, Social Security is a solemn promise from the United States to its citizens, a promise that this Republican-led Congress is dedicated to keeping.

For more than 30 years, the Social Security Trust Fund was used as a slush fund for government spending by the Democrats and their leadership. However, this Republican Congress stopped this dangerous practice by implementing a fiscally responsible budget; and we passed the Social Security Lockbox Act, which protects the Social Security Trust Fund permanently.

This Republican-led Congress is dedicated to ensuring that all Americans can rely on Social Security, now and in the future.

I call upon the administration to follow our lead and help assure all Americans, young and old, that Social Security will be there for them when they retire.

I yield back the administration's irresponsible tax-and-spend policies that only jeopardize the future of Social Security.

TIME TO STOP THE CASH COW FOR RUSSIA

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Madam Speaker, the CEO of the Bank of New York has admitted to laundering \$7 billion; and bingo, surprise, surprise, \$5 billion of it is expected to be Russian dollars that they got from the International Monetary Fund.

Now, if that is not enough to barf up your vodka, the investigators say, in addition to that, Russian politicians have secretly stolen \$15 billion, diverted them to bank accounts all over the world, and most of the money came from Uncle Sam.

Unbelievable, Uncle Sam giving billions to Russia to dismantle their nukes. They do not dismantle their nukes. They sell their nukes to Iran and China. China then aims them at us. Russia comes back, asks us for more money, the White House gives more billions.

Beam me up. I say it is time to stop the cash cow for Russia.

Madam Speaker, I yield back all the cash the Russian politicians have been stealing from the American taxpayers.

UTAH PIONEER DAY CELEBRATION

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

Mr. CANNON. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor Utah's pioneer heritage. The State of Utah is celebrating the arrival of the first company of Mormon pioneers in the Salt Lake Valley today.

These pioneers and the many wagon and handcart companies that followed on the trek from Nauvoo, Illinois, believed that they could build a better way of life in the West. They were tough. They suffered blistering and freezing temperatures. Many succumbed to the limited food supplies. They walked more than a thousand miles from Illinois to Utah, and many died along the way.

Those that survived had the strength necessary to thrive in the desert and harsh climates of the West. Evidence of their toils surrounds us today. There is a ditch in Wayne County, Utah, that brought water 5 miles from a mountain lake to the farms in the valley.

The amazing thing about this simple irrigation ditch is that it was built by hand. More water would disappear into the sandy soil than could be used for the crops at the end of the ditch. But all their hard work, in the words of Isaiah, made "the desert blossom like a rose."

There are several dams in my district that need repairs. The discussions about those repairs are centered around the roads needed to be built to bring the equipment in. The dams had been built over 100 years ago by Mormon pioneers by hand. Hand repairs were not an option now because the builders "were much tougher back then."

These dams, as well as countless landmarks, buildings and cities stand today as evidence of the Mormon pioneers' strength and determination. They were central to the westward expansion, providing a place of rest and resupply for travelers heading to the gold fields of California and the Oregon territory.

Their strengths, self-sufficiency, and determination have become the cultural foundation of the West. I am proud to be the descendant of the Mormon pioneers and to live with the fruits of their labors. I am proud to join my fellow Utahans in honoring and celebrating our pioneer heritage. The desert truly has blossomed like a rose.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair

announces that she will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

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

□ 1415

EXPRESSING SENSE OF CONGRESS CONCERNING SAFETY AND WELL-BEING OF UNITED STATES CITIZENS WHILE TRAVELING IN MEXICO

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 232) expressing the sense of Congress concerning the safety and well-being of United States citizens injured while traveling in Mexico, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 232

Whereas hundreds of United States citizens travel by automobile to Mexico every day;

Whereas United States automobile insurance is not valid in Mexico and travellers may purchase additional insurance to cover potential liability or injury while in Mexico;

Whereas in cases where additional insurance is not purchased and a United States citizen is involved in an automobile accident, the American will be subject to a bond requirement before being permitted to return to the United States; and

Whereas in a recent incident, a United States citizen injured in an automobile accident in Mexico was not transferred to a United States hospital for 18 hours, even after medical personnel in Mexico recommended his immediate transfer to the United States for emergency treatment, until the family posted the bond set by Mexican authorities: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That it is the sense of Congress that, in order to protect the safety and well-being of United States citizens travelling in Mexico, the President should continue to negotiate with the Government of Mexico to establish procedures, including a humanitarian exemption to Mexican bond requirements, to ensure the expedited return of United States citizens injured in Mexico to the United States for medical treatment, if necessary.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam 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. 232.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Speaker, as the Vice-Chairman of the Committee on International Relations, this Member rises in strong support of House Concurrent Resolution 232. This resolution, which expresses the sense of Congress regarding the safety and well-being of United States citizens who are traveling in Mexico, was introduced by our colleague, the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER). It is the result of a particularly unfortunate incident involving a California resident caught in a conflict between Mexican law and sound medical treatment provided to U.S. citizens as well as to other foreign citizens while traveling in Mexico.

Last August, California resident Donald Craft, his wife, and three children were vacationing in Baja, Mexico, when they were involved in a serious automobile incident. Mr. Craft broke his neck and was in critical condition when he was taken to a local Mexican hospital where doctors advised his family that he be immediately transported to a trauma center in San Diego for more intensive life-saving medical care.

There was, however, one problem. Under Mexican law, foreigners involved in traffic accidents being investigated for possible criminal action or who do not have Mexican automobile insurance cannot leave Mexico until a bond is posted. Mrs. Melody Craft, the victim's wife, was required to find and pay \$7,000 before her critically injured husband would be allowed to leave the country. After what must have been a very confusing and unbelievably excruciating period of almost 18 hours, the bond was raised and Mr. Craft was released and sent back to the United States.

Regrettably, on September 6, 1999, Mr. Craft died of complications reportedly associated with that accident and the delay in providing him adequate medical attention. Sadly, this tragedy has been repeated on several traditional occasions since Mr. Craft's death, including a case involving a Florida constituent of our distinguished colleague, the gentlewoman from Miami (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN).

Madam Speaker, I would also like to indicate that in 1998, one of my constituents, Gregg Gahan, the adult son of Mr. and Mrs. Duane Gahan of Oakland, Nebraska, Mr. Gahan being the editor of the Oakland Independent, a newspaper serving that area, was also involved in a similar accident with also extraordinary things that happened that really defy a rational explanation and amount to an abuse of the legal or ethical process by Mexican officials.

Grave concerns arose as a result of the treatment of his son by law enforcement officials, health care officials, and the driver of the car who hit him. There are legitimate questions about the judicial process that was im-

plemented, how culpability was determined, the punitive actions taken, and the damage settlement.

Madam Speaker, we know and appreciate the fact that Mexico has its own laws and procedures and that those should be known and respected by foreign visitors. However, in these kinds of very serious accident cases, flexibility and accommodation of the special circumstances ought to be in order.

Since the Craft incident, this Member has been told that the U.S. and Mexican Governments have initiated a dialogue on how to address this issue. This resolution is designed to support these efforts to seek a reasonable solution to a situation under Mexican law which places the health and well-being of Americans and other foreign visitors to Mexico in question.

The State Department has been consulted on this legislation and has no objection to it. The Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere of the Committee on International Relations and, subsequently, the full committee, reported the legislation by voice vote.

Madam Speaker, this Member urges his colleagues to join him in supporting adoption of H. Con. Res. 232.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

REQUEST TO BE ADDED AS COSPONSOR OF H. CON. RES. 232, S. CON. RES. 81, H.R. 4002, AND H.R. 4919

Mr. SHERMAN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be added to H. Con. Res. 232 as a cosponsor, and also as a cosponsor of the three other pieces of legislation that will follow this, S. Con. Res. 81, H.R. 4002 and H.R. 4919, the Security Assistance Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As to cosponsorship of House bills, the gentleman should talk to the primary sponsor of the bill. It is not done by unanimous consent. Only the sponsor may add cosponsors.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution. This bill sends the right message. It is a bill brought to this House's attention by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), the gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY), the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD) and the gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM), who represent the portion of California that is immediately adjacent to Mexico.

This resolution puts Congress on record in favor of ensuring that U.S. citizens traveling in Mexico have access without delay to emergency medical services. This is of particular importance to all of us in California and along the U.S.-Mexico border. Our citizens travel to Mexico; and when they are involved in an automobile accident, they encounter the Mexican law that requires the posting of a bond, a bond which ordinary automobile insurance does not provide for.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join in this resolution and to support the negotiation with Mexico of a system for at least dealing with those American motorists who are insured and need help on an emergency basis. I urge my colleagues to support H. Con. Res. 232.

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to reiterate my request that this be given strong support by my colleagues.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the Hunter resolution expressing the sense of Congress that U.S. citizens who are injured while traveling in Mexico should have immediate access to medical treatment in the United States. We drafted this resolution in response to several instances where Americans were prevented by Mexican authorities from accessing U.S. hospitals after being injured while traveling in Mexico.

Specifically, this resolution calls upon President Clinton to continue negotiations with the Mexican government to establish a humanitarian exemption to bond requirements that prevent the release of American citizens involved in accidents. One tragic example of this problem happened on August 24, 1999. Donald Kraft of Southern California was involved in an automobile accident in Baja California, Mexico, in which he suffered a broken neck and other injuries. Despite needing quality medical care that was unavailable in Mexico, Mr. Kraft was forced to wait over 18 hours before authorities approved his return to the United States pending his family posting a bond to cover damages for the collision. Mr. Kraft died a few days later in San Diego.

This experience was repeated again in November 1999 when three men from Orange County were involved in an accident that killed the driver and left the two others injured. Family members were required to post an \$11,000 bond before one of the victims was allowed to be transferred to San Diego where he was treated for multiple fractures, a ruptured spleen and a punctured lung. The remaining victim was required to stay in jail until family members convinced authorities that he should be transported to a Tijuana hospital.

Mr. Speaker, when Americans travel abroad, they must not be denied access to medical treatment. The United States and Mexico need to agree on procedures to ensure that the horrible situations of the past never happen again. Our citizens need these protections. The Mexican government can and should make these concessions to our tourists in order to protect Americans in Mexico, and the Mexican tourism industry.

My colleagues, we need to pass this resolution, I urge you to vote yes.

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Speaker, I want to commend Representative DUNCAN HUNTER for introducing this resolution and bringing this matter to the floor of the House.

We will be proceeding with a resolution congratulating the Mexican people on their recent election on July 2nd. That election has ushered in a spirit of renewal both in Mexico and as regards our very important bilateral relations.

This resolution reminds us that our relationship with Mexico involves many matters that concern both nations.

H. Res. 232 urges the President to continue to negotiate with the Government of Mexico to establish procedures for the expedited return of U.S. citizens injured in Mexico.

There is good reason for the Congress to pass this resolution. U.S. citizens who do not purchase additional automobile insurance required by the Mexican government, and are then injured in an automobile accident, are subject to a bond requirement before they can return to the United States for medical treatment.

On August 24, 1999, Donald Kraft of Southern California was involved in an automobile accident in Baja California in which he suffered a broken neck and other injuries. Mr. Kraft was forced to wait 18 hours before authorities approved his return to the United States only after his family posted a bond to cover damages for the collision. Mr. Kraft died a few days later in San Diego.

The United States and Mexico should work together so we can avoid similar tragedies in the future.

I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting this resolution.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, every year, thousands of people leave the port of Miami, located in my congressional district, on cruise ships that take them to foreign lands. Yet these tourists never consider what they would do if they found themselves in an emergency situation abroad.

What was supposed to be a peaceful vacation cruise to Mexico for a couple in my congressional district, turned out to be a nightmare that continues to haunt Michael and Lorraine Andrews today. Fifteen minutes before their ship departed from one of the ports, Michael and Lorraine's car went off the road and into a ravine, causing a tragic accident that would change their lives forever. With no passport, no money and no real means of identification, Lorraine Andrews had a difficult time in obtaining medical assistance for her husband who had lost sensation below his neck. It took approximately an hour and a half before an air ambulance arrived and even then, American dollars had to be exchanged for medical attention. Today, Michael is an incomplete quadriplegic and he and his wife are working to make a difference so that others do not experience similar difficulties.

H. Con. Res. 232, expressing the sense of Congress concerning the safety and well being of United States citizens injured while traveling in Mexico, is a step in the right direction to secure safety for our citizens and raise awareness on ways in which they can better protect themselves. The safety of our citizens must come first and our President must immediately begin negotiations with the Government of Mexico to establish a humanitarian exemption to Mexican bond requirements. No American's life should be endangered due to the existence of a Mexican law requiring an exhaustive investigation of an accident before emergency medical help in the United States is found. No American should be denied the right to emergency medical assistance because a release bond must be paid up front. Humanitarian considerations should be allowed to override any regulatory, so that emergencies like that of Michael and Lorraine Andrews will be prevented in the future. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support H. Con. Res. 232, and I ask my colleagues to vote for its passage.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 232, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF CONGRESS CONCERNING RELEASE OF RABIYA KADEER, HER SECRETARY AND SON BY GOVERNMENT OF THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate 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.

The Clerk read 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 Ablikum Abdyrim 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.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on S. Con. Res. 81.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Speaker, this Member stands in strong support of Senate Concurrent Resolution 81, which was introduced by the senior senator from Delaware, Senator WILLIAM ROTH, and approved by the Senate on May 2.

On June 27, S. Con. Res. 81 was approved by the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, which this Member chairs, and was subsequently approved unanimously by the Committee on International Relations on June 29.

The resolution expresses the sense of the Congress that the People's Republic of China, PRC, should immediately release Rabiya Kadeer, her secretary, and her son, and allow them to move to the United States if they so desire.

Rabiya Kadeer is a prominent ethnic Uigher from China, who was arrested as she was attempting to meet a congressional staff delegation visiting Urumqi as part of an official visit to China organized under the auspices of the Mutual Education and Cultural Exchange Program of the U.S. Information Agency.

Subsequently, on March 10 of this year, Rabiya Kadeer was sentenced to 8 years in prison for the crime of "illegally giving state information across the border." Previously, her son was sent to a labor camp for 2 years in November of 1999 for supporting Uighur separatism and her secretary was recently sentenced to 3 years in a labor camp. In Ms. Kadeer's case, the so-called "state information" appears to have consisted essentially of a collection of publicly available Chinese newspaper articles and speeches and a list of prisoners.

As the resolution notes, this case appears to constitute a clear violation of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. The Chinese Government's action in this case has been reprehensible and must be reversed. This resolution makes clear the strong sense of the Congress that Ms. Kadeer should be immediately released and allowed to join her family in the United States.

Madam Speaker, approving S. Con. Res. 81 sends a strong message that while this body approves of improved trade relations, we are, nonetheless, mindful of the serious human rights problems that exist within the People's Republic of China.

This is an entirely appropriate message to send, for the United States cannot turn a blind eye to the abuses that continue to exist in the PRC.

Madam Speaker, this Member urges adoption of S. Con. Res. 81.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution and commend the chairman of the Committee on International Relations (Mr. GILMAN); the chairman of the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, my colleague here, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER); and the ranking Democratic members, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDESON) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), for their strong support.

The subject of this resolution is Rabiya Kadeer, who is well-known as a Uighur businesswoman and known throughout China as "the millionaire woman of Xinjiang." She is also a philanthropist of many programs designed to improve the lives of Uighur women and children.

Her work led to her election as a member of a nationwide advisory body of the Chinese government from 1993 through 1997, and as a delegate to the United Nations Women's Conference in 1995. She has helped many Uighur women start businesses, and she has established English language classes for Uighur teenagers, several of whom she has sent to the United States for schooling.

Rabiya Kadeer's husband, who is of Uighur descent, fled to the United States in 1996, and she was stripped of her government position when she refused to criticize him. Kadeer was arrested last year on her way to meet with congressional staff members, charged with providing information to foreigners, and sentenced to 8 years in prison.

As my colleague from Nebraska pointed out, these charges were without merit. Unfortunately, it appears that Kadeer's real crime is that her husband now works for Radio Free Asia and he has been critical of the policies of the PRC toward Uighurs in Xinjiang. This situation is all the more troubling because Kadeer has five children and three sisters living in the United States in addition to her husband.

This resolution before the House today calls on the Chinese to release Rabiya Kadeer, as well as her son, and secretary, arrested at the same time, and allow them to come to the United States.

It is with regret that I note that this House passed a provision giving the People's Republic of China most favored nation status on a permanent basis, so the Chinese are free to ignore this resolution, without the slightest risk of losing a single penny of trade benefits with the United States, where they enjoy the largest trade surplus and one of the most lopsided trading relationships that one can imagine.

So although I doubt this resolution will have much effect, given the fact that we have cut ourselves off from any way of really pressuring the Chinese government, it is the least we could do.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support Senate Concurrent Resolution 81.

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Speaker, I urge support for the resolution.

Mr. LANTOS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of S. Con. Res. 81, a resolution urging the Government of the People's Republic of China to release immediately and unconditionally the prominent Uighur businesswoman, Ms. Rebiya Kadeer.

Madam Speaker, as co-chair of the Congressional Human Rights Caucus I have repeatedly voiced my deepest concern regarding Ms. Kadeer to the Chinese Government. Ms. Kadeer was detained by Chinese security forces in Urumqi, Xinjiang Province on August 11, 1999. A particularly disturbing circumstance is the fact that shortly before her arrest, her husband, Mr. Sidick Rozi, had testified to Members of Congress before the Congressional Human Rights Caucus on July 15, 1999, regarding human rights violations in Western China.

As a prominent businesswoman, Ms. Kadeer is well known and respected in the United States. Her efforts to promote business enterprises by Uighur women have been recognized by Chinese authorities as contributing to the overall economic and social development of the Xinjiang Uighur Autonomous Region. Until 1998, she even served as an elected official in the Provincial People's Political Consultative Congress.

On September 2, 1999, however, according to press reports she was charged with the serious crime of "illegally offering state secrets across the border." Ms. Kadeer was detained on August 11, 1999, while on her way to meet with a U.S. congressional staff delegation, whom she intended to give information about political prisoners in Xinjiang. She was convicted under Article 111 of the Chinese Criminal Law. According to Radio Free Asia, neither Kadeer nor her lawyer were allowed to speak at her trial.

Chinese officials never produced evidence of criminal wrongdoing against Ms. Kadeer. She was nonetheless sentenced to 8 years in prison in a secret trial at the Urumqi City Intermediate People's Court in the capital of the Xinjiang Uighur Autonomous Region. In addition, according to information we have received, she is currently detained at Liudaowan jail, a jail notorious for mistreatment of prisoners.

In addition to Ms. Kadeer, her son, Ablikim Abyirim, and her secretary, Kahrman Abdukurim, were also detained in August and were administratively sentenced to 2- and 3-year terms, respectively, on November 26, 1999. They are currently being held at the Walabai Reeducation Through Labor School.

Madam Speaker, the trial and the totally fabricated charges brought against Ms. Kadeer, her son, and her secretary are blatant violations of international judicial standards. As the other body prepares to consider PNTR for the Peoples Republic of China, it is my hope that our colleagues keep these outrageous human rights violations in mind. The Economist reports that China executed three Uighurs as recently as the first week of July of this year, and the harassment and the crackdown against Tibetans, the Falun Gong, and political dissidents continues unabated.

Madam Speaker, it is high time to send the PRC a clear message. The resolution before the House sends a clear message. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. PORTER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to support this resolution and join with my colleague in urging the Chinese authorities to release from Rebiya Kadeer, her secretary and her son, and permit them to move to the United States, if they desire.

Ms. Kadeer is a well respected businesswoman who was once officially touted as an inspiration to her fellow members of the Uighur ethnic group. On March 10th, 2000, Ms. Kadeer was sentenced to 8 years in jail for "giving information to separatists outside the country." Her efforts to business enterprises have been recognized by Chinese authorities as contributing to the overall economic and social development of the Xinjiang Uighur Autonomous Region, one of the poorest regions throughout China.

However, in 1997, Ms. Kadeer was stripped of her passport, and with it the right to freedom of movement as well as subjected to continual police harassments. These actions were clearly aimed at silencing her husband, Mr. Sidick Rozi, a former political prisoner who has been an outspoken critic of China's treatment of the Uighur minority in Western China. Mr. Rozi, now living in the United States, has made numerous statements on Radio Free Asia, Voice of America and testified last July before the Congressional Human Rights Caucus concerning the extremely harsh discriminations suffered by the Uighur minority. Ms. Kadeer was made a hostage in her own country, unable to join her husband and a number of her children in the United States, simply because of the political activities of her husband.

On August 11th, 1999 Rebiya Kadeer was arrested while she was on her way to meet with a group of congressional staff visiting China. She was charged in September with "providing secret information to foreigners." Ms. Kadeer does not have access to "state secrets," she is a businesswoman, not a political activist. After 7 months of detention and the arrest and subsequent arbitrary sentencing of her secretary and one son, Ms. Kadeer was given a 4-hour trial. During this trial, neither she nor her lawyer were able to speak, none of her children were allowed to attend and the 300 Uighurs who had gathered at the courthouse were dispersed by Chinese police.

If China wants to be a full partner in the international arena, it has to start abiding by international norms and living within the rule of law. Seven months of arbitrary detention and a trial where the defendant's lawyer is not allowed to speak is not an accepted practice within the international community and should not be an accepted practice in China.

Ms. Kadeer was traveling to meet with congressional staff, official representatives of the U.S. Government, when she was detained. This did not seem to matter to the Chinese and it appears to be one of the factors for the timing of her arrest. Clearly, the Chinese were sending a signal: Any citizen who meets with or talks to U.S. citizens is risking detention, arrest and a prison sentence.

Incidences such as this prove that now is not the time to ease the pressure on China. We in the United States, and around the world must never give up our ideals and belief in human freedom, and need to pressure dictators, oppressors and abusers around the

world that lack the respect for the rule of law and for human life. Only if Ms. Kadeer's case is brought to the highest level of our administration and the Chinese Government is there any hope that Ms. Kadeer will not spend the next 8 years of her life in a Chinese prison—8 years she should be spending with her husband and 10 children—and for speaking up for the most basic human rights of her people, the Uighurs.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Madam Speaker, I appreciate the work of the International Relations Committee, particularly the Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights and the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, in moving this important resolution forward. Today we are considering the Senate version of the resolution I introduced, H. Con. Res. 249, which has 11 cosponsors.

As the chairman has noted, this resolution expresses the sense of Congress that 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.

Kadeer is a 53-year-old entrepreneur from China's Xingjiang Autonomous Region. As a member of the Uighur minority, she emerged as a symbol of how minorities could succeed in China. However, her relationship with the Chinese Government deteriorated after her husband's emigration to the United States in 1997. Sidik Rouzi has become a prominent critic of China's Xingjiang policies and testified last summer before the House Congressional Human Rights Caucus.

On August 11, 1999, Rabiya Kadeer, her secretary, and two of her sons were arrested in Urumqi, China and charged with "illegally providing intelligence for foreign organizations." She was apparently arrested en route to a previously scheduled meeting with U.S. congressional staff. A member of my staff was part of this official delegation, organized under the auspices of the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Program of the U.S. Information Agency.

The arrest prior to a meeting with an official delegation was an affront to Congress. Members and staff should be allowed to travel internationally and conduct their official duties without fear that their visit will trigger retributive action by the host country. One purpose of this staff delegation was to encourage mutual understanding and cultural exchange—the arrest was clearly contrary to this purpose. Such intimidation should never accompany an official delegation visit.

Even more troubling, Kadeer was convicted and sentenced to 8 years in prison for merely mailing copies of local newspapers to her husband in the United States. Apparently, her high crime was to mark and fold the newspapers in such a way that she was illegally revealing state information.

In February, I received a letter from the Chinese Ambassador noting "Ethnic secessionism in Xingjiang and Tibet is a deep concern for us. I hope our American friends could put themselves in our shoes when approaching this issue." I do not believe that Chinese concerns about ethnic affairs merit a suspension of human rights.

Indeed, this resolution merely calls for the People's Republic of China to adhere to International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which guarantees citizens the right to legal recourse when their rights have been violated

and forbids arbitrary arrest and detention. Even though a Chinese court dismissed this case last November for lack of evidence, Kadeer was tried again. The second trial lasted all of two hours, and according to Human Rights Watch, neither she nor her attorney were permitted to even speak. China signed this Covenant in 1998 and has an obligation to respect the civil and political rights of all Chinese citizens, irrespective of their ethnicity.

I urge my colleagues in the House to join the other body in passing this important resolution. China should immediately release Rabiya Kadeer, her secretary, and her son, and should allow them to move to the United States. Vote in support of this resolution and send a strong message to China that they must respect the political rights of all of their citizens.

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the chairmen and ranking minority members of the International Operations and Human Rights, and the Asia and Pacific Subcommittees for their work on this important resolution.

Ms. Rabiya Kadeer, her son and secretary were arrested in Chinese-occupied East Turkestan or the Xinjiang Uighur Autonomous Region on August 11, 1999, as they were attempting to meet with a group of congressional staff. Ms. Kadeer's husband works for Radio Free Asia and has been critical of the Chinese occupation of his homeland. After their arrest, the three individuals were eventually accused of illegally giving Mr. Kadeer various news clippings and public speeches concerning the struggle in East Turkestan.

Ms. Kadeer was sentenced to 8 years in prison, her son was sent to a labor camp for 2 years and her secretary to 3 years. The resolution calls on the Government of the People's Republic of China to immediately release them and permit them to move to the United States if so they desire. I urge my colleagues to support the resolution.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 81.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1430

FAMINE PREVENTION AND FREEDOM FROM HUNGER IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2000

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4002) to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to revise and improve provisions relating to famine prevention and freedom from hunger, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4002

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 "Famine Prevention and Freedom From Hunger Improvement Act of 2000".

SEC. 2. GENERAL PROVISIONS.

(a) **DECLARATIONS OF POLICY.**—(1) The first sentence of section 296(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2220a(a)) is amended to read as follows: "The Congress declares that, in order to achieve the mutual goals among nations of ensuring food security, human health, agricultural growth, trade expansion, and the wise and sustainable use of natural resources, the United States should mobilize the capacities of the United States land-grant universities, other eligible universities, and public and private partners of universities in the United States and other countries, consistent with sections 103 and 103A of this Act, for (1) global research on problems affecting food, agriculture, forestry, and fisheries, (2) improved human capacity and institutional resource development for the global application of agricultural and related environmental sciences, (3) agricultural development and trade research and extension services in the United States and other countries to support the entry of rural industries into world markets, and (4) providing for the application of agricultural sciences to solving food, health, nutrition, rural income, and environmental problems, especially such problems in low-income, food deficit countries."

(2) The second sentence of section 296(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2220a(a)) is amended—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking "in this country" and inserting "with and through the private sector in this country and to understanding processes of economic development";

(B) in paragraph (2), to read as follows:

"(2) that land-grant and other universities in the United States have demonstrated over many years their ability to cooperate with international agencies, educational and research institutions in other countries, the private sector, and nongovernmental organizations worldwide, in expanding global agricultural production, processing, business and trade, to the benefit of the United States and other countries;"

(C) in paragraph (3), to read as follows:

"(3) that, in a world of growing populations with rising expectations, increased food production and improved distribution, storage, and marketing in the developing countries is necessary not only to prevent hunger and ensure human health and child survival, but to build the basis for economic growth and trade, and the social security in which democracy and a market economy can thrive, and moreover, that the greatest potential for increasing world food supplies and incomes to purchase food are in the developing countries where the gap between food need and food supply is the greatest and current incomes are lowest;"

(D) in paragraph (4), to read as follows:

"(4) that the engagement of United States universities in agricultural development in other countries strengthens the competitiveness of United States agriculture and other industries by training future foreign partners and by introducing global perspectives into United States curriculum, research, public information services, and other extension programs of the universities;"

(E) by striking paragraphs (5) and (7), redesignating paragraph (6) as paragraph (7), and inserting the following:

"(5) with expanding global markets and increasing imports into many countries, including the United States, that food safety and quality, as well as secure supply, have emerged as mutual concerns of all countries;

"(6) that research, teaching, and extension activities, and appropriate institutional and policy development therefore are prime factors in improving agricultural production, food distribution, processing, storage, and marketing abroad (as well as in the United States);";

(F) in paragraph (7) (as redesignated), by striking "in the United States" and inserting "and the broader economy of the United States"; and

(G) by adding at the end the following:

"(8) that there is a need to preserve and protect the world's natural resources for sustained productivity and health and to take steps to mitigate adverse aspects of climate change which confront agriculture and other natural resource-based industries with new scientific, technological, and management challenges; and

"(9) that universities and public and private partners of universities need a dependable source of Federal funding not requiring State matching funds, as well as Federal and State matched funding, and other financing, in order to increase the impact of their own investments and those of their State governments and constituencies, in order to continue and expand their effort to advance agricultural development in cooperating countries, to translate development into economic growth and trade for the United States and cooperating countries, and to prepare future teachers, researchers, extension specialists, entrepreneurs, managers, and decisionmakers for the world economy."

(b) **ADDITIONAL DECLARATIONS OF POLICY.**—Section 296(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2220a(b)) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Accordingly, the Congress declares that, in order to prevent famine and establish freedom from hunger, the following components must be brought together in a coordinated program to increase world food and fiber production, agricultural trade, and responsible management of natural resources, including—

"(1) continued efforts by the international agricultural research centers and other international research entities to provide a global network, including United States universities, for international scientific collaboration on crops, livestock, forests, fisheries, farming resources, and food systems of worldwide importance;

"(2) contract research and the implementation of collaborative research support programs and other research collaboration led by United States universities, and involving research systems in other countries focused on crops, livestock, forests, fisheries, farming resources, and food systems, with benefits to the United States and partner countries;

"(3) transformation of the benefits of global agricultural research and development into increased benefits for United States agriculturally related industries through establishment of development and trade information and service centers, for rural as well as urban communities, through extension, cooperatively with, and supportive of, existing public and private trade and development related organizations;

"(4) facilitation of participation by universities and public and private partners of universities in programs of multilateral banks and agencies which receive United States funds by means which may include additional complementary funds restricted to the use of United States universities and public and private partners of universities;

"(5) expanding learning opportunities about global agriculture for students, teachers, community leaders, entrepreneurs, and the general public through international internships and exchanges, graduate

assistantships, faculty positions, and other means of education and extension through long-term recurring Federal funds matched by State funds; and

"(6) competitive grants through universities to United States agriculturalists and public and private partners of universities from other countries for research, institution and policy development, extension, training, and other programs for global agricultural development, trade, and responsible management of natural resources."

(c) **SENSE OF THE CONGRESS.**—Section 296(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2220a(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking "each component" and inserting "each of the program components described in paragraphs (1) through (6) of subsection (b)";

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by inserting "and public and private partners of universities" after "for the universities"; and

(B) by striking "and" at the end;

(3) in paragraph (3)—

(A) by inserting "and public and private partners of universities" after "such universities";

(B) in subparagraph (A), by striking "and" and inserting a semicolon;

(C) in subparagraph (B), by striking the comma at the end and inserting a semicolon;

(D) by striking the matter following subparagraph (B); and

(E) by adding at the end the following:

"(C) multilateral banks and agencies receiving United States funds;

"(D) development agencies of other countries; and

"(E) United States Government foreign assistance and economic cooperation programs; and"; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

"(4) generally engage the United States university community more extensively in the agricultural research, trade, and development initiatives undertaken outside the United States, with the objectives of strengthening its capacity to carry out research, teaching, and extension activities for solving problems in food production, processing, marketing, and consumption in agriculturally developing nations, and for transforming progress in global agricultural research and development into economic growth, trade, and trade benefits for United States communities and industries, and for the provident use of natural resources; and

"(5) ensure that all federally funded support to universities and public and private partners of universities relating to the goals of this title is periodically reviewed for its performance."

(d) **DEFINITION OF UNIVERSITIES.**—Section 296(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2220a(d)) is amended—

(1) by inserting after "sea-grant colleges;" the following: "Native American land-grant colleges as authorized under the Equity in Educational Land-Grant Status Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 301 note);"; and

(2) in paragraph (1), by striking "extension" and inserting "extension (including outreach)";

(e) **DEFINITION OF ADMINISTRATOR.**—Section 296(e) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2220a(e)) is amended by inserting "United States" before "Agency".

(f) **DEFINITION OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE PARTNERS OF UNIVERSITIES.**—Section 296 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2220a) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(f) As used in this title, the term 'public and private partners of universities' includes entities that have cooperative or contractual agreements with universities, which may include university beneficiary groups, other

education institutions, United States Government and State agencies, private voluntary organizations, nongovernmental organizations, firms operated for profit, non-profit organizations, multinational banks, and, as designated by the Administrator, any organization, institution, or agency incorporated in other countries."

(g) DEFINITION OF AGRICULTURE.—Section 296 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2220a) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(g) As used in this title, the term 'agriculture' includes the science and practice of activity related to food, feed, and fiber production, processing, marketing, distribution, utilization, and trade, and also includes family and consumer sciences, nutrition, food science and engineering, agricultural economics and other social sciences, forestry, wildlife, fisheries, aquaculture, floraculture, veterinary medicine, and other environmental and natural resources sciences."

(h) DEFINITION OF AGRICULTURISTS.—Section 296 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2220a) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(h) As used in this title, the term 'agriculturists' includes farmers, herders, and livestock producers, individuals who fish and others employed in cultivating and harvesting food resources from salt and fresh waters, individuals who cultivate trees and shrubs and harvest nontimber forest products, as well as the processors, managers, teachers, extension specialists, researchers, policymakers, and others who are engaged in the food, feed, and fiber system and its relationships to natural resources."

SEC. 3. GENERAL AUTHORITY.

(a) AUTHORIZATION OF ASSISTANCE.—Section 297(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2220b(a)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1), to read as follows:

"(1) to implement program components through United States universities as authorized by paragraphs (2) through (5) of this subsection;"

(2) in paragraph (3), to read as follows:

"(3) to provide long-term program support for United States university global agricultural and related environmental collaborative research and learning opportunities for students, teachers, extension specialists, researchers, and the general public;" and

(3) in paragraph (4)—

(A) by inserting "United States" before "universities";

(B) by inserting "agricultural" before "research centers"; and

(C) by striking "and the institutions of agriculturally developing nations" and inserting "multilateral banks, the institutions of agriculturally developing nations, and United States and foreign nongovernmental organizations supporting extension and other productivity-enhancing programs".

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—Section 297(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2220b(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking "universities" and inserting "United States universities with public and private partners of universities"; and

(B) in subparagraph (C)—

(i) by inserting ", environment," before "and related"; and

(ii) by striking "farmers and farm families" and inserting "agriculturalists";

(2) in paragraph (2), by inserting ", including resources of the private sector," after "Federal or State resources"; and

(3) in paragraph (3), by striking "and the United States Department of Agriculture" and all that follows and inserting ", the Department of Agriculture, State agricultural

agencies, the Department of Commerce, the Department of the Interior, the Environmental Protection Agency, the Office of the United States Trade Representative, the Food and Drug Administration, other appropriate Federal agencies, and appropriate nongovernmental and business organizations."

(c) FURTHER REQUIREMENTS.—Section 297(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2220b(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2), to read as follows:

"(2) focus primarily on the needs of agricultural producers, rural families, processors, traders, consumers, and conservators of natural resources;" and

(2) in paragraph (4), to read as follows:

"(4) be carried out within the developing countries and transition countries comprising newly emerging democracies and newly liberalized economies; and"

(d) SPECIAL PROGRAMS.—Section 297 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2220b) is amended—

(1) by redesignating subsection (d) as subsection (e); and

(2) by inserting after subsection (c) the following:

"(d) The Administrator shall establish and carry out special programs under this title as part of ongoing programs for child survival, democratization, development of free enterprise, environmental and natural resource management, and other related programs."

SEC. 4. BOARD FOR INTERNATIONAL FOOD AND AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Section 298(a) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2220c(a)) is amended—

(1) in the first sentence, by inserting after "authorized by this title" the following: "and to provide United States Government followup to the World Food Summit of November 1996"; and

(2) in the third sentence, by inserting at the end before the period the following: "on a case-by-case basis".

(b) GENERAL AREAS OF RESPONSIBILITY OF THE BOARD.—Section 298(b) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2220c(b)) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) The Board's general areas of responsibility shall include—

"(1) participating in the planning, development, and implementation of, initiating recommendations for, and monitoring, the activities described in section 297 of this title; and

"(2) providing advice and assistance to the Inter-Agency Working Group on Food Security (IWG) on carrying out commitments made in the United States Country Paper for the November 1996 World Food Summit and on the Plan of Action agreed to at the Summit."

(c) DUTIES OF THE BOARD.—Section 298(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2220c(c)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (2)—

(A) in subparagraph (A), by striking "increase food production" and all that follows and inserting the following: "improve agricultural production, trade, and natural resource management in developing countries, and with private organizations seeking to increase agricultural production and trade, natural resources management, and household food security in developing and transition countries;" and

(B) in subparagraph (B), by inserting before "sciences" the following: ", environmental, and related social";

(2) in paragraph (4), after "Administrator and universities" insert "and their partners";

(3) in paragraph (5), after "universities" insert "and public and private partners of universities";

(4) in paragraph (6), by striking "and" at the end;

(5) in paragraph (7), by striking "in the developing nations." and inserting "and natural resource issues in the developing nations, assuring efficiency in use of Federal resources, including in accordance with the Governmental Performance and Results Act of 1993 (Public Law 103-62; 107 Stat. 285), and the amendments made by that Act;" and

(6) by adding at the end the following:

"(8) providing advice to the United States Government on the development of a long-term action plan in support of the commitments made in the United States Country Paper and at the 1996 World Food Summit, including—

"(A) participating in the implementation of the action plan through meetings, workshops, and proper involvement; and

"(B) serving as an outreach vehicle to all nongovernmental sectors to achieve maximum involvement in action plan development and implementation;

"(9) developing information exchanges and consulting regularly with nongovernmental organizations, consumer groups, producers, agribusinesses and associations, agricultural cooperatives and commodity groups, State departments of agriculture, State agricultural research and extension agencies, and academic institutions;

"(10) investigating and resolving issues concerning implementation of this title as requested by universities; and

"(11) advising the Administrator on any and all issues as requested."

(d) SUBORDINATE UNITS.—Section 298(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2220c(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (1)—

(A) by striking "Research" and insert "Policy";

(B) by striking "administration" and inserting "design"; and

(C) by striking "section 297(a)(3) of this title" and inserting "section 297"; and

(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking "Joint Committee on Country Programs" and inserting "Joint Operations Committee"; and

(B) by striking "which shall assist" and all that follows and inserting "which shall assist in and advise on the mechanisms and processes for implementation of activities described in section 297."

SEC. 5. ANNUAL REPORT.

Section 300 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2220e) is amended by striking "April 1" and inserting "September 1".

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 4002.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Speaker, as an original cosponsor of H.R. 4002, the Famine Prevention and Freedom From Hunger Act of 2000, this Member wants to commend the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) for taking the lead on this important issue and introducing this legislation.

This measure updates the content of the agricultural development in Title XII of the Foreign Assistance Act and expands the role of America's land grant universities in these efforts. It has certainly been a pleasure to work with the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) on this effort.

Since the Foreign Assistance Act was enacted in 1961, the scope of U.S. food aid and agriculture assistance has expanded to include forestry, fisheries, family and consumer sciences, horticulture, agribusiness, agricultural processing, marketing, distribution, trade, food safety, nutrition, agricultural policy, environmental protection, food science and engineering, veterinary medicine, agriculture economics, other social sciences and other sciences and practices related to food, fiber, and feed.

Indeed, H.R. 4002 updates current law and the U.S. foreign assistance policy to reflect these changes. This legislation also ensures the transformation of developments abroad into benefits to the United States. University research and extension services, especially those associated with America's land grant colleges and universities, such as my alma mater, the University of Nebraska at Lincoln, along with their public and private partners, are supported to help transform agricultural progress abroad and into benefits to American communities and businesses through trade.

The pending legislation also expands the definition of eligible universities to include those institutions engaged in agricultural teaching, research and outreach, as well as extension. This Member believes that this is an effective and responsible approach which utilizes America's land grant university expertise to help famine prevention and alleviate the suffering from hunger and malnutrition abroad.

Madam Speaker, the Famine Prevention and Freedom From Hunger Act of 2000 for the first time creates a direct link between development abroad and the interests of rural communities here at home in the United States. That is why this legislation is so important.

Again, this Member commends the hard work and leadership on this issue by the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY). Clearly, H.R. 4002 deserves our strong support and this Member urges its adoption by his colleagues.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution. I want to thank

the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS), the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) for their hard work on this bill.

American farmers and agricultural institutions have long been the backbone of our foreign aid programs. The productivity of our farms have helped feed starving people around the world, and it was American research and technology developed in our land grant universities which fueled the green revolution that have helped a famine-prone India become self-sufficient in food.

Title XII of the Foreign Assistance Act, the Famine Prevention and Freedom From Hunger Act, was enacted in 1975 to increase world food production and identify solutions to food and nutrition problems in developing countries. However, the agricultural sectors have experienced growth and innovation since that law was enacted. H.R. 4002 addresses that problem by updating Title XII. These changes will result in better partnerships with the Agency for International Development, improved service to and assistance to poor countries, and greater trade and research benefits to the United States.

Specifically, this bill broadens the scope of agricultural assistance to reflect a more modern industry and expands the ability of participants to be eligible to participate in Title XII programs so that the valuable resources of our universities will be better utilized. This bill also encourages NGOs, that is to say nongovernmental organizations, to work with universities.

The legislation will also help our agriculture here in the United States. Title XII as currently written is designed to focus on agricultural research. H.R. 4002 is designed to enhance extension and other outreach activities of Title XII and help bring lessons learned through those agricultural programs in developing countries to farms here in the United States.

Finally, the bill helps American farmers and others of the agricultural community to increase their markets. Developing countries are the fastest growing markets for U.S. farm products and helping strengthen agriculture in developing countries will ultimately benefit U.S. farmers.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4002.

Madam Speaker, at this point I include in the RECORD the remarks of the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

Mrs. CLAYTON. Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of this Bill.

The Famine Prevention and Freedom from Hunger Act updates and expands current American policies as they relate to the elimination of global hunger.

This is vital legislation.

One very important aspect of this Bill is that it not only makes low-income, food deficit, foreign countries beneficiaries of this program, but it also makes rural and urban communities in the United States beneficiaries.

In this era of global economies, nations are becoming more interconnected and interdependent on one another.

It is critical, therefore, that the economies of developing nations are not left behind.

It is critical that these nations have stable and efficient economies.

It is vitally important, therefore, that we assist in integrating Africa into the global economy.

Boosting economic development and self-sufficiency for Africa are keys so achieving this end.

It is for these reasons and others that I was pleased to vote for the Africa Trade and Development Act of 2000.

Generally, we only hear about Africa when issues of hunger, warfare, or natural disaster emerge.

And, it is true, that hunger estimates in Africa range in upwards of 215 million chronically undernourished persons.

And, yes, we need to be concerned and provide as much assistance as possible.

However, there is an old cliché that says, "Give a man a fish, and he'll eat for a day. Teach a man to fish, and he'll eat forever!"

At no other time is this cliché more appropriate for African countries.

As a nation, we have the resources, the capacity, and the capability to "teach" the tools needed to ensure that their economies grow in strength and prosperity.

One of the tools we can teach involves agribusiness.

Agriculture is a primary sector in the economies of many African nations.

It is here that we can provide the tools necessary to technologically upgrade agricultural methods and processes.

I have introduced legislation, "Farmers for Africa Act of 2000," which provides these tools.

Farmers from the United States can help!

Our farmers have the tools and skills to help.

They have the ability to train African farmers to use and adopt state-of-the-art farming techniques and agribusiness skills.

In African countries like Mozambique, farmers need our help.

Ravaging flood waters left the lands devastated and thousands homeless and hungry.

Their farmers need help.

Our farmers can help—We ought to help.

Farmers in Zimbabwe need our help.

In that country, thousands of persons have received parcels of land to farm, but do not have the agricultural skills or training to be successful.

These farmers too need our help!

Our farmers can help.

We ought to help!

In Ghana, one of the more stable and productive countries in Africa, farmers there too need our help!

American farmers, through their efficiency in using the most modern and technologically sound agricultural and agribusiness techniques, can help African farmers.

This will not only help boost African crop yields and efficiency to that these nations can produce enough goods to feed themselves, but will also improve the competitiveness of African farmers in the world market.

In addition, through the establishment of partnerships between African and American farmers, we can also create new avenues for delivering goods and services to African countries in need.

The legislation I introduced is designed to establish a bilateral exchange program between Africa and America—one that benefits both continents.

The Bill before us, H.R. 4002 also redefines and updates the roles of American universities who can share information about new farming techniques with similar institutions in other countries.

I urge my colleagues to support this Bill.

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY). As I earlier indicated, this legislation is primarily the work of the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY). He is an outstanding newer Member of the House Committee on International Relations. I would say that I visited the campus of his alma mater this Saturday. They are proud of him, and with this legislation they are going to be even more indebted to him and appreciate his outstanding work.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 4002, the Famine Prevention and Freedom From Hunger Improvement Act of 2000. Before I talk about the legislation, I want to thank the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) for his leadership in this effort. I want to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS) for agreeing to be the lead Democrat on this bill and make this truly a bipartisan effort. I also appreciate and commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON), their staffs working so well together to ensure this bipartisan legislation could be considered today.

Finally, most importantly, I want to thank one of my constituents, Dr. Ed Price from Texas A&M University, who came to me with the framework for this legislation after working on behalf of the Board of International Food and Agriculture Development, and the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges. Without the help of Dr. Price and Texas A&M University, it is unlikely we would be considering this legislation today.

Briefly, Title XII of the Foreign Assistance Act, which is known as the Famine Prevention and Freedom From Hunger Act, was enacted in 1975 to increase world food production and to identify solutions to food and nutrition problems in developing countries. According to USAID, the goal to increase world food production has been met. That is the good news. Unfortunately, USAID believes that we have not been as successful at solving the other goal, food and nutrition problems, in developing countries, poorer countries.

Specifically, under H.R. 4002, we address that problem. We broaden the scope of agriculture to reflect a more modern industry, and we expand the ability of participants to be eligible to participate in Title XII programs so that the valuable resources of our universities will be better utilized. We also encourage nongovernmental organizations to work with universities; and these changes, we believe, will re-

sult in better partnerships with the Agency for International Development, improved service to the assisted countries, and greater trade and research benefits to us here in America.

This legislation will also help America's agriculture. As Title XII is currently written, we focus on ag research, but this modernization is designed to make extension a more implicit part of Title XII. This will help bring the lessons we learn overseas to our farms, which is important because developing nation markets are the fastest growing markets for U.S. farm products and anything we can do to help speed along their development will help our farmers.

Improved agriculture is necessary to meet the objectives of U.S. foreign assistance, such as improved human health, child survival, democratization, and free enterprise. Furthermore, improving foods for health, flavor and productivity require the assistance of international programs such as those sponsored under Title XII.

Madam Speaker, as the ag industry and our Nation's international development efforts have changed over the past 25 years, the time has come to update this important section to again emphasize the vital role U.S. universities and others can have in our country's international ag development efforts. With over 800 million people worldwide still suffering from inadequate food supplies and associated malnutrition, this update is needed.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Madam Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Texas, Mr. BRADY, for his leadership and hard work on this important legislation. I, myself, am a strong co-sponsor of this legislation.

H.R. 4002, the Famine Prevention and Freedom from Hunger Improvement Act is long overdue. This bill would update Title XII of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, a title which is vitally important to our universities.

Title XII was enacted in 1975 with the goal of increasing world food production and identifying solutions to food and nutrition problems in developing countries. Although the goal to increase world food production has been met, we all know that food and nutrition problems continue to plague much of the developing world.

Since Title XII was enacted, both our agriculture industry and international development efforts have significantly changed. This bill addresses those changes by updating the language under Title XII to reflect a more modern industry and expands the ability of participants to be eligible to participate in Title XII programs, so that the valuable resources of our universities will be better utilized.

Specifically, by expanding the number of eligible participants in Title XII programs, our universities will be able to increase their number of partnerships and play a more significant role in our international agriculture efforts.

Madam Speaker, I would also like to mention that improved agricultural production is essential if the U.S. is to continue fostering democratization around the world, which is one of many important objectives of U.S. foreign assistance. I believe H.R. 4002 addresses this issue.

H.R. 4002 is a win-win for everyone. Internationally, these changes will result in better partnerships with the Agency for International Development (AID), which will improve service to developing countries. Domestically, our country will reap greater trade and research benefits. Moreover, lessons learned through agricultural programs in developing countries will benefit our own agriculture industry.

Madam Speaker, I look forward to seeing this bill become law. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4002.

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Speaker. I rise in support of H.R. 4002, a bill introduced by Mr. BRADY, the gentleman from Texas, and co-sponsored by Mr. BEREUTER and Mr. DAVIS, all members of the Committee on International Relations. H.R. 4002 seeks to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, to authorize the President to establish programs in title XII of the act to encourage the formation of partnerships between land grant universities and non-governmental to promote sustainable agricultural development projects in the world's poorest and neediest countries.

Madam Speaker, although significant strides have been made to increase world food production in recent years, it is clear that more needs to be done to modernize agricultural practices in the developing world and to ensure that sound environmental and conservation practices are applied in rural areas of the world's poorest countries.

As is the case in other development fields, it is sound policy to encourage the formation of partnerships among the public, private, and academic sectors. In the agricultural arena this makes particularly good sense as American technology produces the world's greatest grain yields and can, with the provision of state-of-the-art technical assistance, be applied in developing countries. Moreover, as an added bonus, the lessons learned from these experiences and projects can be brought back home and applied to strengthen our own country's agricultural production.

I commend the sponsors of H.R. 4002 for their efforts to encourage the formation of partnerships between the land-grant university community and non-governmental organizations engaged in agricultural extension work in developing countries and urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Speaker, I urge support of the bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4002, 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.

DEFENSE AND SECURITY ASSISTANCE ACT OF 2000

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4919) to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Arms

Control Export Control Act to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions under those Acts, to authorize the transfer of naval vessels to certain foreign countries, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4919

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 "Defense and Security Assistance Act of 2000".

TITLE I—SECURITY ASSISTANCE

SEC. 101. ADDITIONS TO UNITED STATES WAR RESERVE STOCKPILES FOR ALLIES.

Section 514(b)(2) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2321h(b)(2)) is amended to read as follows:

"(2)(A) The value of such additions to stockpiles of defense articles in foreign countries shall not exceed \$50,000,000 for fiscal year 2001.

"(B) Of the amount specified in subparagraph (A) for fiscal year 2001, not more than \$50,000,000 may be made available for stockpiles in the Republic of Korea."

SEC. 102. TRANSFER OF CERTAIN OBSOLETE OR SURPLUS DEFENSE ARTICLES IN THE WAR RESERVE STOCKPILES FOR ALLIES TO ISRAEL.

(a) TRANSFERS TO ISRAEL.—

(1) AUTHORITY.—Notwithstanding section 514 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2321h), the President is authorized to transfer to Israel, in return for concessions to be negotiated by the Secretary of Defense, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, any or all of the items described in paragraph (2).

(2) ITEMS COVERED.—The items referred to in paragraph (1) are munitions, equipment, and material such as armor, artillery, automatic weapons ammunition, and missiles that—

(A) are obsolete or surplus items;

(B) are in the inventory of the Department of Defense;

(C) are intended for use as reserve stocks for Israel; and

(D) as of the date of enactment of this Act, are located in a stockpile in Israel.

(b) CONCESSIONS.—The value of concessions negotiated pursuant to subsection (a) shall be at least equal to the fair market value of the items transferred. The concessions may include cash compensation, services, waiver of charges otherwise payable by the United States, and other items of value.

(c) ADVANCE NOTIFICATION OF TRANSFER.—Not less than 30 days before making a transfer under the authority of this section, the President shall transmit to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, and the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives a notification of the proposed transfer. The notification shall identify the items to be transferred and the concessions to be received.

(d) EXPIRATION OF AUTHORITY.—No transfer may be made under the authority of this section 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 103. EXCESS DEFENSE ARTICLES FOR MONGOLIA.

(a) USES FOR WHICH FUNDS ARE AVAILABLE.—Notwithstanding section 516(e) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2321j(e)), during each of the fiscal years 2000 and 2001, funds available to the Department of Defense may be expended for crating, packing, handling, and transportation of excess defense articles transferred under the authority of section 516 of that Act to Mongolia.

(b) CONTENT OF CONGRESSIONAL NOTIFICATION.—Each notification required to be submitted under section 516(f) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2321j(f)) with respect to a proposed transfer of a defense article described in subsection (a) shall include an estimate of the amount of funds to be expended under subsection (a) with respect to that transfer.

SEC. 104. SENSE OF CONGRESS RELATING TO MILITARY EQUIPMENT FOR THE PHILIPPINES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—It is the sense of Congress that the United States Government should work with the Government of the Republic of the Philippines to enable that Government to procure military equipment that can be used to upgrade the capabilities and to improve the quality of life of the armed forces of the Philippines.

(b) MILITARY EQUIPMENT.—Military equipment described in subsection (a) should include—

(1) naval vessels, including amphibious landing crafts, for patrol, search-and-rescue, and transport;

(2) F-5 aircraft and other aircraft that can assist with reconnaissance, search-and-rescue, and resupply;

(3) attack, transport, and search-and-rescue helicopters; and

(4) vehicles and other personnel equipment.

SEC. 105. ANNUAL MILITARY ASSISTANCE REPORT.

Section 655(b)(3) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2415(b)(3)) is amended by inserting before the period at the end the following: ", including those defense articles that were exported".

SEC. 106. REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO COUNTRY EXEMPTIONS FOR LICENSING OF DEFENSE ITEMS FOR EXPORT TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

(a) REQUIREMENTS OF EXEMPTION.—Section 38 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2778) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(j) REQUIREMENTS RELATING TO COUNTRY EXEMPTIONS FOR LICENSING OF DEFENSE ITEMS FOR EXPORT TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES.—

"(1) REQUIREMENT FOR BILATERAL AGREEMENT.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—The President may utilize the regulatory or other authority pursuant to this Act to exempt a foreign country from the licensing requirements of this Act with respect to exports of defense items only if the United States Government has concluded an agreement described in paragraph (2) with the foreign country that is legally-binding as a matter of domestic and international law on both the United States and that country.

"(B) EXCEPTION.—The requirement to conclude a bilateral agreement in accordance with subparagraph (A) shall not apply with respect to an exemption for Canada from the licensing requirements of this Act for the export of defense items.

"(2) REQUIREMENTS OF BILATERAL AGREEMENT.—A bilateral agreement referred to paragraph (1)—

"(A) shall, at a minimum, require the foreign country, as necessary, to revise its policies and practices, and promulgate or enact necessary modifications to its laws and regulations to establish an export control regime that is at least comparable to United States law, regulation, and policy regarding—

"(i) handling of all United States-origin defense items exported to the foreign country, including prior written United States Government approval for any reexports to third countries;

"(ii) end-use and retransfer control commitments, including securing binding end-use and retransfer control commitments from all end-users, including such docu-

mentation as is needed in order to ensure compliance and enforcement with respect to such United States-origin defense items;

"(iii) establishment of a procedure comparable to a 'watchlist' (if such a watchlist does not exist) and full cooperation with United States Government law enforcement and intelligence agencies to allow for sharing of export and import documentation and background information on foreign businesses and individuals employed by or otherwise connected to those businesses; and

"(iv) establishment of a list of controlled defense items to ensure coverage of those items to be exported under the exemption; and

"(B) should, at a minimum, require the foreign country, as necessary, to revise its policies and practices, and promulgate or enact necessary modifications to its laws and regulations to establish an export control regime that is at least comparable to United States law, regulation, and policy regarding—

"(i) controls on the export of tangible or intangible technology, including via fax, phone, and electronic media;

"(ii) appropriate controls on unclassified information exported to foreign nationals;

"(iii) controls on arms trafficking and brokering; and

"(iv) violations and penalties of export control laws.

"(3) ADVANCE NOTIFICATION.—Not less than 30 days before authorizing an exemption for a foreign country from the licensing requirements of this Act for the export of defense items, the President shall transmit to the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a notification that—

"(A) the United States has entered into a bilateral agreement with that foreign country satisfying all requirements set forth in paragraph (2);

"(B) the foreign country has promulgated or enacted all necessary modifications to its laws and regulations to comply with its obligations under the bilateral agreement with the United States; and

"(C) confirms that the appropriate congressional committees will continue to receive notifications pursuant to the authorities, procedures, and practices of section 36 of this Act for defense exports to a foreign country to which that section would apply and without regard to any form of defense export licensing exemption otherwise available for that country.

"(4) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

"(A) DEFENSE ITEM.—The term 'defense item' means defense articles, defense services, and related technical data.

"(B) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES.—The term 'appropriate congressional committees' means—

"(i) the Committee on International Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives; and

"(ii) the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate."

(b) NOTIFICATION OF EXEMPTION.—Section 38(f) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2778(f)) is amended—

(1) by inserting "(1)" after "(f)"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(2) The President may not authorize an exemption for a foreign country from the licensing requirements of this Act for the export of defense items under subsection (j) or any other provision of this Act until 45 days after the date on which the President has transmitted to the Committee on International Relations of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a notification that includes—

“(A) a description of the scope of the exemption, including a detailed summary of the defense articles, defense services, and related technical data proposed to be exported under the exemption; and

“(B) a determination by the Attorney General that the bilateral agreement requires sufficient documentation relating to the export of United States defense articles, defense services, and related technical data under an exemption which will be compiled and maintained in order to facilitate law enforcement efforts to detect, prevent, and prosecute criminal violations of any provision of this Act, including the efforts on the part of countries and factions engaged in international terrorism to illicitly acquire sophisticated United States weaponry.”.

(c) NOTIFICATION RELATING TO EXPORT OF COMMERCIAL COMMUNICATIONS SATELLITE.—Section 36(c)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2776(c)(1)) is amended in the first sentence by inserting at the end before the period the following: “, except that a certification shall not be required in the case of an application for a license for export of a commercial communications satellite designated on the United States Munitions List for launch from, and by nationals of, the United States, or the territory of a member country of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), the Russian Federation, Ukraine, Australia, Japan, or New Zealand”.

SEC. 107. REPORT ON GOVERNMENT-TO-GOVERNMENT ARMS SALES END-USE MONITORING PROGRAM.

Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall prepare and transmit to the Committee on International Relations and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a report that contains a summary of the status of the efforts of the Defense Security Cooperation Agency to implement the End-Use Monitoring Enhancement Plan relating to government-to-government transfers of defense articles, defense services, and related technologies.

SEC. 108. WAIVER OF CERTAIN COSTS.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the President may waive the requirement to impose an appropriate charge for a proportionate amount of any nonrecurring costs of research, development, and production under section 21(e)(1)(B) of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2761(e)(1)(B)) for the November 1999 sale of 5 UH-60L helicopters to the Republic of Colombia in support of counternarcotics activities.

TITLE II—TRANSFERS OF NAVAL VESSELS
SEC. 201. AUTHORITY TO TRANSFER NAVAL VESSELS TO CERTAIN FOREIGN COUNTRIES.

(a) BRAZIL.—The President is authorized to transfer to the Government of Brazil the “THOMASTON” class dock landing ships ALAMO (LSD 33) and HERMITAGE (LSD 34) and the “GARCIA” class frigates BRADLEY (FF 1041), DAVIDSON (FF 1045), SAMPLE (FF 1048), and ALBERT DAVID (FF 1050). Such transfers shall be on a grant basis under section 516 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2321j).

(b) CHILE.—The President is authorized to transfer to the Government of the Chile the “OLIVER HAZARD PERRY” class guided missile frigates WADSWORTH (FFG 9) and ESTOCIN (FFG 15). Such transfers shall be on a combined lease-sale basis under sections 61 and 21 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2796, 2761).

(c) GREECE.—The President is authorized to transfer to the Government of Greece the “KNOX” class frigates VREELAND (FF 1068) and TRIPPE (FF 1075). Such transfers shall be on a grant basis under section 516 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2321j).

(d) TURKEY.—The President is authorized to transfer to the Government of Turkey the “OLIVER HAZARD PERRY” class guided missile frigates JOHN A MOORE (FFG 19) and FLATLEY (FFG 21). Such transfers shall be on a combined lease-sale basis under sections 61 and 21 of the Arms Export Control Act (22 U.S.C. 2796, 2761).

SEC. 202. INAPPLICABILITY OF AGGREGATE ANNUAL LIMITATION ON VALUE OF TRANSFERRED EXCESS DEFENSE ARTICLES.

In the case of the transfer of a naval vessel authorized under section 201 of this Act to be transferred on a grant basis under section 516 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2321j), the value of the vessel transferred shall not be included for purposes of subsection (g) of that section in the aggregate value of excess defense articles transferred to countries under that section in any fiscal year.

SEC. 203. COSTS OF TRANSFERS.

Any expense incurred by the United States in connection with a transfer authorized by this title shall be charged to the recipient.

SEC. 204. CONDITIONS RELATING TO COMBINED LEASE-SALE TRANSFERS.

A transfer of a vessel on a combined lease-sale basis authorized by section 201 shall be made in accordance with the following requirements:

(1) The President may initially transfer the vessel by lease, with lease payments suspended for the term of the lease, if the country entering into the lease for the vessel simultaneously enters into a foreign military sales agreement for the transfer of title to the vessel.

(2) The President may not deliver to the purchasing country title to the vessel until the purchase price of the vessel under such a foreign military sales agreement is paid in full.

(3) Upon payment of the purchase price in full under such a sales agreement and delivery of title to the recipient country, the President shall terminate the lease.

(4) If the purchasing country fails to make full payment of the purchase price in accordance with the sales agreement—

(A) the sales agreement shall be immediately terminated;

(B) the suspension of lease payments under the lease shall be vacated; and

(C) the United States shall be entitled to retain all funds received on or before the date of the termination under the sales agreement, up to the amount of lease payments due and payable under the lease and all other costs required by the lease to be paid to that date.

(5) If a sales agreement is terminated pursuant to paragraph (4), the United States shall not be required to pay any interest to the recipient country on any amount paid to the United States by the recipient country under the sales agreement and not retained by the United States under the lease.

SEC. 205. FUNDING OF CERTAIN COSTS OF TRANSFERS.

There is authorized to be appropriated to the Defense Vessels Transfer Program Account such funds as may be necessary to cover the costs (as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 661a)) of the lease-sale transfers authorized by section 201. Funds appropriated pursuant to the authorization of appropriations under preceding sentence for the purpose described in such sentence may not be available for any other purpose.

SEC. 206. REPAIR AND REFURBISHMENT IN UNITED STATES SHIPYARDS.

To the maximum extent practicable, the President shall require, as a condition of the transfer of a vessel under section 201, that

the country to which the vessel is transferred have such repair or refurbishment of the vessel as is needed, before the vessel joins the naval forces of that country, performed at a shipyard located in the United States, including a United States Navy shipyard.

SEC. 207. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING TRANSFER OF NAVAL VESSELS ON A GRANT BASIS.

It is the sense of Congress that naval vessels authorized under section 201 of this Act to be transferred to foreign countries on a grant basis under section 516 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2321j) should be so transferred only if the United States receives appropriate benefits from such countries for transferring the vessel on a grant basis.

SEC. 208. EXPIRATION OF AUTHORITY.

The authority granted by section 201 of this Act shall expire 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 4919.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. BEREUTER. Madam Speaker, this Member rises in support of H.R. 4919, the Defense and Security Assistance Act of 2000.

This legislation modifies authorities with respect to the provision of security assistance under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Arms Export Control Act. It is authored by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on International Relations, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), who was unavoidably detained and could not be here today for this legislation.

Most of the provisions have been requested by the administration. Specifically, these provisions address the transfer of excess defense articles, notification requirements for arms sales and authorities to provide for the stockpiling of defense articles in foreign countries. The bill also includes an important bipartisan provision to address the administration's initiative regarding exemptions for defense export licenses to foreign countries.

This Member wishes to thank the ranking member of the Committee on International Relations, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDESON), for his cooperation on these provisions, as well as the NGO community for their hard work.

In addition, this bill authorizes the transfer of two Naval vessels to Chile and provides authority to the President to convert existing leases for 10 ships which have already been transferred to Brazil, Greece, and Turkey.

This Member is pleased to note that this body has successfully enacted into law, over the past 4 years, each of our bills addressing security assistance matters. It is the hope of this Member that the legislative branch is able to continue this record with approval of this measure, H.R. 4919.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 4919, in order to assist the committee. This bill is an annual authorization for certain activities related to the U.S. assistance for national defense of our friends and allies overseas. The bill authorizes the President to transfer obsolete U.S. ships to friendly countries either through grants or sale/lease arrangements to support their legitimate defense needs. These ships have reached or exceeded their service life and would cost considerable amount for the U.S. to refurbish them or scrap them.

□ 1445

Transferring most of these ships will serve our foreign policy interests. The bill authorized transfer of obsolete U.S. defense equipment and other articles to the stockpiles of South Korea and Israel. These transfers directly support the U.S. plans for the defense of Korea as well as increasing the capacity and readiness of the South Korean and Israeli forces to defend themselves.

Madam Speaker, I believe the bill was quite well summarized by the gentleman from Nebraska. I should point out that I will personally have some concerns with title II of the bill, in particular subsection D of section 201 of the act, which as I may have mentioned is part of title II. But to facilitate the work of this House and of the committee, I stand in support of H.R. 4919.

Madam Speaker, seeing no requests for time, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, in closing I want to recognize the fact this legislation includes two important priorities of this Member as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific. The first is section 103 which relates to excess defense articles to be provided to Mongolia.

Additionally, there is a sense of the Congress expressed in section 104 related to our work with the Republic of the Philippines with respect to the procurement of military equipment, and I am pleased to see those provisions included.

Madam Speaker, I urge support of the resolution.

Mr. GILMAN. Madam Speaker, this bill modifies authorities with respect to the provision of security assistance under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Arms Export Control Act. Most of the provisions have been requested by the administration. Specifically, these provisions address the transfer of excess defense articles, notification requirements for arms sales and authorities to provide for the stockpiling of defense articles in foreign countries. The bill also includes an important bipartisan provision to address the administration's initiative regarding exemptions for defense export licensing to foreign countries. I want to thank the ranking Democrat member for his cooperation on this provision as well as the NGO community for their hard work.

The provision in question here goes to the heart of our jurisdiction and role as an authorizing committee. For the past year and a half the administration fought internally to resolve the question of whether we should provide exemptions from licensing for defense exports to foreign countries. The State Department fought the exemption all the way up to the President. They opposed it at the deputies level. They opposed it at the principals level. They opposed it until the President sided with the Department of Defense and overruled them. Now the State Department is putting on its game face and saying the administration is all one big happy family. That's their story and they are sticking to it.

Now it is time for the Congress to have its say. As most of you know, I have not been an enthusiastic supporter of new International Traffic in Arm Regulations [ITAR] exemptions. I believe that the Arms Export Control Act [AECA] provides the appropriate structure under which the United States should continue to advance our foreign policy, national security and non-proliferation interests. Moreover, it is absolutely clear that State Department regulations and practice in implementing U.S. munitions laws, including the AECA, have long provided for individual, case-by-case licenses for defense exports.

Further, it is my view that any decision to extend exemptions should only be made when the recipient countries have in place an export control system comparable to that in the United States. This means that such exemptions shall only be provided if a country has provided assurances in a legally binding fashion that details how such a country will enact export control procedures that sufficiently conform to those of the United States and has drafted, promulgated and enacted necessary modifications to its laws and regulations.

I have applied this rationale in fashioning section 108 of this bill. We require a legally binding bilateral agreement. We list the overall requirements of what should be in the bilateral agreement but require only that certain of those requirements be certified. We then require a separate notification detailing the scope of the proposed exemption. This is a reasonable compromise on this issue. It allows the administration to proceed with exemptions but requires that it is done in a fashion that does not undercut our current practices and policies and preserves the rationale and logic of the AECA. Now the Department of Defense and some in the defense industry would tell you that real problems would emerge if this language is agreed to. They argue that no

country will ever agree to modify their export control laws and practices to protect U.S. defense exports as we do in the United States.

That is not exactly correct. Let me explain. Everyone should understand that section 108 requires nothing more than what the Pentagon has already said it is willing to do. They agree there should be bilateral agreement. They agree it should be legally binding. They agree there should be end-use and retransfer assurances. They agree that there should be harmonization of export control lists and penalties for violations. They agree that this initiative should only be applied to countries that adopt and demonstrate export controls and technology security systems that are comparable in scope and effectiveness to those of the United States.

What they don't agree with is that we, the Congress, should codify the requirements. I disagree with that position and believe that this provision protects what is embodied in the AECA. The administration argues that the scope of this exemption should not be troubling. They argue that it applies only to unclassified exports. Let's consider that for a moment. Let's be sure that everyone understands this point.

Last year the Office of Defense Trade Controls processed over 45,000 licenses; 45,058 to be exact. Guess how many of those involved classified exports. 258. That's right. That means that 99.995 percent of the license amounting to over \$25 billion were for unclassified exports.

Now let's consider what kind of weapons systems are deemed unclassified. One example is an armored personnel carrier [APC]. This is a good example because a couple of years ago Canada transferred United States-provided APCs to Iran. Guess how we provided them to Canada. Under an exemption. That's why, in part, the State Department yanked their exemption and Canada is still trying to get it back. Another example. F-16s. Unclassified except for the technology incorporated in the nose cone. And my personal favorite. Super cobra attack helicopters. Under the exemption that administration could transfer any of these weapons systems to a foreign country.

That is why we need countries to agree to control our defense exports like we do. We don't want defense items provided under an exemption to wind up in the hands of our enemies. I would also like to note that the Justice Department has raised its concerns about the effect of the exemption on its efforts to ensure that it will not impede the ability of the law enforcement community to detect, prevent and prosecute criminal violations of the AECA. Further they have concerns that the exemption may facilitate efforts on the part of countries and factions engaged in international terrorism to illicitly acquire sophisticated U.S. weaponry.

Accordingly, this provision requires a determination by the Attorney General that any bilateral agreement negotiated between the United States and a foreign country include sufficient documentation on defense items provided under the exemption so that our law enforcement agencies can ensure compliance and enforcement with our laws. In addition this bill authorizes the transfer of two naval vessels to Chile and provides authority to the President to convert existing leases for 10 ships which have already been transferred to Brazil, Greece, and Turkey. I am pleased to

note that we have successfully enacted into law over the past 4 years each of our bills addressing security assistance matters. I hope we are able to continue our record with this measure.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4919.

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.

SUPPORTING THE GOALS AND IDEAS OF NATIONAL ALCOHOL AND DRUG RECOVERY MONTH

Mr. HORN. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 371) supporting the goals and ideas of National Alcohol and Drug Recovery Month.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 371

Whereas 26 million Americans currently suffer the ravages of drug or alcohol addiction;

Whereas 85 percent of all crimes are tied to drug or alcohol addiction;

Whereas American taxpayers incurred more than \$150 billion in drug-related criminal and medical costs in 1997 alone—more than they spent on education, transportation, agriculture, energy, space, and foreign aid combined;

Whereas every dollar invested in drug and alcohol treatment yields seven dollars in savings in health care costs, criminal justice costs, and lost productivity costs from job absenteeism, injuries, and subpar work performance;

Whereas treatment for addiction is as effective as treatments for other chronic medical conditions, such as diabetes and high blood pressure;

Whereas adolescents who undergo addiction treatment report less use of marijuana, less heavy drinking, and less criminal involvement;

Whereas other benefits of adolescent addiction treatment include better psychological adjustment and improved school performance after treatment;

Whereas a number of organizations and individuals dedicated to fighting addiction and promoting treatment and recovery will recognize September 2000 as National Alcohol and Drug Addiction Recovery Month;

Whereas National Alcohol and Drug Addiction Recovery Month celebrates the tremendous strides taken by individuals who have undergone successful treatment and recognizes those in the treatment field who have dedicated their lives to helping people recover from addiction; and

Whereas the 2000 national campaign focuses on supporting adolescents in addiction treatment and recovery, embraces the theme of "Recovering Our Future: One Youth at a Time", and seeks to increase awareness about alcohol and drug addiction and to promote treatment and recovery for adolescents and adults: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress sup-

ports the goals and ideas of National Alcohol and Drug Recovery Month.

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. Madam 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. 371.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HORN. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. RAMSTAD).

Mr. RAMSTAD. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) for yielding me this time, and for his strong effective leadership in this area.

Madam Speaker, I stand before this body today as a personal testament to the fact that chemical dependency treatment works. As a grateful recovering alcoholic of 19 years, I know firsthand the value of treatment and the blessings of recovery. So with deep humility and much gratitude, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution commemorating National Alcohol and Drug Addiction Recovery Month.

For a number of years, several organizations and people dedicated to addiction treatment and recovery have recognized September as National Alcohol and Drug Addiction Recovery Month. This September, special attention will focus on adolescents, young people dealing with addiction, and the theme will be "Recovering Our Future: One Youth at a Time."

As a Nation, Madam Speaker, we must recover our future by addressing addiction. We must recover our youth one young person at a time.

The tragic reality is that today in America 26 million people are addicted to drugs and/or alcohol. Twenty-six million Americans suffer the ravages of addiction. This disease, Madam Speaker, is afflicting people of all ages. Among youth ages 12 to 17, an estimated 1.1 million; ages 18 to 20, 1.1 million young people are dependent on illicit drugs. Another 1 million young people ages 12 to 17, are addicted to alcohol.

Young people ages 16 and 17 have the second highest rate of drug use in the country today, second only to people ages 18 to 20. And by the time these young people reach 17 years of age, over one-half of all young people know a drug dealer. Madam Speaker, over one-half of all people by the time they reach 17 know some drug dealer in America.

In 1999, more than half of our Nation's 12th graders use drugs and more than one-quarter used a drug other

than marijuana. In other words, a so-called hard drug. And although alcohol consumption is illegal in this country for those under 21, some 10.5 million juveniles between the ages of 12 and 20 are consumers of alcohol.

Madam Speaker, addiction is truly a crisis of epidemic proportions in America. Addiction is the number one health and crime problem facing our country. Alcohol and drug addiction, in economic terms alone, cost the American people last year \$246 billion. That is billion with a "B." American taxpayers paid over \$150 billion for drug-related criminal and medical costs alone; more than they spent on education, transportation, agriculture, energy, space, and foreign aid combined.

But, Madam Speaker, it does not have to be this way. The future of our children and the future of millions of other Americans can be saved, can be recovered. Like other diseases, addiction can be treated and all the empirical data done show that treatment for addiction works.

In 1956, the American Medical Association told the American people that chemical addiction is a disease and a fatal disease if not properly treated. In fact, leading physicians at that time found that chemical addiction conforms to the expectations for chronic illness and that relapse rates after treatment for addiction compare favorably with those for three other chronic diseases: adult on-set diabetes, hypertension, and adult asthma. The relapse rates for people treated for chemical addiction is essentially the same as those three diseases.

It is well documented that every dollar spent for treatment saves \$7 in health care costs, criminal justice costs and lost productivity from job absenteeism, injuries and sub-par work performance.

A number of studies have shown that health care costs alone are 100 percent higher for untreated alcoholics and addicts than for people like me, recovering people who have received treatment.

Madam Speaker, the goal of this resolution is to increase awareness about alcohol and drug addiction and promote treatment and recovery for more people, more people who are suffering the ravages of alcohol and drug addiction. Increasing awareness about the ravages of addiction is absolutely critical. How can it be that among 12th graders in America, less than two-thirds find anything wrong with smoking marijuana?

Equally alarming, only 47 percent of adolescents between 12 and 17 believe that having five or more drinks once or twice a week is any risk at all. Only two-thirds believe that having four or five drinks every day is a problem. We must increase awareness as well as access to treatment for young people.

Despite the benefits of treatment, a significant gap in this country exists between the number of adolescents who need chemical dependency treatment

and those who actually receive it. According to a study done in my home State of Minnesota, a State that has led the Nation in the treatment and prevention of addiction, only one-fourth of youths ages 14 to 17 who need treatment actually are able to access treatment.

Madam Speaker, let me close by saying that commemorating recovery month gives all of us an opportunity to recognize the tremendous strides taken by those who have undergone treatment and the professionals in the treatment field who have dedicated their lives to helping others. By celebrating recovery month, we celebrate the lives of the millions of people and their families in recovery today. I urge all of my colleagues to support this important resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 371.

Madam Speaker, I again thank the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) for yielding me this time and for his strong, effective leadership in combating addiction and in recognizing and promoting treatment and prevention of addiction.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of House Concurrent Resolution 371, which expresses the support of the goals and the ideas of the National Alcohol and Drug Recovery Month. As may be mentioned, September is National Alcohol and Drug Addiction Recovery Month, and it is certainly a powerful message to hear the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. RAMSTAD) speak of his own recovery from addiction. I think we should join in commending him for the courage that he displays in sharing his message of recovery from addiction. It should give encouragement to all who fight to overcome addiction in a similar manner.

This powerful message which we hope to send today, that substance abuse treatment is effective and that recovery reclaims lives, is a very important message to send to the American people. Providing effective treatment to those who need it is critical to breaking the cycle of addiction, violence, despair and to helping addicted individuals become productive members of society.

This is an opportunity for all of us to recognize the tremendous strides taken by all individuals who have undergone successful treatment and to salute those who have worked with those individuals so tirelessly and have dedicated their lives to helping people with problems of addiction.

This month celebrates the work of policymakers, Federal, State, and local government entities, business leaders, substance abuse providers and the public. This is an opportunity for all of us to recommit ourselves to the task of substance abuse treatment and recovery.

Substance abuse does cost American businesses and industries millions of

dollars every year, and it has a profound negative effect in the workplace. Contrary to popular opinion, most illegal substance abusers work on the job every day. In fact the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration has found that nearly 73 percent of all illegal drug users in this country are employed. Lost productivity, high employee turnover, low employee morale, mistakes and accidents, increased Workers' Compensation insurance and health insurance premiums are all the results of untreated substance abuse problems in the workplace.

September, designated as recovery month, also highlights the benefits to be gained from corporate and small business workplace substance abuse referral programs. H. Con. Res 371 makes us all aware that recovery from substance abuse is possible and that supporting treatment for addicted individuals increases productivity, improves morale, is important to success in business, and most importantly, preserves and protects the quality of life for the addicted individual and their families.

□ 1500

I join with the author of this bill and with the gentleman from California (Chairman HORN) in support of this resolution to salute those who work with the addicted in this country.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) who has been immensely helpful in this and all the other resolutions that come out of the Subcommittee of Government Management, Information and Technology.

When one looks at the cost here of \$150 billion a year in drug-related criminal and medical costs in 1997 alone, and that is more than we spent on education, transportation, agriculture, energy, space, and foreign aid combined; and when one thinks that we could fill a stadium on a Saturday afternoon for a football team, that number of people would be wiped out by drunk drivers.

This treatment is possible. We see the wonderful work that Alcoholics Anonymous does and the other treatment programs. It is so important. We need to discuss it in people's homes. We need to discuss it in the villages, the towns, the cities, because this is the type of thing that needs the human touch, where people say we care about you and something should be done to help you.

Generally that works, but often they fall off the wagon, as the saying goes, and then thousands of people are injured, hurt, die as a result of these victims.

The saddest, of course, is when one sees young people at their high school prom or something and then a fellow student rams into them and they never

have a chance to graduate and they never have a chance to go and provide the opportunities for themselves in this world.

So let me urge my colleagues to support this important resolution. The resolution of H. Con. Res. 371 by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. RAMSTAD) hopefully will get a few people to be helpful in this area and maybe save many people.

Madam Speaker, I urge the adoption of this resolution.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 371.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL HISTORICAL PUBLICATIONS AND RECORDS COMMISSION AUTHORIZATION

Mr. HORN. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4110) to amend title 44, United States Code, to authorize appropriations for the National Historical Publications and Records Commission for fiscal years 2002 through 2005, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4110

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

SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE NATIONAL HISTORICAL PUBLICATIONS AND RECORDS COMMISSION.

Section 2504(f)(1) of title 44, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (J), by striking "and";

(2) in subparagraph (K), by striking the period and inserting a semicolon; and

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

“(L) \$10,000,000 for fiscal year 2002;

“(M) \$10,000,000 for fiscal year 2003;

“(N) \$10,000,000 for fiscal year 2004; and

“(O) \$10,000,000 for fiscal year 2005.”.

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. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 4110.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, H.R. 4110 would allow the National Historical Publications and Records Commission to continue its valuable work in helping to preserve the records of our Nation's history.

Since its formation in 1934, the commission, affiliated with the National Archives and Records Administration, has complemented National Archives' work in protecting vital American documents.

Unlike the National Archives, which maintains Federal records, the commission assists non-Federal historical societies, nonprofit organizations, universities, and State and local governments.

In 1964, the commission began funding independent archival projects through its grants program, which provide an invaluable service to the Nation through the maintenance of its historical records. These projects include family papers, manuscripts, and other electronic records. The commission has been instrumental in preserving the historical works of such great American leaders as George Washington, John Adams, Henry Clay, and Martin Luther King, Jr.

Last November, the commission awarded grants for 64 projects, totaling \$3 million. In addition, it proposed funding a 3-year, \$1.8 million initiative to help raise the level of archival expertise in the rapidly changing area of electronic record keeping.

The National Historical Publications and Records Commission is the only national grant-making organization in the Nation whose sole focus is the preservation and publication of America's documentary history. The 15-member commission supports the professional development of archivists, documentary editors, and record keepers through fellowships, institutes, conferences, workshops, and other programs.

In addition, the commission has undertaken a number of projects that focus on the records of underdocumented groups, such as Native Americans, African Americans, Asian Americans, Pacific Islanders, and other ethnic and interest groups, such as the large Hispanic population in the United States, and various other social and political movements.

H.R. 4110 would reauthorize the appropriation of \$10 million, the same amount authorized for fiscal year 2001, for the National Historical Publications and Records Commission for fiscal years 2002 through 2005.

On April 4, 2000, the Subcommittee on Government Management, Information and Technology, on which the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER) and I serve, held a legislative hearing on H.R. 4110. On April 5, 2000, the subcommittee marked up the bill by a voice vote and referred it to the full Committee on Government Reform. On May 18, 2000, the Committee on Gov-

ernment Reform, by voice vote, ordered the bill favorably reported to the House for its consideration.

I urge my colleagues to support this important measure.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4110, the legislation to reauthorize the National Historical Publications and Records Commission. This commission is the grant-making arm of the National Archives. It is charged with a very important role of preserving non-Federal records.

Every year grants are made to State and local governments, universities, libraries, historical societies, and other nonprofit institutions for the purpose of preserving important historical documents for years to come.

The Congress created this commission in the 1930s because it understood and recognized the importance of preserving American history, not only within the Beltway, but all across this United States. Proper and accurate historical documentation is essential to recording the history of our great democracy.

This commission has had an important job, and I am pleased to join with the gentleman from California (Chairman HORN) in cosponsoring this legislation which will reauthorize this appropriation through the year 2005.

The papers, the manuscripts and other artifacts preserved by grants from this commission define who we are as a people and as a Nation.

I want to commend Governor John Carlin, our National Archivist, for his leadership in this area. The former Governor of Kansas has done an outstanding job leading at the National Archives, and this grant program is one of the most effective tools that we have to continue the fine tradition of those who have worked diligently at the National Archives over our many years of history to be sure that we, as a Nation, preserve those things that are important to our heritage.

It is a pleasure for me to join with the gentleman from California (Chairman HORN), and I urge the House to adopt H.R. 4110.

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

Mr. HORN. Madam Speaker, I urge adoption of this measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4110, 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.

DEATH IN CUSTODY REPORTING ACT OF 2000

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1800) to amend the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 to ensure that certain information regarding prisoners is reported to the Attorney General, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1800

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 "Death in Custody Reporting Act of 2000".

SEC. 2. REPORTING OF INFORMATION.

Section 20104(a) of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994 (42 U.S.C. 13704(a)) is amended—

- (1) in paragraph (1)—
 - (A) by inserting "(A)" after "(1)"; and
 - (B) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively;
- (2) in paragraph (2), by striking "(2)" and inserting "(B)";
- (3) in paragraph (3)—
 - (A) by striking "(3)" and inserting "(C)";
 - (B) by redesignating subparagraphs (A) and (B) as clauses (i) and (ii), respectively; and
 - (C) by striking the period and inserting "; and"; and
- (4) by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(2) such State has provided assurances that it will follow guidelines established by the Attorney General in reporting, on a quarterly basis, information regarding the death of any person who is in the process of arrest, is en route to be incarcerated, or is incarcerated at a municipal or county jail, State prison, or other local or State correctional facility (including any juvenile facility) that, at a minimum, includes—

- "(A) the name, gender, race, ethnicity, and age of the deceased;
- "(B) the date, time, and location of death; and
- "(C) a brief description of the circumstances surrounding the death."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Madam 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. 1800.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this important legislation, and I would like to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) for his work on this bill. We have both been advocating this proposal for many years, and I am pleased that today we are one step

closer to bringing a new level of accountability to our Nation's correctional institutions, our prisons, in those instances in which individuals pass away while they are in custody.

H.R. 1800 is called the Death in Custody Reporting Act of 2000. It ensures that States report the deaths of individuals who die in custody, whether it be State or local. The bill requires each State that receives Truth in Sentencing funding to report on a quarterly basis the number of and circumstances surrounding deaths that occur during arrest and incarceration.

An estimated 1,000 men and women die questionable deaths each year while in police custody or in jail. An investigative article in the Asbury Park Press of New Jersey reported that a number of deaths which occur in State and local jails are listed as suicides but that such conclusions are often tainted by inadequate record keeping, investigative incompetence, and physical evidence that suggest otherwise. In addition, the study found that many of the individuals listed as suicides have been arrested for relatively minor offenses, reducing the likelihood that they would take their own lives.

One teenage boy who was found dead by hanging in an Arkansas jail had been arrested for a failure to pay a fine for underage drinking. Another individual in an Arkansas jail was found suffocated by toilet paper stuffed down his throat. No records exist as to why he was in custody, according to the Asbury Park Press story.

In any other atmosphere, unnatural deaths under questionable circumstances would not only be reported but would raise serious concerns. State and local jails and lockups should be no different. This legislation will provide openness in government and will bolster public confidence and trust in our judicial system. In addition, I believe that it will serve as a deterrent to future misconduct by wrongdoers who will know that someone will be monitoring their actions.

Three years ago, the Commerce, Justice, State and Judiciary Appropriations Act directed the Office of Justice Programs of the Department of Justice to determine the feasibility of creating a single source for annual statistics on in-custody deaths, including Federal, State and local incidents.

In March of 1998, the Department of Justice reported that this goal is achievable. Currently, statistics are gathered on an annual and a voluntary basis for Federal and State deaths and on a 5-year voluntary basis for county and local jails.

This bill directs the Attorney General to develop guidelines for the reporting of deaths in custody; and it requires that, at a minimum, the report include the name of the deceased, the gender of the deceased, the race and ethnicity of the deceased, the age of the deceased, the date and time and location of the death, and a brief description of the circumstances surrounding the death.

The House Committee on Judiciary unanimously approved a similar provision as an amendment to H.R. 1659, the National Police Training Commission Act of 1999; but that bill has not been considered by the House.

Madam Speaker, I am offering a manager's amendment that makes some minor changes to the bill. The amendment has been cleared with the minority, and I am not aware of any opposition to the amendment.

The amendment simply changes the statutory cite to ensure this legislation amends the correct portion of the Code, and it adds process of arrest to the factors that must be reported about the deceased individual; and it includes a brief description surrounding the circumstances of death as part of the reporting requirement.

I strongly believe that the data gathered under this act will provide us with a better understanding about our Nation's correctional system, and I urge my colleagues to support the legislation.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I am pleased to join the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) in commending H.R. 1800, the Death In Custody Act of 2000, to the Members of the House.

□ 1515

We have worked together in developing this issue for the past 5 years, and I even worked with Senator TIM HUTCHINSON from Arkansas on this issue when he was a Member of the House.

This bill simply requires that deaths in State and local police custody be reported to the attorney general. A similar measure was adopted by the House on a voice vote without opposition in the 1995 Crime Bill, but it was adjusted in conference to simply require this Department of Justice to study the feasibility of requiring localities to report deaths in custody. The Department has now said that reporting deaths in custody is feasible. Of course, I would hate to think that there are any jurisdictions with so many deaths in custody that it would not be feasible to report them.

Dating back to my experiences as a State legislator, I have always been concerned that there was no national system for accounting for deaths in law enforcement custody. As detailed in an exhaustive, year-long investigative report by the Asbury Press in New Jersey, about 1,000 such deaths occur each year. Many of these deaths occur under suspicious circumstances. While most are listed as "suicides," many, the Asbury Press reports, are "tainted with racial overtones, good-ole-boy conspiracies and coverups, or investigative incompetence." The problem is that, with no one looking at these deaths from a systematic point of view, we do not know whether there is any pattern

or practice relating to such deaths nor whether there is any training needed amongst law enforcement officials which could limit such occurrences or anything else.

In fact, without such information, the debate on the issue is relegated to: "There's a problem; No, there isn't; Yes, there is," with both sides yelling at each other and little or no actual information being the basis of the discussion.

Regular reports of deaths in custody will allow us to get a handle on the nature and extent of what I believe to be a serious problem; we just do not know the extent. Let us hope that, at a minimum, the knowledge that a report is required to the Justice Department of all deaths in custody, and something brief about their circumstances, will discourage the misconduct, or questionable conduct, against those in custody by their custodians. And, furthermore, to the extent there may be common elements to these deaths, we will be in a much better position to prevent them in the future.

This is a modest proposal, and I urge Members of the House to support the bill.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1800, 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.

GRANTING CONSENT OF CONGRESS TO KANSAS AND MISSOURI METROPOLITAN CULTURE DISTRICT COMPACT

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Madam Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4700) to grant the consent of the Congress to the Kansas and Missouri Metropolitan Culture District Compact.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4700

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

SECTION 1. CONSENT TO COMPACT.

The Congress consents to the Kansas and Missouri Metropolitan Culture District Compact entered into between the State of Kansas and the State of Missouri. The compact reads substantially as follows:

"KANSAS AND MISSOURI METROPOLITAN CULTURE DISTRICT COMPACT

"ARTICLE I. AGREEMENT AND PLEDGE

"The states of Kansas and Missouri agree to and pledge, each to the other, faithful cooperation in the future planning and development of the metropolitan culture district,

holding in high trust for the benefit of this people and of the nation, the special blessings and natural advantages thereof.

“ARTICLE II. POLICY AND PURPOSE

“The party states, desiring by common action to fully utilize and improve their cultural facilities, coordinate the services of their cultural organizations, enhance the cultural activities of their citizens, and achieve solid financial support for such cultural facilities, organizations and activities, declare that it is the policy of each state to realize such desires on a basis of cooperation with one another, thereby serving the best interests of their citizenry and effecting economies in capital expenditures and operational costs. The purpose of this compact is to provide for the creation of a metropolitan culture district as the means to implementation of the policy herein declared with the most beneficial and economical use of human and material resources.

“ARTICLE III. DEFINITIONS

“As used in this compact, unless the context clearly requires otherwise:

“(a) ‘Metropolitan culture district’ means a political subdivision of the states of Kansas and Missouri which is created under and pursuant to the provisions of this compact and which is composed of the counties in the states of Kansas and Missouri which act to create or to become a part of the district in accordance with the provisions of Article IV.

“(b) ‘Commission’ means the governing body of the metropolitan culture district.

“(c) ‘Cultural activities’ means sports or activities which contribute to or enhance the aesthetic, artistic, historical, intellectual or social development or appreciation of members of the general public.

“(d) ‘Cultural organizations’ means non-profit and tax exempt social, civic or community organizations and associations which are dedicated to the development, provision, operation, supervision, promotion or support of cultural activities in which members of the general public may engage or participate.

“(e) ‘Cultural facilities’ means facilities operated or used for sports or participation or engagement in cultural activities by members of the general public.

“ARTICLE IV. THE DISTRICT

“(a) The counties in Kansas and Missouri eligible to create and initially compose the metropolitan culture district shall be those counties which meet one or more of the following criteria:

“(1) The county has a population in excess of 300,000, and is adjacent to the state line;

“(2) The county contains a part of a city with a population according to the most recent federal census of at least 400,000; or

“(3) The county is contiguous to any county described in provisions (1) or (2) of this subpart (a). The counties of Johnson in Kansas and Jackson in Missouri shall be sine qua non to the creation and initial composition of the district. Additional counties in Kansas and Missouri shall be eligible to become a part of the metropolitan culture district if such counties are contiguous to any one or more of the counties which compose the district and within 60 miles of the counties that are required by this article to establish the district;

“(b)(1) Whenever the governing body of any county which is eligible to create or become a part of the metropolitan culture district shall determine that creation of or participation in the district is in the best interests of the citizens of the county and that the levy of a tax to provide on a cooperative basis with another county or other counties for financial support of the district would be economically practical and cost beneficial to

the citizens of the county, the governing body may adopt by majority vote a resolution authorizing the same.

“(2) Wherever a petition, signed by not less than the number of qualified electors of an eligible county equal to 5% of the number of ballots cast and counted at the last preceding gubernatorial election held in the county and requesting adoption of a resolution authorizing creation of or participation in the metropolitan culture district and the levy of a tax for the purpose of contributing to the financial support of the district, is filed with the governing body of the county, the governing body shall adopt such a resolution.

“(3) Implementation of a resolution adopted under this subpart (b) shall be conditioned upon approval of the resolution by a majority of the qualified electors of the county voting at an election conducted for such purpose.

“(c)(1) Upon adoption of a resolution pursuant to subpart (b)(1) or subpart (b)(2), the governing body of the county shall request, within 36 months after adoption of the resolution, the county election officer to submit to the qualified electors of the county the question of whether the governing body shall be authorized to implement the resolution. The resolution shall be printed on the ballot and in the notice of election. The question shall be submitted to the electors of the county at the primary or general election next following the date of the request filed with the county election officer. If a majority of the qualified electors are opposed to implementation of the resolution authorizing creation of, or participation in, the district and the levy of a tax for financial support thereof, the same shall not be implemented. The governing body of the county may review procedures for authorization to create or become a part of the district and to levy a tax for financial support thereof at any time following rejection of the question.

“(2) The ballot for the proposition in any county shall be in substantially the following form:

“Shall a retail sales tax of _____ (insert amount, not to exceed ¼ cent) be levied and collected in Kansas and Missouri metropolitan culture district consisting of the county(ies) of _____ (insert name of county) for the support of cultural facilities and organizations within the district?

YES NO

The governing body of the county may place additional language on the ballot to describe the use or allocation of the funds.

“(d)(1) The metropolitan culture district shall be created when implementation of a resolution authorizing the creation of the district and the levy of a tax for contribution to the financial support thereof is approved by respective majorities of the qualified electors of at least Johnson County, Kansas, and Jackson County, Missouri.

“(2) When implementation of a resolution authorizing participation in the metropolitan culture district and the levy of a tax for contribution to the financial support thereof is approved by a majority of the qualified electors of any county eligible to become a part of the district, the governing body of the county shall proceed with the performance of all things necessary and incidental to participation in the district.

“(3) Any question for the levy of a tax submitted after July 1, 2000, may be submitted to the electors of the county at the primary or general election next following the date of the request filed with the county election officer; at a special election called and held as otherwise provided by law; at an election called and held on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in February, except in Presi-

dential election years; at an election called and held on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in March, June, August, or November; or at an election called and held on the first Tuesday in April, except that no question for a tax levy may be submitted to the electors prior to January 1, 2002.

“(4) No question shall be submitted to the electors authorizing the levy of a tax the proceeds of which will be exclusively dedicated to sports or sports facilities.

“(e) Any of the counties composing the metropolitan culture district may withdraw from the district by adoption of a resolution and approval of the resolution by a majority of the qualified electors of the county, all in the same manner provided in this Article IV for creating or becoming a part of the metropolitan culture district. The governing body of a withdrawing county shall provide for the sending of formal written notice of withdrawal from the district to the governing body of the other county or each of the other counties comprising the district. Actual withdrawal shall not take effect until 90 days after notice has been sent. A withdrawing county shall not be relieved from any obligation which such county may have assumed or incurred by reason of being a part of the district, including, but not limited to, the retirement of any outstanding bonded indebtedness of the district.

“ARTICLE V. THE COMMISSION

“(a) The metropolitan culture district shall be governed by the metropolitan culture commission which shall be a body corporate and politic and which shall be composed of resident electors of the states of Kansas and Missouri, respectively, as follows:

“(1) A member of the governing body of each county which is a part of the district, who shall be appointed by majority vote of such governing body;

“(2) A member of the governing body of each city, with a population according to the most recent federal census of at least 50,000, located in whole or in part within each county which is a part of the district, who shall be appointed by majority vote of such governing body;

“(3) Two members of the governing body of a county with a consolidated or unified county government and city of the first class which is a part of the district, who shall be appointed by majority vote of such governing body;

“(4) A member of the arts commission of Kansas or the Kansas commission for the humanities, who shall be appointed by the governor of Kansas; and

“(5) A member of the arts commission of Missouri or the Missouri humanities council, who shall be appointed by the governor of Missouri.

To the extent possible, the gubernatorial appointees to the commission shall be residents of the district. The term of each commissioner initially appointed by a county governing body shall expire concurrently with such commissioner's tenure as a county officer or three years after the date of appointment as a commissioner, whichever occurs sooner. The term of each commissioner succeeding a commissioner initially appointed by a county governing body shall expire concurrently with such successor commissioner's tenure as a county officer or four years after the date of appointment as a commissioner, whichever occurs sooner. The term of each commissioner initially appointed by a city governing body shall expire concurrently with such commissioner's tenure as a city officer or two years after the date of appointment as a commissioner, whichever occurs sooner. The term of each commissioner succeeding a commissioner

initially appointed by a city governing body shall expire concurrently with such successor commissioner's tenure as a city officer or four years after the date of appointment as a commissioner, whichever occurs sooner. The term of each commissioner appointed by the governor of Kansas or the governor of Missouri shall expire concurrently with the term of the appointing governor, the commissioner's tenure as a state officer, or four years after the date of appointment as a commissioner of the district, whichever occurs sooner. Any vacancy occurring in a commissioner position for reasons other than expiration of terms of office shall be filled for the unexpired term by appointment in the same manner that the original appointment was made. Any commissioner may be removed for cause by the appointing authority of the commissioner.

"(b) The commission shall select annually, from its membership, a chairperson, a vice chairperson, and a treasurer. The treasurer shall be bonded in such amounts as the commission may require.

"(c) The commission may appoint such officers, agents and employees as it may require for the performance of its duties, and shall determine the qualifications and duties and fix the compensation of such officers, agents and employees.

"(d) The commission shall fix the time and place at which its meetings shall be held. Meetings shall be held within the district and shall be open to the public. Public notice shall be given of all meetings.

"(e) A majority of the commissioners from each state shall constitute, in the aggregate, a quorum for the transaction of business. No action of the commission shall be binding unless taken at a meeting at which at least a quorum is present, and unless a majority of the commissioners from each state, present at such meeting, shall vote in favor thereof. No action of the commission taken at a meeting thereof shall be binding unless the subject of such action is included in a written agenda for such meeting, the agenda and notice of meeting having been mailed to each commissioner by postage paid first-class mail at least 14 calendar days prior to the meeting.

"(f) The commissioners from each state shall be subject to the provisions of the laws of the states of Kansas and Missouri, respectively, which relate to conflicts of interest of public officers and employees. If any commissioner has a direct or indirect financial interest in any cultural facility, organization or activity supported by the district or commission or in any other business transaction of the district or commission, the commissioner shall disclose such interest in writing to the other commissioners and shall abstain from voting on any matter relating to such facility, organization or activity or to such business transaction.

"(g) If any action at law or equity, or other legal proceeding, shall be brought against any commissioner for any act or omission arising out of the performance of duties as a commissioner, the commissioner shall be indemnified in whole and held harmless by the commission for any judgment or decree entered against the commissioner and, further, shall be defended at the cost and expense of the commission in any such proceeding.

"ARTICLE VI. POWERS AND DUTIES OF THE COMMISSION

"(a) The commission shall adopt a seal and suitable bylaws governing its management and procedure.

"(b) The commission has the power to contract and to be contracted with, and to sue and to be sued.

"(c) The commission may receive for any of its purposes and functions any contribu-

tions or moneys appropriated by counties or cities and may solicit and receive any and all donations, and grants of money, equipment, supplies, materials and services from any state or the United States or any agency thereof, or from any institution, foundation, organization, person, firm or corporation, and may utilize and dispose of the same.

"(d) Upon receipt of recommendations from the advisory committee provided in subsection (g), the commission may provide donations, contributions and grants or other support, financial or otherwise, or in aid of cultural organizations, facilities or activities in counties which are part of the district. In determining whether to provide any such support the commission shall consider the following factors:

"(1) economic impact upon the district;

"(2) cultural benefit to citizens of the district and to the general public;

"(3) contribution to the quality of life and popular image of the district;

"(4) contribution to the geographical balance of cultural facilities and activities within and outside the district;

"(5) the breadth of popular appeal within and outside the district;

"(6) the needs of the community as identified in an objective cultural needs assessment study of the metropolitan area; and

"(7) any other factor deemed appropriate by the commission.

"(e) The commission may own and acquire by gift, purchase, lease or devise cultural facilities within the territory of the district. The commission may plan, construct, operate and maintain and contract for the operation and maintenance of cultural facilities within the territory of the district. The commission may sell, lease, or otherwise dispose of cultural facilities within the territory of the district.

"(f) At any time following five years from and after the creation of the metropolitan cultural district as provided in paragraph (1) of subsection (d) of article IV, the commission may borrow moneys for the planning, construction, equipping, operation, maintenance, repair, extension, expansion, or improvement of any cultural facility and, in that regard, the commission at such time may:

"(1) issue notes, bonds or other instruments in writing of the commission in evidence of the sum or sums to be borrowed. No notes, bonds or other instruments in writing shall be issued pursuant to this subsection until the issuance of such notes, bonds or instruments has been submitted to and approved by a majority of the qualified electors of the district voting at an election called and held thereon. Such election shall be called and held in the manner provided by law;

"(2) issue refunding notes, bonds or other instruments in writing for the purpose of refunding, extending or unifying the whole or any part of its outstanding indebtedness from time to time whether evidenced by notes, bonds or other instruments in writing. Such refunding notes, bonds or other instruments in writing shall not exceed in amount the principal of the outstanding indebtedness to be refunded and the accrued interest thereon to the date of such refunding;

"(3) provide that all notes, bonds and other instruments in writing issued hereunder shall or may be payable, both as to principal and interest, from sales tax revenues authorized under this compact and disbursed to the district by counties comprising the district, admissions and other revenues collected from the use of any cultural facility or facilities constructed hereunder, or from any other resources of the commission, and further may be secured by a mortgage or deed

of trust upon any property interest of the commission; and

"(4) prescribe the details of all notes, bonds or other instruments in writing, and of the issuance and sale thereof. The commission shall have the power to enter into covenants with the holders of such notes, bonds or other instruments in writing, not inconsistent with the powers granted herein, without further legislative authority.

"(g) The commission shall appoint an advisory committee composed of members of the general public consisting of an equal number of persons from both the states of Kansas and Missouri who have demonstrated interest, expertise, knowledge or experience in cultural organizations or activities. The advisory committee shall make recommendations annually to the commission regarding donations, contributions and grants or other support, financial or otherwise, for or in aid of cultural organizations, facilities and activities in counties which are part of the district.

"(h) The commission may provide for actual and necessary expenses of commissioners and advisory committee members incurred in the performance of their official duties.

"(i) The commission shall cause to be prepared annually a report on the operations and transactions conducted by the commission during the preceding year. The report shall be submitted to the legislatures and governors of the compacting states, to the governing bodies of the counties comprising the district, and to the governing body of each city that appoints a commissioner. The commission shall publish the annual report in the official county newspaper of each of the counties comprising the district.

"(j) The commission has the power to apply to the congress of the United States for its consent and approval of the compact. In the absence of the consent of congress and until consent is secured, the compact is binding upon the states of Kansas and Missouri in all respects permitted by law for the two states, without the consent of congress, for the purposes enumerated and in the manner provided in the compact.

"(k) The commission has the power to perform all other necessary and incidental functions and duties and to exercise all other necessary and appropriate powers not inconsistent with the constitution or laws of the United States or of either of the states of Kansas or Missouri to effectuate the same.

"ARTICLE VII. FINANCE

"(a) The moneys necessary to finance the operation of the metropolitan culture district and the execution of the powers, duties and responsibilities of the commission shall be appropriated to the commission by the counties comprising the district. The moneys to be appropriated to the commission shall be raised by the governing bodies of the respective counties by the levy of taxes as authorized by the legislatures of the respective party states.

"(b) The commission shall not incur any indebtedness or obligation of any kind; nor shall the commission pledge the credit of either or any of the counties comprising the district or either of the states party to this compact, except as authorized in article VI. The budget of the district shall be prepared, adopted and published as provided by law for other political subdivisions of the party states. No budget shall be adopted by the commission until it has been submitted to and reviewed by the governing bodies of the counties comprising the district and the governing body of each city represented on the commission.

"(c) The commission shall keep accurate accounts of all receipts and disbursements.

The receipts and disbursements of the commission shall be audited yearly by a certified or licensed public accountant and the report of the audit shall be included in and become a part of the annual report of the commission.

“(d) The accounts of the commission shall be open at any reasonable time for inspection by duly authorized representatives of the compacting states, the counties comprising the district, the cities that appoint a commissioner, and other persons authorized by the commission.

“ARTICLE VIII. ENTRY INTO FORCE

“(a) This compact shall enter into force and become effective and binding upon the states of Kansas and Missouri when it has been entered into law by the legislatures of the respective states.

“(b) Amendments to the compact shall become effective upon enactment by the legislatures of the respective states.

“ARTICLE IX. TERMINATION

“This compact shall continue in force and remain binding upon a party state until its legislature shall have enacted a statute repealing the same and providing for the sending of formal written notice of enactment of such statute to the legislature of the other party state. Upon enactment of such a statute by the legislature of either party state, the sending of notice thereof to the other party state, and payment of any obligations which the metropolitan culture district commission may have incurred prior to the effective date of such statute, including, but not limited to, the retirement of any outstanding bonded indebtedness of the district, the agreement of the party states embodied in the compact shall be deemed fully executed, the compact shall be null and void and of no further force or effect, the metropolitan culture district shall be dissolved, and the metropolitan culture district commission shall be abolished.

“ARTICLE X. CONSTRUCTION AND SEVERABILITY

“The provisions of this compact shall be liberally construed and shall be severable. If any phrase, clause, sentence or provision of this compact is declared to be contrary to the constitution of either of the party states or of the United States or the applicability thereof to any government, agency, person or circumstance is held invalid, the validity of the remainder of this compact and the applicability thereof to any government, agency, person or circumstance shall not be affected thereby. If this compact shall be held contrary to the constitution of either of the states party thereto, the compact shall thereby be nullified and voided and of no further force or effect.

“(a) The board of county commissioners of any county which has been authorized by a majority of the electors of the county to create or to become a part of the metropolitan culture district and to levy and collect a tax for the purpose of contributing to the financial support of the district shall adopt a resolution imposing a countywide retailers' sales tax and pledging the revenues received therefrom for such purpose. The rate of such tax shall be fixed in an amount of not more than .25%. Any county levying a retailers' sales tax under authority of this section is hereby prohibited from administering or collecting such tax locally, but shall utilize the services of the state department of revenue to administer, enforce and collect such tax. The sales tax shall be administered, enforced and collected in the same manner and by the same procedure as other countywide retailers' sales taxes are levied and collected and shall be in addition to any other sales tax authorized by law. Upon receipt of a certified

copy of a resolution authorizing the levy of a countywide retailers' sales tax pursuant to this section, the state director of taxation shall cause such tax to be collected within and outside the boundaries of such county at the same time and in the same manner provided for the collection of the state retailers' sales tax. All moneys collected by the director of taxation under the provisions of this section shall be credited to the metropolitan culture district retailers' sales tax fund which fund is hereby established in the state treasury. Any refund due on any countywide retailers' sales tax collected pursuant to this section shall be paid out of the sales tax refund fund and reimbursed by the director of taxation from retailers' sales tax revenue collected pursuant to this section. All countywide retailers' sales tax revenue collected within any county pursuant to this section shall be remitted at least quarterly by the state treasurer, on instruction from the director of taxation, to the treasurer of such county.

“(b) All revenue received by any county treasurer from a countywide retailers' sales tax imposed pursuant to this section shall be appropriated by the county to the metropolitan culture district commission within 60 days of receipt of the funds by the county for expenditure by the commission pursuant to and in accordance with the provisions of the Kansas and Missouri metropolitan culture district compact. If any such revenue remains upon nullification and voidance of the Kansas and Missouri metropolitan culture district compact, the county treasurer shall deposit such revenue to the credit of the general fund of the county.

“(c) Any countywide retailers' sales tax imposed pursuant to this section shall expire upon the date of actual withdrawal of the county from the metropolitan culture district or at any time the Kansas and Missouri metropolitan culture district compact becomes null and void and of no further force or effect. If any moneys remain in the metropolitan culture district retailers' sales tax fund upon nullification and voidance of the Kansas and Missouri metropolitan culture district compact, the state treasurer shall transfer such moneys to the county and city retailers' sales tax fund to be apportioned and remitted at the same time and in the same manner as other countywide retailers' sales tax revenues are apportioned and remitted.”

SEC. 2. RESERVATION OF RIGHTS.

The Congress expressly deserves the right to alter, amend, or repeal this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 4700, the bill now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS), I would like to address this particular bill, H.R. 4700.

This bill grants the consent of Congress to the Kansas and Missouri Metropolitan Culture District to facilitate cultural development in the greater Kansas City metropolitan area.

The compact being considered is uniquely designed to encourage cross-state cultural and intellectual development. Like the original Kansas and Missouri Metropolitan Culture Compact, approved by Congress in 1994, the compact proposed by H.R. 4700 allows voters from both States to jointly support cultural activities benefiting the bistate region.

While nearly identical to the culture compact approved by Congress in 1994, the culture compact proposed by this bill expands the definition of cultural programs to cover sport activities and facilities. It also changes the composition of the culture commission to maintain balanced representation from both States.

Finally, like its predecessor, the Congressional Budget Office has estimated that implementation of the compact would have no fiscal impact on the U.S. Treasury, and I will include the letter from the CBO for the RECORD.

Passage of the 1994 Kansas and Missouri Culture Compact has brought cultural and aesthetic renewal to residents of the Kansas City metropolitan region, while obtaining a broad measure of bipartisanship in the member States and in the Congress. With our help, Kansas and Missouri will continue the cultural invigoration of the greater Kansas City area, and I urge support of the bill.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC July 20, 2000.

Hon. HENRY J. HYDE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S.
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimate for H.R. 4700, a bill to grant the consent of the Congress to the Kansas and Missouri Metropolitan Culture District Compact.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact is Lanette J. Keith.

Sincerely,

BARRY B. ANDERSON,
(For Dan L. Crippen).

Enclosure.

H.R. 4700.—A bill to grant the consent of the Congress to the Kansas and Missouri Metropolitan Culture District Compact

H.R. 4700 would give Congressional consent to the Kansas and Missouri Metropolitan Culture District Compact entered into by Kansas and Missouri. A similar agreement was approved by the Congress in 1994 but that agreement will end in 2001. Enacting H.R. 4700 would enable certain counties in the two states to continue to apply a local sales tax to fund historical preservation activities within the district. Enacting the resolution would result in no cost to the federal

government. Because enactment of H.R. 4700 would not affect direct spending or receipts, pay-as-you-go procedures would not apply. The bill contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act and would impose no costs on state, local, or tribal governments.

The CBO staff contact for this estimate is Lanette J. Keith. This estimate was approved by Peter H. Fontaine, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentlewoman from Missouri (Ms. MCCARTHY), who has done so much work on this important issue affecting her district, be allowed to control the time on this side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Missouri (Ms. MCCARTHY) is recognized for 20 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) very much for that gracious introduction. I would also like to thank the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON), who so eloquently described this very positive and special bill.

I would also like to take a moment, Madam Speaker, to thank the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE); and the ranking member, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS); as well as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS); and the subcommittee ranking member, the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), for expediting this very important effort for my community.

Last Tuesday, the bill was heard in the subcommittee and marked up; last Wednesday in the full committee and marked up; and here we are on Monday, Madam Speaker, back to the floor for a vote by the full membership on consideration of the renewal of this important bistate compact.

In the 1980s, when I served in the Missouri legislature in the House and chaired the Ways and Means Committee there, I and others of like mind, who realized that the uniqueness of Kansas City, with its State line dividing both a Kansas community and a Missouri community with common interests, might require some creative taxing mechanism in order to restore and to secure the very beautiful landmarks that we have there, both in culture, the arts, and also in our heritage, and yet not any one community could do it alone, so we created this bistate cultural compact that needed the approval by the people of greater Kansas City, which is, of course, home to 1.7 million supporters.

We initially proposed this in the Kansas and Missouri legislatures, I happened to handle it in the Missouri

House, and gained the approval of those two bodies in 1987, when we introduced it, and then again as we revised it. In 1994, when we finally agreed to it and passed it and it was signed into law by both governors, I came here as a State legislator to advocate for it before the Committee on the Judiciary and was very pleased for its passage in the House then.

It is being renewed now because it needs to have some changes made to it. We sunset it, quite appropriately then, to make sure it would work successfully, and it has. Now we want to take it back to the community with the changes that the gentleman from Arkansas described in order for the voters to approve its continuance.

The major success story of this effort, this rather unique effort, has been the restoration of our Union Station, a very important structure to both communities, located on the Missouri side. It is second in the Nation in size and history to Grand Central Station. It had fallen into great disrepair and deterioration, was looking for some current use, and this bistate cultural tax raised almost half the money needed to restore the building. It has been turned into a wonderful science center and museum and is a great gathering place for many, many cultural events in the community.

It has been such a great bringing together of people on both sides of the State line, rallying around the importance of maintaining this important structure, that we want to go back now and let the commission discuss future use that might include comprehensive projects to support the arts for school-aged children and renovation or rehabilitation of arts facilities on both sides of the State line. Youth athletic facilities projects are desperately needed and seriously contemplated by the commission. And of course maintenance on existing athletic facilities will be included under new language in the compact.

So I am very, very pleased today to be here in support of this effort, and I would like again to thank the members of the committee for their bipartisan effort in making this a priority and moving so expeditiously.

Madam Speaker, I am providing for the RECORD some letters of support from individuals and organizations involved in this back home in Kansas and Missouri.

GREATER KANSAS CITY
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Kansas City, MO, July 17, 2000.

Hon. KAREN MCCARTHY,
Longworth House Office Building
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE MCCARTHY: The Greater Kansas City Chamber of Commerce has been a strong supporter of the Kansas and Missouri Metropolitan Culture District Compact since it was first proposed more than 10 years ago by a civic task force organized by Kansas City Consensus. From the very beginning, the concept of a multijurisdiction tax for common purposes in a bistate region like Greater Kansas City has had great appeal.

The Chamber was a principal player in the passage of the bistate tax to restore Kansas City's Union Station and establish Science City at the station. The success of that project has naturally led to speculation about other regional needs that might be met through this innovative approach.

Consequently, The Chamber was a leader in the effort to expand the eligible use of bistate tax revenues through legislation in Kansas and Missouri to include sports and sports facilities as well as the cultural arts.

The Chamber continues to be an enthusiastic supporter of the bistate tax concept and urges appropriate action by the Congress to facilitate the further use of this creative multijurisdictional initiative for regional purposes.

Sincerely,

PETER S. LEVI,
President.

KANSAS CITY
AREA DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL,
Kansas City, MO, July 17, 2000.

Hon. KAREN MCCARTHY,
U.S. Representative,
Kansas City, MO.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN MCCARTHY: I'm writing to let you know the support of the Kansas City Area Development Council (KCADC) for HR 4700 granting congressional approval for the bistate compact that would authorize the creation of the Metropolitan Cultural District in the Kansas City area.

KCADC, from its inception in 1978, has been a bistate organization. As you know, we serve 15 counties in both Kansas and Missouri. We approach business attraction and the growth of the economy from a bistate perspective because our community is truly one community that simply happens to be joined by a state line. Nothing could be more important to us than the approval of this legislation. The furtherance of regional cooperation and funding key cultural assets assuming voter approval is critical to the ongoing development of our community. The fact that the legislation has received support in the legislatures of both Kansas and Missouri and would only be enacted upon a vote of the people, provides both evidence of broad support and all necessary safeguards.

We are appreciative of your leadership in this effort and ask that you will do all that is possible to encourage the approval of this legislation initially by the House Judiciary Committee and then by the full House and Senate.

Best regards,

ROBERT J. MARCUSSE,
President and CEO.

MID-AMERICA REGIONAL COUNCIL,
Kansas City, MO, July 17, 2000.

Hon. KAREN MCCARTHY,
U.S. Representative,
Kansas City, MO.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN MCCARTHY: This letter is to convey the support of the Mid-America Regional Council for HR 4700 to grant congressional approval for the bistate compact authorizing creation of the Metropolitan Culture District in the Kansas City area.

As the council of governments and metropolitan planning group for Greater Kansas City, MARC has keen interest in seeing the continuance of this important mechanism to allow for voter-approved regional cooperation in funding key cultural assets. MARC has played an active role in supporting this initiative over the years, and we are eager to see this tool continue to serve our regional community. The proposed changes to the bistate compact enjoy broad public support and have already been approved by the legislatures of both Kansas and Missouri.

We appreciate your leadership in ensuring continuation of this issue so important to our metropolitan progress.

Sincerely,

DAVID A. WARM,
Executive Director.

OVERLAND PARK
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Overland Park, KS, July 17, 2000.

Hon. HENRY J. HYDE,
Chairman, Committee on Judiciary, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On behalf of the Overland Park Chamber of Commerce and its 1,100 members, I want to thank you for granting a timely hearing on HR 4700.

The Overland Park business community wishes to declare its support for the passage of HR 4700. Its passage will complete a legislative process that provides increased flexibility and expanded options for the Kansas City metropolitan area in future bi-state efforts.

Citizens and businesses in both Kansas and Missouri, with the Union Station bi-state success, have demonstrated an ability to reach consensus and support for important projects. This bill, supported by both state legislatures, enhances that unique relationship.

We appreciate your support in addressing this important community issue.

Sincerely,

MARY BIRCH CCE,
President.

JANUARY 4, 2000.

To: Johnson County Commission.
From: Johnson County Chambers Presidents Council, Linda Leeper, Chairman.

Re: Bi-State Efforts.

As strong supporters of the bi-state initiative to renovate Union Station and construct Science City, the chambers of commerce in Johnson County wish to commend the voters of the four counties, the Bi-State Commission, the Union Station Assistance Corporation, the Union Station Project Council and civic leaders for a job well done. This phenomenal project will serve as an excellent first effort toward future partnerships that identify, pursue and support other bi-state efforts.

At this time, the Johnson County Chambers Presidents Council has discussed future bi-state efforts and would like to convey the following concepts to be considered as developments and ideas proceed.

We believe:

1. The current 1/8 cent bi-state sales tax for Union Station/Science City should sunset (end) as promised to the voters.

2. The bi-state tax should be used to enhance quality-of-life components that are not traditionally funded by government, such as the arts, and to preserve major community institutions.

3. The bi-state tax cannot and should not be seen or used as "the" solution for all the problems of the metro-plex.

4. If there is a second bi-state effort, it should include both the arts as was originally intended and consideration of efforts in Kansas. Serious consideration should be given to the renovation or construction of a building in Johnson County for an arts venue.

5. Also, consideration should be given to including sports facilities as a beneficiary of the next bi-state effort. There is no doubt that Kansas City's professional sports teams are a significant economic development component for the entire metropolitan area. The bi-state component, however, similar to Union Station, should be only one part of a larger multi-source funded effort.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT COUNCIL
OF GREATER KANSAS CITY,
Kansas City, MO, July 17, 2000.

U.S. Rep. KAREN MCCARTHY,
*E. 9th St., Suite 9350,
Kansas City, MO.*

DEAR REP. MCCARTHY: The Labor-Management Council of Greater Kansas City urges support from the U.S. Congress for "Bi-State II" legislation. We supported passage of the revised bi-state approach in both the Missouri and Kansas legislatures, and we thank you for your support for the successful first bi-state project as well as for this effort.

As an organization comprised of more than 80 businesses, unions, nonprofits and governments from throughout the Kansas City area, the Labor-Management Council focuses on efforts that enhance the entire metropolitan community. Bi-State II will allow us the opportunity to explore and possibly implement public improvement projects that benefit citizens in both states.

The Labor-Management Council requires a unanimous vote of its Board of Directors to take a public issue position. Bi-State II's achievement of such unanimous support from our diverse leadership demonstrates its strong appeal to labor and to management, to Missourians and to Kansas, to Democrats and to Republicans, to urban and to suburban residents.

We are very pleased that Congress is appropriately considering this legislation to help address our community's needs that cross state, county and municipal lines. Passage of Bi-State II by Congress would allow us to continue our work to benefit the entire metropolitan community.

Please feel free to share our position with your colleagues, and to contact me with any questions.

Sincerely,

BOB JACOBI, Jr.,
Executive Director.

JACKSON COUNTY EXECUTIVE,
Kansas City, MO, July 17, 2000.

Hon. KAREN MCCARTHY,
*U.S. Representative,
Kansas City, MO.*

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN MCCARTHY: I am writing to express my support for HR 4700, which would grant congressional approval for the bi-state compact authorizing creation of the Metropolitan Culture District in the Kansas City area.

Jackson County is proud of its role in the development and implementation of the successful initiative at Kansas City's Liberty Memorial, and looks forward to the opportunity to extend a bi-state solution into other long term capital needs of the entire Kansas City metropolitan area.

We appreciate your efforts in ensuring the continuation and expansion of this cooperative effort among local governments across our region.

Sincerely,

KATHERYN J. SHIELDS,
County Executive.

STATE OF KANSAS,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Topeka, KS.

COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE FAX

From: Don Brown, Communications Director.

Governor Graves made the following comments shortly before signing the Bi-State II legislation:

"I am extremely pleased with the success of our first Bi-State project. The Science City at Union Station, quite frankly, would not exist as we know it today without the funding from this arts and culture initiative. I am pleased to be able to sign the Bi-State

II legislation into Kansas Law. This is just one step in the process, of course. I'm confident the government leaders and voters in the respective counties in and around Kansas City will make good choices as they explore another phase of this cooperative effort."

CARNAHAN SIGNS BILL TO EXPAND
METROPOLITAN CULTURE DISTRICT

Gov. Mel Carnahan gave final approval today to a new law that expands the Kansas and Missouri Metropolitan Culture District to include sports facilities and events.

Carnahan signed the legislation (Senate Bill 719) at Union Station, which reopened last year after being restored through the efforts of the Culture District—a four-county area encompassing Kansas City.

"Bringing Union Station back to life is a testimony to the tremendous success the Culture District has experienced," Carnahan said. "This legislation will allow the district to build upon that success by including sports facilities and events."

The new legislation will allow sporting events and sports facilities to qualify as approved projects for the Culture District. This will enable voters in the district to approve funding for sports-related activities in addition to other cultural facilities and events.

The legislation also adds two members to the Culture District Commission, the district's governing body. That provision was necessary due to the consolidation of Kansas City, Kan., and Wyandotte County governments. The additional two members will ensure equal representation from Kansas and Missouri on the commission.

"Many Kansas Citizens from both sides of the state line are proud of the accomplishments that have been achieved through the bistate Culture District," Carnahan said. "The work of the district and its commission is proof that great things can be done when the spirit of cooperation is a prominent force."

[From the Kansas City Star, Nov. 8, 1999]
DONORS PRAISE UNION STATION

(By Brian Burnes)

Union Station's opening week continued Sunday as about 1,200 benefactors who had contributed \$1,000 or more to the renovation project gathered for an early look at the landmark.

The reviews were good.

"I think it's wonderful. It's fabulous," said Betty Shouse of Kansas City as she stood in the old North Waiting Room, now Festival Plaza.

"I'm in awe of the ceiling," said Carson Ross, a Missouri state representative from Blue Springs, referring to the restored and repainted ceiling in the Grand Hall.

Shouse and Ross also offered praise for the bistate cooperation that led to \$118 million in taxpayer contributions to the renovation from a one-eighth-cent sales tax passed in Jackson, Johnson, Clay and Plate counties in 1996.

"I'm so glad that we were able to have that kind of cooperation among the various parts of Kansas City," Shouse said.

"Being able to bring both states together for this was historic," Ross said. "I tell people from other states about this and they can't believe it."

As the late afternoon sun poured through the west windows, most visitors could be seen looking up at the ceiling or at the huge clock hanging from it.

"What's fun about this is that each person who comes through feels that they had a piece of the project, so it's exciting for them to see it all come together now," said Bill Musgrave, a vice president of the Kansas City Museum, which is developing Science City inside the station.

Renovation officials said Sunday's crowd—much smaller than the crowd of approximately 3,700 who jammed in Friday night—had its virtues.

"Friday night was elbow to elbow," said John Patrick Burnett, a member of the project's Bistate Commission, which oversaw the spending of taxpayer money. "But this was very nice today, and you could actually see some of the exhibits of Science City."

Within Science City, benefactors mingled with some of the approximately 25 "interactors," or costumed performers who will visit with Science City guests in front of some of the approximately 50 "environments."

Interspersed with the interactors were construction workers, some of whom continued working on the Festival Plaza fountain as the party went on around them. The stations opening week continues Tuesday with a preview for volunteers scheduled for 5 to 9 pm.

The grand opening of Science City at Union Station is scheduled for 10 a.m. Wednesday on the station's south plaza.

[From Preservation, November/December 1999]

HOPE RIDES ON THE \$250 MILLION MAKEOVER OF KANSAS CITY'S UNION STATION

(By Steve Paul)

KANSAS CITY, MO.—Kansas citizens have been waiting decades for life to return to the 1914 Union Station, once among the nation's busiest monuments to rail travel. Now the wait is over. Science City, a so-called edutainment complex appended to the newly restored station, has its grand opening on Nov. 10.

A private-public partnership partly funded by taxpayers in two states spurred the ambitious project with a price tag of \$250 million, so there's an extraordinary amount of breath holding. Can the enormous building again become the city's premier gathering place? If revelers return to the station's cavernous spaces this New Year's Eve, the turn of the millennium may be less meaningful than the emotional reconnection to a cherished monument the public didn't know what to do with.

Preservation purists are hoping Science City's idiosyncrasies won't undermine the reception given to restoration of the decayed station itself, second in size only to Grand Central Terminal in Manhattan. Still, the ultimate test of success will be whether tourist dollars can underwrite local pride and any sense that such gathering place is needed.

Andy Scott, executive director of the Union Station Assistance Corp., the building's private, nonprofit owner since 1994, hopes the restoration will redefine downtown. Ever optimistic, Scott is already envisioning more redevelopment. A new pedestrian bridge, designed by Siah Armajani, has been proposed to link the station with the Crossroads district across the rail yards to the north. A lively renaissance of art galleries, restaurants, and residential lofts is under way in that neighborhood of converted warehouses and industrial buildings.

Scott's optimism also stems from the stature of the station itself, designed by Chicago architect Jarvis Hunt in a restrained Beaux-Arts style with well-proportioned columns, windows, and entablature. With all the personal interaction that took place within, Scott says, Union Station means a lot to people in the metropolitan area of 1.7 million. "This building," he says, "was built with such vision and care and love of beauty and architecture that it can inspire people."

Union Station was nearly comatose long before it closed more than a decade ago. In the '80s it suffered a kick in the architec-

tural groin when an office building was crammed into a corner of its T-shaped plan.

That building remains, but the reflections in its mirror-glass reds and blues outlined by cream trim and gold-hued plaster foliage. It also suspends a trio of respected 3,000-pound chandeliers from ornate rosettes.

Science City, a project of the Kansas City Museum, will occupy a new glass-topped annex abutting the station's former North Waiting Room. Responding to focus groups who said they wanted to have fun, the museum made something akin to an amusement park involving science as adventure.

"It's not a museum, it's not a science center, it's not a themes park, it's not theater," says Science City President David A. Ucko. "The phrase I've been using is 'recreational learning.'"

The station's North Waiting Room, more than 100 yards long, serves as the entry to the multilevel maze of Science City. Visitors will be deposited into a series of environments—a hospital, a crime scene, a cave—with actors conducting learning experiences.

There will be a historical streetscape providing a memory lane of pop culture: old televisions showing period programs in an appliance-store window, for instance. A live stage will present science and historical shows. A large-screen Iwerks theater is being installed for science and nature films in 2-D and 3-D formats. And a planetarium will put a laser-show spin on sky gazing lessons.

Nighttime activities are crucial to the return of a constant flow of people—and their dollars—to the station. So the theaters will do double duty, showing Science City films by day and general-interest, date-inducing movies by night. The North Waiting Room, available for special events, can accommodate as many as 1,200 diners. Several restaurants are opening in and off the cavernous Grand Hall.

For the multitudes who passed through there, Union Station is something like a memory bank. Emotional departures and returns were plentiful for several generations before passenger-train traffic and the station itself began to decline after World War II. "In many ways," says Dave Boutras of the Western Historical Manuscript Collection in Kansas City, "it is about the only public place that represents the metro area."

The feeling of a shared history—and the vision of a shared future—helped persuade taxpayers in Johnson County, Kan., an affluent Kansas City suburb, to contribute to the project through a one-eighth-cent bistate sales tax. They joined voters in the three Missouri countries through which Kansas City sprawls to pony up \$118 million in tax money. The rest of the construction funding came from more than \$30 million in federal grants and \$100 million in private donations.

Significant participation (\$20 million) came from Hallmark Cards, Inc., and the Hall Family Foundation. Hallmark's headquarters and Crown Center, a complex with two hotels, restaurants, a shopping mall, and an updated bus waiting area, will be linked to the station by an elevated, glass-enclosed walkway.

An important aspect of the redevelopment is Union Station's revival as a transportation center. Local buses, tourist trolleys, and planned commuter-rail line from Johnson County will stop there, as will a light-rail line in Kansas City, if it ever gets built. Amtrak service may return to the building after its long exile on the bottom level of an underground parking garage.

Long a prominent symbol of inner-city deterioration and dis-investment as it sat rotting, Union Station is ready to be embraced with the pride and excitement it was born to 85 years ago.

[From the New York Times, Nov. 12, 1999]
IN KANSAS CITY, FEW TRAINS, BUT NEW LIFE
IN THE STATION

(By Shirley Christian)

KANSAS CITY, MO, Nov. 14—It required new laws in two states, sales-tax elections in five counties and an act of Congress, as well as a major corporate giving campaign, but Kansas City's monumental Union Station has finally been restored to the grandeur it once enjoyed as a centerpiece of the nation's passenger rail network.

Even as construction crews raced to finish the \$250 million restoration and expansion of the station, the completed portions opened to the public last week after a spate of events toasting large donors and volunteers.

Very few passenger trains pass through Kansas City now, so the station's restored Grand Hall, with its 95-foot ceiling and three 3,000-pound chandeliers, is to serve as a public space, surrounded by new restaurants, shops and offices. The station, second in size in this country only to Grand Central Terminal in Manhattan, is envisioned as a vast indoor plaza, a gathering place intended to help draw people back to the center of the city.

The station opened in 1914 with nearly one million square feet of space. It has been expanded in this new incarnation with a 300,000-square-foot wing on the west side to house Science City, described by its creators as a place of "recreational learning." Science City is projected to draw a million paying visitors a year.

"We are creating an educational attraction for all ages," said David A. Ucko, president of Science City and the Kansas City Museum, which will manage it. "There will be a high degree of emotional engagement, and everything will be contextual, nothing abstract. There will be a lot of humor. This won't be a deadly serious place."

Those who planned, argued and campaigned for years to put together the complicated financing package for Union Station are so pleased with the results that even before the reopening they were talking of returning to the voters and asking them to extend the culture sales tax, which made the restoration possible. The idea would be to use the tax to finance a wider array of cultural offerings. Supporters said the rebirth of the station, whose architectural features are similar to those of Grand Central and Union Station in Washington, has brought a new sense of metropolitan spirit on both sides of the Missouri-Kansas line, a border across which some of the vilest actions of the Civil War occurred.

Civil leaders are daring to dream of what else might be financed by extending the eighth-of-a-cent culture tax beyond 2002, when the station restoration will be paid off. Possibilities include creation of a publicly financed arts endowment, which could benefit museums like the Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art, performance groups like the Lyric Opera and the Kansas City Symphony, and smaller organizations.

Other noncultural possibilities include updating the stadiums in which the football Chiefs and baseball Royals play and improving the very limited public transportation system, which serves one of the most sprawling metropolitan areas in the country.

The new Arts Council of Metropolitan Kansas City was formed partly to look at how a culture tax or other public money might be sought for the arts.

"Kansas City is in the top quartile of cities for private funding of the arts," said Jan Kremer, president of the Greater Kansas City Community Foundation and an organizer of the arts council. "But we are near the bottom of public funding."

Two regional neighbors, Denver and St. Louis, have adopted taxes for cultural purposes, she said. But she added that no specific proposals would be formulated here until public surveys on the issue are completed. Joan Israelite, president of the Arts Council, said its creation was part of a great expansion of arts and cultural activity. "We're on the verge of a cultural renaissance," she said.

The financing of the area's cultural and other needs has grown increasingly complicated as development has spread into the five counties in Kansas and Missouri that make up the metropolitan region, and into a second tier of surrounding counties in both states as well. More than 100 municipal and other governmental entities are involved, and the principal city, Kansas City, Mo., has become a smaller piece of the whole even though its population is growing slightly.

Unlike most other metropolitan areas that reach across state lines, this region's population of 1.7 million is fairly evenly divided between the two states, as are business and industry, and people here seem to view the state line as the de facto heart of the city. Booming Johnson County, Kan., with 20-some suburban cities, rivals Kansas City proper in size and economic clout. Kansas City, Kan., much smaller and poorer than Kansas City, Mo., or Johnson County, maintains a strong industrial base.

A century and a half ago civic leaders of the two Kansas Cities laid out their principal arteries within walking distance of the other state; Union Station was built just blocks east of the state line.

"The fact is that we function as an economic city-state," said Jack Holland, an investment banker who began working on the bistate financing concept 15 years ago.

He was part of a group called Kansas City Consensus, which formed in the early 1980's to look at how Kansas City could continue to pay for cultural and recreational offerings while much of the core city's economic power was being lost to the suburbs. From that group the idea of the bistate tax emerged in 1985.

The group recommended a sales tax instead of a property tax because a sales tax could be applied uniformly throughout the metropolitan area. By contrast, assessed valuation for a similar piece of property might vary from country to county and state to state.

Supporters of the bistate tax said they found many examples around the country of culture taxes and of metropolitan area taxes that crossed county lines, but no examples of a tax that crossed a state line.

After passage of the enabling legislation in Kansas and Missouri in 1993, representatives from each state decided what projects to propose to voters. Although arts and other culture groups had been the driving force behind passage of the legislation, they had trouble agreeing on a package of programs and institutions to support.

In the end everybody could agree only on raising money to restore Union Station. Its beauty, even in its abandoned and unmaintained state, and the emotional attachment felt by people across the area made the station "the perfect candidate for election," said Jack Craft, a lawyer who led the culture-tax campaign in Missouri. "It's handsome, and it doesn't talk."

Next, advocates of the tax had to deal with the almost legendary distrust that Kansans have of the politicians in Kansas City, Mo. "So a lot of safeguards were built into the Union Station operating agreement," said State Rose, a suburban newspaper publisher who ran the culture-tax campaign in Kansas.

A separate legal entity was created to own and operate the station, and an agreement

was drawn up that, if the restoration project should fail at some point, ownership of Union Station would pass not to the city of Kansas City, Mo., but to the community foundation headed by headed by Ms. Kreamer. Still nervous about the outcome of the voting, the advocates of the tax mounted what Mr. Craft said was the most expensive political campaign ever conducted in the Kansas City region, costing slightly more than \$1 million. Some advertising and public relations concerns donated services.

On Nov. 5, 1996, the culture tax went before the voters in the five counties. It passed with more than 60 percent of the vote in four, losing only in Wyandotte County, site of Kansas City, Kan., the poorest county in the metropolitan area.

The tax is raising \$118 million of the cost of restoring and expanding the station. An additional \$100 million was raised from private contributors; the rest is coming from federal money.

Forty million dollars of the estimated \$250 million price tag was set aside as an endowment whose income will pay part of the operating costs for Science City and Union Station. The rest of the \$18 million operating budget is to come from paying visitors to Science City and from leasing the office and commercial space.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of H.R. 4700, to grant the consent of the Congress to the Kansas and Missouri Metropolitan Culture District Compact. This bipartisan legislation would allow the metropolitan area of Kansas City, Kansas, and Wyandotte County to continue the progress of successful arts and cultural initiatives.

Extending the present compact, which is set to expire in 2001, would include sports facilities in the cultural definition. It would also correct the inequity created by the consolidation of the governments of the City of Kansas City, Kansas and Wyandotte County, Kansas which gave Missouri and advantage of two votes over Kansas. Finally, the extension would give states the authority to continue local revenue stream of a .125% sales tax used to support cultural activities in the bi-state region.

I commend Representative MCCARTHY from Missouri for her hard work and dedication to moving this legislation through the legislative process. This an excellent example of a bi-state, private-public, local-federal partnership which works well. The continuation of the compact will allow the metropolitan area to further this productive alignment for successful arts and cultural initiatives in the bi-state region and I strongly support the effort.

Mr. GEKAS. Madam Speaker, H.R. 4700 grants the consent of Congress to the Kansas and Missouri Metropolitan Culture District to facilitate cultural development in the greater Kansas City metropolitan area. The Compact being considered is uniquely designed to encourage cross-state cultural and intellectual development. Like the original Kansas-Missouri Metropolitan Culture Compact approved by Congress in 1994, the Compact proposed by H.R. 4700 allows voters from both states to jointly support cultural activities benefiting the bistate region.

While nearly identical to the Culture Compact approved by Congress in 1994, the Culture Compact proposed by H.R. 4700 expands the definition of cultural programs to cover sport activities and facilities. It also changes the composition of the Culture Commission to maintain balanced representation from both

states. Finally, like its predecessor, the Congressional Budget Office has estimated that implementation of the Compact would have no fiscal impact on the U.S. Treasury.

Passage of the 1994 Kansas and Missouri Culture Compact has brought cultural and aesthetic renewal to residents of the Kansas City metropolitan region while obtaining a broad measure of bipartisanship in the member states and in the Congress. With our help, Kansas and Missouri will continue the cultural invigoration of the greater Kansas City area and I urge your support of the bill.

Mr. MOORE. Madam Speaker, I rise to share my support for H.R. 4700, which would grant the consent of Congress to the Kansas and Missouri Metropolitan Cultural District Compact. I like to start by thanking my friend and colleague, Congresswoman KAREN MCCARTHY, for her leadership on this issue. Her tireless work for the Fifth District of Missouri and the people of the Kansas City metropolitan area should be commended.

Over the past four years, we have enjoyed the successes of the original bi-state compact that was passed by Congress in 1994, that continues to receive tremendous support from individuals and organizations on both sides of the state line. This agreement is essential to a unique city with a state line running through the middle of town. Many residents work on one side of state line and reside on the other. The economy and culture of the region are vitally important to all residents of the Kansas City metropolitan area.

This compact made possible the restoration of Union Station and the completion of Science City, now one of the Kansas City metropolitan area's most important cultural and education facilities. Union Station is a remarkable example of what can be accomplished when federal, state, and local governments work with private and public contributors to improve our communities.

As the existing compact is scheduled to conclude at the end of 2001, it is our responsibility to see to it that a new compact is approved to continue this successful venture. Furthermore, it is important to take this opportunity to correct the advantage of two votes that Missouri currently holds on the Bi-State Board, due to the consolidation of the governments of the Kansas City, Kansas, and Wyandotte County, Kansas, into the new Unified Government. This inequity should be resolved to preserve the balance and harmony of the Compact.

As we move into the twenty-first century, it is even more important to take steps to preserve our common history and strengthen our great community. The Bi-State Compact will enable us to take on cultural initiatives, improve education, develop transportation proposals, and improve the lives of those in the Kansas City metropolitan area.

I support this legislation, which I have co-sponsored, because I believe the residents of the metropolitan area should be able to decide for themselves if they want to participate in this project. I can think of no better way to decide the issue than to give the authority directly to voters on both sides of the state line.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of H.R. 4700, which gives Congressional approval to the Kansas and Missouri Metropolitan Cultural District Compact.

One of the hallmarks of this Republican Congress has been its commitment to empowering state and local governments to address local and regional challenges. This legislation is a great example of that commitment. H.R. 4700 imposes no federal mandates on the states of Kansas and Missouri, or on the local governments which have endorsed the compact. It does not call for the use of federal dollars. It does not require that the Compact be extended into the future. Instead, it simply gives the necessary Congressional approval to the Kansas and Missouri Metropolitan Cultural District Compact.

The Compact is a unique effort to provide a secure source of local funding for metropolitan cooperation across state lines to restore historic structures and cultural facilities. Since it was established a few years ago, local leaders have worked through the Compact to restore Kansas City's Union State, one of the Midwest's important historic landmarks. It has also led to the addition of the Kansas City Museum's Science City Project. When the Compact was initially created in 1994, sanctioning legislation sped through both the House and Senate by voice votes in just a few months.

As other advocates of H.R. 4700 have noted, the breadth of support for the Compact is overwhelming. It is supported by the legislatures of both Kansas and Missouri, the Governors of both states, and by both Republican and Democratic elected officials. I commend the gentleness from Kansas City for bringing this measure forward, and I encourage all my colleagues to join me in voting for it.

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Madam Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS) is recognized to control the time of the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON).

There was no objection.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4700.

The question was taken.

Mr. GEKAS. 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.

GRANTING CONSENT OF CONGRESS TO RED RIVER BOUNDARY COMPACT

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 72) granting the consent of the Congress to the Red River Boundary Compact, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.J. RES. 72

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

SECTION 1. CONGRESSIONAL CONSENT.

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—The consent of Congress is given to the Red River Compact entered into between the States of Texas and Oklahoma and the new boundary established by the compact.

(b) *NEW COMPACT.*—The compact referred to in subsection (a) sets the boundary between the States of Texas and Oklahoma as the vegetation line on the south bank of the Red River (except for the Texoma area where the boundary is established pursuant to procedures provided for in the compact) and is the compact—

(1) agreed to by the State of Texas in House Bill 1355 approved by the Governor of Texas on May 24, 1999; and

(2) agreed to by the State of Oklahoma in Senate Bill 175 approved by the Governor of Oklahoma on June 4, 1999.

(c) *COMPACT.*—The Acts referred to in subsection (b) are recognized by Congress as an interstate compact pursuant to section 10 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

(d) *CONSTRUCTION.*—The compact shall not in any manner alter—

(1) any present or future rights and interests of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Tribes, the Chickasaw Nation, and the Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma and their members or Indian successors-in interest;

(2) any tribal trust lands;

(3) allotted lands that may be held in trust or lands subject to a Federal restriction against alienation;

(4) any boundaries of lands owned by the tribes and nations referred to in paragraph (1), including lands referred to in paragraphs (2) and (3), that exist now or that may be established in the future under Federal law; and

(5) the sovereign rights, jurisdiction, or other governmental interests of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Tribes, the Chickasaw Nation, and the Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma and their members or Indian successors-in interest presently existing or which may be acknowledged by Federal and tribal law.

(e) *EFFECTIVE DATE.*—This Act shall take effect on August 31, 2000.

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

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

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

As everyone knows by now, the Constitution requires that when any one State or more than one State wishes to enter into an agreement with one or another State, that agreement is subject to the consent of the Congress. That is why our committee, charged with the responsibility of overseeing those kinds of agreements, brings to the floor, just as we have now, this pending agreement, already reached between the States of Texas and Oklahoma with respect to the boundary line, that momentous boundary line that exists between the two States, namely the Red River.

It appears that over the years the Red River changes its contours from time to time and causes difficulty for everyone concerned in determining the actual dividing line between those two great States in the Southwest. Such continued argument about the boundary has resulted in a final resolution of it. Yet just as the final resolution was reached, it was also determined that the Indian tribes that abound in that

area were themselves hurt, or they felt that they would be hurt by the final agreement. They determined that some of their interests, land interests and other, would be harmed if they were not consulted or made a part of the agreement, so that their concerns could be addressed.

Voila, then, we have this new compact before us which takes into account all the concerns that the Indian tribes have uttered over the years. And it was as a result of the dispatch by our committee of our chief counsel, Ray Smietanka, and minority counsel, Mr. Lachmann, to that area that lay the groundwork for the final resolution of this problem.

□ 1530

But we are glad to report that here today we are ready to have the House vote on a complete finalization of the boundary line that the Red River constitutes.

Madam Speaker, I include for the RECORD the following letter and cost estimate:

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, July 20, 2000.

Hon. HENRY J. HYDE,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimate for H.J. Res. 72, granting the consent of the Congress to the Red River Boundary Compact.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The CBO staff contact is Mark Grabowicz, who can be reached at 226-2860.

Sincerely,

BARRY B. ANDERSON
(for Dan L. Crippen, Director).

Enclosure.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST
ESTIMATE, JULY 20, 2000

H.J. RES. 72—GRANTING THE CONSENT OF THE CONGRESS TO THE RED RIVER BOUNDARY COMPACT, AS ORDERED REPORTED BY THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY ON JULY 29, 2000

H.J. Res. 72 would give Congressional consent to the Red River Compact entered into by the states of Texas and Oklahoma concerning the new boundary between these states that would be established by the compact. Enacting the resolution would result in no cost to the federal government. Because enactment of H.J. Res. 72 would not affect direct spending or receipts, pay-as-you-go procedures would not apply. The resolution contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act and would impose no costs on state, local, or tribal governments.

The CBO staff contact for this estimate is Mark Grabowicz, who can be reached at 226-2860. This estimate was approved by Peter H. Fontaine, Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SANDLIN) whose district is affected by this compact, be allowed to control the time on this side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

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

Madam Speaker, I would like to first thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman GEKAS) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), the ranking member of the House Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law, as well as the committee staff, for working with all of the parties interested in this legislation so that we can bring a fair and well-crafted bill to the floor today.

Madam Speaker, House Joint Resolution 72 grants a consent of Congress to the River Boundary Compact entered into between the States of Oklahoma and Texas. This compact establishes a new practical boundary between the two States and ends over 200 years of jurisdictional uncertainty. The State legislatures of both Texas and Oklahoma have approved the compact with overwhelming support.

Madam Speaker, the Red River is 1,290 miles long. For about half of this distance, it serves as the Texas-Oklahoma border. To the great frustration of many of those trying to use the river as a jurisdictional marker, mature rivers like those of the American Midwest tend to meander a great deal.

The natural tendency of a river flowing across flat country is to meander and flow loose as it erodes the outer side of a bend and deposits sediment on the inner side. It is clear that several of the loops of the Red River have changed in this way.

As the Speaker undoubtedly knows, the State of Texas was an independent nation from the years 1836 to 1845. In 1841, engineers surveyed the border along the Red River between the Republic of Texas and the United States. The survey set the boundary between the two countries on the southern bank of the river. This definition was later refined by the Supreme Court of the United States as the gradient boundary line on the south bank.

The survey was carefully done, and the results of the survey as recorded in the engineers' report and monuments placed along the border were accepted by both governments as the true and legal boundary.

Unfortunately, however, the river paid no attention to the survey; and in the years since 1841, the Red River has left that border high and dry. As a result, the artificial boundary line long the Red River has caused general confusion in our States for many decades.

The States of Texas and Oklahoma recognize that there are actual and potential disputes, controversies, and criminal and civil litigation problems arising out of the location of the boundary line between these two States along the Red River. In particular, an inability to identify the boundary at a point in time is a significant problem for law enforcement personnel, taxing authorities, and citizens on both sides of the river.

It is in the interest of the party States to establish the boundary between the States through the use of a readily identifiable and natural landmark. This identifiable line is established in the Red River Boundary Compact. The Compact sets the boundary between the States of Texas and Oklahoma as the vegetation line on the south bank of the Red River, except for the Texoma area where the boundary is established pursuant to procedures provided for in the compact approved by both States.

The vegetation line, which includes trees, shrubs and grasses, is easily recognizable. More importantly, the use of the vegetation line as the boundary marker also maintains historical significance. Surveyors of the General Land Office and Bureau of Land Management have confirmed that the vegetation line is substantially the same as the gradient boundary line, with the important distinction of being identifiable without a survey.

Like the Red River itself, this compact is the culmination of years of work. It is not easy to settle a jurisdiction battle that dates back to the Louisiana Purchase.

The U.S. Supreme Court has tried twice to settle this dispute, which at one point brought the governor of Oklahoma to the border in a tank. However, true to the slogan "One Riot, One Ranger," the good governor of Oklahoma and his tank was held off by a lone Texas Ranger on his horse.

Madam Speaker, this is good legislation. A great deal of effort went into ensuring that the interest of all parties along the Red River are protected in the compact.

It is important to note that the terms of the Red River Boundary Compact will not affect private property ownership or boundaries. The compact is strictly political in nature and will in no way alter the property or the claims of individuals or federally recognized Indian tribes.

Finally, I want to take this opportunity before the House to recognize the tireless efforts of the chairman of the Red River Boundary Commission of the State of Texas, Mr. William Abney, from Marshall, Texas, a well-respected East Texas attorney, as well as the other members of both the Texas and Oklahoma commissions.

I would also like to offer special thanks to my colleague from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) who is here today for his work and for the work of his staff. I think both the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) and I recognize that the true work of the House is done by the staff.

I urge Congress to pass House Joint Resolution 72.

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

Mr. GEKAS. Madam Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY).

Mr. THORNBERRY. Madam Speaker, this resolution deals with a special

function entrusted to Congress under article I, section 10 of the Constitution.

I want to express my gratitude to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman GEKAS) and also the gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER), the ranking member, for the serious, thoughtful way that they have met this responsibility and for their patience and persistence in making sure that we get every detail of this compact just right.

I also want to thank their staffs, especially Ray Smietanka and David Lachmann, for their work which brought this matter to a successful conclusion and, of course, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SANDLIN) and the other cosponsors of this bill, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS), the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATKINS) and the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATTS), all of whom represent the border between Texas and Oklahoma.

Finally, I want to thank Trey Bahm of my staff for his work in making sure that we get it right.

As the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SANDLIN) said, Madam Speaker, this dispute goes back 200 years to the Louisiana Purchase. The boundary line between the Louisiana territory and Spain was not well defined at that time. But a treaty with Spain concluded in 1819 by Secretary of State John Quincy Adams helped to define the boundary somewhat more clearly. That boundary was reaffirmed by the U.S. and Mexico and the U.S. and the Republic of Texas.

Later the Supreme Court found that the proper boundary was the gradient boundary along the south bank of the Red River. The problem is that changes periodically, and so it is a difficult thing to measure. They have to have a survey crew go out there to decide where the boundary is every time the river changes. Obviously, that has not worked very well.

Over the years there have been disputes of various kinds. The incident that my colleague the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SANDLIN) referred to in the 1930s was one in which Oklahoma failed to follow a court ruling to close the border. One of the Rangers that was sent to deal with the Oklahoma National Guard and the tanks that they brought happened to be my wife's grandfather. And there was a picture of him in Life Magazine meeting the tank, proving that one tank and one Ranger was a pretty equal match.

More recently we have not had that kind of open warfare, but we have had difficulties in law enforcement taxation.

So having a clearly identifiable border, which this resolution sets out, which has been passed by both the State legislatures of Oklahoma and Texas I think makes sense. We guarantee private property rights. We guarantee the rights of the Indian tribes, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Chairman GEKAS) pointed out.

So this, I think at long last, after 200 years, brings to conclusion the disputes and the difficulties raised by this border. I hope that it will gain the unanimous approval of my colleagues.

MOMENT OF SILENCE IN MEMORY OF OFFICER JACOB B. CHESTNUT AND DETECTIVE JOHN M. GIBSON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the Chair's announcement of earlier today, the House will now observe a moment of silence in memory of Officer Jacob B. Chestnut and Detective John M. Gibson.

Members in the Chamber and the staff and those in the gallery may wish to rise for a moment of silence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS).

Mr. GEKAS. Madam Speaker, we had mentioned the fact that the concerns of the Indian tribes in the area were a highlight of the agreement that was finally reached. As a matter of fact, we approved an amendment in full committee, which is now part of the bill, which takes into account those concerns.

Here we have a resolution issued by the Kiowa, Comanche & Apache Intertribal Land Use Committee, which, in effect, approves and supports the amendment, the language that is now in the bill that expresses our concern about the Indian tribe concerns. And it has been duly certified and rendered to our committee. I include for the RECORD that resolution:

KIOWA, COMANCHE AND APACHE INTERTRIBAL
LAND USE COMMITTEE
RESOLUTION NO. 00-10

Whereas, the Kiowa, Comanche and Apache Tribes of Oklahoma are federally recognized Tribes with approved constitutions; and

Whereas, the Kiowa, Comanche and Apache Intertribal Land Use Committee (KCAILUC) is the duly authorized and delegated official body given the responsibility and authority by the three tribes to act on their behalf with respect to the care, maintenance and development of commonly owned tribal properties and resources; and

Whereas, it is the desire of the Kiowa, Comanche and Apache Intertribal Land Use Committee (KCAILUC) to accept the Amendment to H.J. Res. 72 Offered by Mr. Gekas as follows:

(d) CONSTRUCTION—The compact shall not in any manner alter—(1) any present or future rights and interests of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Tribes, the Chickasaw Nation, and the Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma and their members or Indian successors-in-interest; (2) any tribal trust lands; (3) allotted lands that may be held in trust or lands subject to a Federal restriction against alienation; (4) any boundaries of lands owned by the tribes and nations referred to in paragraph (1), including lands referred to in paragraphs (2) and (3), that exist now or that may be established in the future under Federal law; and (5) the sovereign rights, jurisdiction, or other governmental interests of the Kiowa, Comanche, and Apache Tribes, the Chickasaw Nation, and the Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma and their members or Indian successors-in-interest presently existing or which may be acknowledged by Federal and tribal law.

Now Therefore Be It Resolved, that the Kiowa, Comanche and Apache Intertribal

Land Use Committee (KCAILUC) hereby approve and support the Amendment to H.J. Res. 72 Offered by Mr. Gekas.

CERTIFICATION

The foregoing KCAILUC Resolution No. 00-10 was duly adopted at a Regular Monthly Meeting of the Kiowa, Comanche and Apache Intertribal Land Use Committee held at the KCA Administration Office on July 12, 2000, by a vote of 6 For 1 Against 0 Abstain. A quorum being present and at least two representatives from each tribe concurring in the vote.

BILLY EVANS HORSE,
Chairman.
MELVIN KERCHEE, Jr.,
Secretary.

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of H.J. Res. 72, a Joint Resolution granting the consent of Congress to the Red River Boundary compact. This bipartisan legislation will re-enforce the eroding Red River south bank and establish a new boundary between the states of Texas and Oklahoma. The new boundary is a vegetation line that is not as susceptible to the forces of nature and is substantially the same as the gradient line used to originally determine the states' boundaries.

Initially, three tribal nations, the Kiowa, the Comanche, and the Apaches expressed concerns regarding this legislation's effect on the status of land from which the tribes derive oil and gas royalties. To remedy that issue, language, approved by officials from Texas, Oklahoma, the Indian Tribes, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs, was put into the legislation confirming that neither the rights of the Indian nations nor the boundaries of the Indians lands will be altered by the compact.

I commend my colleagues for working together in a bipartisan manner to resolve this important issue and I strongly support the effort.

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Madam Speaker, I rise as a cosponsor of H.J. Res. 72, the Red River Boundary Compact, and urge my colleagues to support this important legislation. Today, with Congressional consent the border dispute between Oklahoma and Texas that has existed for more than 100 years will come to an end.

The official boundary is currently the south bank of the Red River. However, the Red River constantly runs dry, which makes determining the south bank difficult. There was an obvious need for a new, more definitive way to determine the border.

In 1996, Oklahoma and Texas agreed upon creating a Red River Boundary Commission to solve this border dispute. In the last year, this commission released their findings and both Oklahoma and Texas state governments have agreed on this compromise. This agreement would clarify and affix the boundary between Oklahoma and Texas as the vegetation line on the south bank of the Red River. This agreement would mean that the Red River would be part of the State of Oklahoma, where it belongs.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution. We need to put a stamp on this agreement which will end the Red River War, and I urge my colleagues to support H.J. Res. 72.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 72, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the Speaker signed the following enrolled bills on Thursday, July 20, 2000:

H.R. 1791, to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide penalties for harming animals used in Federal law enforcement;

H.R. 4249, to foster cross-border cooperation and environmental cleanup in northern Europe.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 42 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6 p.m.

□ 1730

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. KUYKENDALL) at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING
NATIONAL MOTTO FOR GOVERNMENT
OF A RELIGIOUS PEOPLE

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H.Res. 548) expressing the sense of Congress regarding the national motto for the government of a religious people, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the national motto of the United States is "In God we trust";

Whereas the national motto was adopted in 1956 and is codified in the laws of the United States at section 302 of title 36, United States Code;

Whereas the national motto is a reference to the Nation's "religious heritage" (*Lynch v. Donnelly*, 465 U.S. 688, 676 (1984));

Whereas the national motto recognizes the religious beliefs and practices of the American people as an aspect of our national history and culture;

Whereas nearly every criminal law on the books can be traced to some religious principle or inspiration;

Whereas the national motto is deeply interwoven into the fabric of our civil polity;

Whereas the national motto recognizes the historical fact that our Nation was believed to have been founded "under God";

Whereas the content of the national motto is as old as the Republic itself and has always been as integral a part of the first

amendment as the very words of that charter of religious liberty;

Whereas the display and teaching of the national motto to public school children has a valid secular purpose, such secular purpose being to foster patriotism, symbolize the historical role of religion in our society, express confidence in the future, inculcate hope, and instruct in humility;

Whereas there is a long tradition of government acknowledgment of religion in mottoes, oaths, and anthems;

Whereas the national motto serves "the legitimate secular purposes of solemnizing public occasions, expressing confidence in the future, and encouraging the recognition of what is worthy of appreciation in society" (*Lynch v. Donnelly*, 465 U.S. at 693 (O'Connor, J., concurring));

Whereas the national motto reflects the sentiment that "[w]e are a religious people whose institutions presuppose a Supreme Being" (*Zorach v. Clauson*, 343 U.S. 306, 313 (1952));

Whereas President George Washington, in his Farewell Address, stated, "[o]f all the dispositions and habits which lead to political prosperity, religion and morality are indispensable supports," and "[w]hatever may be conceded to the influence of refined education on minds of peculiar structure, reason and experience both forbid us to expect that national morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle," and "let us with caution indulge the supposition that morality can prevail in exclusion of religious principle";

Whereas President John Adams wrote that "it is religion and morality alone which can establish the principles upon which freedom can securely stand";

Whereas the role of religion in public life is an important one which deserves the public's attention;

Whereas the signers of the Declaration of Independence appealed to the Supreme Judge of the World for the rectitude of their intentions, and avowed a firm reliance of the protection of Divine Providence;

Whereas President George Washington, in his First Inaugural Address, said that "it would be peculiarly improper to omit in this first official act my fervent supplications to that Almighty Being who rules over the universe, who presides in the councils of nations, and whose providential aids can supply every human defect, that His benediction may consecrate to the liberties and happiness of the people of the United States a Government instituted by themselves for these essential purposes";

Whereas the First Congress urged President George Washington to proclaim "a day of public thanksgiving and prayer, to be observed by acknowledging with grateful hearts the many single favours of Almighty God";

Whereas the First Congress reenacted the Northwest Ordinance, which stated that "[r]eligion, morality, and knowledge, being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged";

Whereas the Declaration of Independence demonstrates this Nation was founded on transcendent values which flow from a belief in a Supreme Being;

Whereas the Founding Fathers believed devotedly that there was a God and that the unalienable rights of man were rooted in Him, is clearly evidenced in their writings, from the Mayflower Compact to the Constitution itself;

Whereas religion has been closely identified with the history and Government of the United States;

Whereas our national life reflects a religious people who earnestly pray that the Su-

preme Lawgiver guide them in every measure which may be worthy of His blessing; and

Whereas the national motto is prominently engraved in the wall above the Speaker's dais in the Chamber of the House of Representatives, appears over the entrance to the Chamber of the Senate, and is depicted on all United States coins and currency: Now therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives encourages the display of the national motto of the United States in public buildings throughout the Nation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARR) and the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARR).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BARR of Georgia. 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. Res. 548.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BARR of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER) and I ask unanimous consent that he be permitted to control that time.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I ask the House to review favorably and pass favorably H. Res. 548. This is a resolution that expresses the sense of Congress that the national motto "In God We Trust" should be posted and made public in all public buildings across the country.

This is an important resolution, one which is inspired for me by Members of the Colorado State Board of Education, who just a few weeks ago adopted a State resolution encouraging the public display of the national motto "In God We Trust" in public schools throughout the State of Colorado.

The State Board of Education in my State recognized the following, that during the Civil War, in response to a public desire for recognition of the Almighty God in some form on our coins, President Abraham Lincoln signed in law on April 22, 1864, a law which introduced the motto "In God We Trust" to our national coinage.

It was on July 30, 1956, that President Dwight Eisenhower signed a law stating that the national motto of the United States is hereby declared to be "In God We Trust." The Federal courts have repeatedly upheld the constitutionality of the national motto and its uses.

It is in the public interest that the State of Colorado's Board of Education affirmed to uphold, affirm and celebrate the national heritage and the traditions and values which have been

the foundation and the sustenance of our Nation as well as the elements vital to its future preservation.

Our national motto is one of which we are all proud, Mr. Speaker. In fact, it is a motto that we will find posted in a number of sites right here in the United States Capitol Building.

Across from the Capitol above the doors of the opposite body we will find the motto "In God We Trust" emblazoned above the doors there. And here in this Chamber just a few feet above where the Speaker stands, we find those encouraging words in bronze and marble, which are front and center as Members of this body stand where I am and where my colleagues are on the House floor to make various presentations of all sorts every day that the United States Congress is in session.

This motto is one that in times of peril and in times of greatness Americans frequently resort to, both as a statement of thanks and also as a statement of reassurance that goes back to our early days, that goes back to our early days which our founders composed and to the Declaration of Independence, observing that all rights and liberties that Americans enjoy, those of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness and other rights, are not secured by government, they are not secured by a constitution, they are not secured by a king, not given by some government authority or power of any kind.

No, in the United States, according to our Declaration, all rights that are enjoyed by the American citizens are given to us by the Almighty himself.

It was to that proposition that our Founders appealed for the rectitude of their intentions in securing that declaration and launching a great and mighty Nation.

Mr. Speaker, we have been troubled for too long a period of time with a certain amount of moral destruction and decay in our country, which results in violence from Americans against Americans, among children, among minorities, among all people who are wishing to thrive and be free and be safe and secure throughout the country.

As we struggle here in this Congress with all kinds of solutions, whether they are to try to curb violence or try to promote responsible behavior or to set the appropriate laws in place to help make our Nation more safe and secure, it is fitting that we look to our national motto, which is the most fundamental statement, in my estimation, of where the answer lies. And so, this motto is one that all Americans embrace, one that we enjoy and celebrate routinely.

But, on this day, I hope that the House will join me and the others that have cosponsored this bipartisan legislation in passing this resolution, which suggests that the motto should be prominently displayed in public buildings throughout the Nation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the resolution, which encourages States and localities to promote "In God We Trust" I guess in public buildings.

Mr. Speaker, we have had no hearings on this resolution. In fact, the final version of the resolution that I received has a date stamp on it, July 24, 5:11 p.m., which was just a few minutes ago the final version that we are considering now was produced. It was not even introduced until 2 weeks ago, and now here we are considering it.

This is a complicated issue when we start talking about religious freedoms. And my colleagues can notice by some of the recent Supreme Court cases, many of them 5-4, some going one way and then in the next case going the other way. We have had recent Supreme Court decisions on religious freedom, just the Texas case where they threw out the school prayer on football games on a 6-3 vote. This is a complicated issue. There are no easy answers to this. And here we are at a very short notice trying to consider this.

Mr. Speaker, I feel very sensitive to this because I come from Virginia. Virginia led the Nation in religious freedom. The Virginia Statute for Religious Freedom was the basis for the First Amendment Bill of Rights. And so, I do not take this casually.

Mr. Speaker, a few days ago we assumed the role of the United States Supreme Court when we declared that the Ohio statute, the Ohio motto which had religious implications, was constitutional. That was an interesting exercise in light of *Marbury v. Madison*, a case decided by the Supreme Court a couple of centuries ago which stated that it was the Supreme Court's responsibility to declare statutes constitutional or not constitutional, not Congress's.

But, in any case, with the emergency, no hearings, here we are on the floor. We are not trying to improve Medicare with prescription drugs. We are not trying to preserve Social Security. We are not doing anything about HMO reform or juvenile crime or background checks for firearm purchases. We are here with this emergency legislation, without any hearings here on the floor, no markup in committee so that these complicated Supreme Court decisions can be analyzed so that we will know what we are doing.

Mr. Speaker, this is not unusual for this Congress. We have shown a lot of disrespect for the Constitution. As a matter of fact, in the last 2 years or so, we have tried to amend the Constitution no less than nine separate times.

We had a prayer amendment that was given consideration, campaign finance, the flag amendment, balanced budget amendment, tax limitation amendment, term limits, electoral college, victims' rights. We even had a hearing on an amendment to make it easier to amend the Constitution.

The Constitution is a foundation of American law that we all have to live under. But, of course, some people seem so privileged that they do not have to live under the same laws and same Constitution as everybody else.

In fact, just this session, when we had a case where a bank lost a case filed by the Department of Labor, instead of being subjected to the law like everybody else, the Committee on Education and Workforce reported a bill to retroactively change the law to help that bank out.

A few years ago, we settled a complex child custody case with language found in a transportation appropriations conference report.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on the Judiciary recently reported a bill to retroactively change the law so asbestos manufacturers will not have to pay the bills run up by victims of asbestos related lung disease.

Here we are, no hearing, 2 weeks after the introduction of the bill, pretending to give consideration to this complex issue involving our fundamental religious liberties.

I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that instead of this kind of drive-by consideration that we would show more respect for our Constitution and our religious liberties by voting no on this resolution.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, as to the complexity of this legislation, I would differ with the description of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) that this is a complex matter. In fact, it is nothing close to that, unless we try to read items such as we just heard about asbestos and banking and Medicare and drug abuse and these kinds of things into that resolution.

None of these items appear here. This is strictly on the motto that we read in front of us here on the House floor and whether it is suitable for the Congress to suggest that it be displayed in public buildings around the country.

I think as far as whether individuals need hearings to understand the importance of whether "In God We Trust" is still a useful motto for the country, I would suggest that most Members probably have a firm opinion about that at the moment. But I will concede that the date that we find on the bottom of the bill suggests it might have been introduced just a few minutes ago.

Actually, the bill has been introduced a few weeks now. This version that is in front of us now and that was moved by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARR) is a corrected version. There were some errors in the legal citations of the Supreme Court references, as well as a couple erroneous dates that were mentioned here. So the version in front of us has no substantive difference from the version which has been before the House now for more than a couple of weeks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. SHOWS).

Mr. SHOWS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my friend the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER) yielding me the time to speak on the bill and on behalf of the bill.

It is not many times I get up here and talk on the opposite side of my friend, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT). But in this I believe.

"In God We Trust" is our motto. We can see it above the Speaker's head right here. And it should be engraved into our national conscience. The values we teach at home and church are universal and should not be left outside the schoolhouse door or outside of where we work and play every day.

I am not afraid to say "In God We Trust" whenever and wherever I want. All Americans should have that right. However, I have long been concerned about the decline of moral values and freedoms in our society.

Recently I introduced H. Res. 551, which encourages "In God We Trust" to be posted prominently in all public and government buildings, just like it is in my own office, right next to the Ten Commandments.

I wrote H. Res. 551 with the direct assistance of Reverend Donald Wildman of the American Family Association. It is a bipartisan measure with 23 cosponsors on the bill. However, today we have H. Res. 548, the bill on the floor today.

This is an issue too important to let partisan politics get in the way, so I have added my name as a cosponsor of this bill, H. Res. 548, as a gesture of unity and bipartisanship.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleagues making "In God We Trust" our priority in Congress. Let us adopt the "In God We Trust" resolution today for our families, for our Nation, and let us encourage a public display of "In God We Trust."

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I just want to make a comment about the complexity of this particular issue.

□ 1745

A simple question as to whether or not you can have a religious display during Christmas season. We have had 5-4 Supreme Court decisions saying in some cases you can, in some cases you cannot.

When and how you can pray in school. We have had cases that say sometimes you can, sometimes you cannot. The Department of Education in that case has published a pamphlet to show localities exactly what the state of the law is and how you can have certain prayers in schools, under what conditions, so that there is some guidance.

We are inviting localities and States into this quagmire without any guidance at all, just inviting lawsuits. That

is why we should show more respect for our Constitution and the Bill of Rights by voting "no" on this resolution.

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

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

Right here on our American currency, we find the motto we are debating here today, "In God We Trust." There is nothing controversial about it. This is the motto that is on all American currency. It is something we live with routinely in the United States. In fact, it is one of the reasons I submit, the meaning of it, that we are the great and mighty Nation that we are today. This is not something to be afraid of or ashamed of. This is a motto we should be quite proud of and be proud to display it around the country.

As to whether the Supreme Court has come close to even ruling on "In God We Trust," the reality is they have considered the national motto and its relevance and its constitutionality, and that is the basis of many of the findings in the resolution itself. There are several cases that I would refer the gentleman to and other Members who are interested in the Supreme Court's record on the national motto.

There is *Lynch v. Donnelly* from 1984. There is also *Engel v. Vitale*, which is a more recent case. There is *Abington v. Schempp*; *Gaylor v. The United States*, a more recent Supreme Court decision about displaying and teaching of the motto to public school children has a valid secular purpose.

And so our Supreme Court has ruled on this question over and over again. It has no relationship whatsoever to the examples that my good friend and colleague had cited. This is our national motto, not a prayer, not promotion of some religion. This is a motto about the same God, the same sentiment, the same beliefs that our Founders incorporated in the Declaration of Independence, ultimately our Constitution, that is incorporated into the prayer that we open up the House Chamber with every day and the motto which we see right before us in bronze lettering embedded in the marble right here in front of us, "In God We Trust."

I concede that there may be some who do not, but as a Nation, as a whole, this is not a controversial statement of any kind. This is one of the key mottos, the key phrases and statements and motto that unites us as a people and has made us the greatest country on the planet. We should not run from it. We should endorse it and embrace it and suggest that the same motto that is on the currency we spend every day is one that we are greeted with in every public building across the country.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUYKENDALL). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BARR) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolu-

tion, House Resolution 548, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WEKIVA WILD AND SCENIC RIVER ACT OF 2000

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2773) to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate the Wekiva River and its tributaries of Rock Springs Run and Black Water Creek in the State of Florida as components of the national wild and scenic rivers system, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2773

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 "Wekiva Wild and Scenic River Act of 2000".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds the following:

(1) Public Law 104-311 (110 Stat. 3818) amended section 5 of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1276) to require the study of the Wekiva River and its tributaries of Rock Springs Run and Seminole Creek for potential inclusion in the national wild and scenic rivers system.

(2) The study determined that the Wekiva River, Wekiwa Springs Run, Rock Springs Run, and Black Water Creek are eligible for inclusion in the national wild and scenic rivers system.

(3) The State of Florida has demonstrated its commitment to protecting these rivers and streams by the enactment of the Wekiva River Protection Act (Florida Statute chapter 369), by the establishment of a riparian wildlife protection zone and water quality protection zone by the St. Johns River Water Management District, and by the acquisition of lands adjacent to these rivers and streams for conservation purposes.

(4) The Florida counties of Lake, Seminole, and Orange have demonstrated their commitment to protect these rivers and streams in their comprehensive land use plans and land development regulations.

(5) The desire for designation of these rivers and streams as components of the national wild and scenic rivers system has been demonstrated through strong public support, State and local agency support, and the endorsement of designation by the Wekiva River Basin Ecosystem Working Group, which represents a broad cross section of State and local agencies, landowners, environmentalists, nonprofit organizations, and recreational users.

(6) The entire lengths of the Wekiva River, Rock Springs Run, and Black Water Creek are held in public ownership or conservation easements or are defined as waters of the State of Florida.

SEC. 3. DESIGNATION OF WEKIVA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES, FLORIDA, AS COMPONENTS OF NATIONAL WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS SYSTEM.

Section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(161) WEKIVA RIVER, WEKIWA SPRINGS RUN, ROCK SPRINGS RUN, AND BLACK WATER CREEK, FLORIDA.—The 41.6-mile segments re-

ferred to in this paragraph, to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior:

"(A) WEKIVA RIVER AND WEKIWA SPRINGS RUN.—The 14.9 miles of the Wekiwa River, along Wekiwa Springs Run from its confluence with the St. Johns River to Wekiwa Springs, to be administered in the following classifications:

"(i) From the confluence with the St. Johns River to the southern boundary of the Lower Wekiwa River State Preserve, approximately 4.4 miles, as a wild river.

"(ii) From the southern boundary of the Lower Wekiwa River State Preserve to the northern boundary of Rock Springs State Reserve at the Wekiwa River, approximately 3.4 miles, as a recreational river.

"(iii) From the northern boundary of Rock Springs State Reserve at the Wekiwa River to the southern boundary of Rock Springs State Reserve at the Wekiwa River, approximately 5.9 miles, as a wild river.

"(iv) From the southern boundary of Rock Springs State Reserve at the Wekiwa River upstream along Wekiwa Springs Run to Wekiwa Springs, approximately 1.2 miles, as a recreational river.

"(B) ROCK SPRINGS RUN.—The 8.8 miles from the confluence of Rock Springs Run with the Wekiwa Springs Run forming the Wekiwa River to its headwaters at Rock Springs, to be administered in the following classifications:

"(i) From the confluence with Wekiwa Springs Run to the western boundary of Rock Springs Run State Reserve at Rock Springs Run, approximately 6.9 miles, as a wild river.

"(ii) From the western boundary of Rock Springs Run State Reserve at Rock Springs Run to Rock Springs, approximately 1.9 miles, as a recreational river.

"(C) BLACK WATER CREEK.—The 17.9 miles from the confluence of Black Water Creek with the Wekiwa River to outflow from Lake Norris, to be administered in the following classifications:

"(i) From the confluence with the Wekiwa River to approximately .25 mile downstream of the Seminole State Forest road crossing, approximately 4.1 miles, as a wild river.

"(ii) From approximately .25 mile downstream of the Seminole State Forest road to approximately .25 mile upstream of the Seminole State Forest road crossing, approximately .5 mile, as a scenic river.

"(iii) From approximately .25 mile upstream of the Seminole State Forest road crossing to approximately .25 mile downstream of the old railroad grade crossing (approximately River Mile 9), approximately 4.4 miles, as a wild river.

"(iv) From approximately .25 mile downstream of the old railroad grade crossing (approximately River Mile 9), upstream to the boundary of Seminole State Forest (approximately River Mile 10.6), approximately 1.6 miles, as a scenic river.

"(v) From the boundary of Seminole State Forest (approximately River Mile 10.6) to approximately .25 mile downstream of the State Road 44 crossing, approximately .9 mile, as a wild river.

"(vi) From approximately .25 mile downstream of State Road 44 to approximately .25 mile upstream of the State Road 44A crossing, approximately .6 mile, as a recreational river.

"(vii) From approximately .25 mile upstream of the State Road 44A crossing to approximately .25 mile downstream of the Lake Norris Road crossing, approximately 4.7 miles, as a wild river.

"(viii) From approximately .25 mile downstream of the Lake Norris Road crossing to the outflow from Lake Norris, approximately 1.1 miles, as a recreational river."

SEC. 4. SPECIAL REQUIREMENTS APPLICABLE TO WEKIVA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—In this section and section 5:

(1) WEKIVA RIVER SYSTEM.—The term “Wekiva River system” means the segments of the Wekiva River, Wekiwa Springs Run, Rock Springs Run, and Black Water Creek in the State of Florida designated as components of the national wild and scenic rivers system by paragraph (161) of section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)), as added by this Act.

(2) COMMITTEE.—The term “Committee” means the Wekiva River System Advisory Management Committee established pursuant to section 5.

(3) COMPREHENSIVE MANAGEMENT PLAN.—The terms “comprehensive management plan” and “plan” mean the comprehensive management plan to be developed pursuant to section 3(d) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(d)).

(4) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—

(1) USE AUTHORIZED.—In order to provide for the long-term protection, preservation, and enhancement of the Wekiva River system, the Secretary shall offer to enter into cooperative agreements pursuant to sections 10(e) and 11(b)(1) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1281(e), 1282(b)(1)) with the State of Florida, appropriate local political jurisdictions of the State, namely the counties of Lake, Orange, and Seminole, and appropriate local planning and environmental organizations.

(2) EFFECT OF AGREEMENT.—Administration by the Secretary of the Wekiva River system through the use of cooperative agreements shall not constitute National Park Service administration of the Wekiva River system for purposes of section 10(c) of such Act (16 U.S.C. 1281(c)) and shall not cause the Wekiva River system to be considered as being a unit of the National Park System. Publicly owned lands within the boundaries of the Wekiva River system shall continue to be managed by the agency having jurisdiction over the lands, in accordance with the statutory authority and mission of the agency.

(c) COMPLIANCE REVIEW.—After completion of the comprehensive management plan, the Secretary shall biennially review compliance with the plan and shall promptly report to the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate any deviation from the plan that could result in any diminution of the values for which the Wekiva River system was designated as a component of the national wild and scenic rivers system.

(d) TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE AND OTHER SUPPORT.—The Secretary may provide technical assistance, staff support, and funding to assist in the development and implementation of the comprehensive management plan.

(e) LIMITATION ON FEDERAL SUPPORT.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize funding for land acquisition, facility development, or operations.

SEC. 5. WEKIVA RIVER SYSTEM ADVISORY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary shall establish an advisory committee, to be known as the Wekiva River System Advisory Management Committee, to assist in the development of the comprehensive management plan for the Wekiva River system.

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—The Committee shall be composed of a representative of each of the following agencies and organizations:

(1) The Department of the Interior, represented by the Director of the National Park Service or the Director's designee.

(2) The East Central Florida Regional Planning Council.

(3) The Florida Department of Environmental Protection, Division of Recreation and Parks.

(4) The Florida Department of Environmental Protection, Wekiva River Aquatic Preserve.

(5) The Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services, Division of Forestry, Seminole State Forest.

(6) The Florida Audubon Society.

(7) The nonprofit organization known as the Friends of the Wekiva.

(8) The Lake County Water Authority.

(9) The Lake County Planning Department.

(10) The Orange County Parks and Recreation Department, Kelly Park.

(11) The Seminole County Planning Department.

(12) The St. Johns River Water Management District.

(13) The Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission.

(14) The City of Altamonte Springs.

(15) The City of Longwood.

(16) The City of Apopka.

(17) The Florida Farm Bureau Federation.

(18) The Florida Forestry Association.

(c) ADDITIONAL MEMBERS.—Other interested parties may be added to the Committee by request to the Secretary and unanimous consent of the existing members.

(d) APPOINTMENT.—Representatives and alternates to the Committee shall be appointed as follows:

(1) State agency representatives, by the head of the agency.

(2) County representatives, by the Boards of County Commissioners.

(3) Water management district, by the Governing Board.

(4) Department of the Interior representative, by the Southeast Regional Director, National Park Service.

(5) East Central Florida Regional Planning Council, by Governing Board.

(6) Other organizations, by the Southeast Regional Director, National Park Service.

(e) ROLE OF COMMITTEE.—The Committee shall assist in the development of the comprehensive management plan for the Wekiva River system and provide advice to the Secretary in carrying out the management responsibilities of the Secretary under this Act. The Committee shall have an advisory role only, it will not have regulatory or land acquisition authority.

(f) VOTING AND COMMITTEE PROCEDURES.—Each member agency, agency division, or organization referred to in subsection (b) shall have 1 vote and provide 1 member and 1 alternate. Committee decisions and actions will be made with consent of $\frac{3}{4}$ of all voting members. Additional necessary Committee procedures shall be developed as part of the comprehensive management plan.

SEC. 6. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out this Act and paragraph (161) of section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)), as added by this Act.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their re-

marks and include extraneous material on H.R. 2773.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2773 adds the Wekiva River and many of its tributaries to the wild and scenic rivers system. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM) is to be commended for his bill, which is the product of extensive public involvement and has the endorsement of a variety of State, local, and Federal governments. H.R. 2773 sets apart over 40 miles of Florida rivers as wild and scenic and in doing so extends existing riparian and water protection zones.

In 1996, Mr. Speaker, Congress passed a law which directed the Secretary of the Interior to study the inclusion of these segments as wild and scenic rivers. The study has been completed and concluded that the river segments contained in this bill are eligible for inclusion into the wild and scenic rivers system. Administration of the river segments will be done by the Secretary of the Interior in cooperation with the State of Florida and Lake, Orange, and Seminole Counties. H.R. 2773 also establishes the Wekiva River System Advisory Committee, which will assist in the development of a comprehensive management plan.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2773, as amended.

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. Speaker, H.R. 2773 would amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to make the Wekiva River in Central Florida, as well as several of its tributaries, components of the wild and scenic rivers system. Congress authorized a study of the river in 1996 to determine whether it met the criteria for addition to the wild and scenic rivers program. The study found that it did. There is a great deal of local support for conferring this status on the Wekiva; and in addition to this Federal designation, the Wekiva already benefits from important State and local protections.

During consideration of this measure by the Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands, an amendment in the nature of a substitute was adopted which made a number of technical changes to the bill, the majority of which are suggested by the National Park Service. With these changes, we support the legislation and urge our colleagues to approve H.R. 2773.

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 2773, the Wekiva Wild and Scenic River Act. This legislation designates the Wekiva River and its tributaries for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

Floridians are blessed with some of the most rich and engaging natural resources in

the world. Every year thousands of people come to Florida to enjoy the ocean as well as our many lakes and rivers. Located in Central Florida, the Wekiva River Basin in a complex ecological system of rivers, springs, lakes, and streams with many indigenous varieties of vegetation and wildlife which are dependent on this water system. Included in this area are several distinct recreational, natural, historic and cultural resources that make the Wekiva River an excellent addition to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. So, it is with great pride that I bring this legislation to the floor for its consideration before the House of Representatives.

First, I would like to take a moment to thank Mr. David Sukkert who brought this issue to my attention years ago. He has been an asset to my staff; illuminating the significance of this beautiful river so that the nation can recognize the environmental treasure we have in Central Florida. I would also like to thank the Friends of the Wekiva, the St. Johns Water Management District, and the Florida Department of Environmental Protection who have been instrumental in this process; I truly appreciate their significant contribution to the Wekiva River.

Growing up, I spent many afternoons with my father canoeing and fishing on Florida's pristine waterways. As they were growing, I took my own sons to experience the same surroundings on the Wekiva River. In this beautiful and serene setting a multitude of species find their refuge. Avid bird watchers travel to the area to catch a glimpse of a few of the 213 different species of birds that are said to be native to the area. The Wekiva area is also home to our national bird, the bald eagle, with 4 active nests. Within the Wekiva River GEOPark, there are 6 threatened or endangered species, including the American Alligator. Not only is the Wekiva River and important wildlife refuge, it also has a deep historical importance. Scientists have found fragments of pottery dating back to the aboriginal period when the Seminole Indians lived in the area.

For more than 30 years, the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Act has safeguarded some of the nation's most precious rivers. In October of 1968, The Wild and Scenic Rivers Act pronounced that certain selected rivers of the nation that possess outstandingly remarkable scenic, recreational, geologic, fish and wildlife, historic, cultural or other similar values, shall be preserved in free-flowing condition, and that they shall be protected for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations. Designated rivers receive protection to preserve their-free-flowing condition, to protect the water quality and to fulfill other vital national conservation purposes.

In the 104th Congress, I introduced legislation which was signed into law to authorize a study of the Wekiva River by the Department of Interior to determine whether it would be eligible and suitable for inclusion in the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. The National Parks Service completed this study and concluded that the Wekiva River system was an excellent candidate for receiving this designation.

This legislation would allow the Wekiva and its tributaries to join the Loxahatchee as Florida's second river to receive this designation. The Wekiva Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1999 provides Congressional designation of

41.6 miles of eligible and suitable portions of the Wekiva River, Rock Springs Run, Wekiwa Springs Run, and Black Water Creek with State management and the establishment of a coordinated Federal, State, and local management committee. As the report states, the Wekiva River area provides "outstandingly remarkable resources" which makes it eligible for this national designation.

Therefore, I thank Congressmen HANSEN and YOUNG for their efforts in bringing this measure to the floor. I enthusiastically support H.R. 2773, the Wekiva Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, and encourage my colleagues to vote in support of this important legislation.

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

Mr. GIBBONS. 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 Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2773, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

GRANTING CONSENT OF CONGRESS TO KANSAS AND MISSOURI METROPOLITAN CULTURE DISTRICT COMPACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 4700.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4700, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The de novo vote on H.R. 2773 is postponed until tomorrow.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 376, nays 1, not voting 57, as follows:

[Roll No. 429]
YEAS—376

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)

Bartlett
Bass
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggart
Bilbray
Billirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt

Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Buyer

Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Crane
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Farr
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Herger

Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoefel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hoolley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jones (NH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)

Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pomeroy
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Snyder
Souder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry

| | | |
|------------|-------------|------------|
| Thune | Viscosky | Weller |
| Thurman | Vitter | Wexler |
| Tiahrt | Walden | Weygand |
| Toomey | Walsh | Whitfield |
| Towns | Wamp | Wicker |
| Traficant | Watt (NC) | Wilson |
| Turner | Watts (OK) | Wolf |
| Udall (CO) | Waxman | Woolsey |
| Udall (NM) | Weiner | Wu |
| Upton | Weldon (FL) | Wynn |
| Velazquez | Weldon (PA) | Young (AK) |

NAYS—1

Chenoweth-Hage

NOT VOTING—57

| | | |
|-------------|--------------|-------------|
| Army | Hilleary | Porter |
| Baca | Jenkins | Rahall |
| Barton | Kennedy | Rogan |
| Bateman | Lampson | Salmon |
| Burton | Lazio | Sessions |
| Clay | Maloney (NY) | Slaughter |
| Coburn | McCollum | Smith (TX) |
| Cook | McIntosh | Smith (WA) |
| Cramer | Meeks (NY) | Spence |
| Danner | Menendez | Stark |
| Doolittle | Miller, Gary | Stearns |
| Engel | Mollohan | Sweeney |
| Ewing | Morella | Taylor (NC) |
| Fattah | Murtha | Tierney |
| Fowler | Norwood | Vento |
| Franks (NJ) | Ose | Waters |
| Gilman | Owens | Watkins |
| Granger | Payne | Wise |
| Hefley | Pombo | Young (FL) |

□ 1828

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, due to a public forum in my district today, I was absent for the vote on H.R. 4700, legislation to grant consent of the Congress to the Kansas and Missouri Metropolitan Culture District Compact. Had I been present, I would have voted in the affirmative for H.R. 4700.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 1167. An act to amend the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act to provide for further self-governance by Indian tribes, and for other purposes.

MAKING IN ORDER ON JULY 25, 2000, OR ANY DAY THEREAFTER, CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 99, DISAPPROVING EXTENSION OF MOST FAVORED NATION TRADING STATUS TO VIETNAM

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order at any time on July 25, 2000, or any day thereafter, to consider in the House the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 99) disapproving the extension of the waiver authority contained in section 402(c) of the Trade Act of 1974, with respect to Vietnam; that the joint resolution be considered as read for amendment; that all points of order against the joint res-

olution and against its consideration be waived; that the joint resolution be debatable for one hour, equally divided and controlled by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means in opposition to the joint resolution and a Member in support of the joint resolution; that pursuant to sections 152 and 153 of the Trade Act of 1974, the previous question be considered as ordered on the joint resolution to final passage without intervening motion; and that the provisions of sections 152 and 153 of the Trade Act of 1974 shall not otherwise apply to any joint resolution disapproving the extension of the waiver authority contained in section 402(c) of the Trade Act of 1974 with respect to Vietnam for the remainder of the second session of the One Hundred Sixth Congress.

□ 1830

Mr. Speaker, let me say it is the intention of this unanimous consent request that the 1 hour of debate be yielded fairly between Members of the majority and minority parties on both sides of this issue.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUYKENDALL). Is there any objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

TRIBAL SELF-GOVERNANCE AMENDMENTS OF 2000

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 562) providing for the concurrence by the House, with amendments, in the Senate amendment to H.R. 1167.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 562

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution the House shall be considered to have taken from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 1167) to amend the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act to provide for further self-governance by Indian tribes, and for other purposes, and the Senate amendment thereto, and to have concurred in the Senate amendment with the following amendments:

- (1) Page 14, line 12, strike "(or of such other agency)".
- (2) Page 15, line 1, insert "so" after "functions".
- (3) Page 19, line 4, insert "other provisions of law," after "section 106".
- (4) Page 20, line 6, strike "305" and insert "505".
- (5) Page 31, line 23, strike "may" and insert "is authorized to".
- (6) Page 39, strike lines 7 through 14, and insert the following:

"(g) WAGES.—All laborers and mechanics employed by contractors and subcontractors (excluding tribes and tribal organizations) in the construction, alteration, or repair, including painting or decorating of a building or other facilities in connection with construction projects funded by the United States under this Act shall be paid wages at not less than those prevailing wages on similar construction in the locality as determined by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with the Davis-Bacon Act of March 3, 1931 (46 Stat. 1494). With respect to construc-

tion alteration, or repair work to which the Act of March 3, 1931, is applicable under this section, the Secretary of Labor shall have the authority and functions set forth in the Reorganization Plan numbered 14, of 1950, and section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1934 (48 Stat. 948).

(7) Page 39, strike line 24 and all that follows through page 40, line 6, and insert the following:

"Regarding construction programs or projects, the Secretary and Indian tribes may negotiate for the inclusion of specific provisions of the Office of Federal Procurement and Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 401 et seq.) and Federal acquisition regulations in any funding agreement entered into under this part. Absent a negotiated agreement, such provisions and regulatory requirements shall not apply.

(8) Page 41, line 1, insert a comma after "Executive orders".

(9) Page 49, strike lines 4 through 10.

(10) Page 56, beginning on line 21, strike "for fiscal years 2000 and 2001".

(11) Page 60, line 6, strike "(a) IN GENERAL.—".

(12) Page 60, strike lines 9 and 10.

(13) Page 60, strike line 16 and all that follows through page 65, line 16.

(14) Page 65, line 17, strike "SEC. 13." and insert "SEC. 12.".

(15) Page 66, after line 7, insert the following:

SEC. 13. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Except as otherwise provided, the provisions of this Act shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GIBBONS. 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 materials, on H. Res. 562.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this legislation that we have been working on for 4 years. H.R. 1167, the proposed Tribal Self-Governance Amendments of 2000, creates a new title in the 1975 Indian Self-Determination Act, a statute which allows Indian tribes to contract for or take over the administration and operation of certain Federal programs which provide services to Indian tribes.

Subsequent amendments created title III in the 1975 act to provide for a self-governance demonstration project within the Indian Health Service which allows for large scale tribal self-governance compliance and funding agreements on a demonstration basis.

H.R. 1167 makes this demonstration contracting program permanent for certain programs contracted within the IHS if this legislation is enacted into law.

Indian and Alaskan native tribes will be able to contract for the operation,

control and redesign of various IHS activities on a permanent basis. In short, what was a demonstration project would become a permanent IHS self-governance program. Tribes which have already contracted for IHS services under existing law will continue under the provisions of their contracts while an additional 50 new tribes would be selected each year to enter into contracts.

H.R. 1167 also allows for a feasibility study regarding the execution of tribal self-governance compacts and funding agreements of Indian-related programs outside the IHS but within the Department of Health and Human Services on a demonstration project basis.

H.R. 1167 is an important piece of legislation which is a result of extensive negotiations between the Committee on Resources, the Committee on Indian Affairs in the other body, the Indian Health Service, the Department of Justice, the Department of Labor, and a special task force representing the many Indian tribes around the Nation.

After negotiations and some minor changes, we have all reached agreement. It is my understanding that H. Res. 562, as it is now being considered by us today, incorporates H.R. 1167 as it has been agreed to by everybody working on the bill, including administration officials and tribal representatives.

I support this legislation as we have amended it and urge my colleagues to pass it today and send it back to the other body so that the other body will again have the opportunity to pass it in its final form and send it to the President.

Mr. Speaker, I submit the following exchange of letters for inclusion in the RECORD.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON RESOURCES,
Washington, DC, June 5, 2000.

Hon. TOM BLILEY
Chairman, Committee on Commerce, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: On November 17, 1999, the House of Representatives passed H.R. 1167, a bill to amend the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act to provide for further self-governance by Indian tribes. This noncontroversial bill had been referred solely to the Committee on Resources. On April 4, 2000, the Senate amended the bill and returned it to the House. Section 12 of the Senate amendments establishes the office of the Assistant Secretary for Indian Health in the Department of Health and Human Services. I believe this provision affects the jurisdiction of the Committee on Commerce, as demonstrated by the referral of H.R. 403, which accomplishes the same end, to the Committee on Resources and additionally to the Committee on Commerce.

I propose to concur in the Senate amendments to H.R. 1167 with an amendment which would strip out Section 12. I ask your cooperation in allowing this to occur when we return after the Memorial Day district work period. My understanding is that the Senate would then take up the amended version of H.R. 1167 and send it to the President for signature.

Of course, by allowing this to occur, the Committee on Commerce does not waive its

jurisdiction over Section 12 or any other similar matter. If the Senate insists on its amendments and requests a conference, I would support the Committee on Commerce's request to be named to the conference. Finally, this action should not be seen as precedent for any other Senate amendments to Committee on Resources bills which affect the Committee on Commerce's jurisdiction. I would be pleased to place this letter and your response in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during consideration of the bill on the Floor to document this agreement.

I appreciate your cooperation in moving this bill, which is very important to the Native American community.

Sincerely,

DON YOUNG,
Chairman.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE,
Washington, DC, June 6, 2000.

Hon. DON YOUNG,
Chairman, Committee on Resources, Washington, DC.

DEAR DON: Thank you for your recent letter regarding H.R. 1167, a bill to amend the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act to provide for further self-governance by Indian tribes. As you know, Rule X of the Rules of the House of Representatives grants the Committee on Commerce jurisdiction over public health and quarantine. Accordingly, you are correct in your conclusion that section 12 of H.R. 1167, as amended by the Senate, falls within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Commerce.

Because of the importance of this legislation and your commitment to strike those matters within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Commerce when the bill comes to the floor, I will not exercise the Committee's right to a sequential referral. I appreciate your acknowledgment that by agreeing to waive its consideration of the bill, the Committee on Commerce does not waive its prerogatives with respect to this legislation or similar legislation, including authority to seek conferees on any provisions of the bill that are within its jurisdiction during any House-Senate conference that may be convened on this legislation. Thank you for your commitment to support any request by the Commerce Committee for conferees on H.R. 1167 or similar legislation.

I request that you include this letter and your response as part of the RECORD during consideration of the legislation on the House floor.

Thank you for your attention to these matters.

Sincerely,

TOM BLILEY,
Chairman.

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. Speaker, this is the third time this important piece to the ongoing struggle for Indian tribes to provide governmental services to their membership has been before us. This bill provides a process through which tribes shall step into the shoes of the Federal Government and administer programs to their members previously run by the Indian Health Service.

Similar legislation passed the House in the 105th Congress and again just last November when we passed H.R. 1167. The bill has passed the Senate,

and today we are here to agree to changes we have worked out with the Senate. This is one of, if not the most, important pieces of legislation this Congress will pass affecting American Indian tribes as it reaffirms our commitment to tribal self-governance.

The nature of self-governance is rooted in the inherent sovereignty of American Indian and Alaska Native tribes. From the founding of this Nation, Indian tribes and Alaska Native villages have been recognized as distinct, independent, political communities exercising powers of self-government, not by virtue of any delegation of powers from the Federal Government but rather by virtue of their innate sovereignty. The tribes' sovereignty predates the founding of the United States and its Constitution and forms the backdrop against which the United States has continually entered into a relationship with Indian tribes and Native villages.

We did not make any changes to the bill as it passed the Senate. We decided to delete a section of the bill relating to the application of the FLRA, which is further addressed in the more appropriate setting. Language included in the bill permits tribes to receive waivers from certain regulations to help tribes administer certain programs. We are all agreed, however, that this language does not alter the obligation of the Indian tribes to comply fully with the laws enacted by Congress.

I want to thank the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and all the members of the committee and all of the Indian tribes who worked so hard on this legislation, the Indian Health Service, and our friends in the other body who labored long and hard to get us where we are today, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague and friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), for his leadership and support on this very important piece of legislation.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, we have no further speakers at this 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 Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 562.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WEKIVA WILD AND SCENIC RIVER ACT OF 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 2773, 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 Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2773, 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 amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate the Wekiva River and its tributaries of Wekiwa Springs Run, Rock Springs Run, and Black Water Creek in the State of Florida as components of the national wild and scenic rivers system."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMEMBERING OUR HEROES, JACOB J. CHESTNUT AND JOHN M. GIBSON

(Mr. DELAY asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes.)

Mr. DELAY. Mr. Speaker, today is a time of remembrance and deep appreciation. It was 2 years ago that we lost our brave friends, J.J. Chestnut and John Gibson. As we recall their sacrifices, I wish to place the accomplishments of these two great heroes into a larger context.

The shock of tragedy we all felt at their loss has grown into the deeper pain of longing. We wonder how can it be that God chooses to allow tragedy to visit the homes of good people, people we honor, love and respect? This we cannot know.

Scripture teaches that God pursues his own purpose in his own time.

But there are questions we can answer. What did these men live for? What drove them to revere their work and to carry out their duty even in the face of terrible danger?

The simple truth is that they lived to defend freedom that is cherished and loved by us all. This passion for liberty is the foundation of our democracy. It is the sturdiest support upholding democracy across the globe.

These officers loved their jobs despite the risks because they embraced a broader commitment to a most noble purpose. In doing so, Detective Gibson and Officer Chestnut have taken their place in the continuum of freedom.

From the New England farmers who routed the British on the road to Saratoga to the volunteers who marched south to San Antonio, as the determined men who charged into destiny at Gettysburg, Americans have always answered freedom's summons. From the fearless defenders of Corregidor, to the besieged ranks of guarding the Chosin Reservoir, to the GIs in the heat of the Ia Drang Valley, the call has been answered.

From our sailors under the strange stars of distant oceans, to our pilots flying above the hostile lights of unfam-

iliar lands, the work of freedom goes on. From the Marine stationed at a tiny embassy in a strife-torn nation, to the officers on duty today under the dome of this Capitol, the tradition endures and America goes on.

It is a continuous line of Americans demanding the most from themselves, freedom for our Nation and the best for this world.

This unwavering commitment is the foundation of our democracy.

In Paul's letter to the Corinthians he states, "If any man builds on this foundation using gold, silver or costly stones, wood, hay or straw, his work will be shown for what it is because the day will bring it to light. It will be revealed with fire and the fire will test the quality of each man's work. If what he has built survives, he will receive his reward."

Mr. Speaker, these men were tested. They endured the flames. Their work still stands, and I know in my heart that having received their reward they are now enjoying a peace and joy beyond our worldly understanding.

God bless John Gibson and J.J. Chestnut and their families. Let us never forget their awesome sacrifice.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

INDONESIA

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to protest the widespread violence and killing of innocent people occurring daily in the Maluku, the Spice Islands and Ambon in Indonesia.

The mass killings in Ambon are deeply disturbing. There are members within the current Indonesia government and former government and the military who do not care how many innocent lives are stamped out. These people simply care about their ultimate goal of controlling Indonesian society and keeping their hold on power. It is deeply disturbing and offensive, Mr. Speaker, that these individuals would allow this. They are in the same league as those who ordered the deaths of innocent people in the concentration camps of World War II.

Horrifying reports and photos arrive each day in my office. I have photos of destroyed homes, businesses, churches, places of worship. I have photos of men, women, children, lying in streets with severed limbs, heads blown off, photos much too graphic to bring to the House floor.

Mr. Speaker, I traveled to Indonesia at the end of May, met with various leaders, including President Wahid and leaders from both the Christian and Muslim communities.

□ 1845

They long for peace to reign again. But it seems impossible because of numerous reports of behind-the-scenes maneuvers by Suharto, Habibie, their cronies, various military officers and others who want to destabilize the present government.

These former government leaders and military leaders are really people with no hearts. Why do I say that? Because only uncivilized people could coldly and callously calculate to cause the deaths of whole societies simply to maintain their power.

Mr. Speaker, the mass killings continue. Day after day, more and more people in these islands become refugees with no access to food, clothing, medicine or shelter.

Reports suggest that the tension in the Maluku is not simply an economic issue; it is a religious issue as well. Members of the more extremist Islamic community, including the current leader of the People's Consultative Assembly, Dr. Amien Rais, openly have supported calls for "jihad" or an Islamic holy war against the Christians and other religious minorities in Indonesia.

The influx of Laskar Jihad fighters into Maluku has only happened through complexity of members of the military who have allowed a mass influx of men and arms into the Ambonese communities.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to share a couple of excerpts from letters and reports that we have received:

"Before the military arrived, we were fine. There was no fighting. They came and the attacks came with them. When we were boarding the evacuation ship, the soldiers had stolen most of our things, including our rings, necklaces, et cetera, and sold them in front of us for almost nothing. A chain saw that costs several hundred dollars was sold for \$10. If we carried two bags of clothes to bring, they threw one out. We took only part of what we had fled with. The clothes I have on are the only ones I now own. This shirt I wore during the attacks. I had no long pants."

"For the 3 days of the fighting, soldiers were shooting at us, many of them died. Two of our kids died. One was handicapped, and the soldiers hung him and burned him alive. These two had not died in the fighting; it was after when the soldiers rounded us up. The soldiers murdered these two."

"The attacks continued until the evening the 3rd of July in the village. The next day, the attack continued. When it was known that the mobs planned to burn down the university, the villagers again asked the military's help to stop the mobs. Again, the request was ignored with the excuse that there are villagers, civil security personnel, and the students regiment who could guard the university campus."

Here is an AP article from July 17: "The leaders of an armed Muslim militia have vowed to rid the islands of Christians. Most members come from

Indonesia's central island of Java, and its leaders are Suharto supporters. In the television footage, many of the Muslim militants can be clearly heard speaking Javanese as they plan their attack on Christian parts of Ambon.

"In television footage shot over the weekend . . . Indonesian soldiers are seen fighting alongside hundreds of Muslim militants in Ambon. Many of the extremists were filmed carrying military-issue assault rifles."

Mr. Speaker, out of desperation, many community leaders from Ambon have urged the international community to help stop these continued killings by bringing in U.N. observers and peacekeepers and boycotting Indonesian businesses involved in supporting the destruction of the Maluku.

Mr. Speaker, we should not stand idly by and watch while the death count continues to rise. Our Nation should not do business with businesses supporting this bloodshed. We are starting our military assistance again. We should not lend our military expertise to military officers who approve of the killing of innocent women and children. We have laws that impose sanctions on Nations that allow persecution of ethnic and religious groups.

I call on Members to join me in sending a letter to President Wahid and President Clinton. I call on the Indonesian and U.S. Governments to act immediately to stop the killings and bring to justice the parties responsible for this reign of terror.

A TRIBUTE TO BENJAMIN FRANKLIN DILLINGHAM III

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

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor one of the most outstanding citizens of San Diego, California.

Benjamin Franklin Dillingham III, or Ben as he is known to his many friends in San Diego, will be honored this Sunday at a community tribute banquet in San Diego. A community leader and philanthropist; former chief of staff to our mayor, Maureen O'Connor; a captain in the United States Marine Corps; Ben is currently serving as chief financial officer for Patient Care Incorporated, reflecting his deep interest in providing quality health care for all.

Ben was born in Honolulu, a fourth generation islander. His father, Ben II, was the general manager of the Oahu Railway and Land Company. His mother, Frances Andrews, is the daughter of Vice Admiral and Mrs. Adolphus Andrews of Denison, Texas.

Ben received his B.A. degree cum laude and his master's in business administration both from Harvard University. Upon graduation from Harvard Business School with distinction, he was commissioned a second lieutenant

in the Marine Corps; and while in Vietnam, he was promoted to first lieutenant.

When he returned to the United States, he began training recruits at Marine Corps Recruit Depot in San Diego and was promoted to captain while at MCRD. He was given orders to Advanced Armor School conducted by the United States Army at Fort Knox and graduated, typically, at the top of his class before returning to duty with the Marines. Ben finished his service as a division training officer and then drove across country to establish residence in San Diego, California.

Here in San Diego, he was recognized as a true community leader. Prior to his work as chief of staff for the mayor, he also worked for General Dynamics, Convair Division, and the Metropolitan Transit Development Board.

Mr. Speaker, his service to the community is broad and spans a number of organizations. He has served as a member of the Marine Corps Association, the United States Armor Association, the Navy League, the Hawaiian Mission Children's Society, the Center for Social Services, the Greater San Diego Business Association, the Metropolitan Community Church of San Diego, the United Way, the Diversity Committee, the San Diego Human Dignity Foundation, the San Diego Scholarship Foundation, and the County AIDS Service Advisory Panel.

He has been a board chair of the AIDS Foundation of San Diego and the County of San Diego AIDS Services Advisory Panel, and he has served as a board member of the Episcopal Community Services, L.I.F.E. Foundation, AIDS Project, and the San Diego Scholarship Foundation.

Aside from all of these memberships and board leaderships, he has numerous honors from across the city. His military awards include the Bronze Star Medal with Combat "V" for Vietnam Service and the Army Commendation Medal at the Armor Officer Advance Course at Fort Knox. His civilian recognition includes Man of the Year, the San Diego Lesbian/Gay Pride Festival; the Human Rights Campaign Fund Crystal Torch Award; the Log Cabin Club Pursuit of Happiness Award; the Brad Truax Presidential Award; the Stan Berry Award; and the Harvey Milk Memorial Award at the Nickys; the Harvey Milk Democratic Club Human Rights Award, and the San Diego AIDS Project Celebration of Life Award.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to thank Ben Dillingham III for his tenacity in the fight for progressive causes; his commitment to the struggle for human rights; his belief in the importance of access to government, education, and health care for every member of our society; his outstanding service to the City of San Diego; and his significant contribution to our community as a whole.

Mr. Speaker, I am truly proud to call Ben my friend.

CELEBRATING THE TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT

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

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, we are now celebrating the 10th year anniversary of the Americans with Disabilities Act. I rise this evening to not only celebrate this landmark occasion, but also to acknowledge my unwavering support of the Americans with Disabilities Act, known as ADA, and the future of this legislation.

Just a few days ago, I signed a pledge of support for the American Association of People With Disabilities, thereby affirming my belief that we need an America that lives up to the promise of liberty, opportunity, and justice for all.

The ADA advocates for our Nation's more than 43 million citizens with disabilities. In the Seventh District of Illinois, there are over 35,000 people with disabilities under the age of 65, and over 20,000 people with disabilities 65 years or older.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to share a few thoughts regarding the principles of the ADA and its successes over the last 10 years.

First of all, the ADA seeks to break down stereotypes and misconceptions about people with disabilities by including them in the progress and prosperity of our Nation. Equal opportunity, full participation in society, employment opportunities, independent living, and economic self-sufficiency are the guiding principles of the ADA.

Today, we are seeing a more inclusive and integrated society as a result of the ADA. People with disabilities are getting jobs that they want and for which they are well qualified. The Global Strategy Group Survey found in October of 1995 that 75 percent of companies with 51 to 200 employees are now hiring people with disabilities. From 1991 to 1994, 800,000 persons with severe disabilities joined the workforce. Public transportation changes and curb cuts are widespread. Accommodations in hotels, restaurants, and stores are becoming more and more accessible. Telecommunications for people who are deaf and hard of hearing is becoming a reality. People who are blind can receive information in a format they can use.

So successes from the ADA are visible today, and I hope that we continue to use these gains as a baseline for future work to liberate those who live in confining conditions and who want to be more integrated into society.

Mr. Speaker, along that line, I am pleased to note that I am the sponsor of the MiCASSA bill, which would bring our Nation's Medicaid system into accord with the principles set forth by the ADA. This bill will allow individuals with developmental and other disabilities to use Medicaid funding for home-based and community-

based services, not just for confining medical institutions. I believe this will strengthen the existing infrastructure set forth by the ADA and the Developmental Disabilities Act.

Mr. Speaker, we are not yet where we want to be, but thank God we are not where we were 10 years ago. We still have much progress to make. However, I am pleased to be here today to offer my unwavering support for our people who live and work daily with disabilities. I am proud that as a result of the ADA, many people with disabilities are now thriving, productive members of society, and looking forward to the future with glee and anticipation.

HONORING LIEUTENANT COLONEL KAREN DIXON

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

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute and congratulate a real American heroine, Lieutenant Colonel Karen Dixon, who hails from the Seventh Congressional District of Maryland. I was honored to attend a pinning and promotion ceremony for Lieutenant Colonel Dixon last Friday at the Women's Military Service Memorial at Arlington National Cemetery, Arlington Virginia. During this ceremony, Lieutenant Colonel Dixon was promoted from the rank of Major to Lieutenant Colonel.

Lieutenant Colonel Dixon is the ninth child of 11 children born to Alice and James Dixon. Of those 11 children, four have served in the military. She is an honors graduate of Catonsville High School and received several awards and served as a member of the All-State cross country team. She received a bachelor of arts degree in social work from Bennett College, where she was commissioned as a second lieutenant in the United States Army Signal Corps upon selection as a distinguished military graduate. In 1995, she received a master's of arts degree in management from Webster University.

Mr. Speaker, during her tenure in the Army, she has served in many capacities. She currently is assigned as a Department of the Army Systems Acquisition Management Coordinator, assigned to the Secretary of the Army's staff. Her next assignment is Chief of the Headquarters Branch, Joint Headquarters Regional Subcommand, NATO in Greece.

Lieutenant Colonel Dixon is an American soldier, a person of capability and ideals. She has dedicated her life to an American Army that always must remain true to its principles, an Army that must always conduct itself with fairness. She understands that our commitment to fairness and merit is our strength. She has served this Nation well. And in the process, she has learned that no one gives us our freedom; it must be earned. No one guarantees fairness that we ourselves are not

willing to affirm, even if that requires some personal risk on our part.

Lieutenant Colonel Dixon understands that life is a struggle, but she is an American. She believes that when we persevere, fairness will ultimately prevail. The United States military is remarkable among the great fighting forces of the modern world.

□ 1900

More often than not, the young people who have defended us and, all too often, have made the ultimate sacrifice have done so as volunteers.

Last March, President Clinton applauded the service and achievements of all the women who have put on the uniform of the United States and fought for their country. As the President also recognized, however, obstacles to hard-earned recognition all too often remain, in the military and in civilian life.

Mr. Speaker, we must continue to build a military which is as diverse as this wonderful Nation. Never again should gender predetermine a person's opportunity to serve.

The ideals of American women and men, our commitment to freedom, to equality and fairness, have made this country the strongest in the world. We must never forget that. Fairness is the foundation of our freedom.

Today, we acknowledge Lieutenant Colonel Karen Dixon for her competence and her commitment to American ideals and for her tremendous service.

Lieutenant Colonel Dixon has demonstrated that merit will be recognized and fairness will prevail if we persevere. By her actions, she has shown that a commitment to fairness remains the foundation of America's strength. That is why I am so honored to represent Lieutenant Colonel Dixon in the Congress of the United States of America.

APPLAUDING LEADERSHIP IN ADVOCACY OF RIGHTS OF DISABLED PERSONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUYKENDALL). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I, too, want to join my congratulations and recognize the Presidential Task Force on Employment of Adults with Disabilities and the American Association of People With Disabilities.

I rise today to applaud the leadership that has been shown in the advocacy for the rights of the disabled, the mentally and physically challenged.

I am delighted to be able to salute the spirit of the ADA torch relay which evidences that we all are created equal. I join my colleagues who have come to this floor to acknowledge that when this country speaks of equality and in its Declaration of Independence, when

it offers to the American people the opportunity for equality and a good quality of life, they speak of everyone no matter what one's position in life and what one's ability.

The people who are physically challenged and mentally challenged have shown us that it is not limiting in their spirit or their ability to achieve. I am very gratified that they continue to press their point of equality and justice.

I believe it is important that we in the United States Congress support the Americans with Disabilities Act in its reauthorization and its implementation. It is important that the businesses of America recognize that they are advantaged by hiring individuals with disabilities.

I recall making a speech some few weeks ago, and I spoke about America's greatness and its diversity. I remember being reminded by someone who came to me in a wheelchair never to forget that diversity is also reflected in Americans with disabilities. Just a few weeks ago, that very same person came to the United States Congress along with 20 other representatives from the community of individuals who are disabled.

Unfortunately, this own Capitol, our own Capitol was very hard for them to access, but, nevertheless, they were not frustrated, they did not yield, and they persisted in getting into the United States Capitol that belongs to all of the American people.

I think it is important that we allow people with disabilities to be independent, and that is why I supported legislation that would not diminish their benefits if they worked, for we all deserve that affirmation that we are able to support ourselves and to stand for ourselves.

I would hope that we, as the United States Congress and the American people, will continue to promote and enhance those who are physically challenged and who may be mentally challenged. People with disabilities are our friends, our brothers, our family members, our sisters, mothers and fathers and our children. They deserve our affirmation.

So today, Mr. Speaker, I rise and affirm them and congratulate them for persisting on the grounds of their own equality, and I seek to have this United States Congress and our legislative initiatives continue to affirm opportunities for them to work and as well making sure that the resources that they earn still allow them to have good health care, good educational resources, good housing.

Again, I implore American businesses to find the talented among Americans with disabilities and for all of us to make sure that everywhere is accessible to all Americans.

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 Extension of Remarks.)

H.R. 4921 AMENDING TITLE 38 TO ENSURE THAT ALL VETERANS EXPOSED TO IONIZING RADIATION ARE CONSIDERED IN FULL FOR THEIR DISABILITY CLAIMS

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

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill to enable veterans exposed to radiation to be considered for medical assistance without regard to their particular level of exposure. The bill, also, expands the definition of radiation-risk activity to include veterans exposed to residual contamination.

The destroyer U.S.S. Brush entered the waters of the Kwajalein Atoll in the Marshall Islands, an area contaminated with radiation from a large number of ships that had served as targets during two atmospheric nuclear tests. Crew members of the U.S.S. Brush ate fish and drank water distilled from the bay and crew members made trips to the target vessels to retrieve souvenirs. There was no dosimetry data collected on the U.S.S. Brush or at the Kwajalein Atoll to determine levels of exposure. No safety precautions were taken to prevent exposure and the crew was unaware of the dangers of ionizing radiation.

Veterans who served on the U.S.S. Brush now suffer from a number of diseases that can be linked to radiation exposure. However, their disability claims have repeatedly been denied because they were not onsite participants in an atmospheric nuclear test and they were exposed to low levels of ionizing radiation.

Congress has assisted veterans exposed to radiation in the past. In 1988 Congress passed the Radiation-Exposed Veterans Compensation Act (PL 100-321). This law covered veterans which participated in a radiation risk activity. The law has three definitions of radiation risk activity. They include: onsite participation in a nuclear detonation, occupation of Hiroshima or Nagasaki, Japan, by United States forces during the period beginning on August 6, 1945 and ending on July 1, 1946, and internment as a prisoner of war in Japan during WWII which resulted in the opportunity for exposure to ionizing radiation comparable to that of veterans occupying Hiroshima or Nagasaki. Clearly, this language does not cover those veterans exposed to radiation while in the service of their country.

VA claims that lab tests on these veterans show that levels of residual radiation are not sufficient to sustain their claims for disability. However, these dose levels were based on lab tests, not data collected on sight at the Kwajalein Atoll. This is important because Congress has previously concluded that determining the level of exposure, unless collected onsite, is a futile exercise. Disability claims must be considered without regard to whether any particular level of radiation was measured for that individual especially when exposure is not denied.

Congress must act to ensure that veterans exposed to ionizing radiation either on site or residually be considered for benefits. Without this legislation radiation exposed veterans do

not have a realistic chance of proving their disability claim. I urge my colleagues to support our veterans by co-sponsoring this bill.

NIGHTSIDE CHAT

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. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I would like to go basically over what the comments that I am going to make this evening, but I guess it would be appropriate to make a couple comments about this weekend back in Colorado.

First of all, I would like to express deep appreciation for all the firemen and the firefighters that are so courageously fighting the forest fires that we have out there in Colorado.

As many of my colleagues know, my district is the Third Congressional District of the State of Colorado. That district geographically is larger than the State of Florida. It is essentially all the mountains of the State of Colorado. As one can guess, it is the highest district in the United States. So we have a lot of lightning strikes and so on.

We do have a major fire down at Mesa Verde National Park down at the Four Corners of Colorado. Right now it has consumed about 17,000 acres. The conditions are very tough to fight the fire. But we have got a lot of volunteer firefighters. We have a got a lot of volunteers from the community. We, of course, have our own fire fighting teams. We have got the bombers in there. We have got the helicopter pilots. We just have a lot of cooperation out there in Colorado. So I thank my colleagues for their expressions of support, and I do want to express my deep appreciation for all of the people out there in Colorado who are helping get an upper hand on the fires right there in their Third Congressional District.

Second thing I would like to mention to my colleagues before I go into my comments, and that is I had the privilege Friday of speaking at a service for a Colorado State patrolman, Captain Fred Bitterman. Captain Bitterman was a well-respected officer of the Colorado State Patrol.

I used to be a police officer. I used to know the captain. Of course, I was not on the State Patrol. I was a city police officer.

The service was a very moving service. He has a wonderful family. His commitment to the State of Colorado, his commitment to the Colorado State Patrol, his commitment to his friends, his commitment to the communities was all well represented at that service.

We are going to miss him. The captain did a good job. He was a very, very good man. I have entered into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a congressional tribute in honor of the service that he gave to us. He will be sorely missed.

Mr. Speaker, this evening I would like to address three fundamental subjects, and they are fundamental especially for the younger generations of this country. For the people that are, say, below 45, 45 and under. We hear a lot of discussions going on, but what is the real focus for the future?

There are three items that I would like to talk about that I think focus on the future that our young people that are under 45 years of age should take special interest in, because I think our generation over 45 years of age owes something to this generation, not owes in the way of a giveaway, but owes in the way that we have a responsibility to move this country forward in such a fashion that these three elements have some sense of protection or some sense of right direction for the generation that follows us.

The first topic that I am going to visit with tonight is this death tax. Then I am going to move from the death tax into the marriage penalty. Then from the marriage penalty, I would like to talk about Social Security. In all three of these areas, there is a distinct difference between what the administration, President Clinton and AL GORE, are advocating and what is being advocated by the Bush team. I think it is fair to reflect on those this evening when I have these discussions with my colleagues.

Let me first of all begin on the death tax. As my colleagues know, I have spoken several times on this House floor in regards to what that death tax does and how devastating it is in this community. What has been of interest is the people opposed to this, including the Clinton administration, and, by the way, I refer specifically to the administration's policies, because I want my colleagues to know here in the House of Representatives we actually had 65 Democrats who voted to eliminate the death tax. So here in the House we have had a bipartisan effort, both Democrats and Republicans, going out there and recognizing just how punitive, how punishing the death tax is.

Well, since the debate started taking place on this several weeks ago, I have noted a number of different comments in our national press. One thing that is of special interest, I think, or a counterpoint I guess one would make, my point being that the death tax is devastating for a community as a whole; and the counterpoint that is being put out there by some of the liberal media writers I guess one would say is, wait a minute, all this does is favors the wealthy in this country.

Well, I want to talk about what I call the trickle-down impact of what that death tax does, not only just in a community, but what it does to family farms and family ranches.

For example, right here, we will have a family ranch. Now, I can tell my colleagues that most working ranches, at least the ones I am familiar with, and I have been on a lot of ranches in my career, but most of the family ranches

that I am familiar with in Colorado are what we call working ranches. What we mean by a working ranch is that the family actually has to make a living off the ranch. They do not own the ranch for the beauty or the esthetics of having a ranch. They own it because that is how they provide a living for their family.

One of the assumptions that is being made by some of the opponents of this, including the Clinton administration, who seems to think that if one owns a ranch in Colorado or a ranch in Wyoming or a farm in Georgia or a farm in Kansas, that one automatically should be classified as the wealthy people of this country and one should be punished upon the event of one's death.

In other words, the Clinton administration says that death is a taxable event. In fact, the Clinton administration feels so strongly that death should be a taxable event that this year in President Clinton's budget that he has sent to us, the administration's budget, they actually call for an increase in the death tax, an increase in the death tax.

We clearly, including the Republicans and 65 Democrats, have a fundamental difference with the administration Clinton-Gore in that we do not believe that death should be a taxable event.

Well, let us go back to that working family or working ranch out there in my district since that is where I am the most familiar. Some of these people are saying, well, you go out there and tell these people to buy life insurance, you know, go out, and that way, when they pass away, because the government, frankly, the administration has pushed this as a taxable event, why you will have the life insurance. Upon the death of the owner of the ranch, why it is no problem. The life insurance pays the government these taxes.

Well, do my colleagues know what? That is based on an assumption that these working family farms and ranches in Colorado and elsewhere in this country make enough money to pay the premiums to buy the life insurance. Do my colleagues know something? Most of the farmers and ranchers that I know in my district no more have the money which would be, by the way, several tens and tens of thousands of dollars at a minimum every year just for the premiums, they no more have that money than they do extra cash in the bank.

What happens when one keeps this death tax? Oh, sure, one may think that one is going after the Rockefellers or the Carnegies or the Kennedys or the people like that, the Forbes or the Gates in our country, but, in fact, those are the families who have their money and the resources to do estate planning. They have their foundations and so on. So one would be surprised at the minimal impact there is on those families.

Where the impact is is these families that have, for example, as one says, has

land, and they work it as a ranch in Colorado, but when they die, the land all of a sudden which has appreciated in value, after all, the one family I am speaking of, they have had the family ranch for 125 years, there has been an appreciation in that 125 years.

Well, what happens? The only thing that can possibly happen is that that ranch is going to cease to exist. There is no choice. The death tax is devastating on family farms and family ranches in this country.

Is this country not in the business of encouraging family farms and family ranches from going from one generation to the next generation? Is that not what our policy should be? Should not we stand up and say, hey, in America, in America, we want these farms to go from one generation to the next?

But that is not what is happening in this great country. What is happening in this country is, as long as we have that death tax in existence, we are discouraging, not encouraging, we are discouraging the possibility that that family farm will pass to the next generation.

□ 1915

And is that really the policy that we want? Clearly, some of my colleagues over here, who have supported the Gore/Clinton policy, actually want an increase in the death tax. They support that budget. But 65 of the Democrats and all the Republicans have said, wait a minute, we should be, in this country, in the business of encouraging that this goes from one generation to the next generation.

The other thing that I want to bring up that is being widely ignored by the critics and the media, who are criticizing us because we are saying that death should not be a taxable event, the media that is criticizing us for saying that death should not be a taxable event are ignoring something. They keep coming out and saying this is for the wealthy. Well, take a look at what it does to a community.

For example, I know a small community in Colorado where there was a fairly wealthy individual, the person was a millionaire in that community, and upon his untimely death the Government came in and taxed his death. And what did they do with that money? Did they keep it in that small community? Of course the Government did not allow that money to stay in the community. It was not enough for the Government to take it away from someone they said was a wealthy person; and by the way, to qualify for that, if someone is a contractor, for instance, all they have to really do is own a bulldozer, a dump truck, and a backhoe and they have to worry about estate taxes.

Let us look closely at that logic. Citizen A is very wealthy. Let us follow the logic. Now, I do not agree with the logic, but let us follow the logic some of my colleagues have. Their logic is just simply because the person is wealthy, based on that fact alone, just

because they are wealthy, we should tax them on their death. Well, if we follow that logic, then we should say, okay, tax the wealthy person, punish them, go after them simply because they are wealthy.

Then what is done with the money? As my colleagues know, this money does not stay here in the community. It does not stay in this community and continue to go to the local church, or charities or help provide jobs or create capital or create investment in that community. That money is sucked out of that small community; and it all goes east, to Washington, D.C., where the bureaucracy takes it and redistributes it, takes the money from the small communities, whether in Kansas or out in California or up in Wyoming or Montana or Idaho, takes the money from those death-taxed estates and takes it out of those communities and ships it to Washington, D.C., back here in the East, and then it is redistributed. And that has a very negative impact.

What these editorial writers who support the death tax, what they should put in their editorials is not what it does to the wealthy family, although in fairness they should say what it does to a small business owner or a rancher or a farmer; but they ought to be fair and talk about what happens to that next generation. They also ought to be fair to the rest of the community where that individual lives and talk about what happens to that community, especially a small community where that money is sucked out of the community and sent to the East. Obviously, it has a very negative impact.

I thought I would bring up a couple articles here and read them for my colleagues. I do not like to read verbatim, but I would just like to just speak to these because I think these are important.

Every June for the past 8 years Jeanne Mizell, owner and manager of Mizell Lumber & Hardware Company, has sent the Government a check for \$19,000. She will have to continue to send that check for the next 7 years. This money is not income tax on profits; the money is because the company is profitable. It has been in business for 78 years, 78 years in that community and in her family. It is the price that she is being forced to pay by the Government because she inherited the hardware store from her father and her mother.

"It is not a very pleasant feeling to get that letter in the mail every May," says Mizell, speaking of the Federal death tax bill. "My father, who joined with his father in the family business in 1947, worked very hard, 6 days a week for 37 years, and he paid his taxes every year on time. He did not owe any past taxes and he should have been able to keep the money he accumulated and pass it on to the next generation so that our generation could have an opportunity to have the lumber company and the hardware company."

Instead, after her parents died, the Federal Government steps in and nails them with a death tax of over \$300,000; with another \$45,000 which had to be spent by Mrs. Mizell just to get the appraisal done of the lumber company so the Federal Government could figure out just exactly how much money they wanted out of that estate. That is what the death tax does.

By the way, this is not Home Depot we are talking about. This is a small family hardware and lumber business. This is what is being punished out there. If my colleagues think Home Depot is going to suffer as a result of the death of one of their founders, they are not. They have got the planning; they have the resources to plan for it. It is the small lumber companies, the small families in small-town America that is being punished by these death taxes.

Here is another one. "My name is Leanne Ferris. My family lives in the central part of Idaho. Our family's cattle ranch is 45 miles northeast of the Sun Valley area and the Lost River Valley. The ranch consists of 2,600 deeded acres and a cow-calf operation with 700 head of cattle.

"My youngest brother, Ross, lives with and manages the ranch with my mother. Although I'm still very involved in the ranch, my husband and I also operate a design business in Ketchum, Idaho. My brothers and sister and I all grew up working alongside my mother and my father and my grandfather. We worked weekends and holidays and summers branding and moving cattle, riding the range and fixing fences. We didn't have a lot of material things, but we had our family, we had the land, and we had the life-style.

"On October 5, 1993, my father was accidentally killed when his clothing got caught in a farm machine. He was 71 years old, and he was very healthy. He worked from dawn to dusk and he loved the land. He loved his family. We all worked as a team. We were always a very close-knit family and the hub of our family was my father and our ranch.

"Even though my brother Jack and my sister Cary and I do not live there anymore, we all go home, along with the grandchildren, to help with the seasonal work. My daughter and I take as much time off in the summer as we can so that we can work at the summer cow camp in Copper Basin moving the cattle. My mother puts on a lot of church and community picnics and barbecues down by the swimming hole. Every June our family enters the local parade with a float representing our ranch, and all our other ranchers and their families in the valley do the same. Last year, the theme for the parade was the Mackays Heritage Ranching Mining and Logging.

"My father's death was the most devastating event any of us had ever gone through. The second most devastating event was sitting down with our estate

attorney after my father's death. And I will never forget what the attorney said. 'There is no way you can keep this ranch. Absolutely no way.' Still in shock from the accident, I asked, 'How can this be? It's our ranch. We own the land. We've paid the taxes. We have no debt. We just lost our father, and now we're going to lose the ranch, the very thing which was the centrifugal force of keeping our family together along with our father?' our attorney proceeded to pencil out the death taxes that would be due after my mother's death, and we all sat back in total shock. It had taken my grandfather and my father their entire lifetimes to build up this ranch."

Let me repeat that. "It had taken my grandfather and my father their entire lifetime to build up this ranch, and now we cannot continue on, and the grandchildren cannot enjoy the land and the rich life-style." Now, not rich in monetary terms, but rich in life-style, of going out and working hard in the fields. They do not get to have that any more. It provided a rich heritage. Rich, again meaning the character, the heritage that was there that is now going to be taken by the Government on taxes that have already been paid on this property.

"It has been three and a half years on my father's death, and we still don't know what we're going to do. We only know we're not going to be able to keep the ranch unless something can be done with the estate tax now. The estate tax on our family ranching assets is going to be estimated at \$3.3 million. Without the land being paid for and tight operating costs, we will not be able to make money from the business. To spread that tax over 14 years at the 4 percent interest is of absolutely no value to us."

In other words, what she is saying, my colleagues, is do not come to us out in small-town America and our families in ranching operations and tell us that we are being done a great big favor because the Government is going to allow us to finance the death tax over a period of 14 years.

"All this means is that we're going to have to pay an amount of money which is virtually impossible. In order to try to buy a life insurance policy, we're going to have to sell one of the spring ranches now, and that might allow us to pay off one-third of the death tax and avoid a fire sale."

So what this family is saying is that they will sell part of the ranch now. They are going to sell part of the ranch, a third of the ranch right now, and by doing that what they hope to do is to be able to pay the Government enough money upon the death of their mother that they do not have to go through a fire sale on the rest of the ranch. They are still going to have to sell the rest of the ranch; but if they sell a third of it right now, then they do not have to go to a quick sale on the remaining two-thirds.

"The same scenario is happening to many of our ranchers in the valley.

Eighty percent of the ranches have been owned by the same families one, two, and three generations.

"The value of the land has risen dramatically in the last 5 years. All of these ranchers live on very modest incomes and most of them can barely educate their children. I am certain that none of them will be able to pay this tax. The town is almost solely supported by the ranchers who buy feed, gas, food and clothing. The community will not be able to survive without them.

"What is happening is that these ranches are being bought by wealthy absentee owners who do not run cattle and who fly in once or twice a year to enjoy the amenities of the ranch. This has already happened to two neighboring ranches, both of those owners, both second generation ranchers were killed, unfortunately, in accidents. Their families could not pay the death tax and had to sell the ranches to wealthy Southern Californians.

"I have heard it said that the death tax exists to redistribute wealth; to take from the rich, presumably to benefit others less fortunate. Let me tell you, from where I stand now, that is a tax that accomplishes exactly the opposite. For my family, the tax means we will not be able to continue running the ranch that has been our heritage for over 60 years.

"The Congress says it is a pro-family Congress. However, I know from my personal experience that the death tax is antifamily. The death tax will force us to sell our ranch to a wealthy absentee owner who is unlikely to run cattle or keep the workers employed or contribute to the community. Surely if Congress does not provide relief from the death tax, many other families across this country will suffer a similar fate. Ultimately, I wonder whether towns like our small town, as we know it today, will continue to exist.

"I urge you to ask yourself why does this death tax exist? Is it worth the great harm it has caused to my family and to many others like us? If it is not worth the harm, then the death tax shouldn't exist, and I hope you will do everything in your power to eliminate the death tax."

What more can I say? This is a letter sent to our office. This is from their heart. This is not something some big fancy lobbying organization in Washington, D.C., sent to me. It was not sent to me by the Rockefeller or the Kennedys or the Mellons or the Gateses, or any of those kind of people. This letter was sent to our office by a small family not to make money on the ranching, simply trying to pass their ranch from one generation to the other, to pass the heritage from one generation to the other; simply to keep the money for their ranching and their ranching community alive in their small community.

And by the way, for those of my colleagues who voted no on the death tax,

voted to keep it in place, in fact supported the President's budget to increase the death tax, if only they could take the time to really, really see, to go out and visit this family, my guess would be that those same individuals, those who voted to support the death tax, who stand in favor of the death tax, and who want to increase the death tax, after having taken the time to go out and visit with this family, I think they would come back a new man or a new woman; and I think they would be prepared to get rid of that death tax.

□ 1930

Now let me go on to the next subject because it is somewhat related.

Once again, here it is the Federal Government, the taxing entity of the United States, has decided that not only death is a taxable event, it is the Government that decided some time ago, and let us call it as it is, Democrats, it happened when you had it here for 40 years, it was determined during that period of time that marriage, being married, should be a taxable event.

Now, let me say at the onset, we had a vote on this, we had a couple votes on this; and I can say with a great deal of confidence with the Democrats here on the House floor, that 48 of the Democrats voted to get rid of that marriage tax. In fact, the President of the United States, standing right here in his State of the Union address, said we needed to get rid of the estate tax.

I have got an editorial here from the Grand Junction Daily Sentinel, an excellent newspaper, western Colorado, Grand Junction, Colorado. It was just last January that President Clinton, as a part of his State of the Union address urged Congress, urged all of us sitting down here listening to the speech being made right there, urged us to enact legislation to end the so-called marriage penalty.

What a reversal. Now the President's policy is he is going to veto it. And some people on this floor support that position.

I hope you have enough guts when you go back to your district to stand up to your constituents and look them in the eye and try and justify that. Number one, tell them how you voted, that you voted to support the marriage penalty, and do not give them some flimsy, run-around excuse for it. It was a straight up-or-down vote, do you support taxing marriages or do you not support it? If you support the marriage penalty, then you voted no on this bill to get rid of it and you ought to stand up.

I hope your constituents understand that it is a straight up-or-down vote. There were no side issues involved here. What we are sending down to the administration, to the President and the Vice President, we hope they sign but they have already promised to veto despite the fact the President stood up here and gave his State of the Union

address and said we ought to get rid of the marriage penalty. So you talk about it on one end and then you end it on the other with a veto.

How can a country who is proud of the family foundation, who boasts to the rest of the world that our country has become the strongest country in the history of the world, in a large part due to the fact that we have strong families, that we encourage marriage, how can we look at other countries and say, by the way, this is the country in the world where we penalize you if you are married, we tax you, it is a taxable event, come to the United States and get married and it is taxable, the event is a taxable event, just like the death? How do you justify any one of those?

Both of those taxes. The marriage penalty, do you think that encourages our young people, the hope of our country, do you think it encourages them to get married? And how much of that money, by the way, for those of you who support taxing marriage, how much of that money do you think could have gone into these young people's education?

There are a lot of young married couples out there that like to have that extra \$1,400 to pay for their college tuition or to go out and further their education. And some of you stand up and talk about how you advocate and you are pro-education, and by the way I have never found anybody that is anti-education, but you stand up and advocate how you are pro-education, but then you turn around and vote for a tax, a marriage penalty, that takes \$1,400 away primarily from these young couples who are the very ones who need that money to further their education.

How can you justify it? How can you look at your constituents and say that you can justify taxing a married couple simply because of the fact that they are married?

And again, my colleagues, when you go out there into your districts, do not give any cock-and-bull story about why getting rid of the marriage penalty would cause this or cause that or as I heard the news report Saturday that the President said getting rid of the death tax and getting rid of the marriage penalty would put the surplus at risk.

What a bunch of hogwash. It is not going to put the surplus at risk, not at all. The question here is fundamental fairness. That is what you ought to look at. Is it fundamentally fair to consider death a taxable event? Is it fundamentally fair to go out there and consider a marriage a taxable event?

This Government is not in such dire straits that it has to go out and tax its own citizens when they die. This Government is not in such dire straits that it needs to go out to our young people and show up with a wedding gift of a tax bill.

And even if this country was in dire straits economically, can you justify the marriage penalty, can you justify the death tax based on that event? Of

course you cannot. Of course you cannot.

Mr. Speaker, let me move from the death tax and from the marriage penalty. But before I do, let me point out one thing. Remember, the President stood up here, as I said earlier in my comments, he stood up here when he gave the State of the Union address and urged all of us to get rid of the marriage penalty. Let us see if he stands by his words this week and signs the bill, or let us see if he turns around and vetoes the bill.

The last I heard coming from the White House was they wanted to do a little bargain, a little tit for tat. Hey, give us this program and maybe we will give you the marriage tax penalty.

Quit the horse play. The marriage penalty is not justified. To many of us on the floor, we make a hundred and some thousand bucks a year. The marriage penalty, you can absorb it. Maybe it is not a big bother to you. But you ought to take a look at our kids. My kids are that age where they are of the age where they are getting married and things like that. Ask yourself, look at what kind of punishment it is on them.

So we will see this week. We will see if the President sticks by his words, his policy. His policy was to get rid of the marriage penalty.

Oh, how interesting it is a couple 3 or 4 months before a national election. Now we are going to see him veto it. I hope we all keep that in mind when we go back to our constituents and say somehow Washington, D.C. is able to justify death and marriage, both of them, as taxable events.

Well, while we are on the discussion that involves our younger generation, a generation, by the way, that has so many things going on for it. My gosh, the young people that come into my office. The excitement they have, the energy. As many of my colleagues know, they run circles around us they are so bright. They are capable, the computer world, that generation that follows us and the generation that follows that generation, these generations have a whole lot more going for them than they do going against them.

And we, I think, my colleagues serving on this House floor, I think we have a fiduciary responsibility to that generation and the generation behind that generation and all future generations to get the programs that this Government has in place in as good a shape as we can get them in.

Frankly, that is what I like about the Governor of Texas', George W. Bush, position on education. Every time I have talked to him, and I have talked to him on a number of different occasions, I cannot remember one conversation of any length that I have had with George W. Bush where he has not brought up education.

Why? Because the best thing we can do for this next generation is to make sure that we have an education system that works, that we have a health care system that works. And there is one

other factor out there that we have got to do some work on. We have got to make sure that our Social Security system is in place.

And you know what? In those conversations that I have had with George W. Bush, that was in the conversation: Healthcare, education, and Social Security.

Now, look, our Social Security system from a cash basis, that means money in the bank today, is not in trouble. Social Security is not in trouble today on a cash basis, but on an actuarial basis.

In other words, Social Security today has this amount of money required for claims and it has this amount of money in the bank. But what happens over the next 30 years is these lines begin to intersect. So on a cash basis today, we have money in the bank, there is a surplus in there. It is a surplus.

But what happens is that as this begins to go out is that when you reach this point, you owe all of this money, and this actually, and then all of a sudden it goes up like that. And not even a slight increase. It is almost like a rocket. It goes up just like that.

Those are our obligations. And these obligations right here are not obligations 30 years out. It is actually 30 years out or so before they collect them. But the obligations had been incurred today. In other words, we owe the money today.

So when we look at the Social Security system, we should not look at the money we have in the bank today. That is one factor to look at the money we have in the bank today. But we also need to look at what obligations we have.

It is kind of like deciding when you get your paycheck on the first of the month, I am a rich person, you know, I have got a \$2,000 or I have got a \$1,500 paycheck here. Well, you cannot just look at how much you have in your hand. You have got to take a look at how much you owe. And when you take a look at Social Security on an actuarial basis, it is bankrupt. Today it is not. But 30 years from now when we pay what we owe, it is bankrupt.

Now, what is giving me some confidence about the debate that we have had on Social Security, what gave me the confidence when I talked to George W. Bush was the fact that we are for the first time in a long time looking out ahead. We do have some time if we really take it seriously.

What I liked about the Bush approach was that they are willing to take some risks. We have got to take some risks. We cannot let the Social Security system stay on status quo. If we stay with status quo, we are all going to be happy until that point right there. That is what status quo buys us. It buys us a plane in the air without a propeller at that point right there.

Now is the time to start thinking about how do we get this line, how do

we adapt for this so that we come close so we still bring those two lines together but we do not have the obligations way exceeding it. What do we do?

Well, I think in order to figure out what we do, we have got to figure out historically what was gone wrong with the fund, where have we run into problems with Social Security.

Well, there are a couple key factors to keep in mind. Number one, when Social Security was first created, when Social Security first came about, there were 43 workers for every retired person. So for every one person that was retiring on Social Security we had 43 workers supporting the system. That is when Social Security first came into place.

Today do you know what that number is? Today we have three workers for every person, three workers in our working system for every person on retirement.

□ 1945

That is a dramatic difference and that is a significant problem that has led us to the actuarial problem we have in Social Security.

What is the other problem that we have in Social Security? That one is actually pretty, hey, good news. It is our health care system in this country. When Social Security was first created, a man could expect to live to be 61 years old. But throughout time because of the advancements of Social Security, and this is good news for us, but because of the advances in Social Security, that man now can expect to live to be 73 years old. For the female, those numbers were 65, and now they are somewhere around 78 approximately. Those are good numbers.

But the problem is that we now have more people on the Social Security system, we have less workers supporting the Social Security system, and we have people living to a longer age. The couple that is drawing from Social Security today draws out about \$118,000 more than they put into the system because of these factors. They are taking out \$118,000 more than they put in. A system cannot operate like that. We have got to make some adjustments.

What kind of adjustments do we make and who is going to be impacted? The plan that Governor Bush of Texas has put out and the plan that I am advocating tonight, not because of the fact that I am absolutely convinced that there is only one plan out there, but it is because of the fact that I have looked at a number of different options; and I think the one that is the best is one that has some experience, and the one that has some experience is the one that the governor of Texas has proposed we adopt in these halls of Congress.

Why does it have some experience? Because we Members of Congress have our own retirement plan. We are on Social Security, by the way. But we have our own retirement plan here in Con-

gress which allows us choice, not allowed under Social Security.

So what we need to do when we look at Social Security is, first of all, any kind of proposal, and the proposal put out by the governor of the State of Texas has one fundamental rule at the very beginning and that is, those who are currently on Social Security, so our current recipients, face no risk. Anybody on Social Security today does not have any threat to their Social Security retirement funds that they are receiving. That is fundamental and they are not at risk in any sense. So during this political season, do not let your constituents be hoodwinked into thinking that their Social Security pension that they are drawing today is at risk. It is not. What we are talking about is what can we do for the future generation? What can we do for my children and my children's children to help assure that when they get there, Social Security will be alive and well?

What the proposal is that has been put forth by the governor, I guess really the best way to do it, let me explain what happens if you are a Member of Congress or if you are a government employee, so it is not just Congress, it is Federal employees, so there are over 2 million Federal employees in this country, over 2 million. Here is the plan they have in effect. First of all, they do pay Social Security.

But here is the Government plan, the U.S. Government plan for its own people. It is called the Thrift Savings Plan. It really works in two ways. It has two sections to it. The first section we will call section A pulls an amount of money out of your paycheck every month and you have no say-so about where that is invested. It is the safety net. It is your safety net. So this amount of money is pulled out. You have no say-so; but as a result of that, after, say, so many years of service and a certain age, you are guaranteed a certain retirement check every month. No risk, not much return, but no risk.

Now, by the way, if you want to consider return, figure out that Social Security, if you were born, for example, in 1960, so that would make you 41 today, 40 years old, if you were 40 years old, your return on the current system, if we do not do anything with Social Security, your return is less than 1 percent. 1 percent. Less than 1 percent. That is what you are making on Social Security. We can do better. And the Government knows it can do better because it does it on its own program.

So the first part of the Government retirement program which covers all government employees has this pull-out; it is an automatic pullout out of your check. It is for your retirement. I forget exactly what mine is every month. I have no choice. That is the safety net. The second section is what we call, we will just call it section B. That is not the formal name; but for our discussion tonight, B. What that allows you to do is it is optional. You

do not have to do it. If you as a government employee do not want to participate in the second portion, you do not have to. But if you want to, you can designate, not all your retirement money but you can designate up to 10 percent. You can designate up to 10 percent of your salary every month to go into that retirement section.

What that allows you to do is it gives you three choices. The three choices really are an opportunity for you as an individual to invest your retirement money, to help plan for your own retirement. It gives you choice. Social Security today gives you no choice. It mandates you live with the 1 percent return. It mandates that. But this program here, the Government program for its own employees allows you, if you want to, totally optional, to participate in this program of choice.

What does it do? You contribute up to 10 percent of your check; then I think the Government matches the first 5 percent, then you get to make a choice. You can have that money invested in government savings where it is insured, it is guaranteed and, of course, when you have a guaranteed return with minimal risk, you are going to have a low return. The history of that shows that pays 3, 4 percent a year. The second option you have is you can go into the bond market. The third option you can go into is your highest risk, which offers your highest returns, but again has its highest risk and it is the stock market. But even if you took the stock market choice and you lost everything, you still had the safety net up here. That is how the Government program for 2.5 million people works.

By the way, I want you to know that the strongest opposition to George Bush's plan to bring out this Social Security, to help it for this next generation, the strongest opposition, of course, comes from the administration. But I can tell you that the Vice President voted for this government program many years ago when he was in Congress. So what is good enough for the goose ought to be good enough for the gander. If it is good enough for government employees, why is it not good enough for the citizens of America who want to participate in Social Security?

What the administration has advocated is to take the status quo. Look, we have got 30 years before this next generation gets up there and is going to make a call on the bank. So let's just ride the status quo, or let's have another committee, to study another committee for another committee study. That is not good enough. We have got to take some risk.

Some of you in here, you do not like risk; and I understand that. But I want you to know that the people who are currently on Social Security or are close to, they face no risk. We are not impairing their ability to draw down on Social Security the benefits that they are entitled to. But those of you who want to sit around and do not

want to take risk, you better be prepared for this next generation to explain to them why frankly you sat on your duff and did not do anything to save this system.

We have got to have some leadership in Social Security. Somebody has got to take the ship out into the storm. The easiest thing to do is to dock your ship in the harbor and get out of it and get onto the land. But somebody has got to get through to the other side. That is exactly why I was pleased when I saw and sat down, was able actually to discuss only briefly, but discuss the governor of Texas' plan and a plan that most of us on the Republican side and I think frankly a lot of Democrats would support.

This is what the plan does. First of all, it is optional. You are not going to be required to do this, to participate in the choice aspect. Second of all, it has a safety net, so no matter what you want to do, there is going to be the majority of the money taken out of your paycheck for Social Security. The majority of it will be put into an account that you do not have any say over it. In other words, we do not want you losing that. We want to have a safety net, because not everybody is going to make money. Certainly on an average over a period of time, you are going to make a lot better than 1 percent, but some people may make bad decisions. It has been known to happen. Some people make bad decisions. We do not want 30 years out from now somebody saying, Look, I made bad decisions. I by choice invested all my money in really high-risk stuff and I lost. I thought I was going to win. I lost. Even for that person, we want to have at least a minimal safety net. That is what we do right here.

The second part is for those of you who want to under the Social Security system, just like the government thrift savings program, you are going to be allowed to take 2 percent of the money taken out for Social Security and you get to direct it, you get to choose how that money will be invested. We would run that program. The proposal for that program, to revise Social Security, so that this next generation, that our young people have something that they know is rock solid. What this allows you to do is to do the same as 2.5 million other government employees get to do, and, that is, with that 2 percent, you could invest it in a low risk. Low risk, of course, means low return. Or you could invest it in moderate risk, which means possibility of a moderate return. Or you can invest it in high risk, which means the possibility of high return. Of course high risk means that. High risk. You could lose it all. Moderate, you could lose it. This lower one, the first one, you would be guaranteed a return on your savings.

Now, what is wrong with that? Why is the administration opposing it? We, by the way, have a lot of Democrats, obviously from my comments I am a Republican, but we have a lot of Demo-

crats who say this is a good idea. When you get beyond the Potomac out here, when you get out into the rest of America, you find out there are a lot of people out there that are not as partisan as you think. A lot of people out there would join together and say, Look, we have got to do something with Social Security.

I think most people in America, especially the younger generation, by the way, who are investing the maximum amount of money right now with the lowest possibility of return because of the pulling out of the funds, I think you would find that younger generation saying, hey, something has got to happen with the management. We need to take some different course with Social Security, because frankly, the young people are saying, we are paying into this system, why should we not be entitled to expect some kind of return out of the system?

Outside of Washington, D.C., people want Social Security to work. People do not want Washington, D.C., to bog down Social Security. They want a program that will move forward. Now, I know that the governor of Texas has come under some criticism because he has been bold enough to go out and say we have got to take this ship on a different course. And sure it looks like there is a storm ahead, but the only way we are going to get to the other side is we have got to sail. And somebody has got to have enough courage to stand up there and say, Look, let's try moving the ship. Not dramatically, not radically. We are not going through the eye of the storm to get torn up.

Under proper guidance and leadership, we can take this ship on a safe voyage. And when we get to the other end, this generation behind us and two generations behind us and the other generations that follow will have a Social Security system that the first thing you talk about is not how quickly it is going to fail. The first thing you should be able to talk about on Social Security is, it is a system that works. It is a system that works. And it allows you to have the choice.

Think about it. If you are confident today and for those of you who are standing and are opposed to any kind of change in Social Security, for those of you who are supporting the administration's policy, go out beyond the Potomac River and ask constituents of yours out there, If you've got a million dollars and you want to invest it, would you send it to the Social Security Administration or would you send it to the United States Congress to invest it on your behalf? Of course they are not going to say that. They have confidence that they can invest it better than we can back here in Washington, D.C.

Considering that the return for somebody born in 1960 is going to be less than 1 percent on their dollar in Social Security, I think they are right. I have got a lot more confidence in this younger generation than some of you

might. I think they know, and I think they can wisely make decisions with a very small percentage of those Social Security payments. Remember, the people that are in the Social Security system, we are not allowing them to invest everything. We are not going to allow somebody to go in there and say, I want to take all my Social Security and put 100 percent of it in the stock market. We are taking 98 percent of it and saying, You don't have any choice on it. That is your safety net.

□ 2000

That no matter how bad a decision you make, you still are going to have a payment available to you for those of us born in 1960 in another 15 years or 20 years, but we are going to do something different. Some would call it a dramatic course of action.

I do not think it is dramatic in its results. I think it is dramatic, and it is finally about time that somebody stood at the helm of the ship and said let us change the course.

What we are doing is we are allowing them to take just a small percentage, that younger generation, and let us give them a little confidence for their capabilities of making decisions and saying to the younger generation we are going to allow you a choice. You get to help in that investment; it is, after all, your dollar. Many people in Washington D.C., get the idea that it is the money of the Government back here.

It is not the money of the Government. It is the money of the people, and they have sent it to us on a trustee basis, and I do not think it is so wrong to ask them to help join us in the decisions that should be made on the investments of their dollars. And that is what that Social Security plan calls for. That is why I hope when we reconvene with a new President in January of next year that on that agenda we have three items of which I consider very important: one, an opportunity to take Social Security and allow the people more input and allow the younger people of this country an opportunity to voice their decision and help make decisions on their own personal investments in that Social Security system. We can save Social Security. It does not need to be bankrupt in 30 years.

The second thing I hope we see when we have a new President in January, because I am afraid unfortunately that the President we have today is going to veto it, and that is elimination of the penalty for being married. As I said earlier, how can we possibly justify marriage as a taxable event? This President does. It is his policy.

The third thing I hope we have when we have a new President in January is the elimination of that death tax. Like with the marriage tax, how can we justify taxing somebody simply based on the fact that they died? What kind of government is this? Is this a socialistic type of government?

What does it do to the local communities? What does it do to the family

farms and ranches? What does it do to the small contractor. Remember, a backhoe, a dump truck, and a bulldozer and you are in that bracket.

Mr. Speaker, I am in hopes in January we have a President that will do those three things: guide us with Social Security, give us some bold strong leadership, as the governor of Texas has suggested; number two, get rid of that marriage penalty. Let us do what we say we are doing. Let us really encourage our young people to get married. Let us encourage our young people to have a foundation of family without worrying about being taxed for it. Third of all, let us give the next generation on the family farm or the family ranch and the local farming community, let us give them an opportunity to keep those resources in the family, in the community, instead of penalizing the family, penalizing the community, in spending that money right out of there straight to Washington, D.C.

I am confident, colleagues, that we have a very positive future ahead of this country. I could not be more excited about the future of the United States of America. I could not be more excited about our young people, and that is why we have to keep education as a priority; that is why we have to look at these factors that I have discussed tonight.

We cannot continue on a positive course and improve it if we do not put a lot of effort into it. It is not going to come free, and it is not going to happen when we penalize marriage. It is not going to happen when we penalize death, when we call it a taxable event. It is not going to happen when we look at this next generation and say to them, well, to Social Security, here is your bankrupt system that you helped pay for. We can change all of that.

I hope my colleagues join with myself and our new President in January to make those kinds of changes, because that is what this country is all about, making a difference. And we, colleagues, can make that difference, and the people of our country deserve it.

INVESTING IN OUR FUTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUYKENDALL). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I trust I will be joined by some of my colleagues before the evening is over with to talk on the issue, but as my colleague, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) was talking about a moment ago on Social Security, I would remind our colleagues and those who are listening this evening that Social Security has been with us now since the 1930s.

There have been those who have talked about its demise ever since and

some who have tried to make sure it was not here, but I would remind them as we talk about all of the gimmicks, anytime we take money out of the system, if it is 2 percent or 3 percent or whatever the percent we take out, that is less money we have for those who are drawing. It means that we will meet that date of finality he was talking about, and it will run out of money sooner.

Mr. Speaker, I was home this weekend and had an occasion to see a movie. The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) talked about the turmoil and all the tough times as if it were a turmoil, and that reminds me of a movie I saw called the Perfect Storm. When these fishermen went out to catch their final catch and they made the fatal decision to head into a storm without really having all the facts, if you have not seen the movie, the Perfect Storm, I will not give away all the plot.

I would say to my colleagues, just like dealing with Social Security, anything else, we better know where we are headed because the Perfect Storm was a total disaster, one of the worst in our history.

Mr. Speaker, this evening I want to talk about investing in our future. As the former chief of my State schools, I want to talk this evening about a critical issue facing our Nation, and that is the education of our children, and the buildings in which we put them as well, because it is about investing these dollars that Congress is talking about now that we have or we may have over the next 10 years.

Before we get too far along this road of making some decisions on tax relief, at a time when we better be investing in the next generation, there is no question that we can have targeted relief; but we better be making the investment in our young people.

Mr. Speaker, all too often in this town we hear politicians making speeches about how the schools are supposedly no good, how they ought to have competition, how it is really in the private sector that things are really happening, it is really not in the public sector.

I am here this evening to tell my colleagues that I am one of those who will defend the public schools as the best opportunity for excellence in education for all children, and we need to stand up and be counted and spread the good news about those quiet successes, those stories that are happening in communities all across this country that are not being told.

Too many times we like to talk about problems. It is easy to talk about negatives; people will listen. This morning I had the opportunity in my district to visit one of those success stories, and I would say that any Member serving in this body can find a success story in their district any time they want to find it. We can always find the glass half empty. The question is, do we really want to find it half full?

Education, and public education is that great leveler in society that helps people have an opportunity to move up. As I said, I visited one of those successes this morning; and I am honored to have an opportunity this evening to brag a little bit on those students, and those teachers, on those teachers' assistants, an outstanding principal, and an awful lot of people that contributed to the success of a bunch of children.

This morning I visited Harnett Primary School in Dunn, North Carolina, to participate in a teacher appreciation day that was put on by the local PTO and business people in that community.

I can say I was amazed at the success that principal Linda Turlington had with her wonderful faculty staff and students, but I probably would not be totally honest, because I know them. They are outstanding people and they work hard; but I think if they were here this evening talking with my colleagues and others, what they would say is they represent millions of teachers and staff who go in to an awful lot of nice schools, some not so nice schools, and some buildings that children ought not to even be in, because of the condition they are in; and they work hard every day and go home in the evenings and prepare for the next day to help children meet the challenges of the 21st century.

Let me talk for just a minute, if I may, about Principal Linda Turlington and about her wonderful staff and her faculty and all of those students. Just 4 years ago, 4 short years ago, they had a performance that they were not happy with. Only about 50 percent of her students, or their students, were performing at what is called grade level on the North Carolina end-of-grade test. They decided that was not acceptable; they could do a better job with their children if they worked together.

And I spoke to them about that this morning, because it is fine to have one outstanding teacher, one outstanding principal; but it is what we have to have as everyone working together as a team to make a difference. We can have a great athletic team, and we can have a superstar; but if all we have is one superstar, they may make a difference in some games. They will not win all the games. We have to be a team.

So they started to work. They started identifying students. They started making sure their curriculum was rich, it was strong, that they were helping every children achieve. So last year they went from 50 percent to raise that level or the year before last, last year, almost 80 percent of their children, 77.4 percent, had reached grade level.

This morning they were saying that is not good enough. They are working for all their children; that is real progress. It is the kind of improvement we ought to go about making in every community, in every county, in every State across the country; and we can

do it. But we can only do it when we talk about the successes and help people achieve the best they can achieve.

We cannot do it when we always talk about all the problems that run people down. This did not happen by accident. It took dedication, hard work on the part of teachers implementing the best practices they could get, not only in their school, but in their system, pulling down the best ideas all across the State and across the country.

They practiced the things they learned, and they shared it on a collective basis; and they brought in some of the best minds to work with them. Everyone was committed and focused on achieving and sharing the goals of one thing, to improve student achievement.

Now, did this school achieve all of these great successes because they had the best students in the county system? The answer is no. They had outstanding students. Every school does. Remember, this is the same school that only had 50 percent 4 years before. What was different? It was certainly attitude on the part of the teachers, and everyone on that staff. And it was also the attitude on the part of parents and students who said we can do better, and we will do better.

I am so proud that this school has achieved the exemplary status for the people in Dunn and for Harnett Primary. But I say to my colleagues this evening that rather than bad-mouthing our public schools, like many politicians in this town do, Congress needs to support the sincere effort under way on the ground.

As we work to improve our schools for all of our children, every child, whether they come from a background of parents who have resources to help them, or whether they come from parents who want their children to do well but just do not have those resources, every parent in the 8 years I served as superintendent, I never met a parent who did not want or desire for their children to have a good education.

□ 2015

They may not have known how to get there, but they wanted it for them.

Mr. Speaker, we have that challenge today, we have it next week, and we will have it next year. Certainly Congress has no business, in my opinion, trying to be a national school board. That is not our charge nor our responsibility. It is a state-funded responsibility and local delivery of education, but there is no reason that Congress should not, cannot, and ought not to put resources in to help those young people in those schools and areas where they are not achieving, where they should be achieving.

We made that decision years ago, and the Federal funding for education has slipped since the 1960s. We went through a period where we saw it drop, and now it is coming back, and we need to continue that push. It is so important.

The 21st century, in my opinion, will be a century that will belong to the

educated. Let me repeat that again: The 21st century will belong to the educated. There was a time when you could get a job if you dropped out of school. Those days are fast disappearing.

We spend a lot of time in this town arguing back and forth about appropriations, budgets, et cetera, et cetera, but what gets lost too often in all the sound and fury of legislative debate is the central meaning of the choices we make.

The choices we make are about our priorities. They also say something about our character, what we care about. Where we put our resources, or our money, if you please, tells people what is important to us. If you go into a town and you see a nice school building where the parents and the community are invested and involved in, it says education is important in that town. I happen to believe if you go into a town with a rundown building, children recognize very quickly, that is not the most important priority on the part of the people in that town. If the businesses are in order, it says that business is important. I think you can have a partnership of all. The budget and spending choices we make here define what our priorities are. As I said earlier, they truly express our values.

I would say to you that many of my colleagues in the Democratic Caucus and I have been working all year to try to give greater priority to education in this budget process. Why education? As I said earlier, because education is the key to the future for every child, every child, no matter what their ethnic or economic background may happen to be. You deny a child an educational opportunity and you have denied a future family an opportunity to prepare and invest in the next generation. It is as simple as that.

Certainly we value education, and we value it because we know that lifetime learning is the key to the American dream and today it is that ultimate ticket to the middle class. Everyone wants to get there. Whether a child is born into poverty today, if they get an education, they can be in the middle class tomorrow. But if we deny them an educational opportunity, they are relegated to poverty and so are their future children.

We talk about the global economy and America's international competitiveness. Certainly we are in a global economy. What happens on the other side of the world, through telecommunications we know about it now almost instantaneously. But it also means that what happens on the other side of the globe economically impacts us, and we are going to have to deal with them educationally, and our ability to have a knowledge-based job economy is important.

That does not mean agriculture will not be important in the future. Certainly it will be. It will continue to be. I grew up on a farm in my home State. As I tell my colleagues from time to

time, I grew up on what we call a small family farm. I knew what it was to get up at 3 o'clock in the morning and take out tobacco and prime tobacco all day.

But those jobs have changed. Those small farms are much larger today when we talk about family farms. Where I grew up on a 50-75 acre farm, now when you talk about a farm, the farmer is talking about hundreds of acres. It has changed. Technologically it has changed. The equipment you use is different.

It means that even the farmers have to be better educated to compete today. They have to know financing, they have to have computers. Their equipment is driven technologically. The combines, the tractors, all of those are the same thing, just like the factories, are computer driven. That is why children need to have technology in the classroom and teachers need to have it so they can teach it and integrate it in the curriculum.

So in this new economy of this information age, what people can earn will certainly depend on what they have learned. We see that each and every day. We see more young people today becoming millionaires on the dot-com, but, in the end, we have to make something. They are speeding up the process.

It comes back again to what I started talking about, Mr. Speaker. It is about education. It is about access so everyone has a chance at this table. I used to tell folks when I was superintendent, this thing we call public education in America is one of the great opportunities in the world. It is one of the few places in the world that I know of that every child, no matter what their ethnic or economic background may happen to be, they can step up to the great smorgasbord, and, if they are willing to work and learn, they can go as far as their ability will carry them.

We have opened that door of opportunity. We ought to keep it open, and we need to swing it open even wider, right on beyond high school, because today just having 12 years or 13 years is just not adequate. We are going to need 2 and even 4 or more years beyond high school as we move into this 21st century.

So we have been trying here in Congress to get this Congress to give higher priority to strengthen our neighborhood schools and demonstrate how much we value education for our children. Yes, it takes resources, yes, that is money. When you have children who have special needs, they will be contributing members of society if we give them an opportunity to get an education. Yes, those children who have been deprived early will do better if we open the doors and give them pre-kindergarten and special care early on. They will be contributing members and they can make a difference in society and be good students in school. But a child who starts school behind, I am here to tell you, will have a tough time, and many of them may never

catch up. That is why Head Start is important for every child who needs it. There are those who would tell you, well, we cannot do it. We cannot afford it. Can we afford not to? Can we afford to have losers? I don't think so.

I think we are a big enough society, we are a big enough country, we have the resources to do all those things if we do it. But, unfortunately, the House Republican leadership has said that we need a lot of other things first. I happen to believe that we need targeted tax cuts. But everything I read lately tells me that what we decided, last year we had almost \$800 billion. This time we are talking about doing it in pieces so we will have more and we want to starve them so they will not have the resources.

I grew up on a farm and one of the things I never forgot that my dad told me, he said, "Son, don't feed the seed corn. Use your best corn to replant it so next year you can have a good harvest." What this majority wants to do is eat the seed corn so that our next generation will not have the opportunities, and that is wrong.

We need to make the kind of educational investments so that we can make our schools world class, so we can have high quality curriculum for every child in every classroom. And, yes, we ought to hold them accountable. We ought to have high standards, because, just as I told you at the outset earlier today, the school in Dunn, North Carolina, Harnett Primary School, is holding their children accountable, holding their parents accountable, holding themselves accountable, setting high standards, and those students are reaching it.

I certainly oppose these misguided priorities. We ought to invest in education, we ought to hold the system accountable, and we ought to get it done.

I am pleased at this time to yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. Holt) to discuss more about our priorities in education. He certainly has been a leader in the whole area of education, but he has focused his attention on science education. He is one of the true scientists here in Congress and brings a lot to the table.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with my colleague from North Carolina, who has been a leader throughout his career on education, and has brought that lifetime of experience here to the House of Representatives.

The number of school children is growing now at a record-setting pace. We are experiencing the echo, the baby-boom echo, where the children of the baby boom are in school. I can tell you in my congressional district, there are some school districts where the number of children in kindergarten outnumbers the number in the 12th grade. You do not need to have higher mathematics to understand the implications of that for school construction and the need to provide good classrooms for those teachers and students.

With more than 52 million students in schools today, an all-time high, we are experiencing real crowding in the classrooms. To alleviate the crowding, many of the schools in my district are using the temporary solution of temporary structures, long, narrow, trailer-like facilities that are really unsuited for classrooms. But many schools are forced to use that.

New Jersey communities, as in many other parts of the country, need assistance to help provide the space for the children to learn, for the teachers to teach, and we really cannot postpone that any longer. The civil engineers point to this as the number one infrastructure problem facing the country today. We are investing billions of dollars in new prisons, we are investing billions of dollars in military installations. We should be investing resources in our schools for the sake of our children. It is the seed corn that my colleague speaks of.

I visited more than 80 schools in this term that I have been in Congress, and everywhere I go I hear from parents and teachers and students who feel that there is a role for the Federal Government. We can help.

Together with my colleague, the gentleman from North Carolina, I am working to help these fast-growing school districts, such as he has in his district, such as I have in mine, helping them to afford new and modern schools with what I think is a very attractive concept, tax credit for the holders of school construction bonds, in effect using Federal tax credits so that the school districts are reduced from the pressure of having to pay the interest to raise the capital for the school construction. These interest-free capital bonds will leverage the amount of money available to the school districts. My colleague has been a leader in devising and advocating this really very creative and attractive way of funding school construction.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time on that point, for our colleagues I hope they remember that that is H.R. 996, and, so they do not misunderstand, as the gentleman has indicated, all this does is pay the interest through a tax credit. It would allow the States and local jurisdictions to build the schools, to issue the bonds, but they would pay the principal only and no interest.

It is a way to help the local units not only build the new buildings they need, and we have 53 million students coming into our public schools, the largest number in the history of America, but it will also allow them to renovate and provide for the technology that they so sorely need.

I thank the gentleman for being such a strong proponent of this and being one of the earliest signers on this legislation with me, and trust before this Congress adjourns, that the Republicans will agree to bring this out of the committee, put it on the floor and let us vote it and help the schools.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, we certainly should have the opportunity to debate this and vote on it on the floor. It takes away no local authority. The local school authorities will determine what needs to be built and where it needs to be built and when it needs to be built, but I know in my district, many of the towns have difficulty justifying to the taxpayers the large increase in property taxes that would result from the necessary school construction.

Now, this is not a free lunch. Of course, what we are doing in effect is deferring Federal revenue, but in the case of the school districts in central New Jersey it would be a shift away from property taxes, which would allow school districts to get on with the school construction that they know, that we all know, that they need to do.

□ 2030

I think it is a very attractive concept. I only wish, as my colleague says, that we could get this to the floor to be debated as it should be.

The gentleman has been a real leader in advancing this idea and I think this will find favor all across the country.

One other thing I would like to comment on is technology education, science education, and the importance of teachers. I think one of the greatest disservices that we do to students and to teachers is sometimes when people will talk about a born teacher, so and so is a born teacher, there are no more teachers born than there are born lawyers, born doctors, born engineers.

When we talk about it that way, we lose sight of the fact of what hard work it is to be a teacher, and how a teacher must work to keep up with developments in their field and developments in learning, learning how children learn.

So that if we are going to invest in the children of this country and in their education, we must invest in the professional development of teachers.

In most businesses, it is customary to spend several percent, maybe 5 percent, maybe 10 or even 20 percent of salaries in the training and development of the employees. In the field of education, in schools, that is typically 1 percent or less that is invested in the professional development of teachers.

We must recognize that teaching requires continuous learning, continuous development, so that teachers can be the professionals that we want them to be.

In the area of technology, our cars now have more computing power than the Apollo spacecraft had. Computers can send billions of dollars of capital around the world at the touch of a key, and our economy is booming with growth in high-tech industries, and yet a recent survey published by the Department of Education tells us that only 20 percent of teachers feel qualified to use the technology that is now available to them. Not some future technology that is coming but what is available to them today.

That is why I am cosponsoring legislation to help teachers teach technology education. We must do more. In order for our country to continue growing and prospering in this century, we must ensure that our students receive a quality education in science and mathematics and technology. We must do what we can to help the teachers be prepared to teach those subjects.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman for those important comments. I particularly agree with the gentleman on the issue of school construction that is so badly needed, not only in those growth areas but in a lot of our urban areas where children are going, as the gentleman said, trailers and substandard buildings that we would not operate a business out of.

I used to go to civic clubs, and still do, and say to the folks, if they really think rundown buildings are good then why do they not invite the next business who comes to town and wants to expand, take them down to the old warehouse front and ask them to put their business in there and just say to them it is the buildings; it does not make that much difference. It is the people that are put in there, and see if they come back and open their factory in their town. They will not come back.

I think the children deserve a quality place to go to school and teachers need a good place to learn.

Mr. HOLT. If I may comment on that point, nationally schools now have an average age of about 45 years. In New Jersey, it is a little closer to 50 years. The average school age in any other business that would be considered obsolete.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. That is correct.

Mr. HOLT. There is nothing that should lead us to believe that teaching techniques cannot advance just as business and manufacturing techniques advance.

We have learned a lot in the last 50 years, in the last 100 years, about how children learn. Some of that has implications for how we construct a classroom and how we run a class. We need modern facilities.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. The gentleman is absolutely correct. Architects are doing that, and I would say to our colleagues who have not been into a school lately, go into one. Talk with the teachers, spend some time other than visiting. They will find out that just because the buildings still may be square or are have corners, it is an entirely different place on the inside.

I happen to agree with the gentleman on this issue of technology. As the gentleman indicated earlier, as a former superintendent of my State schools I also know firsthand of a lot of amazing stories and a lot of good things happening in our schools.

For example, contrary to all the bad-mouthing our schools tend to get from partisan politicians, student mathematics achievement has improved. We

need to do better. Between 1982 and 1996, students improved their achievement in mathematics as measured by the, as the gentleman well knows, National Assessment of Education Progress, one of the most respected testing services we have.

Students in my home State, as an example, have made gains that are three times the national average of gains on NAEP. Some of the greatest gains have come from our minority students, which is crucial because we do not have a single child to waste in the 21st Century. We must bring everyone along. Today when unemployment is low and we are searching for workers, we need everyone.

We have other good news as well, let me just say to the gentleman. Student science achievement is improving. The gentleman has been a leader in trying to make sure we get more dollars out there to improve it even more. SAT scores have increased every year since 1990. ACT scores are up. These are things people do not want to talk about when we are doing good things.

Students are taking more AP courses. As the gentleman well knows, AP is the advance placement courses. In high school, one takes college level courses that they can use their first year in college.

School violence is coming down, and that is important. Public school teachers are better educated than private school teachers.

Some would want to say that is not true. These are statistics from the Department of Education. I think they happen to be accurate.

More students are going on to higher education. We need even more to go in this 21st Century. More women are going on to graduate and to professional degrees. As I said, we have no one we can leave behind. It is making a difference.

We have a lot more examples, but if America is going to seize the opportunity of this new economy that the gentleman was talking about earlier, Congress must provide national leadership in this vital area of education. We cannot shirk our responsibility because across this country American people are calling for a greater effort in investment in education, not less.

Now the Republican leadership is proposing private school vouchers all over again, the same thing we have heard before. They want to take billions of dollars out of tax money and use it to finance private school vouchers. I happen to believe that is wrong. We do not have enough money in the public schools today. We should not be draining those resources away and leave our children behind to be condemned to a bleak future of failure. That is absolutely wrong, and my colleagues and I who have been working on this special order this evening we do have some ideas about how we can do better things.

Yes, we must invest in a national commitment on education. Yes, we

must hold schools accountable. Yes, we must be accountable to the taxpayers. Yes, we must raise standards and every child must have an opportunity to learn, and we have to put the resources under them so they can get there.

Improving education in this country is about creating a classroom environment where children can learn and teachers can teach. We need to foster greater connection between students, teachers and parents, and the gentleman has worked on that. The gentleman has been a leader in it.

Mr. HOLT. The key is what the gentleman referred to just a moment ago, is every student. That is our national ideal, that we provide an excellent education for all students; not just science education for future scientists; not just smaller class sizes for those who can afford private schools; not just reading for those who are fortunate to have good pre-school access and exposure to books. No; for all children. That is the ideal that we should be upholding in everything we do here in the Congress, is that this general education, which is special to America, is what has made us so successful and what we must at every opportunity talk about and try to ensure in every school district across the country, that we are talking about education for all.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. I thank the gentleman for that. The gentleman is absolutely correct. When some people use the words they talk about students and children, they really are not talking about all children. They do not mean all children. The gentleman does. I do. I trust that is what we are talking about when we talk about public education.

I used to tell folks when I was superintendent, and I still do it as I talk, the difference between public school and any other school, than any other, is that when those yellow school buses show up in the front of that school, they do not ask those children have they had breakfast; they do not ask them if they came from a wealthy household with two parents; they do not ask them anything. They take all comers with all their opportunities, with all their challenges, and those teachers go in those classrooms every single day and work their heart out to make sure that every child does the best they can do.

It is a tough job being a teacher. I have a son who is a fourth grade teacher. It is a tough job. I admire him for it because I have been in and seen some of the challenges they face. My daughter was a high school teacher. She is now going to law school. I guess for whatever reason she wants to go into education law.

One of the best ways that we can improve education is one of the things the gentleman just talked about is providing smaller class sizes that are orderly, disciplined and where every child can get that additional attention that they so badly need. When we talk about private schools, or any other

area, we really are talking about personalized attention, smaller class sizes, because when a child has a smaller class size, they can get more individualized attention. That is why this Congress is working with the President trying to get 100,000 new teachers, and we are not talking about block grant so the money can be used for a lot of other things.

I was a superintendent. I know what will happen when block grants are sent. I was at the State level when Congress decided we are going to send a block grant, and the next thing we are going to do we are going to cut that sucker because we decided less can be used in administration; so we will cut it. Then when they cut it, they will come back and say a good enough job was not done with the money we sent so we are just going to cut it out; teachers or staff cannot be hired in block grants.

People tend to want to have a career path if they come into education. They are not looking for a one-year job to move somewhere else, and I do not think Members of this Congress still understand that when teachers are hired, the money ought to be categorized that they can use for that. Children show up in the classroom as kindergartners. The last time I checked, and the gentleman has been a proponent of this, they tend to stay 13 years. They need to be taught for those 13 years.

Mr. HOLT. Smaller class sizes, particularly in the early years, are essential. It is when students learn how to learn. The educational literature is clear on this. Smaller class sizes help students, and the advantage lasts for years and years. In fact, it may last a lifetime.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. I agree.

Mr. HOLT. If we could get class sizes down to an average of 18 students in kindergarten through third grade, it would benefit not only those teachers and those students during those years, it would benefit those students when they get to high school.

The literature is clear on this, and that is what the President has been talking about in his effort to get 100,000 new teachers, particularly in the early years, so that we can have an average class size that appears to be optimum at about 18 students. That is what teachers tell me. One does not need to be smaller than that, but they should not be larger than that. It is a worthwhile goal.

As the gentleman knows, we are two years into this process now. We have appropriated funds for 30,000 new teachers around the country, but we still have more to do.

This would be in addition to hiring the teachers necessary to just keep up with retirement and attrition. This would be to actually reduce class sizes.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. The gentleman is absolutely correct. When we talk about the number of teachers we are going to need over the next 4 or 5 years that are

retiring and the openings and the challenges this country faces in having teachers in front of those classes who are the best teachers we can get who are certified in their curriculum area and doing the things we need to really raise our standards, that probably is a special order for a whole other day, and I hope we can talk about that because I think it is important as we are looking at 53 million students this year and more coming next year and over the next 10 years we are going to see growth.

□ 2045

It is what we are calling the "baby boom echo." I used to tell folks we are growing so fast in North Carolina, we have low unemployment, a lot of folks moving in. We can always tell because school folks tend to want to project out how many teachers they are going to need, how many schools they are going to need. They can do a pretty good job based on live births; take the births in a community and go 5 years out and they can expect them to be coming to kindergarten. We have a lot of folks moving into our community coming from other places, who have a habit of bringing their children with them. That expands the opportunity, the need for more school buildings.

But I think that we need to provide more support for our teachers, because they do have a very difficult but a critical job that has to be done. Because if we do not have the best people in those classrooms and we do not support them with the resources they need, we do not give them the kind of environment to teach in with the tools to teach our children, we are going to pay a heavy price in years to come.

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing in, my opinion, outside of protecting our borders with our military and our national defense, the second most important thing we have is educating the next generation to be able to inherit the greatest country in the world. Because if we do not do that, we will rue the day that we did not do that.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, there is no better investment for the future. The gentleman speaks about the need for more teachers, and the gentleman is right. This is a subject for an entire day's discussion, I think; but let me just point out, as the gentleman knows well, in the next 10 years we will need to hire 2.2 million new teachers just to stay even. Not for smaller class sizes, but just to keep up with the current needs as teachers retire, as teachers, for various reasons, leave the profession. 2.2 million teachers.

We have to make sure that we provide the training. As they enter the profession, that they are provided the mentoring in the early years and that we provide a climate of continuous improvement. That is what we talk about in industry; we should have the same thing in the teaching profession as we have in the medical profession and the legal profession.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield back to the gentleman.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from New Jersey was speaking, I was thinking as we were going through that what the gentleman is talking about is 2.5 million. That does not include the growth numbers we are going to need for whatever that baby boom echo carries out for years. As we think about education, and the gentleman has been a real leader in this certainly in math and science education, but the gentleman has expanded to all education and I thank him for that, bringing his background to this hall of the people's house.

But we recognize that when we talk about hiring more teachers, even with the 100,000 that we are providing in resources, so that our colleagues understand and those who may be watching this evening, we really are talking about them being hired where they teach. They are not hired in Washington. In my case, when I was in Raleigh as State Superintendent, they were not hired at the State capitals. They were hired in the communities where the people are.

That is why it is important when we talk about categorical money, so that people understand, that is money sent down specifically for teachers. When we send a block grant, that is a money that can be pulled away. That is why we think it is important to send that string for teachers so when they hire an individual, if they hire them to teach, they have a job this year and that money is going to follow next year.

Mr. Speaker, when a person makes a commitment to a career in education, they know they are not going to get rich but they are going to be rich in rewards and responsibilities. My son reminds me that his groceries cost just as much when he gets his paycheck as a teacher as the groceries of the president of the largest bank. So we have to recognize if we are going to keep good teachers in the classroom and continue to attract the quality of people that we need to teach our children, we are going to have to make a decision.

Congress certainly cannot do that. It is a local-level and a State-level decision, but we ought not to be bad mouthing them. We ought to be raising them up and empowering them. And any way we can help, if we can fund 100,000 teachers, certainly we can do that. Can we help with school construction? Yes, we can help with that. Can we help with staff development at the university level? Absolutely, we can do that.

Mr. Speaker, rather than talk about these things that I think are irresponsible, and block grants and vouchers, we ought to be talking about how we can help and hold up and encourage.

Young people respond. I remember something in a book I read by Coach John Wooden of UCLA, one of the great basketball coaches of all time in his book entitled, *They Call Me Coach*. He

had several great lines, only one of which I will share this evening. He said: You know, children need role models, not critics.

Mr. Speaker, I believe teachers need encouragement, not criticism from public officials and certainly not from this body, the body that people around this country and around the world look to for leadership from time to time. We ought to be their greatest cheerleaders saying to them, "We are here to support you and help you. We are going to do what we can to help make your life better." And, yes, we are going to send 100,000 teachers and, yes, we can afford to pay that interest to make sure that we have quality classrooms all across this country for children to go to and teachers to teach in.

People recognize in America education all of the sudden again is one of the most important things we have in every community and help our people. As the gentleman from New Jersey indicated earlier, it certainly will not go all the way to correct all the needs, but it will be a start. It will say it is a high priority with those of us in Washington. And, yes, it will have some impact on that local property tax. Mr. Speaker, I yield back to the gentleman.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I must say that we are fortunate to have the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) in the House of Representatives keeping us focused on these issues. There is no one in this body who has more experience, more knowledge, and more dedication to the providing of excellent education for all of America's children. I thank the gentleman, not just for tonight's special order, but for what the gentleman does day in and day out to keep the House of Representatives focused on the most important investment that we as a country make: The investment in the education of our children.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT), and I would say this evening is a very appropriate time as we do this order and talk about education simply because in some communities right now, school is getting ready to open. I went this morning to one where teachers were coming back and over the next several weeks, schools all across America will be opening up. There are some that are year-round schools that are going to be there all year, but there are those who will open up.

Mr. Speaker, 94 Members in this House have signed this bill to build new schools. The gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mrs. JOHNSON) have signed on this bipartisan bill. It enjoys the support of an awful lot of Members of this House, and if we can get it to the floor, I think it will pass. I trust that the Republican leadership will give us a chance to vote on it.

But when school opens for many places across America in the next few weeks, as I have already said, America

will have more schoolchildren in our classrooms than at any time in the history of our Republic. More than even during the height of the baby boom. I guess one way to say it is that it is getting better; some might say it is getting worse. I happen to say it is getting better, because we have more children in our public schools.

Mr. Speaker, we are in the best financial condition and have the best opportunity in this country that I can remember. As the U.S. Department of Education has documented, this explosive growth will continue for the next decade, and we ought to use this time and use these resources and opportunities we have to invest in our future, and invest in our children.

It is wrong, it is absolutely wrong that we ask children to be in cramped closets, on stages, in leaky buildings, in trailers that we would not put a prisoner in, but we put our children in it and we tell teachers to teach there. They are hot in the summer and they are cold in the winter and that is wrong, absolutely wrong and unacceptable in a country that has the resources that we have.

We ought to be investing. It would not take a lot. It would only take just a few small pennies of what we have here to make a difference all across America. The baby boom echo presents an immediate crisis in many states. My home State happens to be one of those. It is one of the fastest growing States in America.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress must take action to build quality schools for our children. We not only have that responsibility, we have that obligation. As these 53 million-plus students head back to school this fall, they will know that we did not live up to our obligation last year. I trust we will not adjourn in October without meeting that obligation this year. We have that responsibility and that obligation. Too many of these children again this year will be stuck in trailers, shoved in closets, crammed into bathrooms that were converted to classrooms, and gyms and other substandard facilities and in some cases buildings that do not have glass in the windows. That is not acceptable.

Mr. Speaker, how do we tell a child that education is really important when they just rode by a new prison to go to an old rundown school building? That is not right. It is not right in America. It is not acceptable.

Our communities need help to build quality schools where good order and discipline fosters a positive learning environment for our children. Our teachers deserve it also.

Mr. Speaker, let me close this evening finally by saying there is another issue I want to touch on just briefly that my State has worked on, and I have introduced legislation in this Congress and trust that it will pass. That is on character education. We did a survey in my State of 25,000 students, teachers, parents and school

employees and nearly one-third of them indicated that they did not treat their teachers with respect. This was in 1989-90, 10 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, we put in place character education. We started out with ethics education and turned it into character education. It is now part of the curriculum in our State and it is making a difference. It is integrated into the curriculum. It is not separate.

It teaches such things as trustworthiness. Who can disagree with that? Respect. Who can disagree with that? Responsibility, caring, fairness, citizenship, perseverance, courage and self-discipline. We can all agree with that. Those are American traits. Every child should be taught that. It makes a difference in their life, they are better students as a result of it, and those classrooms and schools across North Carolina that have instituted it, they are seeing discipline problems go down and academics go up. All we need to do is look at what is happening in North Carolina. It is making a difference.

Mr. Speaker, as I close this evening, I would call on my colleagues to step up to the plate, as we say in baseball, and face up to the responsibility that we have an obligation to fund the 100,000 teachers so children can be taught in smaller classes and make sure that we have the classrooms children can learn in and teachers can teach in. So that parents once again will have the kind of respect they need to have because they feel we put the money where we ought to put it and invest it in the future and we ought to be putting the character opportunities to teach.

As the parent of two teachers, with a wife who teaches, and children who have gone through the public school, I will say this evening that our future is in the K-12 public schools in America where 90-plus percent of all of our children go. We cannot turn our backs on the opportunity for all of our children.

FEDERAL RESERVE MONETARY POLICY: IS GREENSPAN'S FED THE WORLD CENTRAL BANK?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KUYKENDALL). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. METCALF) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, some years ago, William McDonough of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York stated, "The most important asset a central bank possesses is public confidence." He went on in that speech to note that, "I am increasingly concerned that in a democracy, a central bank can maintain price stability over the intermediate and long term only when it has public support for necessary policies."

Public confidence here can only mean the confidence of the Members of Congress in our oversight capacity. Most of the American public to this very day have not the least interest in,

awareness of, or knowledge of the Federal Reserve System, our central bank.

□ 2100

But most members feel that Allan Sproul, another former president of the New York Federal Reserve Bank, was quite correct in his letter, still quoted by Fed officials, that Fed independence "does not mean independence from the government but independence within the government. In performing its major task, the administration of monetary policy, the Federal Reserve System is an agency of the Congress set up in a special form to bear the responsibility for that particular task which constitutionally belongs to the Legislative Branch of the government."

Clearly that form of argument appeals to most Members today. The construct is a masterpiece, not just for being true, Congress did abdicate its enumerated powers, but for letting even those of us responsible for the oversight off the hook; the Treasury does not rule the Fed; the White House does not rule the Fed; and this Congress does not fulfill its supervisory responsibility either.

The current Fed Chairman, Alan Greenspan, will soon testify before this House, expressing his independence. As the journal *Central Banking* recently noted regarding the Fed, "It has acquired an air of sanctity, politicians hesitate to bait the Fed for fear of looking stupid." As a result, and still quoting from *Central Banking*, "the Fed's accountability is less than it appears. The Fed is always accountable in the sense that Congress could bring it to heel if it really wanted to."

The Fed has not done too badly in some areas, as the economy demonstrates, most notably where inflation and interest rates today are resting. Whether they remain even close to where they are come a year or two from now may, indeed, be an altogether different story. Mr. Greenspan has been pretty clear about what is now important in Fed policy.

Let me quote from some past testimony. "The Federal Reserve believes that the main contribution it can make to enhancing the long-term health of the United States economy is to promote price stability over time. Our short-run policy adjustments, while necessarily undertaken against the background of the current condition of the U.S. economy, must be consistent with moving towards the long-range goal of price stability."

The reality is that monetary policy can never put the economy exactly where Greenspan might want it to be. He knows full well that supply shocks that drive up prices suddenly, like the two major oil shocks of the 1970s, are always going to be with us. More so than ever as the process of globalization continues to transform the world's economies.

The United States Federal Reserve is leading this global transformation. Some are quietly arguing, over lunch

mostly, that Greenspan is in charge of what he may already believe to be the World Federal Reserve, the World Central Bank.

There is good reason to suggest this. As Robert Pringle noted some time ago in *Central Banking*, "Central banks rather than governments are laying down the rules of the game for the new international financial system. The Fed is in the lead."

Pringle went on to argue, and now I am quoting him again at length, "If the Fed's record during the debt crisis and in exchange rate management is mixed, most observers would give it full marks for the way it dealt with the stock market crash of 1987. It is not clear that the verdict of history will be as favorable. After being prodded into action, some central banks, notably those of Japan and England, went on madly pumping money into the system long after the danger was passed, creating an unsustainable boom and re-igniting inflationary pressures."

I am still quoting, "Well, our Fed can hardly be blamed for that. The real problem was that Greenspan's action risked creating the expectation among investors that the Board of Governors would support U.S. stock markets in the future. Clearly, the action was prompted by the need to protect banks from the risks to which they were exposed to firms in the securities markets."

"Equally, this support signaled an extension of the central bank's safety net to an area of the financial system where investors are traditionally expected to bear the risks themselves. It is no accident that after 1987 the bull market really took off. It has never looked back."

I have quoted this section in the article by Robert Pringle that appeared in *Central Banking* because we are hearing much the same fears expressed today, though quietly over lunch, by phone, by rumor, by investors and money managers throughout the United States.

Not too long ago, former Fed Chairman Paul Volker strongly suggested that our current boom is driven almost exclusively by the major international firms in the high-tech industry and the 40 industrials. Clearly, this is due to the fact that these few giant monopolies dominate the world market. Therefore, this boom reflects less what is happening here in America than what is going on in the world to these few monopolies' financial benefits.

I am not entirely complaining, mind you. Where these few giant firms are concerned, some American workers do benefit. But more foreign workers benefit than American; more investors and owners benefit than workers; more very wealthy individuals benefit than the middle class bedrock.

My problem is that Greenspan's Fed seems to believe money does not matter. That we can create vast sums of cash and pump it into the financial markets at will, manipulate the adjusted monetary base to even greater

heights, or plummet to the depths; all this done toward long-term price stability. Has Greenspan so rejected Milton's theory that to do so one guarantees inflationary pressures in the road ahead along with savage corrections when actions become necessary by, once again, the same Fed?

Can Greenspan seriously argue the Fed has not created the worst bubble in history, the worst speculation ever witnessed, with millions of day traders gambling their small fortunes, wishing to become, each of them, another Bill Gates? Clearly, Greenspan sent a signal once again to investors that the stock market bears no risk for the middle class citizen.

During 1995, it was Mexico's turn again. As Pringle pointed out, "the American administration panicked. Again, the Federal Reserve was there to help, even though there was less reason for central banks to get involved than in 1982, since there was less risk to the international banking system."

As Pringle goes on to State, "Again European central bankers were annoyed at the lack of consultation. You do not need to be a populist politician to suspect that Wall Street was calling the shots, especially with former senior partner of Goldman Sachs, Robert Rubin, as U.S. Treasury Secretary."

One of the most important arguments regarding Greenspan's Fed's ability to save the world was put forward in this journal Central Banking, and I quote, "The Fed's good record of achievement in controlling inflation over these years contrasts with its mixed record of market management. Its Achilles heel is moral hazard. It has not been so good at preventive medicine or in taking into account the long-term effects of its actions on the behavior of governments and market participants."

It is precisely the long-term effects of Fed monetary policy that should concern Congress. If that is not our oversight role, what is? It is precisely the long-term effects on market participants that should concern Congress. If that is not our oversight role, what is? What are the long-term effects of Fed monetary policy going to be on government?

Now, certainly Congress can get behind that question, if not in our oversight role on behalf of the American people generally, and the ill-informed market participants that are creating this speculation bubble in the mistaken belief that the stock market no longer bears any risk, if not in their behalf, then maybe in our own congressional self-interest.

We have witnessed some rather disturbing policy stratagems in just the last, say, 10 months or so. Greenspan's Fed began around August and September of last year, 1999, to expand the money supply, the adjusted monetary base, from around \$500 billion to nearly \$625 billion, a \$70 billion run up, in anticipation of potential Y2K effects. This enormous expansion flowed di-

rectly into the financial markets and helped create the enormous boom in stock prices prior to that year's end. The speculation was seen primarily in high-tech stocks.

Then comes the sudden and nearly precisely the same spike downward of the same Adjusted Monetary Base right after the year ends and 2000 begins. There were no problems with Y2K. This spike downward lasted until around April of the year 2000. That is this year.

We know the savage corrections the stock market displayed and that there were more losers than winners. All we ever hear about is the winners one sees, not the thousands or the millions of losers. Why do we hear so little about the losers in the media? Because, so the argument goes, the market returned to almost normal. The market bounced back, so the argument goes, certainly, as the Fed began once again to pump up the monetary base around April.

But, the losers remain losers, and lost homes, businesses and bankruptcies continue to reach all time highs. Personal debt, especially credit card debt, and equity finance debt have reached unheard of levels.

This is the speculation, no, let us call it what it really is, gambling, this is the gambling that is today our U.S. stock market.

One will not hear the White House complain. Only praise for Clinton's appointee shall be the sounding out, ringing out the bell in praise for White House management of the economy. One will not hear that from the very speculative bubble created during the last 6 months of 1999. One will not hear that from the quickest investor who took their profits before the inevitable downturn and before the downturn came and before the corrections that came.

Investors were paid handsomely for their gains in capital gains taxes levied. It is no surprise to Fed watchers that the taxes collected from capital gains nearly equaled the much hailed government surplus that Clinton soberly explained was due to his wise leadership of the economy.

If the surplus was really generated by wise leadership of the White House, why is not the government's debt going down? Do not confuse the government debt with some mythical balanced budget.

For a Federal central bank, the concentration of power at the top is very marked. True, although the Board of Governors sets the discount rate and reserve requirements, the execution of monetary policy on an ongoing basis is decided by the larger 12-member Federal Open Market Committee. But the FOMC brings only five voting Reserve Bank presidents, of which the New York bank is always one, leaving the Washington Governors in the majority. They run it. The influence of the chairman alone can sometimes be near to overwhelming.

As an historical note, and I taught history and government, so forgive me, Congress insisted on scattering 12 regional Federal Reserve Banks across the country when the system was devised so that the east could not restrict credit elsewhere. Interestingly, these Federal Reserves were chartered as private institutions in which local banks owned all the stock.

That is still true today with the outside directors on the board of a Reserve Bank, a mix of representatives from small and large member banks in the district, as well as representatives from industry, commerce and the public.

□ 2115

What was intended here was a sort of balancing; three bankers with six non-bankers on each Federal Reserve Board. Supposedly this would put the lenders at a disadvantage to the borrowing classes, which would outnumber the lenders six to three.

The boards choose the Reserve Bank presidents, always from the lending class, but do so only with the approval of the seven-member Federal Reserve Board in Washington. Thus, we can readily see that the bankers, the lenders, clearly dominate the Federal Reserve System itself. Even though at the regional Feds the distinction I just made is superficially valid, many of the nonbank directors are tied inextricably to banking itself or sit on separate boards of directors where bankers rest as well. Nor is the public sector category so clear. Many nonindustry participants on these boards have close ties to banking and banking's network of consultants, academics, and financial management roles clearly bank related.

Just how much power any one regional president has is still debated in inner circles. Previous efforts at restricting Reserve Bank presidents' powers have been dismissed on the grounds that their powers were a proper delegation of authority by Congress.

Allowing that the Federal Reserve is a quasi-government agency, it remains the only government agency in which private individuals, along with Government-appointed officials, together make government policy. Let me repeat that. The Federal Reserve is a quasi-government agency. It remains the only government agency in which private individuals, along with government-appointed individuals, together make government policy. It remains a solid fact that these regional bank presidents cast extremely important votes on public policies that in the present as well as the future affect the economic lives of every American. Yet, and this is the point to my digression, they lack the public accountability because they lack the public legitimacy to be making these decisions, especially these kinds of decisions, some of whose recent effects I have just pointed out.

No one can any longer deny that the Federal Reserve System dominates the

U.S. economy; that its decisions, more than even so-called market forces, which is a sham notion under managed competition in any case, affect everybody's lives and well-being; that within the decision-making process delegated to the Federal Reserve, the Board of Governors clearly dominates the process; that within that Board of Governors the chairman, and this is not intended to single out Mr. Greenspan but to apply to all past and future chairmen, that the chairman dominates the Board.

This does not seem to concern this Congress, but history will record the result; and the people of America may not like that result. Our founders and our constitution carefully limited the power of the President and of the Congress, but now we have an unelected Board of Governors with power, for good or for mischief, immense power, over our national monetary policy.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MENENDEZ (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and July 25 on account of official business.

Mr. SMITH of Washington (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and the balance of the week on account of personal business.

Ms. WATERS (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business in the district.

Mrs. FOWLER (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of travel delays.

Mr. JENKINS (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and the balance of the week on account of the death of his mother.

Mr. POMBO (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of travel delays.

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. FILNER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. FILNER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at her own request) to revise and extend her remarks and include extraneous material:)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's

table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2812. An act to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide a waiver of the oath of renunciation and allegiance for naturalization of aliens having certain disabilities; referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, July 25, 2000, at 9 a.m., for morning hour debates.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

9180. A letter from the Administrator, Rural Utilities Services, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—General Policies, Types of Loans, Loan Requirement-Telecommunications Program (RIN: 0572-AB53) received July 17, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

9181. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Blueberry Promotion, Research, and Information Order [FV-99-701-FR] (RIN: 0581-AB78) received July 17, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

9182. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Trifloxystrobin; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP-301014; FRL-6594-6] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received July 13, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

9183. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Bacillus subtilis Strain QST 713; Exemption from the Requirement of a Tolerance [OPP-300997; FRL-6555-3] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received June 28, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

9184. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Methoxyfenozide; Benzoic Acid, 3-methoxy-2-methyl-2-(3,5-dimethylbenzoyl)-2-(1,1-dimethylethyl) hydrazide; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP-300983; FRL-6496-5] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received June 28, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

9185. 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. 106-273); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

9186. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, Department of Defense, transmitting notification of the Department's decision to study certain functions performed by military and civilian personnel in the Department of the Navy (DON) for possible

performance by private contractors, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2461; to the Committee on Armed Services.

9187. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Annual Defense Report: Appendix L: Resources Allocated to Mission and Support Activities; to the Committee on Armed Services.

9188. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Force Management Policy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Annual Report for the Armed Services Retirement Home (AFRH) for Fiscal Year 1999; to the Committee on Armed Services.

9189. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition and Technology, Department of Defense, transmitting a report entitled, "Plan for Improved Demilitarization of Excess and Surplus Defense Property"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

9190. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting a report entitled, "Integrated Chemical and Biological Research, Development and Acquisition Plan for the Departments of Defense and Energy"; to the Committee on Armed Services.

9191. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on portability of TRICARE Prime Benefits; to the Committee on Armed Services.

9192. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on Completed DoD A-76 Competitions; to the Committee on Armed Services.

9193. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting the approved retirement and advancement to the grade of Vice Admiral on the retired list of Vice Admiral Michael L. Bowman, United States Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

9194. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the approved retirement and advancement to the grade of Vice Admiral on the retired list of Vice Admiral Henry C. Giffin III, United States Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

9195. 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 Richard A. Chilcoat, United States Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

9196. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting the approved retirement and advancement to the grade of general on the retired list of General Anthony C. Zinni, United States Marine Corps; to the Committee on Armed Services.

9197. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report on proposed obligations for the Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) Program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

9198. 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 Ronald R. Blanck, United States Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

9199. A letter from the Comptroller of the Currency, transmitting the four issues of the Quarterly Journal that comprise the 1999 annual report to Congress of the Office of the Comptroller of the Currency; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

9200. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting transactions involving exports to Chad and Cameroon, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3)(ii); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

9201. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Final Flood Elevation Determinations—received

July 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

9202. A letter from the Managing Director, Office of General Counsel, Federal Housing Finance Board, transmitting the Board's final rule—Election of Federal Home Loan Bank Directors (RIN: 3069-AB00) received July 20, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

9203. A letter from the Managing Director, Federal Housing Finance Board, transmitting the Board's final rule—Amendment of Membership Regulation and Advances Regulation [No. 2000-30] (RIN: 3069-AA94) received July 20, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

9204. A letter from the Managing Director, Federal Housing Finance Board, transmitting the Board's final rule—Federal Home Loan Bank Advances, Eligible Collateral, New Business Activities and Related Matters [No. 2000-34] (RIN: 3069-AA97) received July 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

9205. A letter from the Director, Office of Management, transmitting the pay-as-you-go report, as required by the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985; to the Committee on the Budget.

9206. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting a copy of additional technical amendments to the Higher Education Act of 1965 (HEA) that supplements the Administration's "Higher Education Technical Amendments Act of 2000," previously transmitted to Congress; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

9207. A letter from the Administrator, Energy Information Administration, Department of Energy, transmitting the 1999 Uranium Industry Annual, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 2297h-10; to the Committee on Commerce.

9208. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Virginia; Revised Format for Materials Being Incorporated by Reference; Approval of Recodification of the Virginia Administrative Code; Correction [VA084/101-5045a; FRL-6726-4] received June 28, 2000; to the Committee on Commerce.

9209. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Listing of Color Additives Exempt from Certification; Phaffia Yeast (RIN: 97C-0466) received July 17, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

9210. A letter from the Acting Administrator, NHTS, Department of Transportation, transmitting a report on Motor Vehicle Trunk Entrapment; to the Committee on Commerce.

9211. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Maryland; Revised 15% Plan for the Metropolitan Washington, DC Ozone Nonattainment Area [SIPTRAX NO. MD097-3050a; FRL-6735-4] received July 13, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

9212. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; District of Columbia; Approval of

National Low Emission Vehicle Program [DC 045-2020a; FRL-9838-5] received July 13, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

9213. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—National Primary and Secondary Drinking Water Regulations: Analytical Methods for Chemical and Microbiological Contaminants and Revisions to Laboratory Certification Requirements; Technical Correction [WH-FRL-6726-2] received June 28, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

9214. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—OMB Approval Numbers for the Primacy Rule Under the Paperwork Reduction Act and Clarification of OMB Approval for the Consumer Confidence Report Rule [FRL-6726-3] received June 28, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

9215. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Protection of Stratospheric Ozone: Allocation of Essential Use Allowances for Calendar Year 2000: Allocations for Metered—Dose Inhalers and the Space Shuttle and Titan Rockets [FRL-6726-5] (RIN: 2060-A173) received June 28, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

9216. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan; National Priorities List [FRL-6727-2] received June 28, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

9217. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting a report entitled, "Privacy Online: Fair Information Practices in the Electronic Marketplace: A Report to Congress (May 2000)"; to the Committee on Commerce.

9218. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Listing of Color Additives Exempt from Certification; Haematococcus Algae Meal (RIN: 98C-0212) received 17, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

9219. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the 65th Annual Report Securities and Exchange Commission 1999, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 78w(b); to the Committee on Commerce.

9220. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Rule 17Ac2-2 and Form TA-2 (RIN: 3235-AH44) received June 7, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

9221. A letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the annual report of the Securities Investor Protection Corporation for the year 1999, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 78ggg(c)(2); to the Committee on Commerce.

9222. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Air Force's Proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to Denmark for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 00-53), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

9223. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Depart-

ment of the Navy's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to United Kingdom for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 00-50), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

9224. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Navy's Proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to Japan for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 00-45), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

9225. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Navy's Proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to Australia for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 00-51), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

9226. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Army's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to New Zealand for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 00-46), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

9227. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Air Force's Proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to Portugal for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 00-52), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

9228. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Navy's Proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to Italy for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 00-49), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

9229. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Army's Proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to Turkey for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 00-54), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

9230. A letter from the Deputy Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Navy's Proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to Poland for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 00-61), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

9231. 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 Kourou, French Guiana [Transmittal No. DTC 073-00], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

9232. 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 and French Guiana [Transmittal No. DTC 061-00], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

9233. 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 071-00], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

9234. 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 Germany [Transmittal No. DTC 041-00], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

9235. 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 054-00], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

9236. 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 Singapore [Transmittal No. DTC 018-00], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

9237. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting notification of a proposed license for the export of major defense equipment sold commercially under a contract to Jordan [Transmittal No. DTC 069-00], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

9238. 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.

9239. 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.

9240. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Export Administration, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule—Export Administration Regulations Entity List: Revisions to the Entity List [Docket No. 981019261-0207-03] (RIN: 0694-AB73) received July 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

9241. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule—Passport Procedures—Amendment to Execution of Passport Application Regulation—received June 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

9242. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Civil Works, Department of the Army, transmitting the Fiscal Year 1999 performance report on the Army Corps of Engineers Civil Works; to the Committee on Government Reform.

9243. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Policy, Management and Budget and Chief Financial Officer, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Annual Accountability Report for fiscal year 1999; to the Committee on Government Reform.

9244. A letter from the Deputy Director, Support Personal and Family Readiness Division, Department of Defense, transmitting the 1999 report of the Retirement Plan for Civilian Employees of the United States Marine Corps Personal and Family Readiness Division, and miscellaneous Nonappropriated Fund Instrumentalities are furnished as required by Public Law No. 95-595; to the Committee on Government Reform.

9245. A letter from the Director, Division and Program Development, Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs, Department

of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule—Affirmative Action and Non-discrimination Obligations of Contractors and Subcontractors Regarding Individuals With Disabilities; Separate Facility Waivers (RIN: 1215-AA84) received July 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

9246. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Chief Financial Officers Act Report for the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation for 1999, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106; to the Committee on Government Reform.

9247. A letter from the Comptroller General, General Accounting Office, transmitting the Executive Summary Strategic Plan 2000-2005; to the Committee on Government Reform.

9248. A letter from the Executive Director, Japan U.S. Friendship Commission, transmitting a notice that the Commission did not engage in any activities that would be covered under the FAIR Act; to the Committee on Government Reform.

9249. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting a legislative proposal, "To amend title 5 United States Code, to extend the Federal physicians comparability allowance authority, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Government Reform.

9250. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office's final rule—Prevailing Rate Systems; Change in the Survey Cycle for the Orleans, LA, Nonappropriated Fund Wage Area (RIN: 3206-AJ05) received July 17, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

9251. A letter from the CFO & Plan Administrator, PCA Retirement Committee, Production Credit Association Retirement Plan, transmitting the annual pension plan report for the plan year ending December 31, 1999 and a copy of the audited financial statements, pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 12(h); to the Committee on Government Reform.

9252. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report on the systems of internal control and financial management for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999; to the Committee on Government Reform.

9253. A letter from the Secretary of Energy, transmitting the Fiscal Year 1999 Program Performance Report, combining the Accountability Report for 1999 with the Program Performance Report; to the Committee on Government Reform.

9254. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the annual report for the period ending September 30, 1999 in accordance with the Inspector General Act Amendments of 1988, pursuant to 5 app.; to the Committee on Government Reform.

9255. A letter from the Assistant Administrator, Bureau for Legislative and Public Affairs, U.S. Agency for International Development, transmitting the Fiscal Year 1999 Accountability Report; to the Committee on Government Reform.

9256. A letter from the the Chief Administrative Officer, transmitting the quarterly report of receipts and expenditures of appropriations and other funds for the period April 1, 2000, through June 30, 2000 as compiled by the Chief Administrative Officer, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 104a; (H. Doc. No. 106-272); to the Committee on House Administration and ordered to be printed.

9257. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Land and Minerals Management, Engineering and Operations Division, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Producer-operated Outer Continental Shelf Pipelines that Cross Directly into State Waters (RIN: 1010-AC56) received

July 20, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9258. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Change of Official EPA Mailing Address; Technical Amendments [FRL-6487-4] received June 28, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9259. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone off Alaska; Halibut Bycatch Mortality Allowance in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No. 000211040-0040-01; I.D. 051100D] received July 17, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9260. 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; Removal of Vessel Moratorium of the GOA and BSAI [Docket No. 000706201-0201-01; I.D. 060700A] (RIN: 0648-AO00) received July 17, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9261. A letter from the Office of Protected Resources, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Sea Turtle Conservation; Restrictions to Fishing Activities [Docket No. 000511138-0138-01; I.D. 051100B] (RIN: 0648-A019) received July 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9262. A letter from the Office Protected Resources, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Sea Turtle Conservation; Shrimp Trawling Requirements [Docket No. 991207322-0107-03; I.D. 041300A] (RIN: 0648-AN30) received July 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9263. A letter from the Office Protected Resources, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Sea Turtle Conservation; Restrictions Applicable to Shrimp Trawl Activities; Leatherback Conservation Zone [Docket No. 991207322-0115-04; I.D. 042100B] (RIN: 0648-AN30) received July 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9264. A letter from the Acting Director, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Ocean Perch in the West Yakutat District of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 000211039-0039-01; I.D. 071400D] received July 20, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9265. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Northeastern United States Northeast Multispecies; Framework Adjustment 33 to the Northeast Multispecies Fishery Management Plan; Reporting Requirement [Docket No. 000407096-0196-02; I.D. 040300C] (RIN 0648-AN51) received July 20, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9266. A letter from the Office Protected Resources, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Sea Turtle Conservation; Restrictions Applicable to Shrimp

Trawl [Docket No. 005519147-0147-01; I.D. 051800C] (RIN: 0648-AO22), pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

9267. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the thirty-second in a series of reports on refugee resettlement in the United States covering the period October 1, 1997 through September 30, 1998, pursuant to 8 U.S.C. 1523(a); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9268. A letter from the Executive Director, American Chemical Society, transmitting the Society's annual report for the calendar year 1999 and the comprehensive report to the Board of Directors of the American Chemical Society on the examination of their books and records for the year ending December 31, 1999, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 1101(2) and 1103; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9269. A letter from the Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the annual report beginning May 1, 1998, on the status of the United States Parole Commission (USPC); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9270. A letter from the Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Rules of Practice and Procedure; Adjusting Civil Money Penalties for Inflation (RIN: 3052-AC01) received July 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9271. A letter from the Assistant Secretary to the Army, Civil Works, Department of Defense, transmitting a report pursuant to Section 237 of the Water Resource Development Act of 1996 entitled, "Hopper Dredges: Ready Reserve Status of the Hopper Dredge Wheeler"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9272. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30107; Amdt. No. 1999] received July 17, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9273. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 30108; Amdt. No. 2000] received July 17, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9274. A letter from the National Highway Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Procedures for Transition to New National Driver Register [Docket No. NHTSA-00-7551] (RIN: 2127-AG68) received July 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9275. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class E Airspace; Oakley, KS [Airspace Docket No. 00-ACE-20] received July 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9276. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class E Airspace; Columbia, MO [Airspace Docket No. 00-ACE-21] received July 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9277. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision of Airspace Docket No. 2000-ASW-12] received July 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9278. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class E Airspace; Atwood, KS [Airspace Docket No. 00-ACE-19] received July 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9279. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Saab Model SAAB SF340A and SAAB 340B Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2000-NM-23-AD; Amendment 39-11812; AD 2000-14-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9280. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 737-600, -700, and -800 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2000-NM-209-AD; Amendment 39-11811; AD 2000-14-02] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9281. 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. 2000-NM-206-AD; Amendment 39-11813; AD 2000-14-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9282. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 777 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 2000-NM-155-AD; Amendment 39-11814; AD 2000-14-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9283. 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-75-AD; Amendment 39-11816; AD 2000-14-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9284. 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-192-AD; Amendment 39-11815; AD 2000-14-06] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9285. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the National Water Quality Inventory 1998 Report to Congress; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9286. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting informational copies of lease prospectuses for the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Las Vegas, NV, US General Services Administration, Philadelphia, PA, and Rough and Ready Island, Stockton, CA, pursuant to 40 U.S.C. 606(a); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9287. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a report entitled, "Status of the Nation's Highways, Bridges, and Transit: Conditions and Performance Report"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

9288. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Satellite and Information Services, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administra-

tion's "Major" rule—Licensing of Private Land Remote-Sensing Space Systems [Docket No. 951031259-9279-03] (RIN: 0648-AC64) received July 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science.

9289. A letter from the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, transmitting a report covering the disposition of cases granted relief from administrative error, overpayment and forfeiture by the Administrator in 1999, pursuant to 38 U.S.C. 210(c)(3)(B); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

9290. A letter from the Commissioner, Social Security Administration, transmitting the 2000 Annual Report Supplemental Security Income Program, pursuant to Public Law 104-193, section 231 (110 Stat. 2197); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9291. A letter from the Regulations Branch Chief, U.S. Customs Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Forced or Indentured Child Labor (RIN: 1515-AC36) received July 20, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9292. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Laundromat Industry—received July 18, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9293. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Reporting Requirements Update [DFARS Case 2000-D001] received June 21, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Select Comm Narcotics Abuse & Control.

9294. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a notice to oblige \$425.9 million in FY 2000 to implement the Cooperative Threat Reduction (CTR) Program under the FY 2000 Department of Defense Appropriations Act, pursuant to Public Law 104-106, section 1206(a) (110 Stat. 471); jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and International Relations.

9295. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting a notice to obligate certain previously notified in FY 1998 funds of up to \$46.0 million, pursuant to Public Law 104-106, section 1206(a) (110 Stat. 471); jointly to the Committees on Armed Services and International Relations.

9296. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting the response to the Report of the International Financial Institution Advisory Commission (the Commission); jointly to the Committees on Banking and Financial Services and Ways and Means.

9297. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting a draft bill, "To authorize the exchange of land between the Secretary of the Interior and the Director of the Central Intelligence Agency at the George Washington Memorial Parkway in McLean, Virginia."; jointly to the Committees on Intelligence (Permanent Select) and Resources.

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:

(Omitted from the Record of July 20, 2000)

Mr. MCCOLLUM: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 4033. 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; with an amendment (Rept. 106-

776). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SHUSTER: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 4844. A bill to modernize the financing of the railroad retirement system and to provide enhanced benefits to employees and beneficiaries; with an amendment (Rept. 106-777 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. MCCOLLUM: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3380. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to establish Federal jurisdiction over offenses committed outside the United States by persons employed by or accompanying the Armed Forces, or by members of the Armed Forces who are released or separated from active duty prior to being identified and prosecuted for the commission of such offenses, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 106-778 Pt. 1).

[Submitted July 21, 2000]

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 4446. A bill to ensure that the Secretary of Energy may continue to exercise certain authorities under the Price-Anderson Act through the Assistant Secretary of Energy for Environment, Safety, and Health; with amendments (Rept. 106-694 Pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 3383. A bill to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to remove separate treatment or exemption for nuclear safety violations by nonprofit institutions (Rept. 106-695 Pt. 2). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Submitted July 24, 2000]

Mr. BURTON: Committee on Government Reform. H.R. 2842. A bill to amend chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, concerning the Federal Employees Health Benefits (FEHB) Program, to enable the Federal Government to enroll an employee and his or her family in the FEHB Program when a State court orders the employee to provide health insurance coverage for a child of the employee but the employee fails to provide the coverage; with amendments (Rept. 106-779). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House of the State of the Union.

Mr. ARCHER: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 4865. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the 1993 income tax increase on Social Security benefits; with an amendment (Rept. 106-780). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STUMP: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 4864. A bill to amend the title 38, United States Code, to reaffirm and clarify the duty of the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to assist claimants for benefits under laws administered by the Secretary, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 106-781). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1283. A bill to establish legal standards and procedures for the fair, prompt, inexpensive, and efficient resolution of personal injury claims arising out of asbestos exposure, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 106-782). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STUMP: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 4850. A bill to provide a cost-of-living adjustment in rates of compensation paid to veterans with service-connected disabilities, to enhance programs providing compensation and life insurance benefits for veterans, and for other purposes (Rept. 106-783). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

[The following action occurred on July 20, 2000]

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X the Committee on Armed Services discharged. H.R. 3380 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, and ordered to be printed.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker:

[Omitted from the Record of July 20, 2000]

H.R. 1882. Referral to the Committee on Ways and Means extended for a period ending not later than September 15, 2000.

H.R. 3380. Referral to the Committee on Armed Services extended for a period ending not later than July 20, 2000.

H.R. 4844. Referral to the Committee on Ways and Means extended for a period ending not later than July 27, 2000.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. GILMAN (for himself and Mr. GEJDENSON):

H.R. 4919. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 and the Arms Export Control Act to make improvements to certain defense and security assistance provisions under those Acts, to authorize the transfer of naval vessels to certain foreign countries, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. LAZIO (for himself, Mr. HOYER, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio):

H.R. 4920. A bill to improve service systems for individuals with developmental disabilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. MINK of Hawaii:

H.R. 4921. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to revise the eligibility criteria for presumption of service-connection of certain diseases and disabilities for veterans exposed to ionizing radiation during military service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. STENHOLM (for himself, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. HAYES, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. COMBEST, Mr. BOYD, Mr. SHERWOOD, Mr. TURNER, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. BALDACCIO, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. BERRY, Mr. EWING, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin):

H.R. 4922. A bill to ensure that certain controversial changes to the Environmental Protection Agency's total maximum daily load program and permit program be subjected to adequate public and congressional analysis and review; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma (for himself, Mr. TALENT, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. ENGLISH, and Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 4923. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide tax incentives for the renewal of distressed communities, to provide for 9 additional empowerment zones

and increased tax incentives for empowerment zone development, to encourage investments in new markets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Banking and Financial Services, Small Business, and 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 Mrs. KELLY (for herself, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. MCINTOSH, and Mr. TURNER):

H.R. 4924. A bill to establish a 3-year pilot project for the General Accounting Office to report to Congress on economically significant rules of Federal agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. COOKSEY (for himself, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. GOODE, Mr. CANNON, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. ENGLISH, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. FLETCHER, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. TAUZIN, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. LINDER, Mrs. CUBIN, and Mr. SESSIONS):

H.R. 4925. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow more equitable and direct tax relief for health insurance and medical care expenses, to give Americans more options for obtaining quality health care, and to expand insurance coverage to the uninsured; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BACA:

H.R. 4926. A bill to provide for the award of a gold medal on behalf of the Congress to Tiger Woods, in recognition of his service to the Nation in promoting excellence and good sportsmanship, and in breaking barriers with grace and dignity by showing that golf is a sport for all people; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. DINGELL (for himself, Mr.

BROWN of Ohio, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. STARK, Mr. BERRY, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BALDACCIO, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FROST, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. KLINK, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. MOORE, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. WEYGAND):

H.R. 4927. A bill to amend title XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act to provide for FamilyCare coverage for parents of enrolled children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 4928. A bill to amend the Reclamation Wastewater and Groundwater Study and Facilities Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to participate in the design, planning, and construction of the Truckee watershed reclamation project for the reclamation and reuse of water; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 4929. A bill to direct the Secretary of Agriculture to convey certain land to Lander County, Nevada, for continued use as a cemetery; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 4930. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit the expansion of medical residency training programs in geriatric medicine; 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. HORN (for himself and Mr. TURNER):

H.R. 4931. A bill to provide for the training or orientation of individuals, during a Presidential transition, who the President intends to appoint to certain key positions, to provide for a study and report on improving the financial disclosure process for certain Presidential nominees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. KLINK:

H.R. 4932. A bill to amend titles XIX and XXI of the Social Security Act to expand access of children to health care; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. KLINK (for himself and Mr. EVANS):

H.R. 4933. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to reauthorize the program for veterans readjustment appointments within the Federal Government; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD (for herself, Mr. LAMPSON, and Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri):

H.R. 4934. A bill to authorize the Consumer Product Safety Commission to issue a consumer product safety rule to prevent injuries to users of vending machines; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. MINGE (for himself, Mr. EVANS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. FILNER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Mr. HOLDEN):

H.R. 4935. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the size of the estate an incompetent veteran being furnished institutional care by the Department of Veterans Affairs may have without being subject to suspension of benefits; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. MYRICK:

H.R. 4936. A bill to increase the penalty imposed on a sexually violent offender who fails to comply with requirements to register or report, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H.R. 4937. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide relief to providers of services under the Medicare Program by correcting reductions in payment rates instituted under the Balanced Budget Act of 1997; 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. STARK (for himself, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. WEYGAND, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. FROST, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. WEINER, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LEVIN, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. STUPAK, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. FILNER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr.

DEFAZIO, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. NADLER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. KUCINICH):

H.R. 4938. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act and the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to improve access to health insurance and Medicare benefits for individuals ages 55 to 65 to be fully funded through premiums and anti-fraud provisions, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit against income tax for payment of such premiums and of premiums for certain COBRA continuation coverage, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Commerce, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. VELAZQUEZ:

H.R. 4939. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to prohibit discrimination regarding exposure to hazardous substances, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. WAMP (for himself, Mr. TANNER, Mr. FORD, Mr. BRYANT, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. GORDON, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. JENKINS):

H.R. 4940. A bill to designate the museum operated by the Secretary of Energy in Oak Ridge, Tennessee, as the "American Museum of Science and Energy", and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science.

By Mr. WYNN (for himself, Mr. SHAD-EGG, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. BILBRAY, and Ms. ESHOO):

H.R. 4941. A bill to amend the Federal Power Act to provide for the reliability of the electric power transmission system in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. GRAHAM:

H. Con. Res. 379. Concurrent resolution reaffirming the first amendment right to freely exercise religious beliefs without the fear of governmental condemnation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California (for himself and Mr. YOUNG of Alaska):

H. Res. 562. A resolution providing for the concurrence by the House, with amendments, in the Senate amendment to H.R. 1167; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 107: Mr. BACHUS.
H.R. 148: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 488: Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 531: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. BAKER, and Mr. ABERCROMBIE.
H.R. 534: Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. FORD, Mr. BERRY, and Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 797: Mr. DICKS.
H.R. 860: Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon.
H.R. 920: Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 1227: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD.
H.R. 1399: Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 1606: Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 1621: Mr. RANGEL, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. WAXMAN, and Mr. HAYES.
H.R. 1731: Mr. DOOLEY of California.
H.R. 1850: Mr. NEY.
H.R. 1871: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 1890: Mrs. LOWEY and Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 1982: Mr. FILNER, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.

H.R. 2121: Mr. SMITH of Michigan and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 2562: Mr. PICKETT.

H.R. 2710: Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. HOLT, Mr. BE-REUTER, and Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

H.R. 2814: Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California.

H.R. 2870: Mr. FATTAH, Mr. POMEROY, and Mr. WEYGAND.

H.R. 2902: Mr. COSTELLO.

H.R. 3044: Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 3083: Mr. REYES, Mr. BENTSEN, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 3091: Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. CLEMENT, and Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 3105: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 3170: Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 3235: Ms. BALDWIN.

H.R. 3377: Mr. INSLEE.

H.R. 3463: Mr. CROWLEY and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 3571: Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 3806: Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 3825: Mr. RAHALL.

H.R. 3850: Mr. BOUCHER.

H.R. 3880: Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 3907: Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 3983: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CLEMENT, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. LARSON, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. TANNER, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. REYES.

H.R. 3998: Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 4001: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi and Ms. RIVERS.

H.R. 4030: Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 4178: Mr. SCOTT, Mr. BATEMAN, and Mr. COX.

H.R. 4213: Mr. BUYER and Mr. COOK.

H.R. 4215: Mr. DOOLEY of California.

H.R. 4236: Mrs. FOWLER.

H.R. 4239: Mr. CLYBURN and Mr. LAFALCE.

H.R. 4259: Mr. BEREUTER and Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.

H.R. 4271: Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. FILNER, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. RAMSTAD.

H.R. 4272: Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. FILNER, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. RAMSTAD.

H.R. 4273: Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. FILNER, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. RAMSTAD.

H.R. 4328: Mr. BATEMAN.

H.R. 4357: Ms. RIVERS.

H.R. 4395: Mr. GARY MILLER of California.

H.R. 4410: Mr. DEUTSCH.

H.R. 4492: Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.

H.R. 4543: Mr. BECERRA, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. THORNBERRY.

H.R. 4547: Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. BEREUTER, and Mr. COMBEST.

H.R. 4550: Mr. WICKER.

H.R. 4567: Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 4644: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 4664: Mr. FROST and Mr. LATOURETTE.

H.R. 4673: Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. GEJDENSON, and Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 4677: Mr. BEREUTER.

H.R. 4740: Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 4746: Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.

H.R. 4756: Mr. FROST, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mrs. MEEK of Florida.

H.R. 4759: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. WHITFIELD, and Mr. NETHERCUTT.

H.R. 4807: Mr. MOORE, Mr. HALL of Ohio, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. SHAW, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. QUINN, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. OLVER, Mr. HOYER, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. WEINER, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. KLINK, Mr. POMEROY, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. SKEEN, Mr. CAPUANO,

Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. WU, Ms. DANNER, Mr. COYNE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BOYD, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, and Mr. HINOJOSA.

H.R. 4825: Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. BERMAN, and Mr. BLUNT.

H.R. 4827: Mr. BEREUTER.

H.R. 4848: Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. WEINER, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Ms. WATERS, Mr. TIERNEY, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. OWENS, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. OSE, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. ACKERMAN, and Mr. BLAGOJEVICH.

H.R. 4850: Mr. SHIMKUS and Mr. BONIOR.

H.R. 4856: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 4864: Mr. DEMINT, Mr. METCALF, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. NEY, Mr. PETRI, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. LARSON, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. WOLF, Mr. SWEENEY, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. LATOURETTE, Mrs. FOWLER, and Mr. STRICKLAND.

H.R. 4888: Mr. GOODE, Mr. PITTS, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. RILEY, Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. ISTOOK, Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. COX, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. BRADY of Texas, and Mr. GARY MILLER of California.

H.R. 4894: Mr. PHELPS, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. LEACH, and Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 4895: Mr. PHELPS, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. COOKSEY, and Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 4902: Mr. TANCREDO.

H.R. 4907: Mr. PICKETT and Mr. GOODE.

H.J. Res. 102: Mr. DAVIS of Virginia.

H. Con. Res. 321: Mr. WEXLER, Mr. FORBES, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. DOYLE, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H. Con. Res. 327: Mr. CROWLEY and Mr. ORTIZ.

H. Con. Res. 341: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H. Con. Res. 346: Mr. NADLER.

H. Con. Res. 357: Mr. NADLER.

H. Con. Res. 363: Mr. NADLER.

H. Con. Res. 368: Mr. HOYER.

H. Con. Res. 370: Mr. PORTER, Mr. STARK, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, and Mr. FILNER.

H. Con. Res. 372: Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. BUYER, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. BALDACCI.

H. Con. Res. 375: Mrs. ROUKEMA.

H. Res. 543: Mr. WEXLER.

H. Res. 544: Mr. SOUDER, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, and Mr. DREIER.

H. Res. 548: Mr. STEARNS, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, and Mr. LARGENT.

H. Res. 549: Mr. BUYER, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. LAZIO, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. ADERHOLT, and Mr. ETHERIDGE.

H. Res. 561: Ms. CARSON, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. LARGENT, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. PETRI, Mr. FILNER, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Mr. MCINTYRE, and Mr. SUNUNU.

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. —

(D.C. APPROPRIATIONS, FY 2001)

OFFERED BY: Mr. TIAHRT

AMENDMENT NO. 1: At the end of the bill, insert after the last section (preceding the short title) the following new section:

SEC. ____ (a) No person may distribute any needle or syringe for the hypodermic injection of any illegal drug in any area of the District of Columbia which is within 1000 feet of a public or private day care center, elementary school, vocational school, secondary school, college, junior college, or university, or any public housing project, public swimming pool, park, playground, video arcade, or youth center, or an event sponsored by any such entity.

(b) Whoever violates subsection (a) shall be fined not more than \$500 for each needle or syringe distributed in violation of such subsection.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any amount collected by the District of Columbia pursuant to subsection (b) shall be deposited in a separate account of the General Fund of the District of Columbia and used exclusively to carry out (either directly or by contract) drug prevention or treatment programs. For purposes of this subsection, no program of distributing sterile needles or syringes for the hypodermic injection of any illegal drug may be considered a drug prevention or treatment program.