The House met at 2 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC, February 6, 2001.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JOHN SHIMKUS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

PRAYER

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

Lord God, You created each of us in Your own likeness. In the divine image You created us. Male and female You created us.

May we know our dignity by the very fact of our creation, our being, our very living this new day imaging You.

May we treat each other with the sacred honor that each is due. Seeing Your reflection in the eyes of the other, may we touch intelligence, imagination, internal powers and know eternal freedom.

Lord God, having come from You, living in You and destined for You, guide us in all we say and do this day, to sustain and further Your creation.

Teach this Congress and all people of this Nation how to seek the best ways to be Your instruments of a new creation; loving only what is good and seeking only what is true and lasting, now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. PENCE 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.

REMEMBERING FOUNDING FATHERS WHO FOUGHT AGAINST SLAVERY

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, on this day in history, February 6, 1865, 136 years ago, the 13th amendment went into effect, ending 246 years of slavery in America. Slavery was introduced into America in 1619 by the Dutch and subsequently encouraged in the Colonies by the British Crown. In fact, it was not until after the Declaration of Independence was signed that it became possible to abolish slavery, and half of the States promptly did it at that time.

Significantly, the major opposition to slavery in America was led by religious groups like the Quakers, Presbyterians, Congregationalists, and Methodists, and was joined by many of the religious Founding Fathers, including signers of the Declaration like Benjamin Rush, John Witherspoon, Samuel Adams, John Hancock, and John Adams, as well as the signers of the Constitution like Rufus King, John Dickinson, James Wilson, and William Livingston.

While much attention today is often paid to Founding Fathers who owned slaves, nearly nothing is said of the many who opposed slavery. Therefore, it is worth remembering that the work of so many of our Founding Fathers to end slavery finally came to maturity when the 13th amendment was adopted, 136 years ago.

REMEMBERING ALAN CRANSTON

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

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, my first job offer on the Hill came from the late California Senator, Alan Cranston, who will be remembered at a memorial service this afternoon by generations of colleagues and staffers.

Though I never worked on Alan’s staff, I relied on him for counsel and support for 3 decades. Alan was a mentor to me when I served in senior staff positions for Senator John Tunney. I always had the sense that Alan was looking out for John and me, and for California’s interests.

We remained friends through the years and saw each other last at Stanford University only a few months ago.

Alan’s counsel and continued focus on issues he cared passionately about, especially world peace, set the marker. He was always working. No doubt he was working until the moment he left us.

I was fortunate to know and learn from him. We were fortunate to have him as a congressional leader for 24 years.

RONALD REAGAN MEMORIAL ACT

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

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure and very fitting that I am today introducing the Ronald
Reagan Memorial Act as we celebrate this great man’s 90th birthday. This bill establishes a Presidential memorial for one of the most influential men of the 20th century. As one of our most notable Presidents, Ronald Reagan initiated policies that helped win the Cold War, tame the economic stagflation of the early eighties by cutting taxes and increasing funding for the national defense, and helped to restore the United States as the leader of the world front. In doing so, President Reagan helped restore America people’s faith in our system of government and capitalism and returned pride in being an American.

Specifically, this bill creates and then requires the Ronald Reagan Memorial Commission to cooperate with the Secretary of the Interior in the National Capital Memorial Commission to identify and then recommend to Congress an appropriate site for the construction of a memorial honoring former President Ronald Reagan.

This bill specifies that the memorial be situated in “Area 1” as identified in the Commemorative Works Act, and that is between the Lincoln Memorial and the United States Capitol building. The bill creating the Ronald Reagan Memorial Commission would also select the memorial design and raise the necessary funds to complete the memorial.

Mr. Speaker, this bill honors a great American who deserves a national tribute in a place of prominence and recognition.

COZY DEALS BETWEEN NON-PROFIT MEDICAL RESEARCH INSTITUTES AND FOR-PROFIT COMPANIES

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

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Last week, Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal reported on some cozy deals between nonprofit medical research institutes and for-profit companies. It works this way: a nonprofit institute wins millions in research dollars from the National Institutes of Health. The director of the institute also happens to own a for-profit company that has exclusive rights to the institute’s research. The for-profit company turns that research into a marketable product and makes millions. Everyone is flush, except for American taxpayers.

Does this raise conflict-of-interest issues? You bet. Why is the Federal Government using our tax dollars to give for-profit companies a free ride?

Why do Americans pay the highest prescription drug prices in the world, when billions of U.S. tax dollars go into the development of these drugs? Because Congress is not doing its job.

The U.S. invests more than any other nation in medical research. The drug industry feeds off our tax dollars to develop outrageously profitable drugs, and then they “thank” American taxpayers by charging us the highest prices in the world.

It is a racket, and it must stop. Drug companies must compensate taxpayers fairly through lower prices or royalty payments for our front-end investment in their products.

TAX RELIEF NOW

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, last month Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan echoed what this Republican-led Congress has supported for years, that we should pay down our national debt and grant Americans tax relief, instead of increasing the size of the Federal Government.

According to the Census Bureau, Mr. Speaker, the average household pays almost $9,500 in Federal income taxes this year, and that is twice what the average family paid in 1985. But we do not only pay Federal income taxes, we pay taxes when we use the phone, buy clothing, pump gas, sell stock, sleep at a motel, ride on an airplane, get married, or even when we die.

It is time for hard-working Americans to get a break from all of these taxes. Now is the time. We can enact meaningful tax relief while still remaining fiscally responsible and paying off our national debt.

There is no excuse, Mr. Speaker, not to give the Americans what they want, what they need, and what they deserve, a tax break.

SUPPORTING THE PRESIDENT’S PRO-AMERICAN, PRO-WORKER, RETROACTIVE TAX CUT

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, there are opponents trying to kill President Bush’s tax cut. They say it is too big, and cut taxes now.

Beam me up, Mr. Speaker. I support the pro-American, pro-worker, retroactive tax cut of President Bush.

Let me say this, Congress: there are not two or three United States of America, there is just one; one people, one nation, under God. And one tax cut that qualifies for all of America strengthens our Republic.

I yield back the fact that we have a Tax Code that would give Hulk Hogan a hernia.

AMERICA NEEDS TAX RELIEF NOW

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, while the Federal Government prepares to inhale a nearly $5.7 trillion tax surplus over the next 10 years, I rise to speak on behalf of the families, small businesses and working families who face a much less promising future.

Despite the talk of boom times, Hooiser families in my district are faced with layoffs at major employers in Columbus and New Castle, Indiana; and many of the small businesses dependent on these companies are fearful as well.

This House of Representatives is the heart of the American Government; and as such, it should resonate with the hearts of the people.

Mr. Speaker, the people’s hearts are anxious with increasingly disappoing news about our economy. All this while income tax rates measured as a percentage of the economy are at the highest level.

Mr. Speaker, our Congress must again be the Congress of economic recovery. President Reagan, whose birth we celebrate today, showed us the way to turn around this American economy, by cutting taxes for all tax payers. In order for our country to recover economically, we must cut taxes big and cut taxes now.

ELIMINATE THE MARRIAGE TAX PENALTY

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

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask an important fundamental issue of fairness that particularly affects the middle class, and that is the situation, is it right, is it fair that, under our Tax Code, a married working couple, a couple with two incomes, pay higher taxes just because they are married? Is it right that 28 million married working couples pay on average $1,400 more in higher taxes just because they are married, $1,400 more than an identical couple that chooses to live together outside of marriage? That is wrong.

I was proud when this House and Senate last year sent H.R. 6, the Marriage Tax Elimination Act, to the White House to be signed into law. Unfortunately, President Clinton at that time vetoed our effort to eliminate the marriage tax penalty.

But we have an opportunity. President Bush has indicated during his campaign he would sign into law the Marriage Tax Elimination Act, a bipartisan effort to wipe out the marriage tax penalty.

Let us pursue this opportunity. As we work to provide broad-based, real fundamental tax relief for working families, let us remember middle class working couples, and let us eliminate the marriage tax penalty.
IT IS TIME FOR TAX RELIEF
(Mr. WELDON of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, every American who pays taxes deserves a tax cut. With consumer confidence starting to tank and the economy starting to slow down, the Congress and President needs to work in a bipartisan manner to pass meaningful tax relief for the American people. Cutting taxes is essential to strengthening our economy.

With President Bush, we have a greater opportunity to get tax relief to the American people. President Bush has a tax relief proposal that will cut taxes for every American who pays taxes. This proposal will spur economic growth in two ways: first, it will put more money in the wallets of the American people; second, it will take money off the table in Washington, making it more difficult for the government to grow out of control.

Mr. Speaker, we need to reduce marginal tax rates; we need to eliminate the death tax; we need to eliminate the marriage penalty; and we need to have a charitable tax deduction. A series of changes needs to be made in the Tax Code to make it more fair and simpler for all Americans.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT
A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Wanda Evans, one of his secretaries.

THIRD REPORT ON OPERATION OF ANDEAN TRADE PREFERENCE ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

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

To the Congress of the United States:


GEORGE W. BUSH.


ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

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

RECOGNIZING 90TH BIRTHDAY OF RONALD REAGAN

Mr. PLATTS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 7) recognizing the 90th birthday of Ronald Reagan. The Clerk read as follows:

H.J. RES. 7

Whereas February 6, 2001, is the 90th birthday of Ronald Wilson Reagan; Whereas both Ronald Reagan and his wife Nancy Reagan have distinguished records of public service to the United States, the American people, and the international community; Whereas Ronald Reagan was twice elected by overwhelming margins as President of the United States; Whereas Ronald Reagan fulfilled his pledge to help restore "the great, confident roar of American progress, growth, and optimism" and ensure renewed economic prosperity; Whereas Ronald Reagan's leadership was instrumental in extending freedom and democracy around the globe and uniting a world divided in conflict; Whereas Ronald Reagan is loved and admired by millions of Americans, and by countless others around the world; Whereas Ronald Reagan's eloquence united Americans in times of triumph and tragedy; Whereas Nancy Reagan not only served as a gracious First Lady but also led a national crusade against AIDS; Whereas together Ronald and Nancy Reagan dedicated their lives to promoting national pride and to bettering the quality of life in the United States and throughout the world; and Whereas the thoughts and prayers of the Congress and the country are with Ronald Reagan in his courageous battle with Alzheimer's disease: Now, therefore, be it Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Congress, on behalf of the American people, extends its birthday greetings and best wishes to Ronald Reagan on his 90th birthday.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Platts). Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am pleased to have the House consider House Joint Resolution 7, important legislation introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Platts) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Brown) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. Platts), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Brown) each will control 20 minutes.

This resolution expresses the sense of the House of Representatives in recognition of President Ronald Reagan's 90th birthday.

Mr. Speaker, today we honor Ronald Reagan, our Nation's 40th President, who joined John Adams and Herbert Hoover as former presidents to reach the age of 90.

President Reagan moved into the White House in 1981, 7 years after America lost confidence in the presidency due to Watergate, 6 years after the end of the Vietnam War, which ripped America apart and, during dire economic times, including high inflation, high unemployment, and high interest rates. Across the board, morale was low. America was embarrassed in Iran with the hostage crisis, and our standing abroad had been greatly diminished.

And then came Ronald Reagan, riding into Washington to save the American spirit.

From the moment he placed his hand on the Bible to take the oath as President on January 20, 1981, it was clear that America would once again stand tall. In his inaugural address, Ronald Reagan said that we had every right to dream heroic dreams. After all, he said, "Why not? We are Americans."

Ronald Reagan came to office disdained by many so-called wise men and women. They called him an "amiable fool," and an actor reading a script. They twisted his belief in a strong defense and staunch anticommunism into a caricature of a war-monger unable to deal constructively with the Soviet Union. They were aghast at his conservative characterization of the Soviet Union as an "evil empire," and his prediction that it was headed for the "ash heap of history."

But President Reagan was a man of character and a man of conviction. He was a leader, a man bounded by polls and focus groups, but one with the courage to stand up for what was right.

With the strength of his beliefs and his faith in the ideals in the Founders and the inherent talent, energy and character of the American people, Ronald Reagan transformed our country and our world.

He brought the world closer to peace and ended the nuclear arms race with the Soviet Union. Thanks to President Reagan's determination and leadership, the Berlin Wall fell, and then the Soviet Union fell, and with it, all the statues and monuments to Lenin, Stalin, and other former Soviet Union leaders. President Reagan had brought the Cold War to an end. The world was finally at peace.

Ronald Reagan lead our economy out of an economic abyss and into years of prosperity with low interest rates, low unemployment, and low inflation. He brought the world closer to peace and ended the nuclear arms race with the Soviet Union. Thanks to President Reagan's determination and leadership, the Berlin Wall fell, and then the Soviet Union fell, and with it, all the statues and monuments to Lenin, Stalin, and other former Soviet Union leaders. President Reagan had brought the Cold War to an end. The world was finally at peace.

Ronald Reagan was a President with class, dignity and respect for the high office to which he was elected. Future historians will recognize him as one of America's truly great Presidents. For all that he did, for all that he meant, and for all that he stood for, President Reagan deserves our admiration, our respect, and our gratitude. On behalf of
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Mr. Speaker, it is a real pleasure for me to be able to rise and speak in support of this resolution, and join my two distinguished colleagues from California, Mr. COX and Mr. ROHRABACHER, who are both alumni of the Reagan administration.

Later this afternoon I will have a bill on the floor that further honors the legacy of Ronald Reagan by naming a post office in my congressional district after our 40th President.

I feel very strongly that what we are doing today and what we are doing as part of the Reagan Legacy Project in items like naming a post office after Ronald Reagan are extremely important.

Ronald Reagan was a man who was harshly criticized by the liberal Democrat-leaning press in the United States throughout his Presidency. Much of his legacy will be defined by those press reports, and, as well, by those historians who, in addition to journalists, tend to be the most liberal, Democrat-leaning, anti-Republican and anti-conservative in most of their philosophy.

So therefore, I think it is extremely important that people such as ourselves raise our voices and try our best to get the truth out.

In this regard, I was extremely pleased just Sunday to pick up a copy of the Washington Post, a newspaper that had been, I think, harshly critical of much of the Reagan administration initiatives, and lo and behold, there was a favorable story there indicating that when we actually sit down and read some of Ronald Reagan's papers that are being made available to the public, lo and behold, we find that he was actually smart; that he actually had very, very good insights into what he was doing. To see this indeed printed by the Washington Post to me was extremely gratifying.

Ronald Reagan was one of the greatest Presidents in our Nation's history, and I believe was one of the greatest of the 20th century. As was very, very well outlined by my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, in his comments earlier, he came to office at a time when we had very high inflation rates, high unemployment, low morale.

We had been through some very difficult years. His policies were successful not only in ending the Cold War and turning that economic crisis around, but probably, more importantly, lifting the American spirit.

We are living under the legacy of the policies that he introduced back then still to this day. Economists attribute the strength of the economy of the nineties to Alan Greenspan and the policies of Ronald Reagan. It is therefore fitting that we honor him on his birthday in this way.

Mr. PLATTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. OTTER).

Mr. OTTER. Mr. Speaker, today I am honored to join my colleagues and thousands of Idaho citizens in sending the very best of birthday wishes to President Ronald Reagan on his 90th birthday, or, in his words, the 51st anniversary of his 39th birthday.

When President Reagan came to office he faced an economy with double-digit interest rates, rampant inflation, high unemployment, long gas lines, a weakened military, low national morale, and with a Democrat-controlled House, he, too, sought a bipartisan agreement and support, and in that process cut the tax rates 25 percent, reduced wasteful spending, strengthened our national defense, and restored America's pride and her respect.

I was honored to serve on President Reagan's Task Force on International Private Enterprise. His vision of free markets, reducing tax burdensome regulations, and smaller, more responsible government, is as relevant in the year 2001 as it was in 1981.

America thanks President Reagan for his vision and leadership. Our prayers are with him and our prayers are with Nancy.

Mr. PLATTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER).

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

Mr. Speaker, today we honor former President Reagan on the occasion of his 90th birthday. For those of us who worked with him, it is a tremendous source of satisfaction that our former boss is now being given the credit that he is due as one of America's greatest Presidents.

Every day it is becoming ever more clear that the long period of prosperity our people have enjoyed started in January 1983. January 1983 is when Ronald Reagan's economic policies, especially his tax program, went into full effect. At that point the economy took off like a rocket, and it has not ceased to expand since then to this very day, except for a very short 6-month dip in 1999 and 1992, unfortunately during a presidential election.

By the time President Clinton took office, however, the man who now claims credit for this long period of expansion, the growth rate in the economy was already 5.4 percent based on, of course, the strong economy that ignited in January 1983.

My apologies to my friends on the other side of the aisle, but it was President Reagan whose policies led to this dramatic uplifting of the well-being of the American people that we have enjoyed for a decade now.

Most of all, one of the factors that has insured that prosperity was that Ronald Reagan had a tough pro-free-dom, pro-strength foreign policy that ended the Cold War and ushered the world into the historic era of peace. The potential for world peace was never greater than at the end of his term in office, so that hundreds of billions of dollars that would have been spent on weapons now can build better lives for people and help pay off our debt. Our brightest minds, instead of focusing on developing technologies that will kill people more effectively, now can focus on technologies that will benefit mankind.

That is what Ronald Reagan brought us, the kind of world that Ronald Reagan brought us.

The peace and prosperity to which I refer did not just happen. It came as a result of the courage of Ronald Reagan, a former lifeguard in a very small town in Illinois. A lifeguard, that is how he started out, and that is what he did for his entire life. He saved the lives of 17 people in a small lake, and continued trying to save people for the rest of his life.

He invested in the military, in our military, to win the Cold War. Just like we did in World War II, we made a lot of money. There was a great deal of debt in World War II, but under his leadership, America went on the offensive. We began supporting freedom fighters, battling Soviet troops and surrogates from Afghanistan to Nicaragua, and supported democratic movements in Poland and in the Soviet Union itself.

In the end, the greatest and most sinister threat to freedom on our planet collapsed in its own evil. It would not have happened without the vision of Ronald Reagan, a former lifeguard, and yes, a former sports announcer and a former actor.

Today it is often said that the accomplishments I have mentioned would have happened anyway, without Ronald Reagan. Well, it just is not so. Ronald Reagan fought his battle against people who opposed everything he was trying to do every step of the way. He made things happen with the strength of his convictions and the power of his speeches.

He was maligned as heartless and as stupid by people who disagreed with his approach. Let me add, a majority of Democrats in this House of Lies and the Congress at that time consistently voted to undermine every attempt Ronald Reagan made to confront Soviet expansionism, whether it was the supporting of anti-Communist forces in Latin America or the rebuilding of our military strength. Had their policies been heard and carried the day, we would still be in the Cold War and still be spending those billions of wasted dollars on weapons systems that now could be spent in economy-building ways.

Ronald Reagan was a good-hearted man. He was a strong man, but a good-hearted man, as good-hearted as I have ever met. He was hurt by suggestions that he was a mean-spirited person or did not care about others.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMkus). All time has expired.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to speak for 3 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?
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Mr. PLATTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, President Reagan has also enjoyed a special relationship with the American people. In 1994, after being diagnosed with Alzheimer's disease, he wrote: "I now begin the journey that will lead me into the sunset of my life. I know that for America there will always be a bright dawn ahead."

Thanks to President Reagan, there is still a bright dawn in our future. For that, President Reagan deserves our gratitude, our best wishes, and our love. happy 90th birthday. President Reagan. Mr. Speaker, encourage all Members to support this joint resolution.

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, today we celebrate the 90th birthday of Ronald Reagan. As we honor his life it is important to reflect on what he has contributed to our nation. As I consider this remarkable life, from his boyhood to the present, I see the heroic figure of a man coming to the rescue.

His first period of public service was when he served as lifeguard at Lowell Park in Dixon, Illinois. In seven years as a lifeguard, he is credited with saving 77 lives. To this very day, the sum of Ronald Reagan's contributions is measured by what he has done for the American people.

After a successful career in Hollywood as an actor and union president, Reagan again turned to public service. He witnessed the turmoil of the 1960s and the difficulties facing his beloved state of California. He saw the need for leadership and was appointed director of the governor's mansion. Never before holding public office, Ronald Reagan boldly stepped forward and offered his vision to the voters of America's most populous state. He won in a landslide.

After two terms in Sacramento, Governor Reagan saw a series of threats menacing the United States. He challenged the incumbent Republican President in 1976 for the nomination, and, although he did not succeed, he revitalized the Republican party. In 1980, Reagan again entered the presidential race and this time he won his party's nomination.

I remember well the era of uncertainty that clouded America's future. Communism had reached a peak of strength in Asia, Africa, Europe, Cuba, and even Central America. American hostages were held in Iran and the enemies of the United States celebrated our weakness. Our economy was deflated and the American people dispirited.

Here in Washington in 1980, the President buckled to the pessimism of the time and called on the people to accept that our best days were gone. Ronald Reagan would have none of that—not the nonsense that America was a crippled giant, or that our best days were history. He placed before the American people his vision that we could overcome any hardship and route any challenge.

We renewed our belief in ourselves and we elected him to the White House. Again, Ronald Reagan came to the rescue. He turned our economy around, rebuilt our military, and aggressively outlined our national interests. The results were astounding.

Mr. Speaker, during the Reagan years there was a change in America. As has been mentioned, just as there was in World War II. That deficit can almost all be attributed to our military buildup, and I admit that, certainly, that was the factor. But it was that buildup that permitted us to end the Cold War and to lower the level of defense spending and now to balance our budget, which is exactly what we have done. Now, in the spirit of Ronald Reagan, we are cutting taxes and paying down and paying off the debt.

Finally, the viciousness against Reagan was at times so much. However, he himself kept a positive attitude. Then, described as a puppet, a man, just a front man, and other decision-makers were using him. This characterization is so contrary to the reality of those of us who knew him that it just boggles the mind.

The Berlin Wall speech in which Ronald Reagan called for Gorbachev to tear down the wall, every one of his senior advisors told him, begged him, pleaded with him not to say it, but Ronald Reagan knew that if he was to remain true to the things that he believed in all his life and was going to give hope to those people around the world, that they had to know that we believed in what we had been taught as children to tell Mr. Gorbachev to tear down that wall, even though George Schultz and all his advisors and people in this city today who claim to have written that speech for Ronald Reagan were people who were actually advising him not to give the speech.

Reagan stayed true to his ideals, and he saved the world in doing so. Today, the Ronald Reagan we knew and loved still lives, and he grows in stature as history reflects upon his enormous accomplishment and ideals. We wish him a happy 90th birthday.

We enter now a new millennium, celebrating our liberty, secure in our peace, and blessed by prosperity and unimaginined opportunity. A man of vision and ideals saw this as he looked ahead. He took the steps and stands that were necessary to make it happen.

We thank Ronald Reagan. Now it is up to us, and I am certain if he were with us today, he would be just as confident of the American people as he ever was, and he would urge us on to greatness. He taught us that our history is not just a story of succeeding, but also is a story of suffering and fighting for freedom. It is easy to take our freedom for granted, but we need to remember that we are Americans. So, what is holding us up? Let us get going.
note, I distinctly recall how President Reagan energized me to get involved in public service. His words and actions instilled within me the importance of public service. His guiding principles of tax relief, patriotism, contributions to our communities, and pride in our country led me to public service. To use the skills I learned in private industry to enhance the quality of life of my neighbors, friends and family.

I can’t imagine America today if it hadn’t been for Ronald Reagan. For that, and so much more, I tip my hat to each and every one of the millions of citizens of New York’s First Congressional District, grateful for your service to our nation and the inspiration you are, I wish you the very best of birthdays.

Mr. Speaker, thank you, and God bless the United States of America.

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 90th birthday of former President Ronald Reagan, a decent and honorable man, who had the unique ability to see what was best about America and appeal to “the better angels of our nature.”

He came into office when America was suffering from a crisis of confidence, and he gave us back our voice.

By invoking images of a “shining city upon a hill,” he reminded Americans not only of our national heritage, but of how the oppressed and downtrodden of the world looked to this nation for leadership.

In my recent trip to Africa I was again reminded of how incredibly blessed America is. It is my firm belief that to whom much is given, much may have changed, the yearning for freedom throughout the world today still view this nation as Ronald Reagan described it a decade ago—a “shining city upon a hill”—a beacon of hope and democracy.

And so, in the spirit of President Reagan’s birthday I ask that you take a moment to reflect on how we can continue to embrace this calling. While the Cold War is over, the Berlin Wall is down, and Soviet communism is in the ash heap of history as Reagan predicted it would be, there are still those fighting for the freedom that we so often take for granted. Whether it be the persecuted House Church pastor in China or the frightened civilian in the Sudanese capital who is praying not to be the unlucky target of daily bombing raids, these people demand a voice.

President Reagan was a champion for human rights in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe. He spoke up in defense of freedom and democracy. He raised the cases of dissidents during his high-level meetings with Soviet officials. He made passionate and eloquent speeches outlining America’s values. He engaged, but he engaged forthrightly and he backed up engagement with action.

President Reagan once said, “We must be staunch in our conviction that freedom is not the sole prerogative of a lucky few, but the inalienable and universal right of all human beings.”

Sad to say, President Reagan does not remember the hope that his words provided to millions living behind the Iron Curtain. But we can not forget. For while the times and circumstances may have changed, the yearning for freedom has not.

We send our best wishes today to Ronald Reagan, and with those wishes go our appreciation as a grateful nation that we were fortunate enough to have him serve as our President.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the birthday of our 40th President, Ronald Reagan.

It is natural on birthdays to reflect on the mark one has made in life. We have much to reflect upon today, on Ronald Reagan’s Ninetieth birthday. Because of his leadership, Americans are more prosperous, secure, and free.

Reagan’s leadership has left America more prosperous. The record economic expansion of the past two decades can be directly attributed to the profound changes enacted by Ronald Reagan. Cutting back on unnecessary regulations and reducing the possibility of catastrophic war have proven a winning formula for economic success. Leaders across the world have learned and are copying his example.

When his contemporaries pursued an industrial policy or a middle ground between capitalism and socialism, Reagan opted for limited government. As a result, America has reaped virtually uninterrupted economic growth and surged ahead of rivals in technological innovation.

Reagan’s leadership has left America more secure. His grand strategic plan brought down the greatest threat to our way of life. His contemporaries counseled defeat and feared confrontation with the Soviet Union. But Reagan said, “If it is evil, why not call it evil?—and want nothing less than its destruction.”

After years of military decline, Reagan rebuilt and restored the morale of our military. Never has a nation become so mighty as the United States, and it is due in no small part to the leadership of Ronald Reagan.

And Reagan’s advocacy of the Strategic Defense Initiative will shortly bear fruit as we build a national missile defense. He recognized the insanity of MAD, and though we should instead construct a physical, rather than merely psychological, defense to protect Americans and our allies from the horror of nuclear war.

Most important, Reagan’s leadership has left Americans and the world more free. Domestically, Americans are freer than before Reagan entered the Oval Office. And his philosophical legacy has shifted the momentum of history toward, rather than away from, greater individual freedom.

Around the world, hundreds of millions of people formerly enslaved by communism have been liberated by the collapse of the Soviet Union, precipitated by Ronald Reagan. Only five countries remain so enslaved. Even citizens in countries that were not communist also enjoy greater freedom, as their governments recognize the success of the Reagan model and decrease government interference in their lives.

In increasing our prosperity, security, and freedom, president Ronald Reagan succeeded greatly in the most crucial functions of government. For this, he is one of our greatest presidents.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.J. Res. 7, a bill to recognize President Reagan.

What is the standard we use to judge our Presidents? How do we appropriately honor those men who have served our great nation and the office of the Presidency with great distinction, courage, honor, and vision? In this city, which is already graced with so many memorials of marble, granite, and bronze, to men and women who have loved freedom more than life and their country more than self—how can we best remember and celebrate the service rendered to these United States and to those dedicated to the cause of freedom throughout the world by President Ronald Reagan?

President Reagan represents the spirit that has made America strong. He began his eight years in office at a time when America appeared to be on the ebb—economically and militarily demoralized. But for President Reagan, America was moving America during the Reagan years was an America of hopes fulfilled and a place where dreams came true. Reagan’s America was to be a Shining City on a Hill—shining the light of freedom for all peoples throughout the world. This was his vision, a vision from which he never wavered.

In a speech given in 1964, President Reagan responded to his detractors, to those who said that only bigger and more powerful governments could provide security despite the price of freedom. He said:

“They say the world has become too complex for simple answers. They are wrong. There are no easy answers, but there are simple answers. We must have the courage to do what we know is morally right. You and I have a rendezvous with destiny. We will preserve for our children the last best hope of man on earth or we will sentence them to take the first step into a thousand years of darkness.”

Throughout his life, President Reagan has fought against tyranny and oppression—against that thousand years of darkness. He did not shy back from calling the communist Soviet Union an Evil Empire; He did not hesitate to support those freedom-fighters who were engaged in battle against tyranny; He fought back relentlessly against every attack against America’s people and her interest.

His moral courage and his conviction that America should be the example for all who would desire freedom to pursue life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness never failed and he is an example to all Americans. Around the world today, we are harvesting the benefits of that vision and hard labor as more and more nations around the world are turning from tyranny and oppression to democracy and justice.

I still share President Reagan’s vision of America as a Shining City on a Hill shining its light freedom around the world. It is only fitting that we honor the lifetime and legacy of this great American hero. As long as freedom is our watchword and liberty our call to arms, America will continue to so shine its light into the world for all to see.

Mr. KERNS. Mr. Speaker, today history is made, as President Ronald Wilson Reagan is one of only three President’s to reach the age of 90. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to wish President Reagan a Happy Birthday!

President Reagan is the reason I am able to stand here today. He inspired me to make a difference in our country, he inspired me to stand up for what I believed in, and he did so with integrity and conviction.

Because of his hard work and devotion to conservative ideals, his presidency resulted in one of the most dynamic periods in recent
U.S. history, refocusing our nations business, international and social agendas. We are a better country today because of his leadership.

It is my hope, that I may be able to work with my colleagues to continue what President Reagan started, “to make government work with us,” and by our actions and our results to make it ride on our back.” We are still working to continue what he started 20 years ago, “the era of national renewal”.

We are faced with many important domestic policy decisions before us this Congress. Many of the same issues President Reagan’s presidency was faced with including tax cuts, social security reform and issues concerning medicare. May we always be able to look back on his years and have them guide us into the next century.

Let us be able to remember President Reagan’s daily optimism and wake up each day with the aspirations of making today better yesterday, and tomorrow better than today.

In 1980, Ronald Reagan won the Republican Presidential nomination. While working with Congress, Reagan obtained legislation to stimulate economic growth, curb inflation, increase employment, and strengthen the national defense. He embarked upon a course of cutting taxes and Government expenditures, reduced spending from it when the strengthening of defense forces led to a large deficit. His staunch approach to public policy combined with his savvy appeal has earned Ronald Reagan the title as “The Great Communicator”. We all can learn from the legacy of Ronald Reagan.

Today, this nation and this body celebrates his 90th birthday. This resolution acknowledges not only his birthday, but his role as our 40th President.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the passage of this resolution.

Mr. MARKY. Today our nation’s 40th President turns ninety—one of only three other Presidents in our history to reach his ninetieth year. With recent advances made in health and science, we can anticipate many more of our future Presidents to live into their nineties, along with the entire U.S. population.

But what impact does an increase in our aging population have? And what sort of quality of life will our elderly enjoy? I have my concerns.

Currently there is a threat facing our elderly population—a wave, gaining momentum and sweeping its way through the minds of our aged. This disease afflicts President Reagan. It is Alzheimer’s and it threatens the future for our nation’s elderly, their families and our health care system.

Alzheimer’s is indiscriminate and cruel, it creeps into the brain, captures the mind and steals the memory. Irrevocably altering the personality of its victims leaving not only loved ones unrecognizable to the Alzheimer’s patient but the patient unrecognizable to her loved ones. This is what makes this disease particularly cruel . . . . the loss of the thread of continuity that weaves itself through every experience of our lives and define us as who we are. It was only forty years ago that researchers considered Alzheimer’s Disease a rare disorder. But since then, scientists have come to realize that it is far more common than we originally thought . . . so common in fact that today Alzheimer’s Disease is the leading cause of age-related dementia in the country. So common—that one in ten Americans over the age of 65, and one out of every two Americans over the age of 80 are afflicted.

So common—that 319 million Americans say they know someone with Alzheimer’s.

So common—that 19 million Americans say they have a family member with the disease.

So common that 2.7 million spouses, relatives and friends care for people with Alzheimer’s.

And so common that today over 4 million Americans suffer with the disease.

The word epidemic is derived from the Greek word “epidemeia” or “epidemic” and means literally “to visit.” Alzheimer’s has become the epidemic of our aging population . . . but given the projection that by 2050 14 million Americans will be afflicted—unless we find a way to stop this disease—Alzheimer’s won’t be just visiting our aging population, Alzheimer’s will be moving in.

Two years ago, I joined with my Republican colleague Chris Smith of New Jersey to create the Bipartisan Congressional Task Force on Alzheimer’s Disease. Members of Congress have signed on. And last Congress, I along with my dedicated colleagues fought to increase NIH research funding for Alzheimer’s research—I am pleased to say NIH received somewhere in the range of $145 million increase bringing the total budget for federally funded Alzheimer’s research to $515 million.

In addition, I was able to include a $300 million (or $1.3 billion over 10 years) provision in the Balanced Budget Refinement Act of 2000 that would make it possible for homebound Medicare beneficiaries with Alzheimer’s Disease to go to adult day care and religious services mass or synagogue, without losing their home health benefits. Believe it or not, before this provision was passed into law—Medicare beneficiaries with Alzheimer’s Disease would lose their home health benefit if they went to church or adult day care.

My efforts to improve the lives of those afflicted and affected by Alzheimer’s disease are animated by my own personal experience with my mother’s battle. However, there is one program—a bill I introduced last Congress which made its way into law—that was specifically inspired by ongoing discussions I had with the doctors who treated my mother.

In talking to these caring physicians, I was made aware of the lack of funding for clinical research or as physician-scientists call it “translational” research. Specifically, there is not enough application research being done on “real” people with the disease or likely to get the disease. Not enough focus on cutting edge treatments, and preventative measures.

The Alzheimer’s Clinical Research and Training Awards program which passed into law last Congress will provide $11.25 million over five years to fund physician-scientists in translational research. It’s a small start but I’m hoping this program will grow.

In the battle against Alzheimer’s we’ve accomplished some—but there is still so much more we must do. By working together to increase funding for research, prevention and care, it is my hope that President Reagan and the millions of other Americans who currently suffer with Alzheimer’s will be the last generation to experience this terrible disease.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of the Resolution, H.R. 7, expressing the sense of Congress on behalf of
the American people, to extend our birthday greetings to our former President, Ronald Reagan, who turns 90 today.

I am pleased to associate myself with the legislation we will be considering immediately after this Bill, which renames the facility of the U.S. Postal Service in West Melbourne, Florida, in honor of President Ronald Reagan.

Of our 43 Presidents, only two prior to today—John Adams and Herbert Hoover—reached their 90th birthday. It is a remarkable achievement and it is totally appropriate that the Congress recognize the birthday of one of the great Americans of the 20th century, our 40th President, Ronald Reagan.

In recent years, the publication of new material—including the love letters written by the President to his wife, and the radio addresses which he delivered form 1977 until 1980—have led to a long overdue reassessment of our 40th President by historians and by the general public. While some unfairly had characterized President Reagan as a mouthpiece for others, the historic evidence now shows beyond dispute how erroneous that perception has been. Ronald Reagan was the author of his own thoughts and the articulator of them. His vigorous, articulate style helped bring about a better nation and a better world, and it is long overdue that he received appropriate credit for his contributions.

Americans across the nation have long held President Reagan in high regard. President Reagan’s ability to inspire, renewed our citizens’ confidence in and respect for their government, to rally our troops for victory a few years later in the Persian Gulf. His domestic policies introduced an era of economic expansion that would help carry us through the end of the 20th century. His efforts to combat crime and drugs and to reevaluate our Nation’s healthcare system marked the beginnings of much-needed and long-overdue reforms.

In short Mr. Speaker, President Reagan embodied those qualities that we seek in our Nation’s leaders—vision, optimism, decency, integrity, responsibility. He believed in democracy, the goodness of America. And he led by example. I am honored to join my colleagues today in honoring this great American and great former President—Ronald Reagan—and extending to him and to his wonderful wife, Nancy, our best wishes and the thanks of the American people for their contributions to our great Nation.

Mr. BROWN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Ronald Reagan exemplified honor and dignity while serving his country and restored stability to an unstable nation. The United States military was expanded and secured under the stewardship of a great President.

Mr. BROWN. I am proud and humbled to honor our 40th President, Mr. Ronald Reagan, on his 90th birthday.

President Reagan focused on rebuilding our country’s military forces and developing a defense system to protect our shores. On May 15, 1993, Mr. Reagan delivered the Commencement Speech at The Citadel. This remarkable address highlighted his continued support of our military and the need for military readiness, an issue clearly facing us today.

It is with honor and humility that I read to you a part of his address:

“IT is said that the price of freedom is eternal vigilance. And I’d like to offer several reasons why we must stay strong militarily. First, despite the spread of democracy and capitalism, human nature has not changed. It is still an unpredictable mixture of good and evil. Our enemies may be irrational, even out-and-out insane—driven by nationalism, religion, ethnicity or ideology. They do not fear the United States for its diplomatic skills or the number of automobiles and software programs it produces. They respect only the firepower of our tanks, planes and helicopter gun ships.

“Second, the Soviet Union may be gone, but even small powers can destroy global peace and security. The modern world is filled with vulnerable ‘choke-points’ of power, geographic, political and economic . . . ”

“Third, technology—for all its blessings—can enable new enemies to rise up overnight. Scientific information flows to ambitious dictators faster than ever. Who can predict what will be the ‘black-boxes’ of tomorrow?”

President Ronald Reagan advised against weakening the military in peacetime, and, in turn, honored the young men willfully seeking the opportunity to serve our nation. He further commented, “In my eighty-two years, I’ve seen America drop her guard time and time again—and each time with tragic consequences.” Today, the United States dominates the world arena. Once again, our noble first instinct is to seek peace. And that’s where we need to be, not seeking the destruction of the enemy but seeking their conversion and reconciliation. But for all its blessings, civilization is not without its threats.

In my eighty-two years, I’ve seen America drop her guard time and time again—and each time with tragic consequences.”

I share many of President Reagan’s views on military readiness. I am happy and proud to add that we share one more thing—we both received Honorary Doctorates from The Citadel.

Happy Birthday, Mr. President.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to give the purpose of recognizing Ronald Reagan’s 90th Birthday (H.J. Res. 7)—the 40th President of the United States. This resolution simply extends the best wishes and warm birthday greetings of the 107th Congress to former President Reagan on this 90th birthday.

Twelve years after leaving the White House where he plans to spend his 90th birthday chopping wood and riding horses. Ronald Reagan celebrates his 90th birthday while battling old age, Alzheimer’s disease and a broken hip. These are not easy obstacles for a wonderful man like Ronald Reagan or his loved ones. Fortunately, I have learned that Mr. Reagan will celebrate his 90th birthday very quietly at his home with a birthday cake (likely his favorite chocolate) and his lovely wife, Mrs. Reagan. Reagan basked in the glory of retirement for six years, then learned he had Alzheimer’s. Mrs. Reagan, his wife of nearly 49 years, has courageously hidden the fact away from Mr. Reagan, and we are not easy obstacles for a wonderful man like Ronald Reagan or his loved ones. Fortunately, I have learned that Mr. Reagan will celebrate his 90th birthday very quietly at his home with a birthday cake (likely his favorite chocolate) and his lovely wife, Mrs. Reagan.

Former President Reagan was recognized as the Great Communicator for good reason. His powers of persuasion over foe and friend—which extended to a range of issues—were considerable. He clearly held views with an acute passion. He loved public policy and spent a great deal of his life assuming the highest office of the land. From speeches early in his political career to that final day in Hollywood, through the White House years and into retirement, President Reagan has left a vast legacy of achievement.

The perceptions of Ronald Reagan as a political figure and a foreign policy maker are numerous. I respected the fact that Ronald Reagan was dedicated to winning the Cold War. By the end of his presidency, he had led the Cold War effort against the Soviet Empire. While many of us never viewed the Soviet Empire as the danger that he envisioned, we respected his vision and determination to spread freedom around the world.

Finally, let me just make a few remarks about Mr. and Mrs. Reagan. We should salute the couple’s extraordinary courage in continuing to share their story with the world, building awareness, and lifting the enormous stigma of Alzheimer’s and showing that life goes on. Again, happy birthday, Mr. Reagan.

Mr. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I stand today to honor one of our nation’s greatest patriots and most respected Presidents, Ronald W. Reagan, on this, the 40th anniversary of his birthday.
There are those Americans who today will remember Ronald Reagan as the charismatic 40th President of the United States. A leader who by the sheer force of his immutable optimism gave America a reason to be proud and secure of our place in the world.

Others will remember the “Great Communicator” who, with the stroke of “stagflation” and an oil crisis, articulated a doctrine of personal responsibility and limited government, which brought to our nation economic stability, security, and self-respect.

But I am here to honor another Reagan. A man of steely convictions, and resolute vision. A man who in one simple speech redefined America’s purpose, and gave us all new certitude that we would prevail against the Soviet Union.

In 1983, the international stage was a different place than it is today. The Soviet Union still stared menacingly westward over the satellite states of Eastern Europe. The nuclear arms race was a reality, and fear of nuclear war gripped the nation.

It was in this atmosphere of Cold War fear, and amid growing calls to give up the arms race that Mr. Reagan, at perhaps his most eloquent, strode onto a stage in Orlando, Florida and delivered a speech that put his critics on notice that America would not back down. America would stand, alone if she must, to defend and protect the institutions of liberty and freedom from the Communists.

He reminded us not to ignore the facts of history, and the aggressive impulses of an evil empire because, as he said, “to simply call the arms race a giant misunderstanding is to remove ourselves from the struggle between right and wrong and good and evil.” He reminded us not only of why we were fighting, but of what we were fighting for. The cold war was a struggle between good and evil, freedom and oppression.

It was this message which President Reagan carried with him to my hometown of Miami, FL. At the Orange Bowl Stadium, and in the middle of Little Havana, he placed the Cuban Dictator, Fidel Castro, on notice—that the United States would stand firm against the tyranny of Castro for time and would defend the right of the Cuban people to live free of oppression; that the United States would not tolerate communist Cuba’s continued threats against U.S. national security and regional stability.

His words still carry with them a strength and clarity of vision which only the greatest of leaders posses. His insistence that this was the path America would take was tempered by the knowledge that in doing so, we would all share in the glory of the right and the honorable. Ronald Reagan reminded us all that America was strong, that America was right, that America was proud.

The legacy of Ronald Reagan is secure, for no other reason than the fact that he stood up for America and said in a strong, clear voice that patriotism is not dead, and that liberty and freedom are always worth fighting for.

Because of this President Reagan, I would like to thank you for your service to our country, and wish both you, and Mrs. Reagan, Godspeed.

Mr. HULLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to be here today to honor President Ronald Reagan on his 90th birthday. President Reagan’s policies have shaped this great nation and set us on the path to the longest peacetime economic expansion since the end of the Second World War. His optimism restored Americans’ confidence in our great nation and in themselves.

President Reagan once said “A leader, once convinced a particular course of action is the right one, must have the determination to stick to it, and allow nothing to distract when the going gets rough.” President Reagan proved he was a true leader. Despite dire predictions from pundits about his policies, Reagan fought for what he believed in and made the country better as a result.

President Reagan inherited an economy that was out of control with high inflation, interest rates and unemployment. Americans were being held hostage in Iran and the Soviet Union was threatening freedom across the world. Once elected, Reagan embarked on an ambitious agenda to reduce taxes, reduce Americans’ dependence on the federal government, and achieve “peace through strength” by rebuilding our military. His tax cuts stimulated the economy and Americans re-elected him by one of the largest margins in U.S. history. During his second term, we began to see the results of Reagan’s commitment to the principles of individual rights for all and projecting military strength with the weakening of communist control of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union. These principles led soon thereafter to the collapse of the Berlin Wall the Soviet Union.

America is still experiencing the benefits of the Reagan’s economic policies of lower taxes, free trade and reliance on free markets. We have had eighteen consecutive years of nearly unbroken economic growth and low inflation. Productivity and incomes are rising. As Reagan stated at the end of his presidency:

In eight short years, we have witnessed a 50-year trend of turning to the government for solutions. We have relented what our founding Fathers knew long ago—it is the people, not the government, who provide the vitality and creativity that make a great nation. Just as the first American Revolution, which began with the shot heard ’round the world, inspired people everywhere who dreamed of freedom, so has this second American revolution inspired changes throughout the world. The message we brought to Washington—reduce the government, reduce regulation, restore incentives—has been heard around the world.

One of Reagan’s greatest legacies is that he restored Americans’ confidence in themselves and reminded them that the government has no power except that granted by the people. I look forward to continuing Reagan’s revolution by fighting for lower taxes, less intrusive government and individual responsibility.

Happy Birthday President Reagan and God bless.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PLATTS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 7.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. PLATTS. 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The Chair must remind all Members that remarks in debate should be addressed to the Chair and not to others who may be viewing proceedings.

RONALD W. REAGAN POST OFFICE OF WEST MELBOURNE, FLORIDA

Mr. PLATTS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 395) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2305 Minton Road in West Melbourne, Florida as the “Ronald W. Reagan Post Office of West Melbourne, Florida.”

The Clerk read as follows:

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

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.
The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2305 Minton Road in West Melbourne, Florida shall be known and designated as the “Ronald W. Reagan Post Office of West Melbourne, Florida.”

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the facility referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the Ronald W. Reagan Post Office of West Melbourne, Florida.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PLATTS) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SANCHEZ) each will control 20 minutes.

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

Mr. PLATTS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 395.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, this legislation, introduced by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON) is supported by the House delegation from the State of Florida and it is fitting and appropriate that we bring this legislation to the floor today to commemorate the 90th birthday of our great leader.

There has been much written and known about former President Reagan, and everybody has a favorite story or anecdote. We will, however, be unable
to capture all facets of his life during our allotted time.

Mr. Reagan, our 40th President, won a landslide victory in 1980 and was easily reelected 4 years later. Ronald Wilson Reagan came from humble beginnings. He was born in Tampico, Illinois, son of a salesman with a mother who was a devout member of the Disciples of Christ Church.

After moving to various locations, the family settled in Dixon, Illinois, where his father became part owner of a shoe store and his mother did occasional work to supplement the family’s meager income.

Young Ronald Reagan excelled in sports and received a scholarship to attend Eureka College. Even with a scholarship, he had to work hard to stay in college. He graduated with a B.A. in economics and sociology, the first person in his family to attend and graduate from college.

He showed an early interest in politics, but did not participate. He did, however, show interest in some form of show business. "Dutch" Reagan, as he was known, became a very popular sportscaster in Iowa. Soon thereafter, he went to Hollywood where he was offered a 7-year contract with Warner Brothers for $200 a week, an offer he could not turn down. He then brought his parents to live with him in California; and although not an instant star, he was a steady worker.

Mr. Speaker, Ronald Reagan became President of the Screen Actors Guild in 1947, and several years thereafter, his activities with the Screen Actors Guild aroused his latent interest in politics. Thereafter, when his longstanding friend, Barry Goldwater, won the Republican nomination for President, Mr. Reagan helped with the campaign. Soon after, he was persuaded to run for governor of California, a race he won by a landslide over a popular incumbent. He won reelection in 1970.

Ronald Reagan was nominated for President in 1980, supporting the issues of family, work, neighborhood, peace, and freedom. He became the oldest President to be elected in our Nation’s history. Two months after his election, he was the victim of an assassination attempt, but made a remarkable recovery.

He served the Nation as President for 8 years and now resides in California. In 1994, after several years of writing, traveling, and silence, former President Reagan, who was known as the Great Communicator, wrote a handwritten letter informing the Nation he had the early stages of Alzheimer’s disease.

Perhaps the essence of President Reagan’s life is captured in his own words. He wrote: “In this land of dreams fulfilled where greater dreams may soar to new heights no limit is impossible. No victory is beyond our reach. No glory will ever be too great.

“The world’s hopes rest with America’s future.

“Our work will pale before the greatness of America’s champions in the 21st Century.”

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support H.R. 395.

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

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 395, which names a Post Office after Ronald W. Reagan, was introduced today by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON). This measure is identical to H.R. 5309 introduced last year by the gentleman and which was passed by the House on October 27 of the year 2000.

Ronald Wilson Reagan, known as "Dutch," "The Gipper" and "The Great Communicator," was the 40th President of the United States. He served as President from January 1981 to January 1989. At 73, he was the oldest man ever elected to the Presidency. And, as remarked earlier, today marks his 90th birthday.

He was an actor by profession, but he also served as the Governor of my State of California from 1966 to 1979. During his Presidency, his economic policies came to be known as "Reaganomics." In November of 1994, former President Reagan announced that he was afflicted with Alzheimer’s.

Although a number of facilities have been named after the former President, schools, streets, highways, and even the Whittington airport, a crowning achievement was when President Clinton dedicated the Ronald Reagan Building here in Washington D.C. in 1998. That building houses an international trade center, international cultural activities, the Agency for International Development, and many others.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the swift passage of this bill.

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

Mr. PLATTS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON). Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PLATTS) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to stand on the floor of the House today to honor our former President, Ronald Reagan. Today is an appropriate day to consider this bill, because it is President Reagan’s 90th birthday.

Today, we wish him the very best. We have the opportunity to honor a man who made us proud again to be Americans. As was stated, I have introduced this legislation to designate this Post Office at 2305 Minton Road in West Melbourne, Florida, as the “Ronald W. Reagan Post Office of West Melbourne.” This Post Office is in Florida’s 15th Congressional District, and I am honored that the Florida Congressional Delegation has signed on as a cosponsor of this bill.

Last year, I introduced similar legislation and it passed the House on October 27. Due to time constraints, the Senate was unable to give final approval to the bill prior to its adjournment. However, now it is more appropriate than ever for this House to pass this bill again.

Former President Reagan is a true American hero, and naming this U.S. Post Office after him is a fitting way to honor his legacy.

Ronald Reagan was born on February 6, 1911, in Tampico, Illinois. He was a man with many ambitions, growing up in the Great Depression. He worked his way through Eureka College. He started his career as a radio announcer; and in 1937 went to Hollywood where he appeared in more than 50 movies. He became president of the Screen Actors Guild and was involved in fighting Communist influences in Hollywood.

In 1966, he was elected the Governor of the State of California by a margin of more than 1 million votes; and then was elected governor again in 1970 to another 4-year term.

In 1980, Reagan was elected to serve as our 40th President. Ronald Reagan set our Nation on a path to prosperity. He was a strong moral leader and made Americans proud to be Americans. The economic policies he pursued in the 1980s set a firm foundation for the economic prosperity that we have experienced over the last decade as well.

Ronald Reagan reinvigorated the American people through smaller government, putting a lid on inflation, and strengthening our national defenses. President Reagan’s persistence in achieving peace through strength carried our Nation to its longest recorded period of peacetime prosperity.

President Reagan negotiated a treaty with Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev to eliminate medium-range nuclear missiles. Mr. Reagan went to Berlin and challenged Mr. Gorbachev to “Tear down this wall.” His 8 years of persistence paid off; and as a result of his tireless fight for freedom, the Iron Curtain fell shortly after he left office.

President Reagan certainly followed with his 1980 campaign pledge to restore “the great, confident roar of American progress and growth and optimism.”

I am happy that we are considering this legislation today, and I encourage all of my colleagues to support this effort to name this post office in my congressional district in Ronald Reagan’s honor.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PLATTS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 395.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.
HONORING CONTRIBUTIONS OF CATHOLIC SCHOOLS

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 28) honoring the contributions of Catholic schools.

The Clerk reads as follows:

H. Res. 28

Whereas America’s Catholic schools are internationally acclaimed for their academic excellence, but provide students more than a superior scholastic education;

Whereas Catholic schools ensure a broad, values-added education emphasizing the life-long development of moral, intellectual, physical, and social values in America’s young people;

Whereas the total Catholic school student enrollment for the 1999-2000 academic year was 2,653,036; the total number of Catholic schools is 8,344, and the student-teacher ratio is 17 to 1;

Whereas Catholic schools provide more than $17,200,000,000 a year in savings to the Nation based on the average public school per pupil cost;

Whereas Catholic schools teach a diverse group of over 24 percent of school children enrolled in Catholic schools are minorities;

Whereas the graduation rate of Catholic schools is 95 percent, only 3 percent of Catholic high school students drop out of school, and 83 percent of Catholic high school graduates go on to college;

Whereas Catholic schools produce students strongly dedicated to their faith, values, families, and communities by providing an intellectually stimulating environment rich in spiritual, character, and moral development; and

Whereas in the 1972 pastoral message concerning education, the National Conference of Catholic Bishops stated, “Education is one of the most important ways by which the Church fulfills its commitment to the dignity of the person and building of community. Community is central to education ministry, both as a necessary condition and an ardently desired goal. The educational efforts of the Church, therefore, must be directed to forming persons-in-community; for the education of the individual Christian is important not only to his soliary dignity but also to the destiny of the many communities in which he lives.” Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) supports the goals of Catholic Schools Week, an event sponsored by the National Catholic Educational Association and the United States Catholic Conference and established to recognize the vital contributions of America’s thousands of Catholic elementary and secondary schools; and

(2) congratulates Catholic schools, students, parents, and teachers across the Nation for their ongoing contributions to education, and for the key role they play in promoting and ensuring a brighter and stronger future for this Nation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TIBERI) and the gentlwoman from Colorado (Ms. SANCHEZ) each will control 20 minutes.

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

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 28.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER).

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TIBERI) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today in support of House Resolution 28, which recognizes and honors the contributions of Catholic schools in the United States. Our Nation’s Catholic schools have a long tradition of academic excellence, and I am pleased to join in recognizing them today.

As this new Congress begins, it is fitting that we are focusing on the impact and the important role that Catholic schools play in providing a well-rounded education for America’s young people; one that gives special attention to the academic, moral, and social development of our children.

One of the top priorities for the Committee on Education and the Workforce will be to reauthorize this year the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which provides benefits to both public and private schools. Across our country, many Catholic schools participate in many programs and activities assisted by these funds.

Last year, Catholic schools around the country enrolled more than 2.6 million children in more than 8,000 Catholic schools across the country. The student-teacher ratio in most Catholic schools is 17-to-1, and more than 24 percent of their students come from disadvantaged backgrounds.

Mr. Speaker, 95 percent of Catholic school students graduate; and 83 percent of their high school graduates go on to pursue a higher education. It stands to reason that if it were not for our Nation’s Catholic schools, and the dedication of those who choose them, the achievement gap between the disadvantaged students in our society and their peers would be even wider.

Moreover, I would point out that of the total students enrolled in Catholic schools, about 13 percent are not of the Catholic faith. These students come from a wide variety of faiths and have chosen to attend a Catholic school. I think that it speaks to the mission and success of Catholic educators to reach out to all students and their parents—regardless of background—teach students not only academic knowledge, but also real-life lessons in service to mankind and respect for one’s neighbors.

This resolution is very simple. We want to rightly honor and congratulate Catholic schools, students, parents, and teachers for their ongoing contributions to education and for the key role they play in promoting and ensuring a brighter and stronger future for this Nation.

I want to commend the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SANCHEZ) for being a leader in sponsoring this legislation and urging my colleagues to vote in support of it.

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

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to stand with my colleagues and recognize our Nation’s Catholic schools.

First, I must point out the number of Catholic schools in our Nation. There are 8,200 elementary and secondary Catholic schools in the United States. They do, indeed, deserve to be celebrated.

What a great gift to our Nation these schools provide, producing graduates not only as academically tenable but also such a great part of the community. Our Catholic schools not only teach subjects like the alphabet and the Pythagorean Theorem and the Preamble to the Constitution, but they teach our students how to be part of our communities.

They teach that service to others is an integral part any life, religious or lay. They teach the dignity of the individual. They teach students to work for justice and to help each child develop a strong moral compass to follow.

Today, I believe I am joined by several colleagues who are also known for their support of education.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today, along with my colleagues, to recognize the contributions of America’s Catholic elementary and secondary schools and congratulate these schools, the students, the teachers, and their parents.
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for the dedication to education in our country. I would like to thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. Schaffer), the sponsor of this legislation, and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. Boehner), the chair of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, as well as the majority leader, for bringing this important resolution to the floor this afternoon.

This resolution recognizes Catholic schools and Catholic Schools Week. This is an event sponsored by the National Catholic Education Association and the United States Catholic Conference and established to recognize the vital contributions of America’s Catholic schools.

Catholic schools are widely acclaimed for their academic success. Central Ohio, which I am fortunate enough to represent, is blessed with many outstanding Catholic schools. In fact, St. Francis DeSales, a Columbus Catholic high school in my neighborhood, is a past recipient of the U.S. Department of Education’s Blue Ribbon Schools Award for Excellence. This is the highest award any public or private school can achieve.

But Catholic schools provide more than a superior scholastic education. They ensure a broad education emphasizing the development of moral, intellectual, physical, and social values in our young people. They produce students strongly dedicated in our faith, values, families, and communities. Indeed, they are central to building a sense of community in this country that all Americans should have the opportunity to enjoy.

I am proud to be an original co-sponsor of this resolution, and I strongly support its adoption by the House.

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

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how many speakers the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TIBERI) has?

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, we believe there will be three additional speakers.

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, since none of mine have shown, if the gentleman from Ohio would like to go ahead.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. Gibbons).

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TIBERI) for granting me the time in which to speak on this important resolution.

Today I rise in strong support of the resolution honoring the contributions of Catholic schools to our children and the educational system. As the debate on education continues and reform education continues, I think it is vitally important to recognize people and schools who have succeeded in educating our children.

America’s Catholic schools are internationally acclaimed for their academic excellence and among the many fine academic Catholic schools in this Nation.

In the city of Reno, for example, there is Bishop Manogue High School, which has a long and distinguished record of excellence in their academic and athletic programs. Catholic schools, like Bishop Manogue, emphasize the lifelong development of moral, intellectual, physical, and social values in America’s young people. These values are crucial to the future of our Nation, especially as our society tends to grapple with problems like breakdown of the family and school violence.

I want to thank our Catholic schools for their dedication to our children, and I look forward to working with them toward our goal of improving the education of every child.

As an original co-sponsor of this resolution, I encourage all of my colleagues to strongly support its passage and the contributions that Catholic schools have made to our children and to our Nation.

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TIBERI) have any other speakers? We do not have any on this side other than myself to close.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately we have two more speakers, and they are not here.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TIBERI) has the right to close. If the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SANCHEZ) will proceed.

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

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, growing up Catholic in a pretty Catholic family, I know firsthand that the Catholic Church has always sought to meet the hungry and clothe the poor. We welcome immigrants, people who speak different languages and bring very different needs. We welcome everyone as we work to help the rich and the poor, the powerful and the powerless.

Catholic schools, too, welcome diverse students with open arms. It is not just Catholics who attend Catholic schools; children who need special attention, dedicated teachers attend Catholic schools. Families who are looking for an added dimension to faith and morals sometimes choose Catholic schools. Parents who want safe schools that excel in academics choose Catholic schools.

Today with our communities’ public schools, the Catholic schools and the Diocese of Reno, we celebrate, in every sense of the word, our children. Various schools, like Santa Margarita High School or Mater Dei in my own district, Servite in my district, Rosary, Connelly, and numerous elementary parochial schools, all are Catholic schools.

So, Mr. Speaker, today I am proud to recognize Catholic schools and the educators, parents and parishes who make these wonderful institutions possible.

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

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CASTLE), who is the subcommittee chairman on the issue we are debating.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this resolution honoring Catholic schools and their contributions to our communities throughout our Nation.

Catholic Schools Week is an annual celebration of the important role that Catholic elementary and secondary schools across the country play in providing a values-added education for America’s young people.

This tradition of honoring Catholic schools is 27 years old this year and is one I believe should continue.

Just last week, students from St. Hedwig Elementary School in Wilmington, Delaware, visited me in Washington, D.C., during Catholic Schools Week. I was impressed by all they have been learning and achieving, and I applaud them for their hard work and interest in our democratic process.

While the majority of our students are enrolled in public schools, Catholic schools still play a key role in our entire society. Over 10 million students attended 38 Catholic schools in the United States last year.

In my State of Delaware, which is the size of a congressional district, we have over 15,000 students attending 38 Catholic schools.

I regard Catholic schools as a team player with public schools, other private and parochial schools and home schools in defining America’s educational system.

According to the National Catholic Educational Association, the graduation rate of students in Catholic schools is nearly 95 percent. The dropout rate is about 3 percent. Eighty-five percent of all Catholic school graduates go on to college. These achievements impress me and deserve to be honored today on the House floor.

I would just add, Mr. Speaker, the importance of the integration of all the education of our young children, as they get into more choice, more opportunities for our kids, more comparisons, the Catholic schools, along with all the other schools, add to this mix. Our goal should be to educate every child in America as well as we possibly can. Certainly, Catholic schools aid in that; and for that, we are very blessed.

I honor them and appreciate them and encourage support for this resolution.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to close by saying that sometimes I think people think those of us who are so supportive of public schools may not be as supportive of our
private schools, but the reality is that we care about all of our schools and those institutions who choose to help educate our children. Today I have been proud to talk about our Catholic schools and the way that they excel and the ways they contribute to the rest of the education system that we have here in the United States.

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, today, I am pleased that Congress has recognized the important role that Catholic Schools play in our community. Like many in Latino, I know the important place in our history of Catholic Education. In my district, the Saint Thomas Aquinas High School is regarded as both an academic and athletic giant. The San Bernardino Diocese School System under Bishop Gerald Barnes has made major investments into their school system to bring their students education into the 21st Century.

Even though I am a strong supporter of public schools, I understand the importance Catholic Schools have played in our nation’s educational system. Education provided at Catholic schools is truly remarkable. Not only do they focus on academic achievement but they also instill values and moral lessons in young people. Their curriculums are often full of programs for character development and community service. Catholic school students graduate with a wide variety of skills that will not only help them in their careers but also in their family and community life. I am pleased to support this resolution honoring the contributions of Catholic Schools.

Ms. PRYCE of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the invaluable contributions of our nation’s Catholic schools.

Last week was Catholic Schools Week, and January was National Appreciation Day for Catholic Schools. In honor of these events, my colleague, Mr. SCHAEFFER from Colorado, has introduced a resolution to honor our nation’s Catholic schools.

The United States Department of Education has provided us with statistics that show Catholic schools take in children from many different ethnic and socioeconomic backgrounds and yield well educated, college-bound, young adults.

Catholic schools and Catholic schools boast a 95 percent graduation rate and 83 percent of their students go on to college.

Not only do these children come away from their schools with strong academic credentials, but they gain an appreciation for the importance of faith, family, and community that is critical to our society’s well being.

At a time when our nation is asking the question: “How can we give our children the best education possible?” The Catholic schools are providing some answers by demonstrating that what works.

For these achievements, I congratulate Catholic schools, students, parents, and teachers across the Nation for their ongoing contributions to education and for the key role they play in promoting and ensuring a brighter, stronger nation’s education system.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I am proud today to join with my colleagues in passing House Resolution 28, honoring the contributions of Catholic schools to academic excellence. Catholic schools have enhanced the quality of life for the community, as well as hundreds of thousands of young people who have benefited from its commitment to developing their minds and their spirits.

I would like to recognize the good work of schools such as Notre Dame High School, Resurrection High School, Northside Catholic Academy Schools, and St. Scholastica Academy in Illinois. These Catholic schools, like their counterparts, provide critical leadership and support to the intellectual development of young people. The 95 percent graduation rate, and 83 percent rate of continuing on to higher education, Catholic schools deserve our recognition for the work they do.

I applaud the success and commitment of Catholic schools in the 9th Congressional District and in this nation.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of our nation’s Catholic schools. Catholic schools not only provide students with an excellent education but also provide spiritual enrichment.

The contributions made by Catholic schools often exceed the classroom walls. The curriculum is designed to challenge students and to encourage religious awareness and development of morals and values. Students are given opportunities to participate in a wide range of activities including working in soup kitchens, aiding other students with homework or working to improve a neighborhood park.

During the past 30 years, Catholic schools around the nation have made significant improvements in enrolling minorities and have continued to expand the educational mission in urban areas. There are approximately 1,020 Catholic schools in urban areas today.

A common complaint of parents and teachers is overcrowding in classrooms. Catholic schools often provide students and teachers with the opportunity for learning on a personal level. For instance, class size on average provide a ratio of 17 students to every one teacher, allowing teachers to focus on the needs of individual students. The effectiveness of this system is repeated in the statistic that 82 percent of Catholic high school graduates go on to college and the drop-out rate is only 3.4 percent.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting these institutions and the wonderful contributions they make in their communities and in our nation’s future.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of house resolution 28 which celebrates the contributions of Catholic schools throughout the nation. From the easternmost point of the U.S. Virgin Islands to the westernmost tip of Orote Point in Guam, Catholic schools continue to provide a valuable education to more than 2.5 million students in the United States.

As Guam is home to more than 100,000 Roman Catholics, representing an overwheming majority of the resident population, I am particularly pleased to speak in support and in recognition of the contributions of Catholic schools today.

Guam has a long and rich history of Catholicism since the island was discovered by Ferdinand Magellan in 1521, who docked at Guam with his chaplains during his sail around the world. The year 1662 ushered the first of many arrivals of Spanish missionaries. Over the years, various types of Catholic education have been provided in Guam beginning with the tradition of providing religious education in the classroom. Several religious orders and countless cadres of lay teachers have provided educational guidance and have broadened opportunities for Guam’s school children since the end of World War II, when a formal Catholic school system was established. The School Sisters of Notre Dame, Sisters of Mercy, Dominican Sisters of Capuchin, Franciscans, Jesuits and Marists have all served to educate Guam’s school children.

There are three Catholic high schools in Guam, including: Notre Dame High School in Talolofo; Academy of Our Lady of Guam in Hagatna; and Father Duenas Memorial School in Mangilao serving an enrollment of approximately 1,100 students. There are also seven elementary and middle schools, including: Bishop Baumgartner Memorial School in Sinajana; Our Lady of Mt. Carmel School in Agat; Saint Anthony School in Tamuning; Saint Francis School in Yona; San Vicente School in Barrigada; Santa Barbara School in Dededo and Dominican School in Yigo, serving an estimated enrollment of 2,300 students.

Four Catholic nursery schools in Guam Bridge the continuum of education from infancy to elementary. These include the Dominican Child Care Center in Ordot; the Infant of Prague in Mangilao; Maria Artero in Agana Heights; and Mercy Heights in Tamuning. Although I have not attended Catholic schools, as a former educator raised in the Catholic faith, I certainly appreciate the education provided by Catholic schools. Three of my five children have attended Catholic schools in Guam in Virginia and 10 of my 17 staffers in both my District and D.C. offices are products of the Catholic school system in Guam and the Philippines. Additionally, my aunt, Mary Underwood, was instrumental in the establishment of the Catholic school system after World War II. She was also the first native of Guam to become a nun.

Catholic schools have often provided a broad, value-added education and shape to the life-long development of moral, intellectual, physical and social values of students. Catholic Schools Week is the culmination of an annual national celebration of the important role that Catholic elementary and secondary schools across the country and in Guam play in the education of our nation’s students.

At this time, I would like to commend the contributions of all Catholic schools, students, parents, teachers and administrators in Guam and across the nation. I would also like to recognize the contributions of the Archdiocese of Hagatna, which oversees the administration of Guam’s Catholic schools, and particularly Archbishop Anthony Apuron, for continuing the tradition of providing excellence in the education and moral well-being of the children of Guam.

I urge your support of House Resolution 28.

Mr. SCHAEFFER. Mr. Speaker, I urge the House to adopt H. Res. 28 commending the contributions of Catholic schools. As a Roman Catholic having attended and graduated from Catholic Schools as a Catholic university, I am proud to be the original sponsor of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, today the House voices its strong support for the goals of Catholic Schools Week and recognizes the vital contributions of Catholic elementary and secondary schools. The House also congratulates Catholic schools, students, parents, and teachers across our
great nation for their ongoing contributions to education and for the key role they play in promoting and ensuring a brighter, stronger future for America. As the first clause of the resolution states, “America’s Catholic schools are internationally acclaimed for their academic excellence, but provide students more than a superior scholastic education.” Mr. Speaker, this is the essence of the resolution.

Catholic schools ensure a broad values-added education, emphasizing the life-long development of moral, intellectual, fiscal and social values in America’s young people. Americans have a positive view of Catholic schools. The total Catholic school student enrollment for 1999 and 2000 was 2,653,038, which is an increase over the 1998 and 1999 school year. The total number of Catholic schools is 8,144. The student/teacher ratio in those institutions is less than 17 to 1.

Catholic schools provide more than $17 billion a year in savings to the nation based on the average school per pupil cost, enabling more money to be spent on students in government-owned schools. Catholic schools teach and contribute to a diverse group of students. Twenty-four percent of school children attend Catholic schools, their students, their parents, and alumni. In El Paso, our Catholic schools have exhibited high quality teaching and have provided a safe and spiritually stimulating environment for learning. Spirituality, as a guiding principal, should be emulated across our country. The values that are instilled at our Catholic schools are fundamental values that are central and important to the functioning of society as a whole.

Catholic schools not only develop sound academic abilities in their students, but they produce students strongly dedicated to their faith, their values, their families, and communities. Catholic schools do this by providing an intellectually stimulating environmental rich in spiritual development and moral character.

In 1972, a pastoral message was adopted by the National Conference of Catholic Bishops that stated the following, “Education is one of the most important ways by which the Church fulfills its commitment to the dignity of the individual, its building of community. Community is central to education ministry, both as a necessary condition and an ardently desired goal. The educational efforts of the Church, therefore, must be directed to forming persons-in-community; for the education of the individual Christian is important not only to his solitary destiny, but also for the destinies of the many communities in which he lives.”

It is on that basis, Mr. Speaker, that this resolution recognizes Catholic schools and Catholic Schools Week. This is an event sponsored by the National Catholic Education Association and which has been established as the largest private organization of professional teachers in the world. It is also sponsored by the United States Catholic Conference and established to recognize the vital contributions of America’s thousands of Catholic elementary and secondary schools.

So today the House congratulates Catholic schools, their students, their parents, and teachers across the country, for their ongoing contributions to education and for the key role they play in promoting and ensuring a brighter and stronger future for this nation.

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, this week is National Catholic School Week and I want to spend a few moments commending the Catholic schools in my home district of El Paso, Texas and in other parts of our country for a job well done.

There are many Catholic Schools in my district including Cathedral High School and Loretto Academy; Our Lady of Mount Carmel, Blessed Sacrament, Holy Trinity; Our Lady of the Assumption, Our Lady of the Valley, St. Joseph’s, St. Patrick’s, Saint Maurice, St. Raphael’s, and St. Michael’s. I know each and every one of these schools as I am very familiar with the fabric of the educational system in El Paso, and I am proud of the efforts of all of the priests, nuns, teachers, and other support staff in these schools. They work tirelessly to improve the lives of our children.

Our Catholic schools continue to show exemplary results in education. They share, with other Catholic schools across the nation, a long-standing tradition of excellence. The Catholic schools in El Paso continue to show steadfast commitment to teaching and spiritually guiding young men and women as they prepare for higher education and for life’s many challenges. That is why our Catholic schools exemplify strong leadership, a clear vision and sense of mission that is shared by the schools, students, parents, and alumni. In El Paso, our Catholic schools have exhibited high quality teaching and have provided a safe and intellectually stimulating environment for learning. Spirituality, as a guiding principal, should be emulated across our country. The values that are instilled at our Catholic schools are fundamental values that are central and important to the functioning of society as a whole.

Daily school prayer, religion classes, and school Mass emphasize God’s central role in our lives. As a Catholic myself, God and reverence are personally and centrally important to me and I appreciate the commitment that our Catholic schools make in insuring that our students will have faith and prayer in their lives. I cannot overstate how important faith in God is to overall success and happiness in life.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I wish to acknowledge Bishop Armando X. Ochoa of the Archdiocese of El Paso for his strong leadership and dedication. He continues to support the mission of our Catholic schools in educating our youth. I urge all my colleagues to join me and commend all of the people across the country who make the catholic schools so successful.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution honoring the contributions of Catholic schools in America. I congratulate the more than 8,000 Catholic schools that serve this nation’s students. I am a product of Catholic schools as a graduate of Holy Family High School in Birmingham, Alabama so I know first hand about the value of a Catholic school education.

According to the National Catholic Education Association, Catholic schools serve over two and a half million students a year. With an impressive average student-teacher ratio of 17 to 1, Catholic schools provide the necessary one-on-one teaching that students need to learn. My graduating class of Holy Family had 23 students who graduated with me! I was able to bond with my classmates and received fantastic support. My experiences with Sister Mary Catherine, Sister Mary Ambrose, Sister Mary Mathilda, Sister Jean Bernadette, Father Nathaniel, Future Carl, and Father Alvin instilled in me and the other girls at Holy Family an appreciation for Math and Science that was unprecedented at that time. The same quality education that I enjoyed as a youth is making a difference in communities across the United States, including my 37th District of California.

Catholic schools provide a job well done in my district that have created rigorous educational environments with quality teaching: St. Miguel Catholic School in Los Angeles, California, Verbum Dei High School in Watts, California, St. Albert the Great Catholic School in Compton, California, Our Lady of Victory Grade School in Compton, California and St. Philomena Grade School in Carson, California. These schools make a tremendous contribution to the community and I am proud to represent them in Congress.

Many ears ago, my Catholic education spawned a love of learning that I have treasured throughout my life. Institutions that generate this type of intellectual curiosity in our nation’s youth are critical to developing productive, hardworking citizens and leaders of tomorrow. That is why I am joining my colleagues in recognizing America’s Catholic schools. I commend the community of teachers, students, parents and administrators who have established this high standard for learning that challenges and engages students. They are play- ing an integral role in promoting and ensuring a brighter, stronger future for the children of today and the leaders of tomorrow.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon to recognize the splendid reputation, the years of dedicated service, and the outstanding achievement of Catholic Schools. During Catholic Schools Week, it gives me great pleasure to extend warm remarks that highlight the achievements of a leading institution that provides immeasurable educational support to neighborhoods and communities throughout our Nation.

In fact, Catholic Schools in America have had a tremendous impact in the lives of many Americans. For example, Chicago has the Largest Catholic School System in the United States. It is comprised of 277 elementary schools serving close to 105,000 students. In addition to educating younger students, the Chicago Catholic School System provides direction and oversight to 48 secondary schools; its programs and services reaches the lives of 33,648 teenagers.

In Chicago and abroad, Catholic Schools have provided education and service to those that have been traditionally left behind in our society. For years, through their educational programs, they planted seeds of hope in the minds and hearts of many poor and neglected children, which have germinated to produce leaders and change agents.

So, I graciously thank our teachers, counselors, Nuns, and Priests in our Catholic Schools for their years of dedicated service. And I urge them to “keep on, keeping on” as they continue to prepare our young to excel in the New Millennium.

Ms. KAPUTR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in recognizing the contributions of our Nation’s Catholic schools. As Father Andrew Greeley of Chicago has observed: “Our Nation’s Catholic schools are a seventh sacrament.” Today, we salute Catholic teachers and students around the world. As a product of Catholic schools, back home in Toledo I can attest to the quality of instruction,
the professional and nurturing approach of the many fine sisters, priests and lay teachers whom I remember so fondly, and in fact still count among my friends and advisors to this day.

Despite the coarsening of our popular culture, what I call the ‘poverty of affluence’, it is heartening to know that total Catholic school enrollment for the 1999–2000 school year was over 2.6 million students at more than 8,100 schools. In my home state of Ohio, there are over 193,000 students attending 528 Catholic schools in nearly 270 quality institutions, joined by many fine public schools, character and commonly cherished values are instilled into generation after generation. Honestly, integrity, love of family and country, self-respect and self-discipline are just a few of the hallmark results of Catholic-based education.

Catholic schools are one of the cornerstones of our educational system providing faith based educational opportunities to those families who desire their children to have a Catholic faith based education. Catholic schools provide education to people from every walk of life, from all economic and ethnic backgrounds. These schools have played an historic role in welcoming and teaching the sons and daughters of immigrants, whether they be Irish, Polish, Hungarian or Russian, whether they be Chinese, or Canadian, or Mexican, or Latino, just to name a few. In the heart of our Nation’s biggest cities and most humble rural towns, Catholic schools continue this missionary endeavor. It is my pleasure to honor the contributions of Catholic schools, both the men and women who lead and teach and care so deeply for our young people. Those students have made, and continue to make, a difference in the life of their families, communities and world.

Our Nation’s declaration of independence is most appropriately conducted on the local level. Therefore, it is both our right and responsibility to support our schools, our teachers, parents, support staff, administrators, our sisters and priests, and our children, whom we know will one day inherit and take responsibility for all of our work and world.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the nation’s Catholic schools and the record of excellence they hold in our children’s education. I believe our most profound responsibility is to ensure that every child has a first-class education, that no child is left behind and that all students share in the pride and promise of educational opportunity. Catholic education provides that opportunity.

As a former student at the University of Notre Dame and a former teacher at Mount Saint Michael’s Academy in the Bronx, NY, I know the benefits Catholic schools and universities provide to students in America.

Our children deserve the best schools in the world; they deserve schools that will help them meet the challenges of tomorrow. That is why I’m pleased with the bipartisan support H. Res. 28, “Honoring our Catholic Schools,” is receiving from my colleagues in the House today.

America’s Catholic schools are internationally acclaimed for providing small classrooms where each student can have the attention they need to achieve their future goals. America’s Catholic schools also graduate a record 83 percent of students who go on to college. I believe that while we call for higher standards in our nation’s schools, we must also recognize those schools that are providing the education America’s students need to succeed. I am pleased to join with my colleagues in honoring the contributions of Catholic schools. After all our children are our country’s most precious resources.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Catholic schools across America and back home in Illinois. All Catholic schools, their teachers, administrators, parents and students should be congratulated for their vital role in promoting and ensuring a bright future for this country.

It is amazing that Catholic Schools graduate 95 percent of their students and that 83 percent of Catholic high school graduates go on to college. I know that the education and, in particular, the spiritual formation imbedded in me at St. Patrick’s high school in Chicago proved themselves invaluable in college and in my professional career.

In my hometown of Chicago, the Catholic Archdiocese has an unparalleled record of educational achievement and educating students from all economic backgrounds. Chicago has one of the largest Catholic school systems in the nation, and the best and the brightest in Chicago are often alumni of their Catholic schools.

So, Mr. Speaker, I thank you for scheduling this vote honoring the contributions of Catholic Schools. It is my hope that they will continue to flourish and prosper for the benefit of millions of school children around the country.

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of the National Appreciation Day for Catholic Schools. As a Catholic school graduate, I know the value of a Catholic education. I know first hand that Catholic schools teach students discipline, pride and respect for learning. I am so grateful to the priests, nuns and lay persons who taught me at St. Peter’s Elementary School, St. Charles, St. Barnabas and St. Peter at New Milford.

Catholic schools across the country have contributed greatly to the communities in which they exist and the nation at large. Numerous studies show that parents place their children in Catholic schools for the superior academic achievement of Catholic school students. They 1996 tests of the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) sponsored by the U.S. government demonstrated that students in Catholic schools score higher than those in public schools. As a result, Catholic school education is becoming the model choice and Catholic preschool enrollment has increased by nearly 223% since 1987–88.

As I pay tribute to the 8144 Catholic schools in this country, I want to pay tribute to those schools that have nurtured and educated me, the schools I have previously mentioned, and St. Pius V in Jamaica, New York.

I also would like to make special mention of the Catholic Schools in my district—St. Mary’s, St. Joseph and St. Patrick’s in St. Croix, and Saints Peter and Paul in St. Thomas. The people of the Virgin Islands and I appreciate them for all they do and have done for the children of our islands.

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join the sponsors of the H. Res. 28 in honoring the success of Catholic Schools in providing a quality education to millions of children around the country. However, I am concerned that this resolution also contains language that violates the spirit, if not the letter, of the establishment clause of the first amendment, thus insinuating the millions of religious Americans who are struggling to educate their children free from federal control and endangering religious liberty.

The success of Catholic schools has been remarkable. Catholic schools operating in the inner-city have been able to provide an excellent education to students written off by the educational establishment as "unteachable." Contrary to the claims of its critics, Catholic schools do not turn away large numbers of children in order to limit their enrollment to the "best and the brightest." In fact, a few years ago the Catholic schools of New York offered to enroll all students who had been expelled from New York’s public schools! Mr. Speaker, I have introduced legislation, the Family Education Freedom Act (H.R. 368) which would help more parents afford to send their children to Catholic, or other religious schools, by providing them with a $3,000 tax credit for K–12 education expenses.

While I join with the sponsors of this legislation in praising Catholic schools, I am disturbed by the language explicitly endorsing the goals of the United States’ Catholic Conference of Bishops. The Catholic Conferences is an organization devoted to spreading and advancing Catholicism. While the Conference may advance other social goods through its work,
their 27th annual Catholics Schools Week. This event was established to increase support for private Catholic schools and to recognize their accomplishments and contributions to the country.

“Catholic Schools Week” celebrates education that goes beyond preparation for a secular life; it is an education that prepares students for a Christian life. Parents who chose to send their children to Catholic Schools do so because they not only want their children to have an excellent education in reading, writing, and arithmetic, they also want to train them for a Christian education.

Although public schools can prepare children for a secular life through a good education, they are constitutionally bound not to extend their role as educators into the area of religious education. I strongly urge parents who would like the benefits of public education and the rewards of faith based education to make a commitment to work with those religious communities that share their beliefs in the development of after school and weekend parochial programs.

This bill states that Congress supports the goals of Catholic Schools Week, an event sponsored by the National Catholic Education Association and the U.S. Catholic Conference, and congratulates Catholic schools, students, parents, and teachers for their contributions to education.

Catholic schools teach a diverse group of students, 24 percent of whom are minorities. Moreover, only three percent of Catholic high school drop out of school and 83 percent go on to attend college.

Finally, this resolution states that, by providing an intellectually stimulating environment rich in moral guidance, Catholic schools produce students and, ultimately, citizens who are strongly dedicated to their faith and communities.

I offer my heartfelt thanks to the Catholic Schools across the nation for their dedication to excellence in the classroom as they prepare young people to achieve excellence in life. In closing I would like to extend a special thanks to the Catholic Schools in Houston like Saint Agnes Academy, Saint John Paul II School, and Saint Pius High School.

Mrs. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support this resolution on Catholic education, and to share with my colleagues some of the rich history and achievements of Catholic schools in New Mexico.

The Catholic Church has had a presence in the American Southwest for over 400 years. Before public education was established in New Mexico, Catholic friars began teaching at local Indian pueblos. In the early 1800s, the Spanish government, cooperating with the Catholic Church, established schools in the territory of New Mexico.

Today New Mexico has 29 Catholic elementary schools and 4 secondary schools. Over 8,000 New Mexico children are enrolled in Catholic schools and the ethnic composition of the student body reflects the rich diversity of New Mexico (Hispanic 43%, Anglo 31%, American Indian 11%). I am very proud of New Mexico’s Catholic schools and their students. Last year 324 students graduated from Catholic high schools in New Mexico. This is a 99% graduation rate and, of those, 99% went on to post-secondary education.

It’s the dawn of a new century: It is a century in which knowledge is a commodity children must have to succeed. Catholic schools across America are giving our children this opportunity.

Catholic schools have given New Mexico’s children the wings they need to achieve their dreams. As Catholic schools nationwide celebrate Catholic school week, we thank them.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TIBERI) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, House Resolution 28.

The question was taken. The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. TIBERI. 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.

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 11 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6 p.m.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. Biggert) at 6 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will now put the question on motions to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today.

Votes will be taken in the following order: House Joint Resolution 7, by the yeas and nays, and House Resolution 28, by the yeas and nays.

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

RECOGNIZING 90TH BIRTHDAY OF RONALD REAGAN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 7.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by
the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PLATTES) that the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, H.J. Res. 7, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 410, nays 0, answered “present” 7, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 9]  
**YEAS—410**

Abercrombie
Acker
Aderholt
Akin
Allen
Andrews
Armey
Baca
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barca
Barr
Barrett
Barton
Bass
Benten
Berkley
Berry
Biggart
Bilirakis
Blumenauer
Blumenauer
Bouier
Boyce
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Bryant
Burke
Burton
Callahan
Camp
Capito
Capuano
Cardin
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Castle
Chabot
Cheney
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Connect
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Creshaw
Crowley
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Jones, Sam

[Roll No. 10]  
**YEAS—412**

Abercrombie
Acker
Akin
Allen
Andrews
Armey
Baca
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barca
Barr
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bentsen
Berkley
Berry
Biggart
Bilirakis
Blumenauer
Bouier
Boyce
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Bryant
Burke
Burton
Callahan
Camp
Capito
Capuano
Cardin
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Castle
Chabot
Cheney
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Connect
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Creshaw
Crowley
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)

Ms. SANCHEZ and Ms. WATERS changed their vote from “yea” to “present.”

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:
Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, on rollo No. 9, I did not have a beeper notification. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, on rollo No. 9, I didn’t get a beeper notification and the vote was not recorded. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device may be taken on each additional motion to suspend the rules on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

HONORING CONTRIBUTIONS OF CATHOLIC SCHOOLS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 28.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TIBERI) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 28, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 412, nays 0, answered “present” 1, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 2]  
**YEAS—412**

Abercrombie
Acker
Akin
Allen
Andrews
Armey
Baca
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barca
Barr
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bentsen
Berkley
Berry
Biggart
Bilirakis
Blumenauer
Bouier
Boyce
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Bryant
Burke
Burton
Callahan
Camp
Capito
Capuano
Cardin
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Castle
Chabot
Cheney
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Connect
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Creshaw
Crowley
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)

Ms. SANCHEZ and Ms. WATERS changed their vote from “yea” to “present.”

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:
Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, on rollo No. 9, I did not have a beeper notification. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, on rollo No. 9, I didn’t get a beeper notification and the vote was not recorded. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device may be taken on each additional motion to suspend the rules on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

HONORING CONTRIBUTIONS OF CATHOLIC SCHOOLS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 28.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TIBERI) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 28, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 412, nays 0, answered “present” 1, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 2]  
**YEAS—412**

Abercrombie
Acker
Akin
Allen
Andrews
Armey
Baca
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barca
Barr
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bentsen
Berkley
Berry
Biggart
Bilirakis
Blumenauer
Bouier
Boyce
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Brown (SC)
Bryant
Burke
Burton
Callahan
Camp
Capito
Capuano
Cardin
Carson (IN)
Carson (OK)
Castle
Chabot
Cheney
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Connect
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Creshaw
Crowley
Culberson
Cunningham
Davis (CA)
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)

Ms. SANCHEZ and Ms. WATERS changed their vote from “yea” to “present.”

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:
Mr. OSBORNE. Mr. Speaker, on rollo No. 9, I did not have a beeper notification. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

Mr. GRAVES. Mr. Speaker, on rollo No. 9, I didn’t get a beeper notification and the vote was not recorded. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device may be taken on each additional motion to suspend the rules on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GRUCCI. Madam Speaker, due to the death of my mother-in-law, Mrs. Carmella Fierro, I was unable to participate in today's recorded votes. However, I would have voted in the affirmative on each of the three suspension bills on today's agenda:


AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER TO ENTERTAIN A MOTION TO SUSPEND RULES ON WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 2001

Mr. WAMP. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Speaker be authorized to entertain a motion to suspend the rules relating to H.R. 132 on Wednesday, February 7, 2001.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. JEFFERS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Madam Speaker, Reagan stood for two simple but indisputably big things: the expansion of freedom at home and the extinction of tyranny abroad. He achieved both. When he came into office, the top tax rates in the United States were 70 percent. Against all odds, Reagan slashed the top rate to 28 percent and ignited the economic boom that is still with us.

He was right about taxation and the role of government. He was also right about the other great question of his day, the Soviet Union. I will never forget the moment I heard his “evil empire” speech. It was broadcast on Radio 4 with shocking British commentary about this inflammatory new president who knew nothing about the complexities of communism.

But for all the criticism, what came through in my teenage brain was the actual truth. Yes, the Soviet Union was evil. Who now doubts that? He alone saw that communism was destined to be put on the ash heap of history, as he told the House of Commons, and he helped put it there.

Think of Tony Blair and Bill Clinton. In the 1980s, they were nuclear freeze supporters; and yet both now thoughtlessly enjoy the soft and easy fruits of a greater man’s courage.

The critics harp on the economic deficits of the Reagan era, but the truth is that the Federal revenue boomed on Reagan’s watch. What created the deficits was an unprecedented increase in defense spending, the bargaining chip that eventually forced the Soviets to surrender.

The end of the welfare entitlement was also presaged by Reagan. Reagan’s unlikeliest dream, the nuclear missile defense, is also still with us. Lamooned as “Star Wars,” it will soon regain the pre-eminence it deserves in American military defense, as Donald Rumsfeld aggressively moves it forward.

He was devoted to his second wife with a romantic zeal, wore a coat and tie at all times, held Oval Office, a room he considered sacred.

Madam Speaker, Reagan turns 90. The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker’s announced policy of January 3, 2001, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

PRESIDENT REAGAN TURNS 90

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

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Madam Speaker, tonight we celebrate the 90th birthday of President Ronald Reagan, and I would like to read some lines from a column that appeared on Sunday in the London Times in London, England. It was written by Andrew Sullivan, and frankly I cannot say this better than he did about a President that I have admired literally for many, many years. Let me read and I quote: ‘He will turn 90 on Tuesday, but in all likelihood he will barely be aware of it. The cruelty of Alzheimer’s has robbed Ronald Reagan of the capacity for clear memory, but that doesn’t apply to the rest of us.

“He seems, in some respects, a historical oddity now, his political and cultural presence obscured by the Clinton psychodrama and the Bush dynasty. But his successors do not begin to compare—either in achievement or legacy.”’

Mr. LEWIS of California. Madam Speaker, I remember when Ronald Reagan, just outside of this Capital, stepped aboard Marine One for the last time and saluted back and left the presidency. I remember turning to my wife and saying, “He was a long time coming. He will be a long time gone.”

Mr. President, on behalf of a grateful Nation, let me say, thank you, God bless you, and happy birthday.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Madam Speaker, I so much appreciate my colleague for taking a moment to express
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Mr. LEWIS of California. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. SHOWS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHOWS. Madam Speaker, the United States Congress, I was going to take my mom and dad to meet the President. And by golly, not very far after that, he did run and was successfully elected.

During that period of time, it was my privilege to work very closely with the governor. And people should know this about Ronald Reagan, two items I would mention. The first is it was my privilege to work with him on what is now known as the Child Development Act of 1972. It was the first quality preschool day-care act in the country and now serves as a model for the country, a Ronald Reagan-signed bill in 1972. And 25 years later the Federal Government discovered it might be an issue.

Another item: In the southland in my district in California, air quality is by far the most serious challenge we faced in the last 20 or 30 years. It was Ronald Reagan who signed model language for the Clean Air Act. He developed the toughest clean air standards in the entire country, leading the country.

Above and beyond that, let me say that the gentleman is correct at pointing to this great man as President of the United States.

TRIBUTE TO RONALD REAGAN

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

Mr. LEWIS of California. Madam Speaker, I wanted to further say to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) that the job that Ronald Reagan did as President, my colleague has expressed almost the wonderment of that very well. But the thing that we must all remember is that the East-West confrontation is now a thing of the past. And we are now poised on a new road. And what Ronald Reagan did was to serve in the United States Congress. And, of course, they both had great aspirations for me, but they, in the back of their minds, thought I would never make it.

So I promised my mom and my dad that, if I ever made it to the United States Congress, I was going to take them in the front door of the White House to meet the President of the United States, not the back door, but the front door.

And so, the time came when I was elected; and it just so happened that Ronald Reagan was the President of the United States and a man whom I think was one of the greatest Presidents we ever had. The day came when I was going to take my mom and dad over to the White House and go in the front door to meet the President. And unbeknownst to me, Ronald Reagan’s staff, because the President had asked them to, had called and said, we want to have Dan Burton in the Oval Office. His background and everything before he comes over so we can talk to his parents.

And when we went in the Oval Office to meet the President of the United States, this little waitress and this man who worked in a foundry all his life getting up at 5:30 in the morning, he walked in and he shook their hands and he started telling them what a great guy I was, and told them all the things he knew about me, and what a great asset I was to the United States Congress. He did not need to do that, but it sure was great for me and it was great for my mom and dad.

And so, I thank President Reagan very much for making my mom and dad feel like they were two of the proudest people in the United States one day in my life.

Mr. LEWIS of California. Madam Speaker, I say to the President, our colleagues and all Americans join together in joining Ronald Reagan, our great President, a very happy 90th birthday.

EIGHTH ANNIVERSARY OF FAMILY FARM EMERGENCY ENERGY ASSISTANCE ACT

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

Mr. SHOWS. Madam Speaker, the unusual cold winter and the dramatic increase in heating costs are hurting everybody in my State of Mississippi. We need to encourage more domestic production of oil and gas.

And in Mississippi, we need immediate action, we need help today, especially for our region’s agriculture industry.

Some farmers and ranchers have seen their gas bills double and triple over the last year. And this is through no fault of their own.

Our own local economy depends on agricultural production, which is a major employer in many of our communities.

These days the industry has been devastated by the dramatic rise in the cost of gas. This may not be a natural disaster, like a tornado or a flood, but this is a disaster just the same. This is an economic disaster that threatens the very existence of farms throughout our region.

Today I introduced a bill that will provide both immediate and long-term emergency assistance to our farmers and ranchers. My bill, the Family Farm Emergency Energy Assistance Act, will authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to provide grants that will not have to be repaid to help local agricultural producers deal immediately with financial pressures caused by this crisis.

This bill would also make low-interest loans available to help deal with the energy crisis for the months ahead.

This important legislation needs to be enacted quickly. Our farmers need help, and they need it now.

I am calling upon our leaders in Congress to move this emergency assistance bill quickly to passage. I will not rest until the Family Farm Emergency Energy Assistance Act becomes law.

EIGHTH ANNIVERSARY OF FAMILY AND MEDICAL LEAVE ACT

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

Ms. WOOLSEY. Madam Speaker, yesterday was the eighth anniversary of the signing of the Family and Medical Leave Act.
Since 1993, that landmark legislation has allowed 35 million Americans to take time off from their jobs to be with children or ailing relatives without fear of losing their jobs. That is peace of mind for the American worker, and it is something that all workers need and deserve.

But even with FMLA in place, not all parents are taking the time off that is available to them. In fact, a recent study by the U.S. Department of Labor found that 80 percent of eligible employees do not, for example, take their full 12 weeks of leave because they cannot afford to go without a paycheck.

Scientific research shows that early bonding between parent and child is exceptionally critical to that child’s future, to that child’s success. Yet 83 percent of women who give birth are back to work within 6 months, and 70 percent of them say it is because they need the money.

Madam Speaker, America’s children are paying the price for their parents’ need to earn a living; and those parents are forced to choose between the needs of their children and putting food on the table. And that is not right.

The Family and Medical Leave Act has helped millions of families. But what we are finding out is there are millions more who are being left behind. It is time that the United States joined the more than 120 countries around the world that provide paid leave for new parents.

Let us face it, times are changing. If our children are lucky enough to have two parents living with them, chances are that both parents are in the workforce and they work outside of the home. Parents are working hard. They are commuting long hours. And it is our children who are being left behind due to today’s hectic lifestyles.

Studies find that parents are spending an average of 52 days a year less with their children than they did 30 years ago, 52 days a year less with their children.

We have to give parents the tools they need to bridge the gap between work and family, especially when there is a new baby in the home.

Along with Senator CHRIST DODD of Connecticut, I have, again with this Congress, introduced legislation to provide start-up funding for States that want to establish paid leave programs for newborns.

Already, my State of California offers new moms paid maternity leave through their State Disability Insurance. Women are eligible for up to 4 weeks of leave before delivery and 6 weeks after. That means a great deal for mothers. It means a lot to the newborns and the newly-adopted children. And, in the long-run, it will mean a great deal for the children as they grow up and become successful and are working on their futures.

But 10 weeks is not enough time. It is too short.

As a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, I continue to work to make education our top priority. But I have come to realize that having the best schools and the best teachers in the world will not matter if kids are not ready to learn when they enter the classroom.

One thing that we need to do to help them become ready to learn is have them bond with their parents right after birth or right after adoption.

As my co-chairs and I on the Democratic Caucus Task Force for Children came to the conclusion last year that part of our children’s agenda was paid leave for new parents, we realize that it is more critical than ever to allow paid leave so that kids will get a good start.

Madam Speaker, parents want to be there for their children. Children are their number one priority. As a parent and a grandmother, I know how important those first months are to the parent and to the child. Let us show America’s families, their parents and their children that the Family and Medical Leave Act was a good start but that these parents, these families, deserve more. It is time we make paid leave for new parents a priority in this Congress.

Our children are 25 percent of our population, but they are 100 percent of our future.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE
A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:


The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 105-83, the Chair, on behalf of the Democratic Leader, announces the reappointment of James B. Steinberg, of New York (Mr. Dunbin) as a member of the National Council on the Arts.

The message also announced that pursuant to section 2761 of title 22, United States Code, as amended, the Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, and upon the recommendation of the Democratic Leader, appoints the Senator from West Virginia (Mr. Byrd) as Co-Chairman of the Senate Delegation to the British-American Parliamentary Group during the One Hundred Seventh Congress.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 106-550, the Chair, on behalf of the Majority Leader, announces the appointment of the following Senators to serve as members of the James Madison Commemoration Commission—

the Senator from Virginia (Mr. Warner); and

the Senator from Alabama (Mr. Sessions).

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 106-398, the Chair, on behalf of the Majority Leader, announces the appointment of the following individuals to serve as members of the Commission on the Future of the United States Aerospace Industry—

William Schneider, j., of New York; and

Robert J. Stevens, of Maryland.
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PROTECTING OUR GREATEST MILITARY ASSET: OUR MILITARY PERSONNEL

The Speaker pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELOTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SKELOTON. Madam Speaker, as we begin the 107th Congress and our debate turns to our national security, I want to remind our colleagues that we must remain vigilant in protecting the greatest asset in our defense arsenal, our military personnel. Without our soldiers, sailors, airmen and Marines, we cannot sail our ships, fly our fighters, or put boots on the ground to protect our Nation’s interests here and abroad.

Our highly qualified, well-trained military personnel are the core of our Nation’s defense. I am concerned that the new administration will rush to fund high visibility weapons systems with important political constituencies, like the National Missile Defense, at the expense of ensuring that our military personnel remain the best in the world.

I believe we must make every effort to continue to recruit quality service members to ensure the continued success of our Armed Forces. With the good economic times, rising numbers of high school graduates going on to college, low unemployment, myriad job opportunities in the private sector, and a host of other factors, it is no secret that the military services have been experiencing difficulties in recruiting and retaining enough qualified individuals.

Last year, all of the services reached their yearly recruiting goals for enlisted active duty personnel, but this success was not easily achieved. For example, the Air Force, which historically has had an easier time recruiting, had
to establish a special task force in order to improve its recruiting program. This year, the services are forecasting that they will each make their active duty recruiting goals for enlisted personnel. Time will tell.

Active duty recruiting is not the only challenge facing the services. Maintaining a suitable reserve force to provide the additional support for our military is also a daunting challenge. Last year, two of the seven reserve components, the Navy Reserve and the Air Force Reserve, missed their enlisted recruiting goals.

Currently, the Army National Guard and the Naval Reserve are both on a path to miss their projected goals for this fiscal year. Both the Army and the Air National Guard are struggling to meet a higher recruiting mission with fewer recruiters than last year. With our growing dependence on the Guard and the Reserve, these difficulties are a cause for serious concern. Unlike years past, our armed forces cannot operate effectively without the participation of the National Guard and Reserve. So we must do everything possible to ensure that we devote sufficient resources to Reserve and Guard recruiting.

Retaining highly trained service members who are already in the military is also vitally important. We cannot afford to lose the investment we make in our service members by failing to provide adequate education, training, working conditions and quality of life to make military service an attractive career option. Today, highly skilled, motivated individuals are being enticed to leave the military and to use their skills and expertise in the private sector. We simply cannot allow this trend to continue if we hope to remain the world's most foremost military power.

Last year, enlisted retention was a particularly acute problem for the Air Force. In the officer corps, the Army missed its officer retention goal by 1,069 while the Air Force was short 523. Many officers who leave are in the junior officer ranks. These are the leaders of tomorrow; and if we hope to keep them in the military, we must be responsive to their needs and concerns.

Spending on high-tech weapons systems is important, but we simply cannot afford to neglect the people side of our defense equation. The personnel and operating systems of the 21st Century will be based on outdated notions which do not make sense for the 21st Century. For example, the up or out promotion system may not make the most sense in an era where we have computer experts who aspire only to work with computers from the entire military.

We need to revisit how the services fill critical specialty positions. The current retirement system, which penalizes those who do not stay for a full 20-year career, clearly merits scrutiny. The current retirement system, which penalizes those who do not stay for a full 20-year career, clearly merits scrutiny. The TRICARE system, which also serves the active duty and reserve communities, is broken and needs to be fixed. If we do not attend to these programs, all the sophisticated weapons systems in the world will not do us any good because we will not have enough people who are smart enough and well trained enough to operate them.

We simply cannot afford to let that happen. Therefore, as we begin this new millennium, let us renew our commitment to the dedicated men and women who serve our Nation's military and to ensuring that our Nation's Armed Forces continue to be the best trained, most highly qualified force in the 21st Century.

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

[Mrs. MINK of Hawaii addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. DeFAZIO addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

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

[Mr. BERRY addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

HONORING FORMER PRESIDENT RONALD REAGAN ON HIS 90TH BIRTHDAY

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, on this 90th birthday of Ronald Reagan, I think all of us should be inspired; and we unfortunately are a country that has grown so cynical that, okay, it is not cool to say something nice about Ronald Reagan because I am a Democrat or it is not good to say something about Jimmy Carter because I am a Republican. Yet, I think all people who have served in public service in the courthouses, in the school boards and in the Nation's Capital, in the State legislatures around the country deserve respect for their contributions and for their attempts to make the world a better place.

I was a college student when I first knew of Ronald Reagan. He was running for President in 1976. I was in the Ford camp, but I listened to his speech, and I took it very carefully and realized over the next several years that he, in fact, had something to contribute and something to say.

Reagan's ideas, I would say, were probably basic conservative philosophies of less government, of individualism, of people solving problems and not government solving problems, and yet beyond that there seemed to be something else in his acceptance of the human being in the eye that maybe captured our imagination; in the words of a poet, maybe took the ordinary and made them extraordinary, and had this ability to galvanize the people of America to do what's good.
fine. But if you found out we could do it on less than what you were paying in, you would probably want the money back.

I had the opportunity to talk to a little girl at Johnson High School over the break. She had a job, senior in high school, made $7.00 an hour. So I said to her, Julie, if you work for two hours, you make $14. Do you get to take it all home?

She said, no. I have to pay about $4 in taxes.

I said, okay. On the $14 you earn, you have to pay $4 in taxes. If you knew that I could run the government on $3.50 of that money, what would you want me to do with the extra 50 cents?

She said, give it back to me.

Now, why does she want it back and what is she going to do with that money? She is going to buy more CDs, more hamburgers, fill up her tank a few more times; and when she does that, the whole system stimulates the economy. Businesses expand, jobs are created, more opportunities, more people are working. Therefore, less people are on welfare, more are paying taxes, more paying into the system than taking out of the system. It is a win-win. It is what Adam Smith, the great economist, called the invisible hand of America that makes the whole engine thrive.

If this senior in high school at Johnson High in Savannah, Georgia, could understand that, why is it so many people in Washington are confused about it? The surplus does not belong to the government. It belongs to the 17-year-old Julies around the country, and Bush understands this. I am looking forward to working with the new President on this.

On Social Security, he supports a lockbox. He says, we are going to save Social Security, not just for the next election but for the next generation. And in doing so, we are not going to change benefits for near-retirees or for retirees. We are not going to have a tax increase, and that is important. And from there on we are going to work on a bipartisan basis to do what is best for the American people.

The reason I believe that we have a new President and a new administration in the White House is because President Bush dared to stick his foot in the water of issues. Rather than skirting around the edge, he got into the water. I think the American people are ready for a substantive debate on real issues that affect all of us.

So on this birthday of Ronald Reagan, let me wish the Reagan family the best, but let me also wish the best to the Bush family and make a pledge that this Member of Congress is ready to work.
path. That includes not only the biggest tax cut in history, that we are still benefiting from, but I want to also read from some remarks that Ronald Reagan made when he was over at the Brandenburg Gate at that time. That is when the Wall was still there in Berlin.

He pointed out that Kruschev had predicted that he is going to bury us. Mr. Reagan said, “But in the West today, we see a free world that has achieved a level of prosperity and wellbeing unprecedented in all human history. In the communist world, we see failure, technological backwardness, declining standards of health, even want of the most basic kind, too little food. Even today, the Soviet Union still cannot feed itself.”

He went on to say, “We welcome change and openness; for we believe that freedom and security go together, that the advance of human liberty can only strengthen the cause of world peace. That is one sign the Soviets can make that would be unmistakable that would advance dramatically the cause of freedom and peace.”

“General Secretary Gorbachev, if you seek liberalization; if you seek prosperity for the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, if you seek liberalization; come here to this gate. Mr. Gorbachev, open this gate. Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall.”

Amen. And we know the Wall came down.

I had a meeting in my office today with 12 businessmen from Russia coming to talk about expanded trade opportunities for us and them. It is exciting to hear them expressing their interest in pursuing those values and those principles that Ronald Reagan played such a key role in achieving.

It is something that has brought our Nation to a peak unprecedented in history, and it simultaneously has brought the world to a peak unprecedented in history. It is not that we still do not have a lot more to accomplish, we do indeed; but we can be excited about this.

Let me just conclude with one final word. Ronald Reagan, and I say this as an Iowan, Ronald Reagan is the only President we have ever had from the State of Iowa. He was born in the little town of Tampico. He grew up in Dixon, Illinois. In high school and while he was going to college, he used to work as a lifeguard. He did that for like $15 or $20 a week in those days. But he pointed out that during the 7 years that he served in the capacity of lifeguard, that he saved 77 lives, 77 lives.

I just want to pay tribute to the man who has saved more than 77 lives as he remarkably did in his years as a lifeguard. He has saved millions and millions of lives, and he has left his permanent stamp on the course of history. We salute that gentleman who has turned 90 today and pay tribute to him.

God bless you, President Reagan. We are all eternally grateful for that unprecedented role that you played in our national experience and which will never be forgotten.

Mr. SCHAEFFER. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. Gibbons).

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, first I want to thank my friend and colleague from Colorado for granting me the time to speak on this very important issue this evening.

Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor for me to introduce this evening in recognition of former President Ronald Reagan’s 90th birthday. Last year, for his 89th birthday, the ladywoman from Washington (Ms. Dunn), the late Senator Paul Coverdell from Georgia and I introduced legislation to bestow the Congressional Gold Medal to President Ronald Reagan and his beloved wife, Nancy, in honor for their individual, and, may I say, combined dedicated service to the United States. I would like, Mr. Speaker, once again to thank the Senate for passing in the aisle for joining with me in that tribute, a tribute which touched both President Reagan and Mrs. Reagan very deeply.

Upon passage of the Reagan Congressional Gold Medal bill, Mrs. Reagan remarked personally to me, “It means a lot to us to receive so much support at this difficult time, and we are very honored.”

Yet, Mr. Speaker, and may I say not surprisingly, honor and fame were never the priorities of Ronald Reagan, and his journey to the White House was not marked by a desire for personal power or position of personal privilege. He preferred to see himself, however, as just a simple citizen who was called upon to serve the Nation he so loved.

Ronald Reagan truly is a great American in every sense. Led by his belief in the limitless potential of Americans, President Reagan turned the tide of public cynicism and sparked a national renewal.

During his 8-year tenure, the United States enjoyed a period of astonishing economic growth, renewed military superiority and international respect. Ronald Reagan’s contagious optimism and passionate patriotism served as an inspiration to the entire Nation. Under his leadership, Americans believed once again in that American dream.

As we enter the 21st century, Mr. Speaker, our Nation still finds its strength in President Reagan’s ideals and his steadfast confidence in democracy, freedom, and America. Often as Americans we look back at our history to learn from our mistakes, but as well as Americans we look back and celebrate our triumphs.

The leadership and accomplishments of President Reagan certainly will not be forgotten, for they shaped the country we call home and the world today as we know it.

Thank you, President Reagan, for your commitment, dedication, and faith in America and her people. Today as you celebrate your 90th birthday, please know that we wish you and Mrs. Reagan the very best, and we also thank you for distinguished service to our great Nation.

Mr. SCHAEFFER. I thank the gentleman for joining us tonight.

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the floor to my good friend and colleague from the great State of Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO), who a few years before coming to Congress was an appointee in the Reagan administration and served with distinction in our region or the West in the Department of Education.

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I thank my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAEFFER).

It is true, as has been cited here by other Members, that there was one time in history, about 1966 or 1967, at the time I was in college in Colorado, and I happened to see a television rebroadcast of a speech that, again, as I recall, was one of Ronald Reagan. It was at a campaign rally for Goldwater. I was mesmerized by that speech. It was the first time I had heard that man speak. I was amazed at his ability to capture the imagination of the audience he was speaking to directly and of the millions of people he was speaking to through the power of television.

I was later privileged to be a delegate to the national convention, a Reagan delegate in the 1980 election, and shortly thereafter was asked to serve, as the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAEFFER) mentioned, in the Reagan administration.

Although I am truly humbled and proud of my service here in this body, it is a wonderful experience; it is an incredible experience for anyone. I must say that I have never cherished anything in my public life more than I have cherished the time I spent in Mr. Reagan’s administration, because I was in the Reagan administration and he made me feel like a revolutionary, and he gave me the zeal and the ardor and the enthusiasm for the cause.

His words inspired me. His integrity illuminated the American spirit. How wonderful it was to be so proud of the President of the United States. How wonderful it was to see him up there on that dais when he spoke to the assembled Congress of the United States, or when he spoke at the Berlin Wall or when he spoke at Normandy. How wonderful it was to recognize that this man, the leader of the free world, was in fact a man with as great a heart as anyone who has ever occupied that office.

□ 1930

I have in our office in Denver, our regional office, I have almost a shrine to Ronald Reagan. We have everything, every imaginable picture that has ever been taken, we have all of the Christmas cards that they sent us from the White House in those days, and every time I walk into my office, I look back
February 6, 2001

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H194

Mr. Speaker, Michaelangelo, I believe it was, stated once, when they asked him about his particular talent as a sculptor, and I am certainly paraphrasing, but he said something like, I am just the person that takes away all of the exterior rock from this form that God has put inside that thing. I can see it in there. I am just moving the rock away, that is all I am doing. I often think of Ronald Reagan in that way. I think that Ronald Reagan saw the beauty of America and the American spirit. He saw it inside a complex and somewhat rough mold that we would see it as, someone without his insight, and he saw the opportunity of America, the greatness of America, and he expressed it eloquently. And, in doing so, he let us all see inside that rock, known as a public way. He made us all part of that incredible experience.

Mr. President, you made us proud. You made me proud to be part of the Reagan revolution. And even as you said goodbye to America, you did once again, inspired me personally in your message to the country when you told us of your debilitating disease, of Alzheimer's, and I say you inspired me personally because my father is stricken with this afflicting disease.

This is the way the President left us; these are the words he gave us in this letter: "I have recently been told that I am one of the millions of Americans who will be afflicted with Alzheimer's disease."

"Upon learning this news, Nancy and I had to decide whether as private citizens we would keep this a private matter or whether we would make this news known in a public way. In the past, Nancy suffered from breast cancer and I had my cancer surgeries. We found through our open disclosures we were able to raise public awareness. We were happy that as a result, many more individuals are being treated in early stages and able to return to normal, healthy lives. So now we feel it is important to share it with you. In opening our hearts, we hope this might promote greater awareness of this condition. Perhaps it will encourage a clearer understanding of the individual and families who are affected by it.

"At the moment I feel just fine and I intend to live the remainder of the years God gives me on this earth doing the things I have always done. I will continue to share life's journey with my beloved Nancy and my family. I plan to enjoy the great outdoors and stay in touch with my friends and supporters.

"Unfortunately, as Alzheimer's disease progresses, the family often bears a heavy burden. I only wish there was some way I could spare Nancy from this painful experience. When the time comes, I am confident that with your help, she will face it with courage and faith.

"In closing, let me thank you, the American people, for giving me the great honor of allowing me to serve as your President. When the Lord calls me home, whenever that may be, I will leave with the greatest love for this country of ours and eternal optimism for this future.

"I now begin the journey that will lead me into the sunset of my life. I know that for America there will always be a bright dawn ahead."

"Thank you, my friends. May God always bless you."

And may God always bless you, Mr. President, and happy birthday.

Mr. SCHAEFFER. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. HART)."
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Mr. SCHAEFFER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PLATTS).

Mr. PLATTS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise tonight to join my colleagues in paying tribute to our Nation's 40th President, Ronald Wilson Reagan on this, his 90th birthday.

When Ronald Reagan was elected President in 1980, I had just graduated high school and was already involved in politics, I followed and admired President Reagan over the next 8 years in office, and certainly ever since.

In that time, the world changed a lot. President Reagan challenged the Soviet Union to "tear down this wall," and the wall came down. He saw a day when Eastern Europe would join the Free World, and it did. He stayed firm at Reykjavik and, for the first time, Russia and America stopped building, and started destroying, nuclear weapons.

Over those 8 years, America itself changed.

Ronald Wilson Reagan was the eternal optimist, a believer in America's ability to return to its inherent goodness. His faith in the greatness of our Nation was best expressed when he said, "In this land of dreams fulfilled where greater dreams may be imagined, nothing is impossible, no victory is beyond our reach, and no glory will ever be too great."

Ronald Reagan restored America's confidence in itself.

Three years ago, in commemoration of President Reagan's 87th birthday, I had the pleasure of joining First Lady Nancy Reagan at the Reagan Library in California. I was there as an elected official at that time with the Pennsylvania General Assembly, a step that helped lead me here to becoming a member of this great institution. But I was there, most importantly, to pay tribute to, and to express my deep gratitude to President Reagan for his tremendous service to our Nation. In my conversation with Nancy Reagan that day, my message was simply one of thanks. Thanks to her and, through her, to President Reagan for their dedicated, hard-working and outstanding service to our great Nation and its citizens.

President Reagan's conduct in office and his statesmanship, his love of country, were great role models for all of us citizens, and they were very inspiring to countless citizens. His example helped to reaffirm my commitment to the ideals of public service, to the ideals of giving back to one's Nation, and certainly helped to reaffirm my interest in serving in office and to serving here in Congress.

I am greatly honored to join with my colleagues tonight in saying, Mr. President, happy birthday, and God bless you and all the great Nation of ours, the United States of America.

Mr. SCHAEFFER. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Pennsylvania for joining us tonight and for his fine remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of President Ronald Reagan on the occasion of his 90th birthday.

More than 12 years having passed since Mr. Reagan left the White House in Washington, the passing of time only magnifies his greatness as a leader and as a human being. I ask our colleagues to recall those early days of the Reagan era.

I remember too well that January 20, 1981, President Reagan inherited a nation wallowing in pessimism produced by the previous decade. I also remember how Mr. Reagan strode into Washington, confident of America's promise and ideals, and quickly revived this country's morale. By reminding Americans, we are the most able people in the world, he reinvigorated our patriotism like no other President of the postwar era.

Mr. Reagan's tenure in the oval office was underscored by his amazing life story, a tale of one of America's most popular leaders. Most of us remember Mr. Reagan as President. But if we examine his earlier years, we learn a lot about Mr. Reagan, the man, and what fueled the vision he brought to Washington, D.C.

What is often overlooked is that long before he became our 40th President, Mr. Reagan was a liberal Democrat, and just like his father, he cast the first presidential vote that he cast for Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1902, and he campaigned for Harry Truman in 1948.

Perhaps Mr. Reagan felt obliged to be liberal in his younger days. After all, at 26 Mr. Reagan left the great Midwest and his promising radio career to go to Hollywood. The work ethic instilled in him as a young boy in Illinois paid off. He earned a reputation as a solid, dependable performer, even though he appeared in mostly less-than-memorable films.

Despite the environs of Hollywood, Mr. Reagan's political philosophy evolved as the years passed. While the sixties brought a new era of liberal rule, Mr. Reagan found himself siding with the country's new conservative movement. Granted, it was not the popular thing to do, especially given his trendy California backdrop. But by 1964, Mr. Reagan was backing Barry Goldwater for President, campaigning vigorously for the Arizona Republican.

It was a mighty display of political courage, and at the same time, it was the courage that brought Mr. Reagan a change of political thought and affiliation when Mr. Reagan left the White House. He then served two terms as California's governor, and of course 8 years as our President, 8 glorious years that changed America.

How did he do it? Some say it was his vision and his unmatched ability to communicate. Others credit his warmth and congeniality. Still others attribute his success to his strength and his determination.

Over the case, no one can dispute the gravity of Mr. Reagan's accomplishments. No one can argue the greatness of his years as our Nation's chief executive. Given the mess he inherited, Reagan's legacy is one to behold.

Remember 1979? The country had fallen victim to the days of malaise, with 21 percent interest rates, 14 percent inflation rates, skyrocketing unemployment, and long gas lines. It was Ronald Reagan who restored the American economy by setting it on a course for long-term success.

With dramatic tax cuts and other measures, Reaganomics produced the strongest and longest peacetime economic expansion in the history of the United States. Since 1981, when President Reagan's economic programs were first enacted, we have had less than 2 years of recessions. Mr. Reagan understood that if we made good people, productive people, instead of punishing them, the whole country would fare better. More than anyone else in the last half century, he brought that concept home and empowered millions of Americans to reach new heights of excellence.

We all reap the rewards of Mr. Reagan's leadership still today. In addition to his economic legacy, we remember Reagan for conducting the Cold War to a conclusion, all because he never lost faith in the virtues of America's free market and our democratic gospel.

When dealing with the Soviets, Mr. Reagan put aside his affability and labeled the evil empire for what it was. By confronting the Soviet Union with military rearmament, he gave Americans the upper hand. By replacing detente with the policy of containment and rollback, he was the first President to reach an arms reduction accord with the Soviets. He broke the debilitating grip of the Nation's post-Vietnam syndrome, and restored our confidence in the American military.

In the realm of social issues, President Reagan was a conservative of the highest order. He sided with pro-life citizens, he gave Americans the upper hand. By replacing detente with the policy of containment and rollback, he was the first President to reach an arms reduction accord with the Soviets. He broke the debilitating grip of the Nation's post-Vietnam syndrome, and restored our confidence in the American military.

No focus groups, no poll-driven shifts, no triangulation, Reagan was driven by what was in his heart and what he believed to be right. Opposed to a hostile Congress and a rabid liberal media, Mr. Reagan stood up for what he believed was correct, and stood up to those who he opposed.
Indeed, the Reagan years were revolutionary years. Looking back, that revolution was not only a shift in the legislative priorities and White House personnel, it was an intellectual challenge to the status quo that had reigned for generations prior. Suddenly, because of Mr. Reagan, no serious national politician wanted to be identified as a "liberal." Of course, the same holds true even for today.

With a perfect blend of realism and idealism, this courageous man single-handedly overhauled our system of politics, as well as our collective outlook. The greatest communicator of all time, he reaffirmed with eloquence the value and validity of the American dream. Most of all, he trusted his fellow Americans like no other.

As he said in his farewell address, by appealing to our best hopes, not our worst fears, to our confidence rather than to our doubts, he made us conscious of our own potential. He restored people, and brought together his party and his countrymen in an unprecedented manner. Never were we as proud to be Americans as when the Gipper was at the helm.

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

Mr. SCHAFER. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank the gentleman from Colorado, Mr. Speaker, for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, on the occasion of his 90th birthday, this Congress remembers President Ronald Reagan, celebrating his life and his legacy.

In the current time, where some confuse legacy with licentiousness; where some confuse notoriety with being notorious; where some, regardless of partisan stripe or political philosophy, so confuse the notion of leadership to be poll-driven rather than principle-based, we celebrate the life of Ronald Wilson Reagan.

Prime Minister Thatcher said that one man more than any other was responsible for the spread of freedom and the embrace of democracy in the world. His name is Ronald Reagan.

It is interesting, Mr. Speaker, at a time when the dominant media culture castigates simplicity for lacking in intellectual rigor, the triumph of Ronald Reagan is the notion that simple beliefs sincerely held are not only eloquent, but life-changing: that intellect and all we can bring at this time is needed to do our part, that the circumstances in which we find ourselves, understanding that the Constitution is not just a document to be put on the shelf to collect dust, but the very cornerstone of our liberty, and if you will, in the words of President Carter, the mission statement that defines us. Ronald Wilson Reagan, called by some a revolutionary, instead went about the business of restoration, restoring more than our pride, restoring a sense of national purpose. That is what we celebrate, and that is what we remember, and that is what will sustain us in the days ahead, celebrating his life and his accomplishments, and learning from the rhythm and rhyme of his vision and our collective search that can motivate us in what he called the last best hope of mankind.

Mr. SCHAFER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for joining me tonight on the floor. I was in college, starting in 1980, during the campaign between President Reagan and President Carter, and I remember the first debate, I think it was the debate in Cleveland, that was televised.

All of my friends who I had just met at the University of Dayton met in my dormitory room, so imagine 10 or 15 people packed into a small little cell and watching this debate on television. For many of us at that time, we were just starting to figure out where we stood politically in America.

We were just youngsters, graduated from high school and moving on to college. President Carter, as you know, was a very honorable man, a very well respected political figure, as a broadcaster, still ostensibly was a private citizen, not a candidate for political office, not an office holder. In that appearance, one of his last public campaign appearances, the genius of Ronald Reagan came through. And, again, it was not something that would please the intellectual elite, but it was the simplicity of his optimism.

That was my honor to serve as a master of ceremonies at a time, while as a public figure, as a broadcaster, still ostensibly was a private citizen, not a candidate for political office, not an office holder. In that appearance, one of his last public campaign appearances, the genius of Ronald Reagan came through. And, again, it was not something that would please the intellectual elite, but it was the simplicity of his optimism.

Another great President, Dwight David Eisenhower, noted that the most important component of leadership is that leadership is that the leader is not for what pollsters might have advised him, but stood up for what was right and what was just and what was fair.

That is the kind of courage that I think about often on this House floor. It is something that I know many of us think about, not just on the President's birthday. We think about President Reagan every day as we carry out the business of the United States Congress.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Colorado is caught up in collegiate reverie for what was for the gentleman a political epiphany in the campaign debates of 1980, I thought back in my own memory to a brilliantly beautiful day in late October in 1992 when former President Reagan, answering the call of duty to his party and to his Nation, hit the campaign trail.

It was my honor to serve as a master of ceremonies at a time, while as a public figure, as a broadcaster, still ostensibly was a private citizen, not a candidate for political office, not an office holder. In that appearance, one of his last public campaign appearances, the genius of Ronald Reagan came through. And, again, it was not something that would please the intellectual elite, but it was the simplicity of his optimism.

Another great President, Dwight David Eisenhower, noted that the most important component of leadership is the leader is not for what pollsters might have advised him, but stood up for what was right and what was just and what was fair.

That is the kind of courage that I think about often on this House floor. It is something that I know many of us think about, not just on the President's birthday. We think about President Reagan every day as we carry out the business of the United States Congress.
Reagan championed the essential goodness of the American people. That notion that tomorrow would bring a better day, that notion that this constitutional republic represented the last, best hope of mankind, that vision of a shining city on the hill was more than poetic license. For Ronald Reagan, it was a vision that he championed every day to make reality.

The lessons are legion and the examples are great. When professional diplomats of the State Department said, “Oh, this is another of his poetic licenses,” Ronald Reagan went to West Berlin and in the sight of the terrible wall, Mr. Speaker, said, to the general secretary of what was then the Soviet Union, “Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall.”

His sense of purpose and his clear and unmistakable call led eventually to The Wall coming down and opportunity and freedom being swept up, not only across what was called East Germany, but all of Eastern Europe.

When those said the Soviet Union would be relegated to the dustbin of history, he was not disdainful of the Russian people but instead of the tyranny and the ultimate unworkability of their system. And Ronald Reagan was right. What those in this town championed, oh, we must have a nuclear freeze, we must be subservient to the Soviet Union, we must throw up our hands in hopelessness and despair, Ronald Reagan believed in the goodness of the American people and the constitutional charge of this unique, grand experiment. And his vision, his prophecy was correct.

A British writer today put it, talking about other contemporary leaders, saying of those who may have sat in seats of power here or in the halls of Parliament from our British allies, lesser men who easily enjoy the fruits and labors of a greater man with firm convictions.

That is what we remember and that is what we champion and that is why the American people, regardless of political party, rise as one, Mr. Speaker, to the general secretary of what was then the Soviet Union, “Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall.”

I am reminded of a trip I took to Israel. I met with Mr. Scharansky who had grown up in the old Soviet Union and who had spent a number of years in the Russian gulags being oppressed as a political prisoner, as a Jew, and in a very antireligious society in the Soviet Union. He said that when word passed through the prison cells that Ronald Reagan had publicly and emphatically described the Soviet Union as an “evil empire,” that was the day their hearts began to pound, because they knew that it was just a matter of time before they were released.

As I stood there in Jerusalem listening to this story years later about a former Soviet prisoner, it made me extraordinarily proud, not just to be an American, but to be one who voted for, supported, worked for Ronald Reagan and his candidacy, because it was a victory that did more than set the United States of America on the proper course.

And at the time, was the hill to which, the city to which people around the world in some very dire circumstances looked toward with hope and with optimism. Sometimes that vision of America was all they had.

Mr. Speaker, when I was reminded of a trip I took to Israel. I met with Mr. Scharansky who had grown up in the old Soviet Union and who had spent a number of years in the Russian gulags being oppressed as a political prisoner, as a Jew, and in a very antireligious society in the Soviet Union. He said that when word passed through the prison cells that Ronald Reagan had publicly and emphatically described the Soviet Union as an “evil empire,” that was the day their hearts began to pound, because they knew that it was just a matter of time before they were released.

As I stood there in Jerusalem listening to this story years later about a former Soviet prisoner, it made me extraordinarily proud, not just to be an American, but to be one who voted for, supported, worked for Ronald Reagan and his candidacy, because it was a victory that did more than set the United States of America on the proper course.

And at the time, was the hill to which, the city to which people around the world in some very dire circumstances looked toward with hope and with optimism. Sometimes that vision of America was all they had.

When those said the Soviet Union would be relegated to the dustbin of history, he was not disdainful of the Russian people but instead of the tyranny and the ultimate unworkability of their system. And Ronald Reagan was right. What those in this town championed, oh, we must have a nuclear freeze, we must be subservient to the Soviet Union, we must throw up our hands in hopelessness and despair, Ronald Reagan believed in the goodness of the American people and the constitutional charge of this unique, grand experiment. And his vision, his prophecy was correct.

A British writer today put it, talking about other contemporary leaders, saying of those who may have sat in seats of power here or in the halls of Parliament from our British allies, lesser men who easily enjoy the fruits and labors of a greater man with firm convictions.

That is what we remember and that is what we champion and that is why the American people, regardless of political party, rise as one, Mr. Speaker, to the general secretary of what was then the Soviet Union, “Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall.”

I am reminded of a trip I took to Israel. I met with Mr. Scharansky who had grown up in the old Soviet Union and who had spent a number of years in the Russian gulags being oppressed as a political prisoner, as a Jew, and in a very antireligious society in the Soviet Union. He said that when word passed through the prison cells that Ronald Reagan had publicly and emphatically described the Soviet Union as an “evil empire,” that was the day their hearts began to pound, because they knew that it was just a matter of time before they were released.

As I stood there in Jerusalem listening to this story years later about a former Soviet prisoner, it made me extraordinarily proud, not just to be an American, but to be one who voted for, supported, worked for Ronald Reagan and his candidacy, because it was a victory that did more than set the United States of America on the proper course.

And at the time, was the hill to which, the city to which people around the world in some very dire circumstances looked toward with hope and with optimism. Sometimes that vision of America was all they had.

Mr. Speaker, I say to the former President, “Mr. President, I thank you and happy birthday. America and the world are better because of you, because of your courage, and because of your sacrifice. We shall never forget you.”

If we have time left, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado for yielding. As the gentleman discussed, those who have crossed his path who have run for public office, whether in this country or beyond these borders, I think of the scores of young people who apply for internships or that first job here in Washington or back in our districts who unflaggingly cite the example of Ronald Reagan coming to political awareness, whether in elementary school or junior high, looking to that example of leadership. It is an example which will continue to inspire and motivate what he called the last, best hope of mankind.

Mr. Speaker, it is the optimism that this noble experiment would continue. That despite the travails and the challenges we face, our basic goodness as a people and our reliance on principle and the notion of limited government will prevail. We shall not see his like again, though he will be emulated, though he always will be remembered.

Mr. Speaker, the special nature of the leadership of Ronald Reagan, his optimism, his eloquence, his leadership ability, his foresight give us all reason to pause on this, his 90th birthday, not only to remember the past, but to pledge ourselves to work in the present, to provide for a glorious future. For as he said, America’s greatest days are still to come.

Mr. SCHAEFFER, Mr. Speaker, I would like to close with three quotes from President Reagan. In his first inaugural address on January 20, 1981, he said, “No arsenal or no weapon in the arsenals of the world is so formidable as the will and moral courage of free men and women."

Later that year, in September of 1981, he said, “We who live in free market societies believe that growth, prosperity, and ultimately human fulfillment are created from the bottom up, not the government down. Trust the people.”

And, finally, in a speech to the Republican National Committee, August 23, 1984, President Reagan said this: “In this springtime of hope, some lights seem eternal; America’s is.”

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for recognizing me for this special order and for all of my colleagues who joined in this special order tonight in wishing President Reagan a happy 90th birthday. The country is grateful for the President’s service and for his optimism and passion for the country.
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. SHOES) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SHOES, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. BERRY, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. KINGSTON, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. MNSK of Hawai `i, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. DEFazio, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. BERRY, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. SENSENBRENNER, for 5 minutes, today.

(At the request of Mr. ROGERS of Michigan) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. BIGGERT, for 5 minutes, February 7.
Mr. ALTNECHT, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. LEWIS of California, for 5 minutes, today.
Mr. SENSENBRENNER, for 5 minutes, today.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. Trandahl, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a joint resolution of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

Joint Resolution recognizing the 90th birthday of Ronald Reagan.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SCHaffer. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 7, 2000, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

527. A letter from the Administrator, Food Safety and Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Retained Water in Raw Meat and Poultry Products; Poultry Chilling Requirements [Docket No. 97-054F1] (RIN: 0572-AC01 received, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

528. A letter from the Administrator, Rural Utilities Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Post-loan Policies and Procedures Common to Guaranteed and Insured Loans (RIN: 0572-AC33 received, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

529. A letter from the Administrator, Rural Utilities Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Policy on Audits of RUS Borrowers; Management Letter (received January 17, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.


531. A letter from the Under Secretary of Defense, Department of Defense, transmitting a report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act by the Department of the Air Force which occurred at the 438th Air Mobility Wing (now the 302nd Air Mobility Wing), located at the McGuire Air Force Base, New Jersey, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1353; to the Committee on Appropriations.

532. A letter from the Chief, Programs and Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, Department of Defense, transmitting notification that Headquarters Air Mobility Command has conducted a Business Analysis to reduce the cost of the Andrews Air Force Base (ABF), Maryland, 89th Airlift Wing Air Craft Maintenance and Base Supply function, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2461; to the Committee on Armed Services.

533. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Secretary's determination and findings and that it is in the public interest to use other than competitive procedures for a particular procurement, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2304(c)(7); to the Committee on Armed Services.

534. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the approved retirement and advancement to the grade of general on the retired list of General Patrick K. Gamble, United States Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.


536. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule—Determining Adjusted Income in HUD Programs for Persons With Disabilities; Requiring Mandatory Deductions For Certain Expenses; and Disallowance for Earned Income; Delay of Effective Date [Docket No. 2000-AC06 received February 2, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

537. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for Legislation and Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule—Application of the Federal Housing Administration's Program for Rehabilitation of Condominiums; Post-loan Policies and Procedures Common to Guaranteed and Insured Loans; Mortgage Insurance Program; Post-loan Policies and Procedures Common to Guaranteed and Insured Loans; Mortgage Insurance Program; Post-loan Policies and Procedures Common to Guarantees and Insured Loans, as revised, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

538. A letter from the General Counsel, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations (Docket No. F.E.M.A.-P-7600) received January 17, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Financial Services.

539. A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury and Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting a report on the feasibility and desirability of mandatory subordinated debt, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 201; to the Committee on Financial Services.

540. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting the pay-as-you-go report, as required by the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended; to the Committee on Budget.

541. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a report on the Cost Estimates For Pay-As-You-Go Calculations; to the Committee on Budget.

542. A letter from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule—State Vocational Rehabilitation Services Program; Delay of Effective Date—received January 31, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

543. A letter from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule—State Vocational Rehabilitation Services Program; Delay of Effective Date—received January 31, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

544. A letter from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Office of Postsecondary Education and Institutions, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule—Federal Family Education Loan Program; Delay of Effective Date—received January 31, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

545. A letter from the Acting Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Office of Employment and Training Standards, Department of Labor, transmitting a report entitled, “Minimum Wage and Overtime Hours Report”, to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

549. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the annual financial report to Congress required by the Prescription Drug User Fee Act (PDUFA), as amended (section 100b); pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 337g, to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

550. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report entitled, "Demonstration Projects to Study the Effect of Allowing States to Extend Medicaid to Pregnant Women: Not Otherwise Qualified to Receive Medicaid Benefits," pursuant to Public Law 101–299, section 6407(g)(2) (103 Stat. 2267); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

551. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting a report on the Anticybersquating Consumer Protection Act of 2000 concerning the abusive registration of domain names; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

552. A letter from the Chief Counsel, National Intelligence, Office of the Director of National Intelligence, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule—Technology Opportunities Program [Docket No. 99–1411 (CC 0–099)]; received January 9, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.


554. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report entitled "Performance Improvement 2000: Evaluation Activities of the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

555. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a study concerning any safeguards needed to better protect the health care of individuals with special health care needs and chronic conditions, enrolled with Medicaid managed care organizations are adequately met; pursuant to section 4701(c)(2) of the Balanced Budget Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

556. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule—Asacoline Transmission of Prescriptions Through the Drug Enforcement Administration Prescription Programs [DEA–190F] (RIN: 1117–AA54) received January 17, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

557. A letter from the Director, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a report entitled "Subpopulations and Drinking Water Contaminants"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

558. A letter from the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's report entitled, "Response to Section 602(e) of the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century"; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.


562. A letter from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.622(b), Table of Allotments, Digital Television Broadcast Stations (CC Docket No. 99–218) received January 25, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

563. A letter from the Acting Chief, Network Services Division, Common Carrier Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Approval of Docket 00–018; Approved Docket No. 00–018; (RIN: 0510–ZA06) received February 2, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

564. A letter from the Chairman, Nuclear Waste Technical Review Board, transmitting a report on the Board's technical and scientific review of the Department of Energy's program to characterize a site at Yucca Mountain, Nevada, for its suitability as the possible location for the Committee on Energy and Commerce.


566. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule—Asacoline Transmission of Prescriptions Through the Drug Enforcement Administration Prescription Programs [DEA–190F] (RIN: 1117–AA54) received January 17, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

567. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting a report containing an analysis and justification for the Foreign Military Sales agreement declared by Executive Order 12904 of August 19, 1994, to deal with the threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States caused by the lapse of the Export Administration Act of 1979, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 4401c; (H. Doc. No. 107–38); to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed.

568. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification that the Republic of Turkmenistan and the Republic of Tajikistan are committed to the courses of action described in Section 502 of the FREE- DOM Support Act (Public Law 102–511); to the Committee on Senate Oversight.

569. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the report from the White House Conference on Culture and Diplomacy; to the Committee on International Relations.

570. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification that the Republic of Turkmenistan and the Republic of Tajikistan are committed to the courses of action described in Section 502 of the FREE-DOM Support Act (Public Law 102–511); to the Committee on Senate Oversight.

571. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendments to the International Traffic in Arms Regulations: Canadian Exemption—received January 30, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.


598. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 13-545, “Street Festival One Day Public Space Rental Amendment Act of 2000" received February 2, 2001, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1—233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.


600. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. ACT 13-513, “Convention Center Authority Shaw Community Development Fund Amendment Act of 2000" received February 2, 2001, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1—233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.


2000” received February 2, 2001, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1—233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.


624. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of the Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting a list of all reports issued by EPA during December 2000, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 711(h); to the Committee on Government Reform.


637. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting a report pursuant to the Federal Managers’ Financial Integrity Act, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3522(c)(3); to the Committee on Government Reform.

646. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office’s final rule—Prevailing Rate Systems; Redefinition of the Los Angeles, CA, Appro- priation of Funds and Wage Area (RIN: 1200-AO35) received December 19, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

647. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office’s final rule—Prevailing Rate Systems; Amended Request of the St. Louis, MO, Special Wage Schedule for Printing Positions (RIN: 3006-A4) received December 19, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

649. A letter from the Director, Office of Personnel Management, transmitting the Office’s final rule—Prevailing Rate Systems; Amended Request of the Philadelphia, PA, Special Wage Schedule for Printing Positions (RIN: 3006-A2) received December 19, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.


668. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department’s final rule—Prohibition on Abolishment of the Philadelphia, PA, Special Wage Schedule for Printing Positions (RIN: 3006-A4) received December 19, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.
PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

[Omitted from the Record of January 30, 2001]

By Mr. BILIRAKIS (for himself, Mr. CONDIT, Mr. SHOWS, and Mr. KOLBE):
H.R. 303. A bill to amend title 10, United States code, to permit retired members of the Armed Forces who have a service-connected disability to receive both military retired pay by reason of their years of military service and disability compensation from the Department of Veterans Affairs for their disability; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, 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. TANCREDO (for himself, Mr. CANTOR, and Mr. BAKER):
H.R. 316. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a refundable credit for education expenses of children receiving or eligible to receive free or reduced price school meals; to the Committee on Ways and Means.
The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable Lincoln D. Chafee, a Senator from the State of Rhode Island.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Lloyd John Ogilvie, offered the following prayer:

Gracious Father, we join Americans across the Nation in celebrating the 90th birthday of President Ronald Reagan. On this day, Democrats and Republicans unite in thanking You for Ronald Reagan’s life and leadership, his patriotism and character, and his wisdom and vision. Our prayers for our former President and friend lift us above politics as we pray that You will tenderly care for him in these days of illness and recovery from surgery. In Your wondrous grace, penetrate to the depths of his soul with Your comfort and assurance of our admiration. Through Your Spirit, may he somehow feel the love that overflows from the hearts of people here in the Senate and throughout the land

Dear Lord, bless Nancy Reagan as she continues to care for the President with indefatigable devotion and courageous love. Be with the family as they celebrate this day with the joy of wonderful memories and deep affection. We renew our commitment to pray for and support the research seeking a cure for Alzheimer’s disease. Now we invite You to fill this Chamber with Your presence and each Senator with Your power for the work of this day. You are our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable Lincoln D. Chafee led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. Thurmond).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby appoint the Honorable Lincoln D. Chafee, a Senator from the State of Rhode Island, to perform the duties of the Chair.

Strom Thurmond,
President pro tempore.

Mr. L. CHAFEE thereupon assumed the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The acting majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, today the Senate will be in a period for morning business until 12:30 p.m., with Senators Durbin, Daschle, and Hutchison in control of the time. By previous consent, at 12:30 p.m. the Senate will recess for the weekly party conference meetings. Upon reconvening at 2:15 p.m., the Senate will begin consideration of the nomination of Robert Zoellick to be U.S. Trade Representative. There will be up to 2 hours debate on the nomination, with a vote scheduled to occur at 4:15 p.m.

I thank my colleagues for their attention.

MEASURE PLACED ON CALENDAR—S. 235

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I understand there is a bill at the desk due for its second reading.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 235) to provide enhanced safety, public awareness, and environmental protection in pipeline transportation, and for other purposes.

Mr. NICKLES. Mr. President, I object to further proceedings on this bill at this time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. REID. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WELLS TONE. Mr. President, would I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WELLS TONE. Mr. President, could I ask, what are the terms of morning business?

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, there will now be a period for the transaction of morning business not to exceed beyond the hour of 12:30 p.m.

Under the previous order, the time until 10:30 a.m. shall be under the control of the Democratic leader or his designee.

Mr. WELLS TONE. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

This “bullet” symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.
EDUCATING CHILDREN

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I had a chance to speak before the National School Board Association yesterday. Sometimes it is only when you speak that you realize how strong your conviction is on an issue. I have come to the floor of the Senate to make an appeal to all Senators, starting with Democrats.

The President, in his inaugural speech, talked about leaving no child behind. And the President, in his education proposal called for accountability—I would like to hold the administration accountable on the floor of the Senate, and with amendments and with debate, in what I think is going to be a historic debate.

The non-social Security surplus—putting the Social Security trust fund aside—is $3.1 trillion. President Bush calls for $1.6 trillion in tax cuts. The argument is: There is $1.5 trillion left. What is the problem?

The problem is, first of all, when you look at the $1.6 trillion and when you look at the $3.1 trillion surplus, it is not really that, because we all know the Medicare trust fund money will be kept separate, and now all of a sudden $3.1 trillion in surplus becomes $2.6 trillion. When you add to that the tax extenders—the tax credits that we all know will be extended—and the payments that will go to farmers and other groups of citizens in our country, we add up to $2 trillion. And when you understand that there will be Social Security trust fund solvency issues, which, if we do not deal with those issues, will mean that either benefits are cut or the age eligibility goes up, it may be less than $2 trillion. That is $2 trillion.

On the other side of the equation, the $1.6 trillion in tax cuts—once you now understand that we will no longer pay down part of the debt, and interest payments go up—becomes $2 trillion. And when you add up to $2 trillion, you have the administration $2 trillion in surplus; and there will be no resources for our investment to leave no child behind. There will be no resources.

So the only thing you have is a proposal, A, with vouchers, which I think is a nonstarter and I think ultimately will be discarded. Then what you have is telling States and school districts: You do not do it every year, starting at age three, you do it when you are moving into kindergarten, so you move our third grade—all the way up to eighth grade. But we are setting the schools and the children and our teachers up for failure because we are not providing any of the resources to make sure that all of those children will not be left behind and will have an opportunity to achieve.

Fanny Lou Hamer is a great civil rights leader from the State of Mississippi. She once uttered the immortal words: I’m sick and tired of being sick and tired.

I am sick and tired of symbolic politics with children’s lives. Where in this budget, where in the arithmetic of the tax cuts and the surplus, will there be the investment to make sure that no child is left behind?

Two percent of all the children who could benefit from Early Head Start, 2 years of age and under, benefit today. That is all we have funded.

Within only 50 percent of Head Start, only 10 percent for good child care for low-income families, much less middle-income families, when are we going to fully fund the IDEA program, which made a commitment to all children?

Where is going to be the investment called the Children’s Defense Fund? I would like to hold the administration accountable on the floor of the Senate, and with amendments and with debate, in what I think is going to be a historic debate.

The non-social Security surplus—putting the Social Security trust fund aside—is $3.1 trillion. President Bush calls for $1.6 trillion in tax cuts. The argument is: There is $1.5 trillion left. What is the problem?

The problem is, first of all, when you look at the $1.6 trillion and when you look at the $3.1 trillion surplus, it is not really that, because we all know the Medicare trust fund money will be kept separate, and now all of a sudden $3.1 trillion in surplus becomes $2.6 trillion. When you add to that the tax extenders—the tax credits that we all know will be extended—and the payments that will go to farmers and other groups of citizens in our country, we add up to $2 trillion. And when you understand that there will be Social Security trust fund solvency issues, which, if we do not deal with those issues, will mean that either benefits are cut or the age eligibility goes up, it may be less than $2 trillion. That is $2 trillion.

On the other side of the equation, the $1.6 trillion in tax cuts—once you now understand that we will no longer pay down part of the debt, and interest payments go up—becomes $2 trillion. And when you add up to $2 trillion, you have the administration $2 trillion in surplus; and there will be no resources for our investment to leave no child behind. There will be no resources.

So the only thing you have is a proposal, A, with vouchers, which I think is a nonstarter and I think ultimately will be discarded. Then what you have is telling States and school districts: You do not do it every year, starting at age three, third grade—all the way up to eighth grade. But we are setting the schools and the children and our teachers up for failure because we are not
used. We agree that Social Security should be set aside, put in a lockbox. If you listened to the campaign debate last year, you would have thought Vice President Gore came up with that idea. He needs to check with Senator DOMENICI and others who actually came up with the idea of having a lockbox on Social Security.

We should continue to pay down the debt in an orderly way, as was suggested by Alan Greenspan, Chairman of the Federal Advisory Board for a period of years, and we can eliminate it earlier than was indicated. We ought to have additional investment in areas where we really need it—in education, in health care, even in defense.

To the President's credit, he is saying in the defense area, let's take a look and see what our needs may be in defense; let's look and see if there might be someplace where we can save some money in defense while we clearly are going to have to do more in terms of having readiness and modernization and quality of life for our men and women in the military. We need to assess what we are going to need in the future. He is going about it in an orderly fashion. That is a good idea.

There is no question that working Americans need some tax relief. You talk about breaks for the wealthy. What about the single educated young woman who makes $30,000 a year in the 28 percent bracket? That is not rich. We have these brackets now that force people into higher and higher brackets at very low income levels. That is fundamentally unfair. We are talking about tax relief for all Americans across the board. It is very fair to do it that way.

I thought we had fundamental agreement last year that we need to do something about reducing the marriage penalty. The Senate then agreed to increase the base in the 28 percent bracket. Mr. President, I would not have voted for the base increase.

There is another benefit here. We are not just about the fairness in the Tax Code; we are talking about the need for some economic growth incentives. Look at what President Kennedy did, what President Reagan did, and how much their tax relief was as a percentage of GDP. As a matter of fact, President Reagan's proposal is the only one below what the Kennedy-Johnson package provided for way back in the 1960s. In each case, we had economic growth; we had an increase of revenue coming into the Federal Government.

The problem was, in the 1980s, we had an insatiable spending appetite by the Democratic-controlled Congress that kept pushing up spending. Unfortunately, we could not convince President Reagan to veto more of those bills. I hope President George W. Bush will press aggressively for his proposal on tax relief. I know he is doing it. He is going today to have an event with a young woman in Buffalo, to show how this tax cut will help her.

As a matter of fact, we checked on a lady who was here a couple years ago, expressing concern about Government mandates and regulations and taxes, named Harriet Cane. She is the owner of a small restaurant in Marietta, GA. She had eight employees. She was struggling to make ends meet. She was doing more and more herself. She did the mopping, the preparation.

Well, we checked with her to see how she is doing. Guess what. She is out of business. She said: What drove me out of business was a lot of things, but Government mandates and regulations and taxes contributed mightily to it. When she heard what President Bush is talking about, she said: That certainly would have helped me. For the young entrepreneur, this tax relief will be very positive.

There is a fundamental difference. There are people here who think that any money from people to bring to Washington, we have the brilliance on how it should be spent. I have a fundamental faith in the people to decide what they should do with their own money that they worked so hard to earn. Now they are paying 28 percent, 15 percent, 33 percent, 35 percent. When you add it all up, 36.5 percent, you still have people in this country paying 40, 50 percent of everything they earn for taxes, to bring it to Washington so the brilliant Members of Congress and the bureaucrats can decide how they think it should be spent.

I don't agree with that. I think the family can decide how to best spend money for their children's needs, whether it be a microwave, a refrigerator, a different car, or a tutor for education. The same thing is true in education.

States such as Minnesota put a lot of money into education. Other States don't put as much into education. Quality education is not consistent across this country, between States and within States, including my own State.

My State has put a high priority on education. We are beginning to make progress. We are going to be paying teachers more. Our universities have been competing more aggressively for research money in physics, acoustics, and polymerscience.

I still believe education should be run at the local level and decisions should be made there. I think we should have a program that leaves no child behind; we should improve reading, but we should also improve math and science skills.

The Federal Government can help with that. By the way, not everybody even agrees with that. My predecessor—a Democrat, I might add—in the House and in the Senate thought there was a great concern about the Federal dollar and Federal control following the Federal dollar. I don't agree. I think we have a role to play in early childhood education and elementary and secondary areas in higher education. We have been doing a better job in higher education than in elementary and secondary.

I think money should be given to the States and the localities, local education administrators and parents, with flexibility so they can decide how to spend it. People in Washington don't like it. They want to tell you to spend it here, there, or somewhere else. Pascagoula, MS, might have different needs from Pittsburgh, PA. We may need more teachers, or maybe we need more remedial reading programs, or maybe we need to fix a leaky roof. But the Federal Government doesn't know what the priority is.

We are going to have a good debate. I look forward to it. When I check with my constituents, the people working, paying taxes, pulling the load, people out there in the forests who are being told, "By the way, you can't do any more and you can't have roads to get to those trees," and people working in the shipyards or oil refineries, they are wondering what will happen. They don't have to have a national energy crisis. The problem is we haven't been producing more energy because we want to shut down our resources—coal, oil.

Let's debate education and energy policy and we will get a result. I believe the American people will be better off when we get those done.

If we don't have a budget plan of how to use this tax surplus, it will be spent by the Washington Government. That is a mistake. I think the working people deserve help. Should we be concerned about low-income needs? Yes. We should address that in a variety of ways, and we are going to do that.

I think it is time to earn Newt's credit with the debate. I commend the President for what he proposed. He will bring it up to the Congress Thursday. We will have a chance to study it. I am pleased that he said let's make the income tax cuts retroactive to the first of the year. I think that will be even more positive for the economy.

THE NOMINATION OF ROBERT ZOELLLICK

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, there is one other subject on which I want to touch. Later today we will consider the nomination of Robert Zoellick to be United States Trade Representative. That vote will occur at 4:15 p.m. I am satisfied that he will be confirmed, and he should be confirmed. He has a tremendous record in terms of education and experience and previous administrations in the private sector. I believe he will be a strong USTR.

I want to add that I am very much concerned about what I see happening
in the trade area. I want the U.S. Trade Representative to be strong. I am concerned about dictates I have seen in the past by both Democrat and Republican administrations, where the State Department or the Commerce Department go to the White House and stop the Trade Representative from enforcing the trade laws. Free trade, yes, but also fair trade and enforce the laws on the books.

Canada is not dealing with us fairly when it lifts wood lumber and wheat. Our closest neighbor, perhaps our best friend in the world, and we cannot get them to live up to the trade agreement we have with them. While we see increased trade in Mexico and Central America, that is good. We have certain problems with Mexico, too. In Europe, for heavens' sake, the first two decisions that the WTO made the Europeans basically have thumbed their noses at. I suggested to Mr. Zoellick, to quote a former great Senator from Georgia, Richard Russell, "I believe we ought to have an American desk at the U.S. Trade Representative's office."

Somebody needs to speak for America and quit quaking in our boots about the diplomatic impact it would have with Canada if we say enforce the law. Enforce the law.

I made that statement to Mr. Zoellick privately and in the Finance Committee hearings, and I am going to do so when he is confirmed. I thought Chairman Bartleman of the previous administration was a good U.S. Trade Representative up until the last year. Then I think she was overruled by the election year and the State Department and all kinds of other people. I think she was tougher than most Trade Representatives. Overall, she did a good job, particularly in the high-tech area.

In agriculture, she was not quite so good. But I am worried. I have supported all of these trade agreements we voted on over the years—GATT, NAFTA, Africa and CBI trade, and China PNTR. But I am getting really fed up with the way we are treated by our trading partners. I am even more fed up with the way our administrations don't insist on the laws being enforced. So I have urged Mr. Zoellick to do that. I believe he will. I hope he will. If he does not, I can assure him and this administration and our trading partners that a strong letter to follow will be taken to be commensurate with how I feel about this issue.

We have to have some change in how we deal with our trading partners. Now is the time, at the beginning of a new administration, without being overly critical, it has been both Republican and Democrat administrations. It is time we look after American interests in the trade area as well as in the diplomatic, economic, and military areas. I know others will say things such as this, and in the Finance Committee some of my friends on the Democratic side were surprised to hear me say this and liked it. I don't mean to sound as if I am some sort of a traditional protectionist, but fair is fair. I don't think our trading partners are dealing with us fairly right now.

I support this nomination, and I will urge a vote for his confirmation. I yield the floor.

**TAX CUTS**

Mr. WELSTONE. Mr. President, I will say to the majority leader that I think his last set of remarks may be the basis of bipartisanship between the two of us. We will keep this civil.

I will also say to the majority leader and others that I can't wait for the debate because he focuses on the $30,000-a-year family. But anybody who looks at the distribution of benefits of President Bush's tax cut plan will see—I don't know—40 percent of the benefit going to the top 1 percent of the top 5 percent, which is ridiculous. It is like Robin Hood in reverse. Yes, we will make sure there is a set of tax credits to go to middle-income and working-income families. Absolutely.

I will point out one more time—and I didn't have to say this to the majority leader respond to this at all—I want to hold President Bush accountable for these numbers—a $3.1 trillion non-Social Security surplus becomes 2.6 when you put Medicare trust money aside, which we will do. It becomes $2 trillion when we extend tax credits, and we also provide payments to farmers and other people, which we will do without doubt. The tax cuts go from $1.6 trillion to $2 trillion, when you now have to pay the interest on the debt, when you are not paying the debt down, in which case I want to know where are the resources to leave no child behind.

I say to the majority leader that I am more than willing to debate after he provides tax cuts for middle-income families, whether or not we, in fact, provide some benefits so elderly people can afford prescription drugs versus tax cuts for the wealthy, whether we can expand health care coverage versus tax cuts, or whether or not we will live up to the words of leaving no child behind and make investment in child care and in Head Start and in our schools and fund the IDEA program versus tax cuts for the wealthy.

I think the message President Bush is trying to send to the majority leader echoes to the people in the country—I all of a sudden find myself being a fiscal conservative—is that we can do it all. There is no free lunch. We can't do it all. We can't have tax cuts disproportionately to the wealthy, erode the revenue base, and at the same time say we are going to leave no child behind; we are going to make an investment in education; we are going to make an investment in covering prescription drugs for the elderly. We cannot do it. The people in this country are smart enough to figure that out, and I hope Democrats will engage this administration. The sooner the better. I don't think we need to wait one more day to have this debate.

Senators and President Bush: You cannot proclaim the vision and the value of leaving no child behind and keep this on a tin cup budget. If we are real about this, we will make the investment in the skills, and the character of our children.

This budget is not real. It does not make that commitment to leaving no child behind.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

**AIRLINE INDUSTRY COMPETITION**

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, a key principle of economic competition today is that one big merger begets another. Known as copycat mergers, these deals are made when the companies that did not merge first felt forced to copy the initial merger. If those left behind do not merge, then they just can't keep up with the Joneses.

This morning, I am going to focus for a few minutes on competition in the airline industry. I want to begin by saying that when I look at airline mergers, this country has reached the point where there are virtually no more cats.

This weekend, Americans opened their newspapers to learn that Delta Airlines, the world's third largest carrier, and Continental, the world's fifth largest, began merger discussions. The Associated Press says that Delta and Continental don't even really want to merge. But you guessed it—they say other major airline mergers might drive them to it.

The trend toward concentration in the airline industry did not begin in the last few weeks. More than 20 consecutive airline mergers were approved in the 1980s.

In my opinion, if nothing is done in the face of these proposed airline mergers, our country is headed down a runaway of no return. If this lineup of mergers takes off, it will destroy the last remnants of competition in the airline industry.

The trend toward concentration in the airline industry did not begin in the last few weeks. More than 20 consecutive airline mergers were approved in the 1980s.

I believe much of the problem we are seeing today stems from that huge array of airline mergers that took place in the 1980s. In fact, I think the merger between TWA and Ozark sets in motion the trend that began in the 1980s.

This weekend, Americans opened their newspapers to learn that Delta Airlines, the world's third largest carrier, and Continental, the world's fifth largest, began merger discussions. The Associated Press says that Delta and Continental don't even really want to merge. But you guessed it—they say other major airline mergers might drive them to it.

The latest round of airline merger reports comes on the heels of the proposed United-U.S. Airways merger and America's proposed deals with TWA and United.

In my opinion, if nothing is done in the face of these proposed airline mergers, our country is headed down a runaway of no return. If this lineup of mergers takes off, it will destroy the last remnants of competition in the airline industry.

The trend toward concentration in the airline industry did not begin in the last few weeks. More than 20 consecutive airline mergers were approved in the 1980s.

I believe much of the problem we are seeing today stems from that huge array of airline mergers that took place in the 1980s. In fact, I think the merger between TWA and Ozark sets in motion the trend that began in the 1980s.

This weekend, Americans opened their newspapers to learn that Delta Airlines, the world's third largest carrier, and Continental, the world's fifth largest, began merger discussions. The Associated Press says that Delta and Continental don't even really want to merge. But you guessed it—they say other major airline mergers might drive them to it.

The latest round of airline merger reports comes on the heels of the proposed United-U.S. Airways merger and America's proposed deals with TWA and United.

In my opinion, if nothing is done in the face of these proposed airline mergers, our country is headed down a runaway of no return. If this lineup of mergers takes off, it will destroy the last remnants of competition in the airline industry.

The trend toward concentration in the airline industry did not begin in the last few weeks. More than 20 consecutive airline mergers were approved in the 1980s.

I believe much of the problem we are seeing today stems from that huge array of airline mergers that took place in the 1980s. In fact, I think the merger between TWA and Ozark sets in motion the trend that began in the 1980s.
roughshod over the American consumer—the flying public.

The Justice Department, which has been run by officials from both political parties since concentration in the airline industry accelerated, has not fully utilized the antitrust tools at its disposal. As a result, I want to make a proposal this morning: Before the Justice Department clears one more major airline merger, the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) should have to make a public report demonstrating that the economy. The FTC should dig in, hold public hearings to examine these deals, and get to the bottom of the long-term consequences of these airline mergers. It is time to make sure that these mergers don’t strand any more airline passengers with too few choices and too many headaches.

The real question is: Is competition in the airline industry working today? In many ways, it is. But certainly not enough competitive forces in the airline industry force companies to compete now to improve service.

Actually, some of our constituents report to us that they are left out on the runway for hours with a glass of water. Is it any wonder consumer complaints are at record high levels and some fliers call the departure board at our airports the “delay board”? I think not. I think those problems stem from the lack of competition we are seeing in the airline sector today. This Congress should not stand idly by while a chain reaction of mega-mergers squeezes out whatever competitive juices remain in the airline industry. As I make my proposal for airline mergers this morning, I want to make clear that I am not one who believes that all the mergers taking place in America are bad. Many of the mergers our country is watching have not only not been harmful, they have been beneficial. They have increased the efficiency of companies that ultimately benefit consumers with better service and lower prices.

When it comes to the big airlines, it doesn’t look like that’s the case. These airline mergers seem to permanently reduce competition. So I believe it’s time for Congress and the executive branch to take a time out on airline mergers and assess the long-term implications of where the airline industry is headed. The shape of the airline industry created today is one America will have to live with for a long time, and we ought to know what we are getting into. Competition in the airline industry is too important to too many people, who fly to conduct their business and their personal affairs.

Slowing up this airline merger frenzy to look at the long-term consequences, as I propose this morning, is a modest step that the U.S. Congress ought to take now.

I yield the floor.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator from Nevada is recognized.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I understand we are in morning business and I have a matter assigned to me; is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. Under the order, the time until 11 a.m. shall be under the control of the Senator from North Dakota.

TAX CUTS

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, last Friday morning we had an issues conference with the Democratic caucus at the Library of Congress, just across the street from this building. Those of us in the Democratic caucus in the Senate—and there are 50 of us in a 100-person Senate—on that day talking about the issues we want to raise during this Congress.

We invited President Bush to come by this issues conference, which I believe was unprecedented. As chairman of the Democratic Policy Committee, I recommended we invite the new President. He came and made a very short presentation to us—very general and very cordial. We asked a series of questions, and then he departed. We were very pleased he did come by to our issues conference.

One of the things he said in discussing issues with the Democratic caucus was that when he campaigned for the Presidency, he campaigned on certain issues, and he said: I intend to pursue those issues as President, and there will be time when we disagree, but we should be able to do that without being personal and without being disagreeable. He understands that there are times we will disagree as a matter of public policy, and that is the way democracy works.

There is an old saying that when everyone in the room is thinking the same thing, no one is really thinking very much. That is certainly true in public policy. The ability in this kind of a setting to have a good aggressive debate on public policy issues, especially controversial issues, benefits the American people. Then we get the best out of what everyone has to offer. So let’s begin this debate.

The President has proposed that we have a $1.6 trillion tax cut in this country over the next 10 years. That was not a surprise to us, because he campaigned on that throughout this country. That election ended in a dead-even tie, but the members of the electoral college cast their votes, and he is now President. There is not necessarily a mandate for this tax cut, at least one for $1.6 trillion.

I make the point that this President campaigned on it and yesterday he announced it, and we will in this Congress now begin to discuss and debate Social Security and Medicare in the future. There is a range of needs and a range of priorities, and that is what I want to talk about today.

Twenty years ago, we had a new President come to this office, President Ronald Reagan. He proposed in 1981 a very large tax cut. In fact, one of the contestants for the Presidency was Republican Senator Howard Baker who called the economic plan that President proposed in 1981 a “riverboat gamble.”

President Reagan said we should cut taxes substantially and double the defense budget, and the concurrence of those two policies—cutting taxes and doubling the defense budget—would result in a balanced budget. In fact, the plan backfired. It did not result in a balanced budget. It resulted in long-term, abiding, deep Federal budget deficits that kept growing and grew to $3 trillion to the Federal debt in a very short period of time because the plan did not add up—with annual budget deficits of hundreds of billions of dollars.

I make that point only because it has taken years of struggle to try to deal with those annual budget deficits that kept growing like a cancer in our budget. But we did deal with it. Through a
series of public policies and private initiatives, those budget deficits are gone and replaced now by surpluses.

How did they disappear? One, we changed the direction of fiscal policy early in the last decade. We cut some spending and increased some taxes. Some did not like it. It was very controversial. Some of my colleagues said, if we do this, it will throw the country into a recession and throw people out of work. Of course, it did not. It gave the American people confidence that we were going to be on the right track and that finally Washington was serious about getting rid of Federal budget deficits. The result: We had unprecedented economic growth. We then had, as we all know, a Federal budget deficit to the point where deficits turned into surpluses.

So finally, after 20 years, the accumulated deficits are gone. But we still have a substantial amount of Federal debt that resulted from those annual deficits.

President Bush says, let us decide to cut the Federal tax load by $1.6 trillion over the coming 10 years. What is wrong with that? Aren’t tax cuts always good? Don’t the American people always want tax cuts—the bigger the better?

Let me read something written by Allan Sloan, who is a thinker and a journalist that I really respect. This was his column. He described what is wrong with it, from my perspective. I am quoting Allan Sloan:

"There are weeks when you have to wonder whether the American economic attention span is longer than a sand flea. Consider last week’s two big economic stories: The Congressional Budget Office increased the projected 10-year budget surplus by $1 trillion, and the Federal Reserve Board cut short-term interest rates another half-percentage point to try to keep the economy from tanking. The real story isn’t either of these events; it is their connection. The Fed is cutting rates like a doctor trying to revive a cardiac patient because as recently as last fall, Alan Greenspan and his colleagues did not foresee what today’s economy would be like. Meanwhile, although it is now clear that even the smart, savvy, data-inhaling Greenspan couldn’t see 4 months ahead, people are treating the 10-year numbers from the Congressional Budget Office as holy writ."

Let me hasten to add, this is not a judgment. It is history, when we look at the difference in optimism versus pessimism in views of things, if you want to always look for a pony in a manure pile—you always think there is good news just around the corner—you can ride on this top line. But what if it is wrong? What if it is this bottom line? Does anybody think that may be the case? What does it mean for kids going to school in disrepair? What does it mean for kids going to school in classrooms where there are 32, 34 kids in a classroom? What does it mean for a woman who has diabetes or heart trouble and can’t pay for her medicine because Medicare does not cover it? If you make the wrong choice—and we have a huge tax cut that lasts 10 years, when the economy is soft, and we jump into debt. It means there is no money for education, no money for prescription drugs in Medicare, and no money for health care.

The President proposes that we can see 10 years out, and with the surplus that we expect for 10 years out we can propose massive tax cuts. Eighty-five percent of this is the $2.2 trillion that people say really is the cost of what the President says his tax cut is—and it is very little. These are budget deficits, which, in my judgment, ought to be a priority. It seems to me, one of the things that ought to rank high here is reducing the Federal debt during better times, if you run it up during tough times, reduce it during good times.

Prescription drugs in Medicare, we ought to do something in that. We know of the challenges in education. They say that defense is going to need more money. Think of all this money we are talking about but has talked about substantially more money for defense. You also have agriculture, Medicare reform, Social Security reform. And how about a rainy day fund. Should there be something set aside in case something goes wrong with our economy? Yes, I believe so.

Those are some of the considerations. And President Bush’s plan is a tax cut that has a relatively small cut in the 10 years, but it is backloaded with huge tax cuts in the 10th year. What that does is, it puts us right back in the same circumstances that we found ourselves in in the 1980s, in my judgment.

Some say, this public debt is all coming down. Let me take a look at this chart. We have a long way to go to reduce public indebtedness, and it ought to be a priority. What better gift to America’s children, to remove that weight of indebtedness around their shoulders. It ought to be a priority. It is, in my judgment, a conservative ethic to decide one of the priorities is to reduce debt.

Let me make the point that we are going to discuss this at a time following the longest economic expansion in this country’s history, when we see a weakening of the economy.

Let me hasten to add, this is not a surprise. Seven months ago, Alan Greenspan decided the American economy was too strong. He and his brethren at the Federal Reserve Board..."
locked their door because they are the last place in town that locks their door to keep the public out. It is the last American dinosaur in our Government. They locked their door. They make secret decisions. And 7 months ago they locked their door. They make secret decisions.

Seven to eight months later, where are we? Local job cuts at Lucent Technologies, Sara Lee, and General Electric—potentially 80,000. This morning EToys is broke. This economy is softening far beyond the imagination or expectation of the Federal Reserve Board. But no one should be surprised by that. The Fed insisted that the economy was growing too rapidly, and they wanted to slow it down. We are going to increase interest rates.

Finally, let me talk for a moment about the alternatives. If we decide to lock in a 10-year tax cut, a very sizable proportion, there will not be any money left to pay down the Federal debt, which, as I said, I think ought to be a priority, and, second, to make needed investments which we know are necessary.

Second, as we talk about taxes, there is one other thing we ought to do. I have been working on this for a couple years. I have introduced it with a couple of my colleagues. It is called the FASST plan—the Fair and Simple Shortcut tax plan. Over 70 million Americans can avoid having to file income tax returns in the future if we adopt this plan, without ever having to file a tax return. Your withholding at work is your actual tax liability. Check a few additional boxes on your W-4, one of which says I am a homeowner, yes or no, and your actual withholding becomes your actual tax liability. No little printed line on April 15 at the post office. No more audits. Over thirty countries have return-free tax filing systems for most of their taxpayers. We could, and we should.

Seventy million Americans can avoid having to fill income tax returns in the future if we pass the Fair and Simple Shortcut tax plan I propose. That also can be done in a way that reduces taxes, because in order to do that, you would have to eliminate tax laws. We have the first increment of interest, dividend and other investment income that families have.

I won't go into all of the details of my plan, but it makes sense, if we are talking about substantial changes in the tax code, to consider simplifying the tax code at the same time. Those are a couple of things I think we should do. We ought to recognize that payroll taxes count as well. That is part of the tax burden. We ought to do something that recognizes that.

I have talked before about a couple of people. I will do it again. We know it is not fair to have a tax cut plan that provides a prescription drug benefit in Medicare.

I was in Michigan, ND, one evening. A woman came up to me after a town meeting, and she grabbed hold of my arm. She was perhaps in her late seventies, early eighties. She began to speak to me about the prescription drug medicine she had to purchase. Then her chin began to quiver, her eyes filled with tears, and she said: I can't afford to buy these prescription drugs. I don't have the money. I know I need them. The woman says, but I don't have the money. Her eyes were filled with tears, and she turned away from me. That goes on all across this country, people who need prescription drugs, living on Medicare, but they don't have the money.

Do we have needs to respond to in those areas? You bet your life we do. That ought to be a priority.

I have talked about Rosie Two Bears, a third grader in a school that is dilapidated. She sits at desks 1 inch apart in crowded classrooms in a school, part of which has been condemned, in a school that has...
classrooms where they have to evacuate because the sewer gas comes up a couple times a week. And little Rosie Two Bears says to me: Mr. Senator, are you going to build me a new school? I can't build her a new school. I don't have the money, the first class facility for her school. She and so many others around this country need a school that is renovated and modern and capable. When she walks through that classroom door, we do her and others a disservice by not having a first-class facility for her to be educated in. Is that a need for us? Yes, that is a need.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. DORGAN. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional minute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DORGAN. We have many needs and many priorities, one of which is, yes, let's provide a tax cut. Let's make it fairer.

Second, let's not have a 10-year tax cut locked in so that we put this country's risk and throw us back into Federal deficits.

Third, let's also pay down the Federal debt while we have some surpluses. What better gift to our children than paying down the Federal indebtedness we ran up during tougher times.

Fourth, let's not provide a tax cut that is so large, the bulk of it will go to the upper income people, in a way that would prohibit us from having the resources to make education, health care, and other areas that we know need additional investment in this country. Those ought to be our priorities.

I say to the new President, I am interested in working with him and others. Having an aggressive, good debate about fiscal policy is not personal, and it shall never become personal. We have different ideas about the priorities in this country. We need to debate that 10-year proposal. I want to talk about that because I believe so strongly that we ought to do all of the things I have described in order to give us an economy that will continue to grow, prosper, and provide opportunities for all Americans.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Enzi). The Chair recognizes the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I have been here on the floor listening to the debate. I am very pleased that we are engaging in a real debate about the possibility of meaningful tax relief. I have worked since I was elected to Congress, about 9½ years ago, to try to reform the Tax Code. I hope our debate over reducing taxes does not cause us to lose sight of the fact that we have to ultimately reform our Tax Code. Taxes are not only too high but too complicated, and the cost of simply complying with the Tax Code is a burden the people must see removed.

Tax relief. Why are we debating so much about tax relief right now? What is the thing that caused us to come together? It is the fact that President Bush has been elected and has followed through on his campaign commitment to propose a $1.6 trillion tax cut to the American people.

I want to talk about what it is President Bush has proposed. We have had a lot of debate about whether it is good or bad to have a tax cut, but not a lot of details about what President Bush is proposing we do. The President’s tax relief proposal is fair and responsible. It provides a typical family at least $1,600 in relief. They get to keep at least $1,600 of their own money that they are now sending to Washington with these skyrocketing surpluses, which I will talk about in a moment, which are growing. The typical American family is defined in this context as a family of four with one wage earner who earns $50,000 annually. I will give you more statistics about what this means for other types of situations.

For example, the President’s proposal gives a tax cut to every single family in America who pays income taxes. What does it do? It reduces the current five-rate tax structure to a two-rate system with the highest rate being 33 percent. Every taxpayer who is in any tax rate—in any tax bracket—will receive relief. Right now, he is proposing that we move to a 10-percent, a 15-percent, a 25-percent, and a 33-percent tax rate structure.

For those of you who don’t follow tax brackets, currently the lowest is 15. So if you are in the lowest income category, paying the lowest rates of income taxes, you will see your tax rates go from 15 percent to 10 percent—a 33-percent reduction for that tax bracket alone. The tax reductions are lower as the rates go higher, in terms of percentage of income.

It doubles the child tax credit to $1,000. It reduces the marriage tax penalty.

I think we ought to eliminate the marriage tax penalty. I have cosponsored legislation which does that. Many of us will be trying to see if that total elimination of the marriage tax penalty can be worked into this package.

It eliminates the death tax and expands the charitable tax deduction.

What does this mean? It means that one of our children now who is paying taxes will no longer pay any tax at all. Six million families, those at the lower income levels, will be totally eliminated from the tax rolls. A family of four making $35,000 would get a 100-percent tax cut. A family of four making $50,000 would receive a 50-percent tax cut. A family of four making $75,000 would receive about a 75-percent tax cut. The marginal income tax rate on low-income families will fall by over 40 percent.

The tax relief is unfair to a single mom paying $25,000 a year. She pays a higher marginal tax than somebody making $250,000 a year. That will be changed under this tax proposal. Federal taxes today are the highest they have ever been in peacetime America. Americans pay more now for taxes than they spend on food, clothing, and housing combined. Americans are working more than 4 months out of every year just to pay their tax bills. The current high tax rates are keeping low-income taxpayers out of the middle class.

Recent business layoffs show that the economy needs a boost quickly. Those who receive a tax cut will have the means to spend more and increases in spending will create jobs and increase the tax base. Someone who pays $1,000 in taxes will see his or her taxes reduced by another $1,000. That person is free to decide where to spend the money. I think we ought to eliminate the death tax and expand the charitable tax deduction.
over the next decade. President Bush is proposing that we give tax relief for $1.6 trillion of that.

You have heard the argument made that it is risky; we can’t project 10 years and be accurate. That is true. In the last 5 years we have been on track, but I can’t remember a year when we got it exactly right. But I can remember that every year we got it low. We used conservative estimates. We have built in downturns in the economy. Frankly, if we felt that even these conservative estimates are not too low—and I will note that they are upgraded every month now, showing that they are low—we can adjust things as we move along. To scare people out of a tax cut by saying we don’t know for sure is simply another argument by those who never want to see taxes cut.

We have an opportunity to reduce taxes in a significant way, and we ought to take it.

Let’s talk a little bit about what the positive effect of tax relief will be. Tax relief is going to have the immediate effect of helping families, businesses, and communities save and invest more while also providing the direction toward reforming the Tax Code. Prompt action will also improve the economic environment and strengthen consumer confidence.

By the way, those projections we use are what we call static projections. As we project, we are not allowed to assume reduced taxes will stimulate economic activity. We have to assume that every dollar of taxes that we cut is a dollar of lost revenue to the Federal Government.

Experience shows us that in many of the areas where we reduce taxes the increased stimulation to the economics of the country actually generates increased revenues in the years we cut the taxes. Every time so far that we have cut the capital gains tax, the revenues from the capital gains tax have gone up—not down—because it has allowed more capital transactions to take place in this country. We are not allowed to take any of that into consideration. But tax relief will—mark my words—allow for more investment, will allow for more safety, will strengthen consumer confidence, and will stimulate and strengthen our economy.

Recently Alan Greenspan was emphatic about the superiority of tax cuts to spending increases. He said: If long-term fiscal stability is the criterion, it is far better to spend first. Frankly, I agree with that.

I strongly believe that our highest priority should be to pay down the Federal debt. Alan Greenspan pointed out that with the surpluses we are seeing now we are paying down the Federal debt at a rate as fast as we can. There are certain instruments out there that go beyond the 10-year time frame—I call themhic, and if we pay those down early, we will actually have to pay a premium in order to do so.

His point was that if we continue our current rate of paying down the national debt, we can do so and have this tax relief.

We have already reduced the national debt by $360 billion. We reduced it last year by $224 billion. Even assuming this tax relief package goes into place, in 5 years we will have paid off more than half the Federal debt, and in 10 years we can pay off most of it—still working on both areas where we have debt instruments that are out there beyond the 10-year time cycle.

Make no mistake about this either. We are committing to paying down the national debt, and we will pay down the national debt. But stopping a tax relief package is not going to accelerate that process. Stopping the tax relief package is simply going to accelerate the other Federal spending sprees as we go into our appropriations cycles in this Congress.

I think it is important that we get this debate in its proper perspective. Our goal here is to improve the quality of life for all Americans. The argument has been made about this tax package that, well, it is going to stop us from being able to make needed investments in areas that we have to invest.

Remember those budget surplus numbers I talked to you about earlier. Even if they are not adjusted up anymore, we are going to have somewhere in the neighborhood of $1.5 trillion over the next 10 years after the tax relief package; after saving all the Social Security surplus, we will get surplus dollars to use for strengthening things where we have legitimate needs for Federal spending.

For example, America’s falling schools still fail to deliver a world-class education; and President Bush has proposed to make sure not one student is left behind.

Our national security needs some strengthening. We can assure that we have an effective defense against ballistic missiles and our military’s aging equipment and personnel shortages are addressed; Our health services and programs for the elderly are out of date and need reform and strengthening.

These things can happen. We can address the needs of this country without being caused, by the politics of fear, to think we don’t have an opportunity for tax relief right now. That is what it ultimately gets down to.

This time, as well as every time in the last 5 years, we will try to talk America out of a tax cut. They will use what I call the politics of fear. They will say we can’t protect you if you do not let us have these tax dollars; that we can’t do what is needed to make sure that your life is made safe; and that if you allow this tax relief package to go through, then all kinds of terrible things are going to happen to this economy.

The truth is, this is a modest tax relief proposal given the potential surpluses we see growing; and as we move forward this country will be strengthened—not weakened—by a resolve to reduce the tax burden paid by the American families.

Again, we pay the highest rates of taxes today than we have paid in peacetime America. We have some of the highest surpluses ever. We can protect Social Security and strengthen our country, and we can do so if we will properly address the issue of tax relief.

I encourage us to move forward quickly to pass this tax package.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I might consume up to 15 minutes. I may not use all 15 minutes, if there are other speakers waiting to come to the floor.

I am then asked by the manager of this bill to accommodate Senator DURBIN by adding 11 minutes at the end of the time of morning business for Senator DURBIN, and in the process of my doing that for Senator Thomas, I need to apologize to the Senator from Louisiana, Ms. LANDRIEU, because she asked to do the same thing. I guess we weren’t at that point so accommodating because I said I would accommodate her at 3 o’clock this afternoon. I apologize to Senator LANDRIEU.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, this morning, and a lot of times during this debate over the next 4 or 5 months on tax legislation, we hear a lot of economic arguments. I don’t want to detract from those economic arguments as not being good arguments, but I think they are tailored to fit the pattern of people who have a political philosophy that believes more money running through the Federal budget, and through the Federal Treasury, as a percent of our gross domestic product is a better thing to do.

They believe that a political decision made by Senators and Congressmen and a President on the distribution of goods and services within our country is better than leaving the money in the pockets of the men and women who are working in America to pay those taxes to decide how that money should be spent. We may not talk about it enough, but our philosophy for those of us who are fighting for tax relief for every taxpayer in America is that we believe there is more economic good done for America—and creating jobs in America and a better life in America—if the money does not come through the Federal Treasury; or at least if less of it comes through the
Federal Treasury and more is spent and invested by individual working men and women, entrepreneurs, and people who create jobs; or even if the money is spent by consumers. We believe that by having the marketplace and housing builders and sellers make that determination of how the money should be divided creates more jobs, and turns over many more times in the economy than if the money comes through the Federal Treasury, and there is a political decision on how it should be distributed.

Those are honest political and philosophical differences between our political parties. They are honest differences, but one has great faith in government to make decisions; the other one, mine, has great faith in individuals to make decisions. My philosophy will create more jobs. Since government does not create wealth, government will create more jobs. Since government distributes wealth or expends money is spent by consumers. We believe that determination of how the money should be distributed.

These economic arguments are very good, but I feel more comfortable applying common sense to the whole argument of a tax cut; a little common sense to offset a lot of Washington nonsense. It is common sense that we have a tax surplus. We haven’t had a surplus for a long time. In fact, we have had a tax surplus only twice in the last 20 years. And even before that, I have to admit, Congress was very fiscally irresponsible with budget deficits. We had some tax surplus in the Social Security account, and we still have it, but it was meant to cover up irresponsible spending on the other side. That is behind us now that we have had a new Congress for the last 6 years, going on 7. We have not only budget surpluses, but surpluses beyond budget surpluses; those are tax surpluses.

It has reached a point, because of automatic bracket creep, where people earn more and they are put in higher brackets. That money is coming in at historically high levels of taxation. Automatic bracket creep comes because people get put in a higher bracket and there isn’t enough reduction in the tax brackets through the inflationary adjustment to offset that. Consequently, we have automatic tax increases on people without a vote of Congress. It is a problem as well as other enacted tax increases, taxes are now at 20.6 percent of gross domestic product, whereas over a 50-year period of time it was somewhere between 18.5 and 19.5. Historically, the economy has adjusted itself to that level of taxes. I think the people have accepted it as a reasonable rate of taxation. But they don’t accept this historical high of 20.6 percent. That is why we are having the demand for tax relief for every taxpayer.

Common sense dictates that we are going to keep this level of taxation up, that it is going to be burning holes in the pockets of Senators, Congressmen, and even Presidents to get spent. Those expenditures are generally on a continuing basis and an obligation always on the Federal Treasury. We want to discourage the level of expenditures growing as it did over the last 3 years, an average of 6 percent, twice the rate of inflation, three times the rate of inflation. That is not sustainable because taxes aren’t coming in at that level. Even if they were coming in at that level, we would not want to have the level of expenditures growing at that time in this period there will be a downturn in the economy, and when that income goes down, expenditures don’t go down to adjust to the income of the Federal Treasury.

Common sense dictates we have to take some money out of Washington, DC, and leave it in the pockets of the taxpayers of America so we aren’t the overtaxed nation that we are, that we are more where the historical level of taxation has been for 50 years.

Now is the time to make up for the real bracket creep we have had, these automatic tax increases we have had, where we have reached the point where the average taxpayer is spending more on food, clothing, and shelter, whether or not they are paying on capital gains taxes. We will give tax relief to working men and women, to taxpayers in America, because of this high level of taxation, because we don’t want money burned up in Washington, DC. We want to keep it out of Washington, DC, leaving it in the taxpayers’ pockets.

There is 50 years of common sense behind that because that has been the level of taxation, 18 to 19 percent of the gross national product.

We need to understand the taxpayers trust themselves with the money more than they trust the Internal Revenue Service. We will hear the tax relief that I am talking about is labeled a risky scheme. The only scheme is Washington’s insatiable appetite for more and more of the working men and women’s hard-earned tax dollars.

There is a threat, we are told, that we can’t continue to pay down the national debt. We can continue to pay down the national debt. We will continue to pay down the national debt. We are going to continue to pay down the national debt until we get to that point where Chairman Greenspan has advised us that you can’t pay down any more national debt because there is about $1 trillion of the national debt that is held by individuals who want the security of the Federal Treasury for their savings. They have bought 30-year Treasury bonds, and about $1 trillion of those are not callable. In about 6 or 7 years, we are going to reach the point where there is money coming into the Federal Treasury, that if these bonds are not callable, you don’t pay down the national debt anymore, you invest in the stock market, buying other bonds, buying other stock, or at the very least, as the law requires now, to invest in federally insured financial institutions and then have an inadequate political impact upon the economy when that enormous transfer of billions and billions of dollars is put into the private banking system. That caution is not urged by Senator Grassley. That caution is urged by Chairman Greenspan.

I assure people we are going to continue to pay down on the national debt. Taxes are so high we have reached the point where a two-wage-earner family, particularly if they are middle-income or below, one-wage-earner is working to put food on the table and a roof over the head and just to provide for the family; the other one is working to pay for the Washington bureaucracy. That isn’t how a family gets ahead.

For a family with a $50,000-a-year income—this will probably be a two-wage-earner family; it wouldn’t have to be but it could be—but for a $50,000 income family of four, their taxes now are now over $14,000. If we keep the President’s proposal they drop down to $2,000. Consequently, that will leave in the pockets of those working men and women income for them to decide on their own how that money can be better used, whether to send their children to college, invest in education, pay more down on credit card debt, pay more down on the house mortgage. They may want to spend it, but that family making a determination of how to spend it is going to do more good for the entire U.S. economy than anything else.

We have also been urged this morning: Don’t get locked into a tax cut—this is where the trigger mechanism comes in—and that maybe we ought to have automatic increases in taxes for 4 or 5 years down the road in case something unpredictable happens.

We do not need to worry about that. Common sense tells me that it is easier for Congress to increase taxes than to decrease them. We have a less appetizing scheme than an automatic trigger. It is not good for the economy to have it anyway because working men and women are going to perform according to the predictability of the Tax Code, and we should make sure it is predictable.

We have also been urged this morning, by Mr. Thomas, the Senator from Wyoming. Mr. Thomas, the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. ENZI. I thank the Chair. Mr. President, it is always an exciting day when an accountant gets to talk about taxes.

Mr. THOMAS. The American people have had some concerns over taxes for a long time. If you were to throw that into a list of things about which they are concerned,
Instead of attempting to pick winners and losers—beware of the tax plan that starts out with: Don’t give any money to the rich; just give it to the poor. You will find that under the definition of “rich,” anyone who pays taxes is considered rich and will not get money back. Watch the wording. Watch the details.

We cannot have a bill that attempts to pick winners and losers and makes tax relief a lottery, particularly including those who do not pay.

The President honors the contribution of all Americans and recognizes they can spend their own money better than the Federal Government.

In addition to a simplified lower tax structure, President Bush’s tax proposal will benefit families by doubling the child credit from $500 per year to $1,000 a year. It lowers the marriage penalty. It kills the death tax.

This is a tax plan that puts its money where its mouth is. The current Tax Code punishes marriages and savings. The Bush proposal rewards marriage, rewards parents, rewards savings. This plan recognizes the enormous burdens that many parents are under of paying for college and for their children. It provides some hard-earned relief for each and every taxpaying family in the United States by returning to them part of the tax overcharge that has made this historical surplus possible.

While this tax relief proposal will benefit all taxpaying Americans, it especially helps middle-class families who are the backbone of our economy. Those receiving the largest percentage reduction in their Federal income taxes will be those in the middle class.

For example, a family of four earning $75,000 a year will see their Federal taxes reduced by 25 percent. The same family of four earning $50,000 a year will benefit from a 50-percent reduction. If a family of four earns $35,000 a year, they will pay no Federal income taxes under President Bush’s proposal.

This tax proposal is part of a three-prong strategy to save Social Security, pay down the debt, and return a portion of the tax overpayment to the people responsible for it: the American taxpayers.

For decades, the Democrat-controlled Congress spent the Social Security surplus on a variety of programs. Under a new program, the Social Security surplus is being protected so that it will be there for present and future retirees. It is now time to return a portion of the non-Social Security tax overcharge to the American people.

There are those on the Democratic side of the aisle who say we cannot afford tax relief for Americans because we need to spend the money to pay down the Federal debt. If I really thought that were true, I would be more inclined to listen. The problem is, in the 4 years I have been here, I have not seen their actions back up this rhetoric.

I have been working with my colleagues, primarily Senator ALLARD and Senator Voinovich, to actually implement a policy that ensures we pay off the entire publicly held debt regardless of whether all the budget surplus numbers materialize. We have tried at least 5 times to pass legislation that would eliminate how many Democratic cosponsors we have had on any of those proposals? Zero.

Our Democratic friends love to talk about debt reduction, but when it comes time to vote on a tax cut, when it comes time to vote on debt reduction, their enthusiasm disappears as soon as the next appropriations bill hits this floor; and they envision 1,000 ways to spend that same surplus. They say: Don’t lock us into $1.6 trillion of tax relief. Don’t lock us into that.

Do you know what spending does? Spending locks the American taxpayer into an eternal debt. Do you ever see us stop a program? Do you ever see us hold a program at the same level? Every program continues; every program gets an increase.

We talk about how the cost of living is going up, and we better spend more on that program to cover the additional costs of that program for the cost of living. They are going to increase it on the basis of whether it is a good program. The evaluation isn’t whether it is good or bad. We lock things in. Every time a dime of the American taxpayer’s money is spent on a new program, that dime is obligated, year in and year out, for their generation and generations to come.

Tax relief isn’t locked in quite that well, as people have noticed when they have had their taxes raised in previous years.

A tax raise can happen. Tax raises happen more often than spending cuts. So don’t talk about locking in a tax cut, particularly with the hope of being able to put it into new programs.

We need to talk about the need to reduce payroll taxes. The Bush plan reduces payroll taxes. It reduces that portion of the payroll taxes that are income taxes. It does not yet deal with that portion of the payroll tax that is Social Security or Medicare. Those are two programs funded separate from the Federal income tax. Those are two programs that must be reformed. To make statements on the floor that we are going to reduce those payroll taxes without putting reform in place says that we do not care about Social Security and Medicare. We do. We need the reform. The payroll taxes that are involved with Medicare and Social Security have to be taken into consideration as part of that reform.

And the rich versus poor. That is an attempt to start class warfare. The idea is to relieve the tax burden of every taxpayer.

You will see things thrown into the rhetoric that I will give tax relief to those who do not pay taxes. To me, the surplus is a tax overcharge. That is like going to the store and buying something and being overcharged.
When that happens—and somebody discovers it, and somebody is honest enough to pay that back—I kind of expect them to pay it back to me. I do not expect them to pay it back to somebody who just happened to walk through the door. That is what we are talking about with some of the proposals that are being put out there.

We need to remember that the surplus is not some magical pot of money created by those in Washington. It is an overpayment of taxes by the American people. It is only fair that we return a portion of that overcharge to those who gave us this surplus in the first place.

My experience has been that if we do not give a large portion of this surplus back, we will see it disappear in the waning days of this Congress, as we feed the unquenchable appetite of the ravenous appropriations bills. How does that affect you? When we are voting on appropriations, we are spending a very small part of the American taxpayer's money on each and every proposal. I think the American taxpayer realizes, if you spend enough quarters, you can empty out their tax money. That is about what they put into a program—25 cents. Some people are more than willing to put 25 cents into a new program. But they ought to be able to pick which programs themselves and not rely on the beneficence of the unique knowledge that 100 of us have here and 435 have on the other end of the building. If they want to give, they should be able to give. They should get credit for giving, but they should be able to select what they want to give. They should be able to select what they want to buy. That is what the tax package does.

We also have a unique opportunity to simplify. Complexity is a tax burden. It is a tax on individuals. That is the No. 1 thing the National Taxpayer Advocates have pointed out: Complexity is the No. 1 problem. The No. 2 problem is complexity for small businesses, where a lot of individuals are trying to do that there.

It is time to ax the tax and cut the burden down to size. We do need tax relief, and we need it now. President Bush's tax proposal is fair, responsible, and will benefit all American taxpayers. This tax plan will create jobs, it will spur economic growth, it will mean jobs for us and our kids, and it will support families in the essential task of raising children.

Let's return the tax overcharge and give the American people tax relief now.

I yield the floor.

Mr. HUTCHINSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Enzi). The Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, I commend my colleagues from Wyoming for his very strong, clear, and forceful statement on tax relief for the American people. It was well reasoned. I applaud him for making his statement and associate myself with it.

CORRECTION OF RECORD

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial I submitted last Thursday be stricken from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

TAX CUTS

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, I also applaud President Bush for his leadership on the tax relief issue. He has come forward with a plan that I think will have the support of the American people and will provide them much needed relief.

Senator ENZI very correctly called the huge surplus that is projected over the next 10 years a tax overcharge. That is precisely what it is. The CBO has estimated the Federal surplus will total $5.6 trillion over the next 10 years. Setting aside Social Security and Medicare, the Federal surplus will total $3.1 trillion. So if you take away the Social Security—put it in that lockbox—you still have $3.1 trillion over that same period.

Our country and our Government has experienced a surplus for the last 3 years running, and we have paid down the national debt now by over $363 billion. It is clear, we have to continue that path of fiscal responsibility. We have paid down the public debt $363 billion.

President Bush has pointed to a very real problem that exists, and that is the increase in personal debt, consumer debt, in this Nation. One of the imperatives for providing tax relief to low- and middle-income working Americans is that that increasing personal debt, consumer debt, in this country can be addressed while we simultaneously address the problem of the national debt.

The Government also has an obligation to pay the taxpayer who is now paying more in taxes than the Government is spending every year. The Federal tax burden is the highest ever during our peacetime history. Americans, as Senator Enzi pointed out, pay more in taxes than they spend on food, clothing, and housing.

Instead of growing Government bureaucracies, and devising new Federal programs on which to spend that surplus, it is incumbent on Congress to give taxpayers back some of the money they have overpaid because it is, in fact, their money.

President George W. Bush has proposed that we give back about one-quarter of the projected surplus, which allows us to pay down the national debt, protect Medicare, and ensure the viability of Social Security, and not touch the Social Security trust fund—all at the same time—and give back to the American people one-quarter of the tax overcharge, of the surplus.

I think that President Bush is wiser and smarter for us to collect the tax revenues and then, in our sense of priorities, decide where those revenues will go.

We can prevent the tax relief debate from degenerating into a class warfare debate, and we can keep the focus on: Whom do you really trust, do you want to return the surplus to the American people, or do you want to keep it in Washington where we will divide it up and decide who are the winners and who are the losers and what programs should be started and what programs should be increased? That will be the debate we ought to have before the American people, and on the floor of the Senate.

President Bush has a number of key reforms in the plan with which he has come forward. He replaces the current five-rate tax structure with four lower rates—10, 15, 25, and 33. The average American with the President Bush: No American taxpayer should be required to give more than one-third of their income in Federal income taxes.

There was a time, back before Ronald Reagan was elected President, when the top rate for some Americans was 70 percent. That was obscene. Frankly, 33 percent is too high. No American ought to pay more than a third of their income in Federal taxes. President Bush simplifies it by replacing the five-rate tax structure with four lower rates. The most common complaint about the current Tax Code is its complexity. While this isn't a panacea and it is not going to fix all of the problems in the Tax Code, at least it is a step toward greater simplification. I applaud that. It doubles the child tax credit to $1,000. I was the original sponsor, when I was in the House of Representatives, of the $500-per-child tax credit which eventually was signed into law. President Bush says we must go further; we need to double that to $500-per-child tax credit. He is right.

Americans who have the greatest burden from our tax system are those
who are trying to rear their children, trying to pay for their clothes, trying to keep food on the table, and trying to plan for college tuition. Those Americans facing the greatest economic challenges deserve that commitment to the American family that the child tax credit provides.

When the per-child deduction was originally passed and put into the Tax Code, the goal was, the statement was, that our Tax Code was to say families are important and they are important. But over time, the effects of inflation so eroded tax deduction that it became less than significant. The $500-per-child tax credit is a move in the right direction, and doubling it, as President Bush has proposed, is a big step in providing relief for American families. He reduces the marriage penalty. And he eliminates the death tax altogether.

This has been an effort of Senators and Congress men and women on both sides of the aisle for years. It is the faith in our Tax Code that is widely recognized as being inequitable and anti-American: Penalizing savings, penalizing investments, penalizing the American dream of passing on part of what you have in your life to your children and to your grandchildren. I applaud the fact that that death tax would be pulled up by the roots to no longer be a part of our American tax system.

He expands the charitable tax deduction. This is very much needed as part of the faith-based initiative the President came forward with and will unleash charitable giving in this country.

Contrary to the claims of critics that the Bush plan only benefits the rich, in fact low- and middle-income families will receive the greatest reduction in the amount of taxes they must pay each year relative to their income.

There are going to be a lot of lingo in this. It is true that those in higher income brackets may see a greater relief in terms of dollars because 5 percent of wage earners in this country pay 40 percent of the taxes. Even though President Bush’s plan is highly progressive, it is going to benefit low- and middle-income taxpayers more in percentage terms, in raw dollar terms, because they pay so much more of the tax revenues of this country, they will receive more of the benefits of reduction in the tax burden. The American taxpayer will receive relief. And those in low- and middle-income brackets are going to receive the highest percentage of relief relative to their income.

A family of four making $50,000 a year would receive a 50-percent tax cut, which means an extra $1,600 in their pockets every year, enough money to pay the average monthly mortgage payment, depending upon where you live, or several months’ worth of grocery bills for an average family. A family of four making $35,000 a year would receive a 25-percent tax cut, and a family of four making $50,000 a year who has deployed. I applaud the fact that to the family of four making $50,000 a year who will see their tax burden cut in half, that this is a tax break for the rich.

President Bush’s tax plan will use approaches that are important. First, the Bush plan would decrease total Federal revenue by no more than 6.2 percent each year.

By comparison, President Reagan’s tax plan reduced Federal revenues by over 18 percent. My favorite Democrat, President Kennedy’s tax proposal would have cut Federal revenue by over 12 percent. He saw the value of what tax relief would mean not only to the American people but to the economy itself.

President Bush is proposing fair and responsible tax relief. The surplus doesn’t belong to the Federal Government; it belongs to the hard-working Americans who pay taxes every year. I wholeheartedly support the President’s plan and look forward to seeing it passed very much intact.

May I inquire, how much time do we have remaining?

The PRESIDENT PRO Tempore. The Senator spoke for 11 and a half minutes.

The PRESIDENT PRO Tempore. The time under the control of the Senator from Wyoming, Mr. THOMAS.

TRIBUTE FOR SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE PETERS

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. President, I rise to take a few minutes to recognize the contributions of a patriot, a leader, and a good friend of this institution who has committed his service to return to life as a private citizen.

During his 4-year tenure as Under Secretary, Acting Secretary, and Secretary of the Air Force, F. Whitten Peters had led his service to new heights of achievement, and the world is better for it. At a time when the global security environment became less predictable with each passing day, Whitt Peters understood the need for the Air Force to become more responsive, more versatile, and more affordable at the same time. With boundless energy and enthusiasm, he set out to help the U.S. Air Force do those things and more.

As the leading architect of aerospace power, Whitt Peters drove a fundamental re-examination of the relationship between air, space, and information systems. As a result, the cold war Air Force he inherited was well on its way to becoming a modern, integrated aerospace force, designed to meet the challenges of a new millennium.

During Secretary Peters’ tenure, in the troubled skies over Serbia, a war was won using the strengths of our military—and we did it without losing a single American to enemy action.

Today, despots and dictators hesitate to act because they know America’s Air Force can bring power to bear at the point of delivery of minutes or hours. And, millions of people, the world over, live better lives because of the humanitarian missions undertaken by our U.S. Air Force in the last 4 years.

Proudly guiding the evolution of the Air Force’s operational capabilities, Secretary Peters also directed significant improvements in acquisition, logistics, and sustainment programs to ensure the best possible use of defense resources. He presided over the development of the Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle—a revolutionary pairing of Russian propulsion technology with the best United States commercial space-launch capabilities—which will drastically lower the cost of placing commercial and military payloads on orbit. He led the consolidation of five Air Force aircraft depots into three, reducing depot over-capacity by 40 percent and saving the taxpayers over $377 million a year. And, he implemented a 10-year reduction in readiness rates by putting 2 billion dollars’ worth of additional spares on the shelves where they will be useful to aircraft maintainers. He was instrumental on an issue critical to my home State of Kansas—his secured Little Rock Air Force Base as the Nation’s C-130 schoolhouse and the Center of Excellence for future generations.

Most important, Whit Peters took care of his people. As every Member of this body knows, he fought hard for improved pay, housing, and medical benefits for every member of America’s Air Force. He fought for better re-enlistment bonuses for people in hard-to-fill skills such as air traffic control, command and control network administration, and a hundred others. He pushed relentlessly for better child-care facilities to meet the demands of working families, and today 95 percent of all Air Force child care centers meet federal accreditation standards, compared to just 19 percent of child care facilities nationwide.

No wonder the enlisted men and women of the Air Force honored him with their most prestigious recognition—his commitment to his Air Force Order of the Sword. In the 53-year history of America’s youngest service, no other Air Force Secretary has even been so honored. Nor has any service secretary been so respected by the men and women he leads.

Like the men and women of the Total Air Force—the Air National Guard, the Air Force Reserve, and the Regular Air Force—we hate to see Whit Peters go, and I know my colleagues will join me in wishing him the fondest of farewell.

I hereby declare someone with greater commitment, greater work ethic, or a greater zeal for life than Whit Peters displayed. He is a rare
leader and an even rarer person in this town: a true gentleman who cares more about others than himself. As the Air Force slogan says, “No one comes close.”

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado is recognized.

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, it is my understanding that time has been set aside for Senator Thomas. I would like to claim 15 minutes of that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection from the Senator from Colorado is recognized.

TAX CUTS

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, before I say anything about how necessary I believe the President’s tax cut is at this time in our Nation’s history, I want to also point out to my colleagues on the Senate floor another way we can save dollars, save on Government expenditures, another way we can make money available for tax cuts, another way we can begin to do more to pay down the debt: voluntarism. Senators who are here in this body are going to have a great opportunity on March 7 to volunteer in a worthwhile endeavor, Habitat for Humanity. Members of the Senate are sponsoring a home, where staffs, spouses, and Members of the Senate can actually go out and help construct a home for a family who is struggling and needs assistance. This is an excellent alternative to a Federal program. I encourage Members of the Senate to participate in this volunteer program.

I am also pleased to join my colleagues in the Senate in calling for tax cuts for all Americans. I support tax cuts for the people who work hard every day. Everyone paying taxes should receive tax relief. I agree with my colleague from Arkansas who earlier spoke very eloquently about the need for a plan that people have a better idea how they would like to spend their dollars than any bureaucrat in Washington or any Member of this Senate. I think it is time we have a tax cut now that we have unprecedented revenues coming into the Federal Government. Many people I see here on the floor arguing against tax cuts, willingly and excidedy spend more money in the appropriations process. Their argument against it is that people need the money to pay down the debt. But when we get toward the end of the session, we have a spending binge. In the final 6 months of last year, we spent $561 billion—the biggest tax spending binge in this country’s history in peacetime. I don’t think we should allow that to happen because in the long-term we are dealing with some very big liabilities. To increase programs and increase spending at this time just means it is going to get worse. We should work to pay down the debt, and we did a good job toward paying down the debt. Ninety percent of our surplus went toward debt repayment last year. I am proud of our efforts in doing that.

I think the other solution is that we need to have a tax cut. We need a plan to pay down the debt, and we need to have a plan to reduce the tax burden on the American people. I agree with what the President recently said, that we need to make tax cuts retroactive. Why not? In the past, Congress has instituted tax increases and made them retroactive. So if we see a need to keep the economy from slowing down too much, or if we have excess surpluses, then I think we ought to go ahead and have tax cuts that are actually retroactive rather than increase spending.

We frequently discuss the budget surplus, and I believe it is actually more accurate—and I want to emphasize this—to talk about it as a tax surplus. The surplus represents an overpayment by taxpayers. I am known as a budget and debt repayment hawk. I want to see the debt paid down as fast as possible. Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan said in a recent Budget Committee hearing, which I attended, that based on the current projections, there is room in the surplus for both debt repayment and a tax cut. He stated repeatedly before many different committees that the least desirable option is to use surplus money for new spending—exactly what the Congress did in the final 6 months of the last Congress.

On July 1, 2001, CBO delivered an encouraging fiscal forecast. They saw that the foreseeable budget surplus would allow the Government to return a major portion of the surplus to its rightful owners. That means a tax cut. They saw that the surplus would allow continued efforts to pay down our national debt. It continues to make good on a Republican promise to protect the Social Security surplus.

To put it simply, CBO’s baseline assumptions for 2001 to 2011 project surpluses large enough to allow the Federal Government to retire all available debt held by the public. Surpluses from this year through 2011 are projected to approach between $5.6 trillion and $6 trillion—nearly four times the amount needed to fund the Bush tax cut.

The Bush tax cut plan is an important first step towards returning the tax surplus by lowering taxes. It will return the average surtax for each American family. That is real money. It can be used for such things as buying a home, paying for a college education, purchasing a computer to help kids in school, buying a car, or paying the energy bill.

I support the Bush tax cut because it offers real tax relief for every American taxpayer.

First, the Bush plan cuts and simplifiers the current tax rate structure. Rather than five marginal tax rates President Bush proposes four new, lower rates. In effect, this simplifies the Tax Code and also provides tax relief where it is really needed. I think, that I hold up a town meeting in a tax break. The current tax rate brackets, which run from 15 percent to 39.6 percent, will be replaced by four new brackets at 10 percent, 15 percent, 25 percent, and 33 percent. Those at the lower end will see their tax rate reach 10 percent—will receive the highest percentage of relief. I want to repeat that. Those at the lower end—that is the 10 percent range—will receive the highest percentage of relief. In fact, one in five taxpaying families with children will no longer pay any tax at all. This means 6 million families will receive complete tax relief.

The Bush tax cut will also provide important tax relief for families by redefining the marriage tax penalty.

In meeting with my constituents at town meetings, I have heard repeatedly that the people of Colorado want marriage penalty relief. I am one who takes my responsibilities seriously, and I hold my town meetings in every county in Colorado every year. You can imagine how many people stood up and made that very important statement on behalf of their family.

The statistics show why. In the State of Colorado, over 250,000 couples pay additional, unfair taxes simply because they are married. Nationally, this amounts to more than 21 million couples paying on average another $1,400 per year in taxes; again, just because they are married.

The Bush tax cut will go a long way towards eliminating this disparity.

The penalty runs counter, in my view, to common sense. Marriage is a practice that should be encouraged rather than discouraged. This penalty really hits young married couples hard. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Housing, I am constantly reminded of the increasing seriousness of the housing shortage for young couples. This tax relief would go a long way towards helping working families afford a home.

President Bush also proposed that the child tax credit be doubled from $500 per child to $1,000 per child.

Again, this is money in the pocket of hard-working American families—particularly young American families just
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getting started. Undoubtedly, it would be especially helpful to lower income families.

I am particularly pleased to support the provision to eliminate the death tax. I share the President’s belief that the tax should be eliminated. I have already introduced legislation to do just that, as have a number of other Members in the Senate.

The United States retains among the highest estate taxes in the world, and top estate tax rates can reach over 55 percent. This is money that was already taxed when it was earned. Frankly, the estate tax—or death tax—can destroy a family business. This has been called to my attention a number of times in the State of Colorado. One of the more recent examples happens to be a ranch in the Aspen area—a pretty affluent area experiencing a lot of growth.

A family happened to have an unexpected death. They had to sell off the family ranch to pay the estate tax. As a result, open space will be developed, contrary to what many people in that area wanted to see happen. They wanted to see more open space instead of more development.

Repeal of the estate tax would certainly benefit the economy. Without the estate tax, greater business resources can be put toward productive economic activity.

I think the President’s proposal to expand education savings accounts will also give parents more flexibility in determining what is best for their children.

There is a lot more to the President’s tax plan. But the fact is that I do think we need to move forward. Americans are spending more than ever on taxes, and we need to reduce that tax burden. I strongly support the President’s comments that we should make it retroactive. In other words, we ought to address the problem now and not wait. I offer my strong endorsement of the President’s proposed tax cut, and I look forward to a swift enactment.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine is recognized.

Ms. COLLINS. Thank you, Mr. President.

(The remarks of Ms. Collins pertaining to the introduction of S. 253 are contained in today’s RECORD under “Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.”)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas.

TAX RELIEF

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about President Bush’s tax relief plan and what I hope will be congressional approval of tax relief for hard-working Americans.

It is very clear we are going to have a big tax cut, one we have never dreamed would be possible when we passed the Balanced Budget Act. It is estimated now at $5.6 trillion. The President’s plan takes approximately 25 percent of this huge surplus and says the people deserve to keep more of their money. This is an income tax surplus. People are sending more to Washington than Washington needs to do its responsibilities to the people of the United States Government, to the tune of $5.6 trillion. Doesn’t it make sense to cut back on the amount people have to send to Washington? We think so.

The President’s plan gives a tax cut to every American who is paying taxes. It creates a simple tax structure with four lower rates: 10, 15, 25, and 33. It doubles the child tax credit to $1,000, reduces the marriage penalty, which we have been trying to do now for 4 years, eliminates the death tax, expands the charitable tax deduction, and makes the research and development tax credit permanent.

What happens when this is passed? Who are the biggest winners? One in five taxpaying families with children will not pay any income tax at all. One in every five families who pay taxes and have children will pay no income tax. It will remove 6 million American families from the tax rolls. A family of four making $35,000 will get a 100-percent Federal income tax cut. A family of four making $50,000 a year will receive a 50-percent tax cut, receiving at least $1,600 in tax relief. A family of four making $75,000 a year will receive a 25-percent tax cut. The marginal income tax rate on low-income families will be cut by more than 40 percent. That is the effect this tax relief will have on American families.

The current code is not fair, and it is taking too much. What we need is balance in our system. What this approach will do is pay down the debt, protect Social Security, increase spending for priority needs, and give hard-working Americans more in their pocketbook.

Mr. President, you are going to hear a lot more about in future months because I believe Congress is going to work with the President to give the tax relief he is seeking. I look forward to the discussion because I cannot think of any reason hard-working Americans should not have the money they earn in their pocketbooks rather than sending it to Washington for a program of which they have never heard.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 11 minutes.

Mr. DURBIN. I thank the Chair.

Mr. President, during the last hour and a half Senators have come to the floor to talk about the President’s proposed tax cuts, and we are all interested in finding out what the details are on that tax cut because it is true, the devil is in the details. We need to know exactly what the President is proposing, the impact it will have on our budget, first, certainly on our economy and on the families of this Nation.

I guess two of the most magic words for politicians are “tax cut.” Can you think of anything more popular to say to an audience? I think we have learned over history that if you just focus on the term “tax cut,” and you do not fill in the details, you can find yourself in a pretty terrible predicament.

When President Reagan was elected in 1980, he was dedicated to a tax cut. He said that was the highest single priority. Of course, he enacted that tax cut. We all understand what happened and that tax cut was enacted. He totaled up the biggest run of deficits in the history of the United States. We created such a monster that many of my Republican friends who were faithful supporters of President Reagan came to the floor and said: We are going to have to amend the Constitution now; there is no other way to stop this mess between the President and Congress; we have to give the Federal courts the authority through a constitutional amendment to Congress and the President to stop spending and stop the President from spending.

Thank goodness cooler heads prevailed. Leadership came on the scene and changed the dynamics of the debate dramatically. In 1993, under President Clinton, we passed a deficit budget reduction plan, and several years later we passed a bipartisan plan. Between the two of them, we have finally reined in the growth of where we are no longer laboring with annual deficits adding to the national debt but we are dealing with surpluses.

The obvious question is, What is the responsible thing to do? First, we have to ask ourselves this question: How big is the surplus? How much money do we have to spend either on tax cuts or for programs or for some other purpose? I have to say, quite honestly, that is where I have some difficulty with this debate.

Let me give one illustration. Seventy percent of all the surplus we are talking about for tax cuts does not appear for 5 years. Thirty percent of it starts today, but then 70 percent of it is in the last 5 years of the economists’ estimates.

Think about that for a second. We are pinning our hopes on statistical projections starting 5 years from now as to what America is going to look like, what the economy is going to look like.

I have a very limited education in economics, and I do not consider myself an expert, but I have worked with some of the real experts on economics here in Washington, and they miss by a country mile trying to guess where we are going to be 5 months from now, let alone 5 years or 10 years from now.

Allow me to use one example. If the 5-year projection is where we really start coming into surpluses, it is reasonable to step back and ask: What were the economists in America saying 5 years ago about today? Let’s take a look.

They projected that today in America we would be running a $320 billion...
We are running a $270 billion surplus. They missed it by $590 billion 5 years ago. They did not have a clue. They were clearly guessing based on assumptions that were just plain wrong.

I think we understand the skepticism of many of us who say, if we are going to build on America's future, let us do it with assumptions that are honest, that are accurate, and on which we can cut. We owe over $5.7 trillion for things we have done in the past—roads we have built, decisions we have made, programs we have funded. That $5.7 trillion national debt costs American families, businesses, and individuals $1 billion a day in interest. We collect that much in your taxes and mine to pay interest on old debt. That $1 billion a day does not educate a child, does not buy a computer for a school, does not provide a prescription drug benefit under Medicare to a soul in America, nor does it buy us a new tank, a new plane, or pay for a new soldier—nothing. It is money paid on interest servicing old debt.

But I can tell you, if you are making $25,000 a month having husbands or wives, saying: Our heating bill goes up to $400 this month. I don't think that is an unreasonable idea. Senator HARKIN has had a proposal, which I think makes sense, to give a tax credit to people for the increase in their heating bills over this last year. Do you know what the people are going to do with it? They will pay their bills or they will replenish their savings, or they will decide, yes, we can go ahead and make an important purchase for our family. I think that is the kind of tax cut that really is reasonable in America.

We are running a $270 billion surplus. Guess what. They were wrong.

If we are wrong, if we commit ourselves to spending tax cuts we cannot cover, we will find ourselves not only putting our toe but our whole leg back into that red-ink deficit pool. I do not want to see that happen.

Keep in mind, the mortgage we now have on America, our national debt, is substantial. We owe over $5.7 trillion for things we have done in the past—roads we have built, decisions we have made, programs we have funded. That $5.7 trillion national debt costs American families, businesses, and individuals $1 billion a day in interest. We collect that much in your taxes and mine to pay interest on old debt. That $1 billion a day does not educate a child, does not buy a computer for a school, does not provide a prescription drug benefit under Medicare to a soul in America, nor does it buy us a new tank, a new plane, or pay for a new soldier—nothing. It is money paid on interest servicing old debt.

But I can tell you, if you are making $25,000 a month having husbands or wives, saying: Our heating bill goes up to $400 this month. I do not think that is an unreasonable idea. Senator HARKIN has had a proposal, which I think makes sense, to give a tax credit to people for the increase in their heating bills over this last year. Do you know what the people are going to do with it? They will pay their bills or they will replenish their savings, or they will decide, yes, we can go ahead and make an important purchase for our family. I think that is the kind of tax cut that really is reasonable in America.

But I can tell you, if you are making $25,000 a year, a $400 heating bill, or more, is something of which you would take notice. That is why I hope if there is going to be a tax cut, that it be sensible, based on the real surplus, and that it be after we have dedicated funds to bringing down this national debt, the debt that costs us so much, and raises interest rates on everything across America and, finally, a tax cut that really zeros in on the people who need it the most.

I am worried, too, that the President's proposal, when you take a look at it, takes 85 percent of our surplus and dedicates it to a tax cut, leaving precious little for things which we value.

People across America are getting heating bills that are absolutely stopping them in their tracks. These are working families, by large, who have seen their bills doubled and tripled, and they are calling my office and saying: What can you do to help us? There is a limited amount we can do, but one thing we can consider and I support is providing some tax relief to these families struggling to pay their heating bills. I do not think that is an unreasonable idea. Senator HARKIN has a proposal, which I think makes sense, to give a tax credit to people for the increase in their heating bills over this last year. Do you know what the people are going to do with it? They will pay their bills or they will replenish their savings accounts, or they will decide, yes, we can go ahead and make an important purchase for our family. I think that is the kind of tax cut that really is reasonable in America.

Could I take the example of the people making over $25,000 a month having husbands calling wives, saying: Our heating bill is up to $400 this month. I don't think so.

But I can tell you, if you are making $25,000 a year, a $400 heating bill, or more, is something of which you would take notice. That is why I hope if there is going to be a tax cut, that it be sensible, based on the real surplus, and that it be after we have dedicated funds to bringing down this national debt, the debt that costs us so much, and raises interest rates on everything across America and, finally, a tax cut that really zeros in on the people who need it the most.

I am worried, too, that the President's proposal, when you take a look at it, takes 85 percent of our surplus and dedicates it to a tax cut, leaving precious little for things which we value.

People across America are getting heating bills that are absolutely stopping them in their tracks. These are working families, by large, who have seen their bills doubled and tripled, and they are calling my office and saying: What can you do to help us? There is a limited amount we can do, but one thing we can consider and I support is providing some tax relief to these families struggling to pay their heating bills. I do not think that is an unreasonable idea. Senator HARKIN has a proposal, which I think makes sense, to give a tax credit to people for the increase in their heating bills over this last year. Do you know what the people are going to do with it? They will pay their bills or they will replenish their savings, or they will decide, yes, we can go ahead and make an important purchase for our family. I think that is the kind of tax cut that really is reasonable in America.

But I can tell you, if you are making $25,000 a year, a $400 heating bill, or more, is something of which you would take notice. That is why I hope if there is going to be a tax cut, that it be sensible, based on the real surplus, and that it be after we have dedicated funds to bringing down this national debt, the debt that costs us so much, and raises interest rates on everything across America and, finally, a tax cut that really zeros in on the people who need it the most.

I am worried, too, that the President's proposal, when you take a look at it, takes 85 percent of our surplus and dedicates it to a tax cut, leaving precious little for things which we value.
Representative, with the rank of Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the time for debate on the nomination shall be limited to 2 hours equally divided between the chairman, Mr. GRASSLEY, and the ranking member, Mr. BAUCUS.

The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Today we are taking up the nomination of Robert Zoellick to be United States Trade Representative. Mr. Zoellick appeared before the Finance Committee exactly one week ago, and I am pleased that we have been able to schedule this vote so quickly. I support this nomination, and I urge my colleagues to join in supporting his confirmation at the end of this debate.

Trade has never been as important to the American economy as it is today. The export-oriented service, and export of goods and services is equivalent to 27 percent of America’s gross domestic product, as compared to only 11 percent in 1970. Opening and expanding markets around the world for our manufactured goods, our agricultural commodities, and our services, helps our economy to grow and for the creation of good quality jobs at home. Expanded trade is also critical for global economic growth.

For that reason, I was very pleased that President Bush, when announcing the selection of Robert Zoellick to be USTR, stressed that Mr. Zoellick would be a member of the Cabinet and would report directly to the President. Trade must have a prominent and equal place at the table when we make decisions about our Nation’s global affairs.

Last year, the Congress and the Administration worked together on trade policy. We had a number of significant accomplishments. We passed a bill to extend permanent normal trade relations status to China, PNT, once it accedes to the WTO, a monumental achievement. We passed legislation on expanding trade with Africa and enhancing CBI, the Caribbean Basin Initiative. We changed the structure of the Foreign Sales Corporation. And we passed a Miscellaneous Tariffs Act.

This year, we have a full trade agenda. We must build on the progress we made last year. We must make sure that we are not left behind as other nations make new trade arrangements with each other. Let me stress that our trade policy and our efforts at further trade liberalization must be carried out in the proper way.

Our first priority must be to rebuild the consensus on trade in this country. Further progress on trade liberalization and opening markets requires a political consensus, and that means a public consensus. We must make sure that all our citizens that trade and expanding markets contribute to their prosperity. We must address legitimate labor and environmental concerns in our trade agreements. We must aggressively enforce our trade laws. And we must ensure that we provide new opportunities to those who have been left behind by globalization.

One focus of discussion during Mr. Zoellick’s confirmation hearing was whether it was appropriate to include labor and environmental issues in trade negotiations. In fact, this has dominated much of the trade policy debate over the past decade.

I must confess to a good deal of frustration. Trade-related labor and environmental issues were addressed in NAFTA, the North American Free Trade Agreement, and in the U.S.-Jordan FTA. The United States concluded a historic agreement with Cambodia in cooperation with the International Labor Organization that tied increased access to the United States market to Cambodian observance of basic labor rights. Our law on the Generalized System of Preferences, GSP, environment and the Caribbean Basin Initiative, CBI, also include labor provisions.

Labor and environmental issues were on track to be included in free trade agreements with Singapore and Chile. That the Clinton Administration was negotiating in its closing days.

Labor and environmental issues have been discussed under the aegis of the world trading system. In the last several years, a number of important WTO disputes have directly involved environmental matters. The WTO has created a Committee on the Environment.

And the interest in labor and environmental issues is not limited to the United States. In developing the European Union, the countries of Europe addressed these issues. As they work on their own free trade area, some of our neighbors in Latin America have also recognized the need to address labor and the environment.

In short, like it or not, environment and labor issues are firmly on the trade agenda. Unfortunately, at least in some circles, the debate in the United States goes on as if none of these things had happened, as if the issues will just go away if we do not talk about them.

I fear that a major reason for the disappearance of the public and political consensus in the United States is our refusal to acknowledge these important issues. I don’t pretend to know all the answers about how to deal with these complex questions, but I do know that it is long past time for us to acknowledge them and to begin to address them.

For this reason, I have made it clear that I will vote against fast track trade negotiating authority, and work to defeat it, until environmental issues are meaningfully addressed.

I welcome the fact that, in his confirmation hearing, Mr. Zoellick expressed a willingness to address these issues. In that spirit, we may issue a challenge to him and to the Administration on three specific labor and environmental issues related to trade.

First, I call on Mr. Zoellick to endorse the U.S.-Jordan Free Trade Agreement and work for prompt congressional passage. Among other provisions, this agreement calls upon Jordan and the United States to adhere to their own labor and environmental laws. Because of this agreement has been endorsed by many labor and environmental groups.

Second, I call on Mr. Zoellick to implement rigorously the Executive Order requiring an environmental assessment of all trade agreements. These assessments help to focus discussion, identify issues, and avoid needless problems. We should be doing these assessments for all future trade agreements.

Finally, I call on Mr. Zoellick to appoint an Assistant USTR for Labor. This position was created last year and has never been filled. A trade official focused on labor could ensure that labor issues are not ignored and serve as an important point of contact between our trade negotiators and the labor community. This position should be filled before the April Ministerial meeting that will discuss the Free Trade Area for the Americas, the FTAA.

By taking these three steps, Mr. Zoellick and the Bush Administration would demonstrate that the commitments to work together in a bipartisan fashion are real and not just rhetoric. It would help set the stage for granting fast track authority and go a long way toward establishing trust between the Congress and the administration on trade policy.

As Mr. Zoellick sends his deputies to the Finance Committee for confirmation, I plan to review his progress in meeting these three challenges that I have set out today.

Let me now discuss a number of other trade issues that will be before the Administration and the Congress in the coming months.

I have already discussed the U.S.-Jordan Free Trade Agreement. Jordan is a critical partner in our effort to promote lasting peace in the Middle East. This agreement will help bring our two nations even closer together.

Second, the Administration should send the U.S.-Vietnam Bilateral Trade Agreement, First, to the Congress for early action. This agreement would open additional market access for Vietnam and help promote our longstanding relationship.

Third, the Administration should send the U.S.-Japan Trade Agreement to the Congress. This agreement includes labor rights provisions that will help improve conditions in Japan.

Fourth, the Administration should send the U.S.-Ukraine Trade Agreement to Congress.

These assessments help to focus discussion, identify issues, and avoid needless problems. We should be doing these assessments for all future trade agreements.

Finally, I call on Mr. Zoellick to appoint an Assistant USTR for Labor. This position was created last year and has never been filled. A trade official focused on labor could ensure that labor issues are not ignored and serve as an important point of contact between our trade negotiators and the labor community. This position should be filled before the April Ministerial meeting that will discuss the Free Trade Area for the Americas, the FTAA.
Agreement to the Congress soon. We have made significant progress in our economic and political relationship with Vietnam over the past decade, and this agreement builds on that. The agreement requires major liberalizing changes in Vietnam’s economic and trade structure. The agreement paves the way for Vietnam’s eventual application to join the WTO. The agreement will provide American business and agriculture with predictability and stability in Vietnam’s market. We need to approve this agreement, and we need to look at how to deal with legitimate labor and environmental issues.

Third, President Bush will attend the Summit of the Americas in Quebec in April, where the major topic will be progress on completing a Free Trade Area for the Americas. I support trade liberalization in this hemisphere. I will support fast track negotiating authority for the FTAA, so long as it properly accommodates legitimate labor and environmental concerns. And I hope that President Bush will tell the gathering of leaders in Quebec that he plans to work closely with Congress, business, labor, and environmental groups over the coming year so that he can succeed in enactment of this negotiating authority.

Fourth, the U.S.-Canada Softwood Lumber Agreement expires on March 31. Today, the U.S. lumber industry is in dire straits. The price of lumber is less than half what it was in 1995. Many timber operations in Montana, and around the nation, have closed as a result of the depressed lumber market—displacing workers and devastating communities. The Canadian softwood lumber industry receives over four billion dollars in stumpage and other subsidies annually. There is considerable evidence that they are dumping lumber into the United States. To make matters worse, the absence of adequate environmental laws in Canada clearly provides an unfair advantage to Canadian firms. It contributes to over-cutting in Canada’s forests and damages the environment, with significant implications for our own forests and environment. We need to resolve this issue quickly and, I hope, avoid lengthy and costly litigation.

Fifth, the agriculture crisis. Commodity prices remain near record low levels. Agriculture is Montana’s largest industry. Over 60 percent of Montana’s grain and meat products are exported, so the farmers and ranchers in my state depend on new and growing markets. We need to expand agricultural exports from Montana and from the entire country. That means:

Opening agricultural markets around the world.

Attacking the massive agricultural export subsidies of the European Union that distort food trade world-wide.

Getting Europe to end its decade-old ban on hormone-treated beef.

Taking measures to end the trade distorting activities of the Canadian and Australian wheat boards, including completion of the Section 301 investigation of the anti-competitive practices of the Canadian Wheat Board.

Ensuring that China fully implements its WTO obligations, as well as the U.S.-China bilateral agreement on agricultural cooperation.

Abandoning unilateral embargoes, including the embargo on Cuba that has closed that market to our food producers.

Ensuring that our domestic agriculture industry is insulated against devastating surges of imports, such as has happened with lamb.

Sixth, the survival of America’s steel industry is in jeopardy. Over the next few months, Congress, the Administration, the steel companies, and the United Steelworkers of America must work together on a program to prevent irreparable damage to this important sector of our economy.

Finally, we need to develop a comprehensive approach to monitoring and compliance. This includes bilateral agreements as well as multilateral commitments of our trading partners. China’s accession to the WTO will present further new challenges to our ability to ensure full compliance. We need an early assessment of the monitoring activities in the Executive Branch to ensure that we are using them as effectively as we can. I welcome Mr. Zoellick’s statement at his confirmation hearing that justice delayed is justice denied. We take a double hit when we fail to ensure full compliance with trade agreements. First, our businesses, workers, and farmers don’t receive the benefits we negotiated. And then, our credibility as a nation is damaged, and our future negotiating ability is hampered. We must be more aggressive on monitoring and compliance.

This is a full agenda for a short period of time. I look forward to working closely with Bob Zoellick as we try to rebuild the consensus for trade so that we can enhance the benefits to America of opening markets and expanding trade liberalization.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Mr. Grassley.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

I apologize to Senator Baucus because I was not here to hear his statement. I am glad he was able to go ahead and proceed with his opening statement. I also appreciate Senator Baucus’ cooperation during the hearing and, more importantly, to be able to bring this nomination to the floor without delay.

Obviously, I am going to support President Bush’s nomination of Robert Zoellick to the position of U.S. Trade Representative. As chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, I am pleased to report to my distinguished colleagues that Robert Zoellick is uniquely qualified to represent the United States in an extremely important position—important because the United States is the largest trading nation in the world and important because the China wall, they never stop.

They just go on and on. I want to go into some detail about Mr. Zoellick’s impressive professional qualifications for a very demanding and highly sensitive Cabinet post. One of the questions I asked him in the private meeting in my office was whether or not he was prepared to spend this much time away from home. There is much time away from family because there is a tremendous commitment to travel with this job besides the policymaking. You get the impression that these people who do our trade negotiations are very hard workers and they have a lot of time they spend away from their families. This is a highly demanding job and I think it is fair to say that Members on both sides of the aisle were highly impressed with Mr. Zoellick’s thorough command of complex trade issues, with his broad visions of America’s historic leadership role in the whole international trade regime, and with his understanding of the close cooperation required between the legislative and executive branches of government in crafting and implementing an effective U.S. trade policy.

The nature of trade issues Congress will deal with this year clearly requires that a person of Mr. Zoellick’s stature and ability be the U.S. Trade Representative. In regard to working closely with Congress, understand that Congress has the authority to regulate international, or what you call interstate, and foreign commerce. We guard this very jealously. We have to, in the process of doing that under the practicality of 535 Members of Congress and negotiating with 138 different countries in the World Trade Organization on the issues of reducing tariff and nontariff trade barriers or settling any sort of dispute. From time to time, Congress has given the President of the United States the authority to do that in negotiation. But we do it with a very tight rein. I suppose in the future it will be even more of a tighter rein. That requires a person in Mr. Zoellick’s position as U.S. Trade Representative to work very closely with Congress, particularly the Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee, consulting with us on a regular basis. That consultation,
as I have seen in the past, has made the executive branch of government responsible to Members of Congress; more importantly, respectful of our constitutional rights as we guard them. It is our responsibility to do that not only for the economic interests of our constituents but also that we take an oath to uphold the Constitution of the United States.

I will mention a few of the challenges that face Mr. Zoellick, and then I will go into why Mr. Zoellick is ideally suited to deal with them.

One important trade challenge right around the corner is the free trade area of the Americas negotiations. The objective of these talks, which are supposed to conclude in 2005, is to create a single free trade zone of nearly 700 million people, stretching from the Arctic Ocean in the North, to Tierra del Fuego in the South.

The free trade area is the single most important economic initiative we have undertaken in Latin America since President Kennedy launched the Alliance for Progress in 1961.

Latin America is our fastest growing regional trade partner. Roughly 46 percent of all the goods manufactured in this hemisphere are imported to our own hemisphere. We export large amounts of our agricultural products to the FTAA countries as well.

Our continued prosperity, and our leadership in world trade, clearly rests on the success of these talks. But when you see the concentration of trade in the Western Hemisphere, you know why these talks are singularly important.

Yet despite the obvious importance of the PTAA, there is little agreement on the major issues under discussion. It’s time to get these talks moving again. And it’s time for the United States to resume its leadership in trade not only in the Western Hemisphere but in all of the Americas.

The FTAA Ministerial Conference is coming up in Buenos Aires in the first week in April. Two weeks after the FTAA Ministerial, the United States will attend the Third Summit of the Americas in Quebec City.

Mr. Zoellick knows how important U.S. leadership is in getting the FTAA talks headed in the right direction.

And more importantly, he has the skills and the background to get the job done.

What about these skills? For example, while serving in the former Bush administration, Mr. Zoellick played a key role in the NAFTA process. At one point during the NAFTA negotiations, when the talks weren’t going well, Mr. Zoellick served as a special channel with then President Salinas of Mexico to keep the negotiations on track.

Also during the former Bush administration, Mr. Zoellick served as Coordinator of Trade and Investment of State, and Under Secretary of State for Economies. At the State Department, he helped launch APEC, the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation group for advancing trade and prosperity in that region.

The creation of APEC was a tremendous achievement. It is a highly successful international trade and economic forum. APEC’s main agenda is to break down commercial barriers in the region, to strengthen an open, multilateral trading system, and to encourage constructive interdependence by encouraging the flow of goods, services, capital, and technology. Mr. Zoellick, who launched APEC clearly demonstrates his deep commitment to the principle of international cooperation that is at the heart of America’s leadership in promoting global free trade.

It also demonstrates his broad vision, and his ability to accomplish big things.

In recognition of his outstanding service to his country, Mr. Zoellick received the Distinguished Service Award, the State Department’s highest honor.

Another important trade challenge this year is to launch a new round of multilateral trade negotiations at the WTO Ministerial to be held later this year in Qatar.

The failure of the Seattle WTO Ministerial was a terrible embarrassment for the United States, and a major setback for trade liberalization around the world than we now realize 18 months later.

The collapse of the Seattle talks was also a major setback for American agriculture. Without a comprehensive new round of global trade negotiations, it will be extremely difficult for American agriculture to gain access to new markets, and to get rid of the trade-distorting subsidies and barriers that shut our agricultural producers out of foreign markets.

If we lose the momentum for the liberalization of world agricultural markets that we gained with the successful conclusion of the Uruguay Round of trade negotiations, we may never be able to recover.

Here too, Mr. Zoellick’s experience demonstrates that he is the right person for the job of U.S. Trade Representative.

In 1992, when it looked like the fundamental disagreement between the European Union and the United States over agricultural trade liberalization would end the Uruguay Round in failure, Mr. Zoellick helped forge the Blair House Accord, the compromise agriculture agreement that broke the negotiation logjam, and saved the Uruguay Round, not just for agriculture but for other segments of the economy that was held by them.

Thanks to Mr. Zoellick’s efforts in crafting the Blair House accord, negotiators then immediately were able to clear the political hurdles that brought about an agreement.

As a result, the World Trade Organization agreement on agriculture represents the first serious step toward re-forming the international rules governing trade in agricultural products. That agreement is now the springboard for current efforts to further liberalize world agricultural trade. Other trade challenges beyond agriculture that Mr. Zoellick and the Congress will face are the United States-Jordan Free Trade Agreement, the United States-Vietnam Trade Agreement, we have the Singapore free-trade negotiations, and on December 5th of last year we began the Chile free-trade negotiations. But in all areas, the key initiative we have is the FTAA. The creation of APEC clearly demonstrates he has the ability to handle those which might be called lesser issues because they are still bilateral but still very important.

During his distinguished career, he has led various bilateral trade negotiations with the European Union, with Korea and other nations, but most importantly, they involved the structural impediment initiative with the country of Japan.

I will say a word about another tough trade challenge, one that will involve, hopefully, this Congress. As chairman of the Finance Committee, I can help move it along. We had discussions with Senator BAUCUS about that, even this week, about how he and I can get together and try to solve some of the things involved with giving the President negotiating authority; in other words, that authority which allows a President to move forward and finalize a multilateral or WTO-involved trade agreement. It is very important to have that even for bilateral agreements but perhaps less important for bilateral than for the multinational, multilateral negotiations. It will be very difficult to write this legislation. We shouldn’t have any illusions that it will be easy to accomplish. I can’t think of a single thing more important to restoring America’s leadership in trade and to preserving America’s negotiating credibility.

It is certainly true, as many have pointed out, that the United States can start negotiations without the President having trade negotiating authority. We know this from our experience during the Uruguay Round when it took 2 years to get legislation renewing the President’s trade negotiating authority through the Uruguay Round started. But doing it that way misses the point. The President—not just this President, any President—needs negotiating authority from Congress because his negotiating credibility is diminished, sometimes a little, most often a lot, without that grant of authority from Congress. That is as true at the start of formal trade negotiations as it is at the conclusion—maybe a little less at the beginning than at the end.

We would all be better off if we could have the President go to the table with Congress saying here is what we want you to do for us; here is how we want
you to keep in touch with us so we can represent the people, our constituents, and the leeways that we might give on final negotiations when we get something we can pass. This is sometimes referred to as fast track. We all remember from history, designed in large part as a response to the diminished U.S. negotiation credibility that resulted from the failure of Congress to implement some of the trade agreements concurred by the Kennedy Round. Here again I think Mr. Zoellick played a very important role. I think he has a record that speaks for itself. Other than U.S. Trade Representative Carla Hills, Mr. Zoellick spent more time with the Congress than any other administration official to get fast track authority passed in 1991. I have confidence in Mr. Zoellick’s ability to work with Congress, to get a bill renewing the President’s trade negotiating authority through Congress. We need at least start that process, even though it is a very difficult process, and do it soon. That is the conversation that Senator Baucus and I have had to this point.

I am not satisfied why I view Mr. Zoellick’s nomination with enthusiasm. It is a very extraordinary record and has some length. I have looked carefully at what he has done during the past 20 years in promoting America’s trade interests. That record tells me Mr. Zoellick understands that trade matters to every American. It matters to the farmers in my hometown of New Hartford, IA, who want to sell his or her grain in the international markets. It matters to the Caterpillar workers in Illinois who make tractors for sale in Asia, Europe, and America. It matters to John Deere workers in Waterloo, IA. One out of five jobs on that assembly line are related to export. These are very good jobs and on average, jobs connected with trade pay 15 percent above the national average.

It matters to the Boeing employees in the State of Washington who make state-of-the-art aircraft for every major world aircraft maker. It matters to the radio workers who make avionics in Cedar, IA, that go into these Boeing airplanes. It is going to involve their jobs, as well. Trade is very important in almost every State. But 40 percent of our agricultural products are exported. We pay a dollar for a dollar that, but I know for manufacturing and services, the dollar value of those exports is many times what it is for agriculture. Perhaps most importantly, open international markets increasingly matter to millions of very small entrepreneurs as well. These are the people who compete for business every day, wherever they find it, anywhere in the world.

Bob Zoellick understands that all of these Americas, whether they roll on the floor or punch the time clock at the assembly line, or whether they work in the high-tech new economy, are able, through these jobs, which are better jobs because of international trade, to pay their mortgage; they are able to support their families; and they are able to make their communities better places to live.

I believe Mr. Zoellick has already shown himself as someone who can serve the public with an outstanding record of leadership in trade policy who has already served his country well. I have come to know him and to respect him. I know that my distinguished colleagues on both sides of the aisle will as well.

As chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, I strongly urge my distinguished colleagues to vote to confirm this nomination and appoint this outstanding individual to America’s most important international trade position.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Montana.

I rise to speak not to question the nomination of Mr. Zoellick— he is obviously qualified for the position of U.S. Trade Representative—but to question the trade policy priorities of administrations past and present. For the problems our manufacturers and workers face today are not Democratic problems or Republican problems, they are all problems with a trade liberalization approach that needs to be rethought and reinvigorated. That approach has led to record trade deficits and alarming trends in income inequality. The current crisis in the U.S. steel industry demonstrates that unfettered importation of unfairly traded products causes serious harm to our manufacturers and workers.

Sustained reflection on the causes and consequences of the trade deficits has led me to three conclusions. First, there must be a general recognition that low-wage competition from less-developed countries is part of the problem. The low wages in those countries both undercut the economics of production in the United States and impede the development of a middle class that can purchase U.S. exports. Our trade is too vulnerable from first to last. American companies in, or on the verge of, bankruptcy? Are we so naive as to believe that the problems of the steel industry—as well as the elimination of millions of manufacturing jobs from the economy since 1979—are unconnected to predatory trade practices by foreign producers and their governments? For those who have any doubts on this score, I recommend study of the recent Commerce Department report entitled “Global Steel Trade.”

Second, we must recognize that a key objective of many of our trading partners in any full trade negotiation is to weaken U.S. trade laws, including our antidumping, countervailing duty, and safeguard regimes. It is an iron law of international trade negotiations and the implementation of international trade agreements—that, if the trade laws are “on the table,” they will be weakened. Is there any doubt that the antidumping and countervailing duty laws were weakened in the Uruguay Round negotiations? Is there any doubt that we see more evidence of this weakening every day? Has the trade liberalization approach of the World Trade Organization in defending U.S. implementation of U.S. trade law? The United States simply must not once again enter into an open-ended negotiating round in which countries such as Japan, Korea, and the European Union are able to work in concert to eviscerate the framework of fair trade. Equally important, we cannot permit any international tribunal to interpret and to apply the trade laws of the United States.

Third, in addition to including strong labor and environmental protections in all trade agreements, we must adopt and enforce policies to attack hidden and non-tariff barriers and to effectively counter or challenge foreign subsidies for research, development, and exports. For example, we must do more to address the manner in which producers in many countries are able to control distribution in their home markets and thereby shut out their U.S. competitors. The current trade liberalization approach limits the ability of the United States to use import restrictions to ensure fair trade in our markets while giving mercantilist foreign countries virtually a free hand in weakening our own producers. The problems of the steel industry demonstrates that the United States simply must not permit any international tribunal to interpret and to apply the trade laws of the United States.
the International Trade Commission, then-President Clinton stated that “our analysis of the current and prospective import situation and recent events in the steel industry lead us to believe that Section 201 relief may be warranted.” The near future has Zaellick, our steel companies and steel workers cannot wait for the “near future.” The crisis is now. The remedies are at hand. Let us not tarry!

Mr. CORZINE. Mr. President, I rise in support of the nomination of Robert Zoellick to be United States Trade Representative.

I know Mr. Zoellick personally and am confident that he has the background and skills to do an outstanding job. He is an exceptionally bright and talented individual with a broad understanding of trade policy and a strong commitment to public service. President Bush deserves real credit for this selection.

Robert Zoellick has an extensive background that should prepare him well for his new position. During the administration of former President George H. W. Bush, he served as Deputy Chief of Staff at the White House, as Counselor of the Department of State and Under Secretary of State for Economics, and as the President’s personal representative for the G-7 Economic Summits in 1991 and 1992. In the 1980’s he also served at the Department of the Treasury in various positions, including Governor to Secretary James A. Baker III.

Mr. Zoellick is now poised to play an important role in the current Bush administration and could have a real impact on the future of our economy. In my view, it is critical that we continue working hard to open up foreign markets for American businesses, while maintaining a strong commitment to environmental protection and labor protections. Although it has received little attention, the United States has been running very large trade deficits in recent years, and our net foreign debt now exceeds $1.5 trillion. This means we are increasingly dependent on foreign investors to maintain our economic strength, a vulnerability with potentially serious consequences.

I know that Bob Zoellick will be an aggressive advocate for opening up foreign markets. As the same time, I hope that he will work hard at forging consensus on this trade issue as well before the Congress. In particular, I am hopeful that he will work constructively with those who want labor and environmental concerns to be addressed seriously in international negotiations. I realize that this is a controversial area and that President Bush has expressed skepticism about incorporating these matters in trade agreements. However, if trade policy is going to enjoy strong bipartisan support, as it should, the administration will have to compromise.

Few people would be better prepared to navigate the complex political and substantive issues involved with trade policy than Bob Zoellick. I believe he will be a highly effective trade representative, and I wish him the best of luck in his new position. I am looking forward to working with him.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I rise today in support of Mr. Zoellick to be United States Trade Representative. As the world economy of the twenty-first century continues to evolve, it is paramount that the United States continue to pursue expansive international trade, commodity, and direct investment policies that create growth and raise living standards both at home and abroad. By nominating Robert Zoellick for the position of U.S. Trade Representative, President Bush has chosen someone who is eminently qualified to coordinate these policies, and I look forward to doing all I can in Congress to support him.

A respected scholar at Harvard University and former trade representative and chief executive officer of the Center for Strategic and International Studies, Robert is no stranger to public service. He served during President George Bush’s Administration in a variety of important posts including Under Secretary of State for Economics, as well as the President’s personal representative for the G-7 Economic Summits in 1991. From 1985 to 1988, he served as Counselor to Secretary of Treasury James Baker, as well as Deputy Assistant Secretary for Financial Institutions Policy at Treasury. Indeed, this extensive government experience, coupled with his outstanding academic credentials, make Robert Zoellick a USTR nominee who I am proud to support.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I rise this afternoon to briefly comment on the nomination of Robert Zoellick to be United States Trade Representative. At the outset, I would first like to commend President Bush for choosing a nominee of such high caliber to take on the responsibilities demanded of the U.S. Trade Representative. Furthermore, I applaud President’s decision to keep the Trade Representative a Cabinet-level position. This was the right decision that reaffirms the United States role in a global trading environment. I fully support Mr. Zoellick’s appointment and look forward to working with him in the new Administration.

Mr. President, in a world that has become increasingly interconnected through international trade, a skilled and experienced Trade Representative is essential to ensuring that the United States maintains it position as a leader in this area. The U.S. Trade Representative has the dual responsibility to open markets for our goods and services while safeguarding the well-being of American workers and businesses. I believe Mr. Zoellick’s past experience makes him qualified to fulfill these obligations.

After earning both public policy and law degrees at Harvard University, Mr. Zoellick went on to serve as a Deputy Assistant Secretary at the Department of the Treasury during the Reagan Administration. He then assumed the position of Under Secretary for Economic Policy at the State Department under President George Bush. He left public service as Deputy Director of the President’s Council of Economic Advisors and as Vice President of Fannie Mae and most recently sat as a fellow and board member of the German Marshall Fund of the United States.

Mr. Zoellick assumed a key role in some of the most critical trade deals to face the United States in decades. Some of his most notable achievements include managing the negotiations over German reunification after the fall of the Berlin Wall, fostering compromise that led to the creation of the World Trade Organization, and negotiating the approval of the North American Free Trade Agreement.

Mr. President, if, which I assume will be the case, Mr. Zoellick is confirmed as U.S. Trade Representative, I would assume stewardship of an agency that enjoys one of its strongest positions in its history. I would be remiss if I did not acknowledge the great strides made under the former U.S. Trade Representative,扳柴锡尔夫, Deputy U.S. Trade Representative Richard Fisher, and their team.

In the last two years alone, we have passed legislation that created new trading opportunities in Sub-Saharan Africa and enhanced the Caribbean Basin Initiative program. And one of the most monumental trade achievements of recent history was the accession agreement reached between the U.S. and China with respect to its entry into the WTO and the granting of Permanent Normal Trade Relations status to China just last fall. These were both landmark agreements that have significantly altered the face of U.S.-Chinese trade relations. More importantly, they are accomplishments we can and should build upon.

And while we should take pride in these achievements, we must not lose sight of the tremendous tasks that still lie ahead, and upon being confirmed as Trade Representative, Mr. Zoellick will be faced with a number of unresolved trade matters that, in my opinion, will require his immediate attention.

First, we must continue to ensure that China adheres to the concessions it made in its WTO accession agreement with the United States in order to guarantee that American workers and industries gain the full benefits negotiated in this historic agreement.

Secondly, the Trade Representative will need to formulate solutions to our ongoing troubles with the European Union (EU), specifically in regard to the beef-hormone and banana disputes. Moreover, the WTO is scheduled to rule on the EU’s case against the U.S. with respect to foreign sales corporations. A ruling against the U.S. in this matter could result in almost $4 billion in retaliatory tariffs being levied against American goods that could financially...
ruin businesses and cost countless American jobs. Resolution of this issue must be a priority.

Finally, one of Mr. Zoellick's greatest challenges will be working with Congress to gain approval of fast-track trade authority for the President. This authority will take on increased importance at the upcoming Summit of the Americas in Quebec in April where, President Bush has stated, he will make the creation of a Free Trade Agreement of the Americas his number one priority. I urge my colleagues to do likewise. I am disappointed that President Bush has publicly voiced his opposition to this initiative as a part of trade agreements.

It is my hope that Mr. Zoellick will show some flexibility on these issues and be mindful of their importance in future negotiations. Absent these safeguards, the President will face a difficult time obtaining the support needed to secure this critical trade authority.

In closing, Mr. President, I have long said we must open the doors of trade to new markets. Expanded trade improves the lives of American workers by providing better paying jobs and increased markets for American goods. Ultimately, this translates into a stronger national economy. I also believe that it can serve the purpose of slowly transforming countries that have been socially and politically intolerant into countries that recognize the rights of their own citizens. Ultimately, a country's success will be its own best economic interest.

At the same time, I firmly believe that every effort must be made to balance the economic benefits of free trade with the needs of American businesses and workers and to vigorously enforce existing trade laws against unfair trading practices. The U.S. Trade Representative must be unwavering in this regard.

Mr. Zoellick has agreed to undertake this critical balancing act, and I believe his record as a fair and capable negotiator will serve him well as he assumes this post. Again, I wish to reiterate my support for his nomination as U.S. Trade Representative and urge my colleagues to do likewise.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, "A foreign policy wunderkind," "Baker's second brain," "a resume so impressive it might be mistaken for a parody of overachievement," "the most impressive thinker of my time in government."

"He was the only one prepared to walk in the room," a man whose "board memberships read like the directory of the internationalist establishment," one whose friends possess "almost a cultlike admiration for his intelligence, hard work, and integrity."—such praise for Bob Zoellick demonstrates the high expectations for his tenure as the United States Trade Representative. The President has pinned his leadership of our ambition to expand free trade and restore America's rightful place at the forefront of global trade liberalization.

Unlike previous trade representatives, who often possessed more narrow legal backgrounds, Bob's range of experience at the Departments of Treasury and State, in the White House, and with organizations like NATO, the WTO, and the G-7 grant him unusual insight into the role of trade within the framework of America's broader engagement with the world. Bob's talents, combined with the enthusiasm and purity of his belief in free trade as a force to advance American interests around the world, suggest that he will serve well President Bush's mandate to push forward with a meaningful free trade agenda. If personnel is policy, as we often say in Washington, Bob's selection for the cabinet-rank trade post reflects the Administration's commitment to our nation's trade expansion efforts.

Yet such achievements will not come easily. America's economy, which has been the engine of global economic growth, has not yet garnered the broad-based domestic consensus on the benefits of free trade. Japan's economy remains mired in an enduring recession that can be ended only by fundamental structural reforms. China's implementation of its market-opening obligations under the WTO remains woefully incomplete. The European Union, where growth has recently accelerated, retains significant market distortions that are reflected in its continued agricultural protectionism and federal disputes with the United States over subjects like hormone-treated beef. The economic health of Latin America is mixed, and many African nations with tremendous trade potential suffer the pernicious effects of poor governance and civil strife. Clearly, Bob has his work cut out for him.

Given the challenges and opportunities ahead—and the critical role of trade to the continued dynamism of our economy, to our military posture, to the extent possible, speak with one voice in favor of trade expansion. Bob has pledged to work closely with the Congress on such priorities as creating a hemispheric free trade zone, providing the Piving and with renewed trade-promotion authority, ratifying our bilateral trade agreement with Vietnam, locking in free trade with partners like Singapore and Jordan, and setting the stage for a new round of global trade talks. It is my hope that Bob will work diligently with the Administration to advance this ambitious but achievable trade agenda, for the benefit of the American people we serve.

As Bob noted in a "Foreign Affairs" article during the campaign, "A primary task for the next President of the United States is to build public support for rapid, aggressive action so as to promote and advance American interests and values for the next 50 years. . . . America must capture the dynamism of the era and transform its new elements into the economic and security foundations for a future system."

Such an integrative approach, which I strongly endorse, requires restoring our nation's leadership in liberalizing global trade. I wish Bob the best as he spearheads this effort, upon which rests our fondest hopes as a people for prosperity and purpose in the world.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, today the Senate will consider the nomination of Robert Zoellick to become the U.S. Trade Representative. I will support the nomination of the Robert Zoellick.

Given the important contribution of the automotive industry to America's economic prosperity and job creation, I wish to flag two important automotive initiatives that have been made a priority by USTR designate Zoellick: the United States automotive trade relationship with Korea and with Japan.

I am also disappointed to note that Mr. Zoellick was not asked during his Senate Finance Committee confirmation hearing last week about two trade agreements of key interest to the automotive industry: the 1995 Framework Agreement on Autos and Auto Parts between the United States and Japan and a 1998 United States-Korea Auto Market Access MOU. Neither have achieved the expected results of opening these markets to United States automotive exports. It is time to go back to the table and insist on the results we were promised.

The automotive industry is the largest manufacturing industry in the United States representing 3.7 percent of GDP. It ranks first among manufacturing industries in R&D expenditures spending over $18 billion a year, employs almost 2.5 million Americans and exports more than any other industry. This is why it is so important for our USTR and the Administration to fight aggressively to allow this industry to compete on a fair and level playing field in foreign markets.

The 1995 Framework Agreement on Autos and Auto Parts between the United States and Japan was allowed by the Government of Japan to expire at the end of 2000. This is despite the Agreement's failure to accomplish its stated objective to significantly expand sales opportunities resulting in purchases of foreign parts by Japanese firms in Japan and through their transplants in the United States to resolve market access problems for foreign autos and auto parts in Japan. The U.S. Government, working closely
with the American auto parts industry, organized labor and Members of Congress, developed and presented a significant proposal for extending and enhancing the 1995 Agreement. In the closing days of 2000 Japan was even unwilling to permit the extension of the existing Agreement which would have allowed time for the new Administration to pursue a more substantial five year agreement.

I urge the Bush administration, and Mr. Zoellick in particular, to make the renegotiation of the 1995 Agreement a high priority. I believe that Mr. Zoellick has the experience, education and the executive leadership skills to be an outstanding USTR.

Mr. Zoellick has had a broad range of experience in the executive branch, including the Treasury Department, State Department, and the White House. Chairman Grassley has detailed his record of accomplishment. Mr. Zoellick’s experience is not just from the view of a government administrator. Since 1997, he has held a number of positions with private sector firms involved in corporate restructuring and capital development. This unique combination of public sector and private sector experience will prove vital to his performance as USTR.

The United States faces a number of key trade issues in the next few years. It will be a great advantage to American workers and American consumers if we can create a bi-partisan U.S. trade policy.

We need to look at the issue of granting new trade promotion authority to Ambassador Zoellick. But fast track authority alone should not replace the hard work and effort to forge bi-partisan support for U.S. trade initiatives.

My experience on the Judiciary Committee has taught me that intellectual property issues will play an increasingly important role in the international economy. We must make sure that the creative efforts of those who produce software, entertainment such as music and movies and breakthrough drugs and medical devices get the benefit of TRIPS implementation and enforcement. Frankly, we need to get better across the board at enforcing the trade agreements that we negotiate.

We also need to resist any efforts to impose unnecessary barriers on the emerging Internet economy. For example, we must work to see that computer downloads are not unduly hindered through tariffs or technical barriers.

I want to re-enforce many of the comments that my friend from West Virginia, Senator Byrd made with respect to the crisis among our domestic steel producers. I want to work with Mr. Zoellick and Senator O’Neill on the efforts by the Bush Administration to re-energize our domestic steel industry. I think at his confirmation hearing that Mr. Zoellick made the correct comment to Senator Rockefeller, my other good friend from West Virginia, on the potential use of section 201 authority with respect to steel. We must come up with a comprehensive plan to help U.S. producers of steel like Geneva Steel from my state of Utah. Part of this plan must focus on foreign dumping and countervailing duties.

At his confirmation hearing, Majority Leader Lott and I raised the banana and beef cases and the use of the carousel rotation of product retaliation lists. We can’t let the Europeans avoid the consequences when the lose WTO cases. Frankly, I think that one of the first things this Administration ought to do in the trade area is to follow the Bush plan we passed last year and immediately implement the carousel system.

The Korean government’s recently announced $2.1 billion bailout of Hyundai electronics raises many troubling questions. This development may be a direct violation of commitments made to the IMF in 1997. Specifically, USTR must examine whether this new bailout program is in accordance with the commitments made in paragraphs 31 and 35 of the 1997 IMF Standby Agreement, respectively, bank lending practices, and government subsidies and tax preferences. I trust that USTR will look into this, and I want my colleagues to know that this is an issue that I take very seriously. Frankly this government bailout must be scrutinized by USTR so that we can be sure that American high technology firms like Micron can remain competitive in the international market.

I am confident that Bob Zoellick can work effectively with Commerce Secretary Evans and other key Administration officials to bring the American public the promise of free and fair trade. We need to focus on both opening new trading opportunities, but we also need to enforce U.S. trade laws and ensure compliance with international trade agreements.

Many believe—and I believe—that the Office of the United States Trade Representative is the best governmental trade organization in the world. We ask Mr. Zoellick to lead and inspire this very strong agency to perform even better. The citizens of Utah and throughout the United States have a stake at stake in the performance of USTR.

As a Senator who believes in the long-term benefits to America of free and fair trade, I plan to vote for Robert Zoellick and stand ready to work with my colleagues to build a strong, bipartisan trade policy.

Mr. President, I thank all Senators and I yield the floor.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, I now yield to my good friend from North Dakota, Senator Dorgan, for 15 minutes.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I thank the Chair and my colleague from Montana, Senator Baucus.

Mr. President, I intend to vote for Bob Zoellick to be the U.S. Trade Representative. I am not a big fan of the U.S. Trade Representative’s office—never have been—under Republican or Democratic administrations. My view is that our trade policy in this country is too much focused on the short-term and price-giving subsidies and tax preferences. I trust that USTR will look into this.
the confirmation of Mr. Zoellick, we need to expect something different from the U.S. Trade Representative's office. You could put a blindfold on and listen to both Republican and Democratic administrations over last 20 years, Republican and Democratic stewards of the USTR, and you would not be able to tell the difference between them. It wouldn't matter. It is all the same, all the same trade policy: Negotiate another agreement and hope things get better. However, what really happens is, they negotiate another agreement and things get worse.

I am told that we have, in the last 8 years, negotiated 304 trade agreements. I am also told, that some of the agreements cannot even be located in the offices of the Trade Representative, let alone get them enforced. At the time when we have negotiated 304 trade agreements, our trade deficit has increased over 300 percent.

Let me show you what bothers me from time to time about our current trade strategy. Let me do it in terms of T-bone steaks. I have a chart I want to share with you.

We negotiated a trade agreement with Japan in 1989 on the issue of beef. The U.S. could not successfully get agreement, and then they had a big phase-in, here is what we have done on automobiles. We have said: Yes, there are probably 1.2 billion people over there, and if they are able to increase their standard of living, at some point they will become more affluent and want to start driving cars. If that happens there will be more automobile trade between the United States and China. What we will agree to, China, we will grant you access to our market at a 2.5-percent tariff on any automobiles we import. A huge surplus with us, or we have to have a tariff that is 10 times higher—25 percent—on any U.S. automobiles going to China.

What on Earth are we thinking about? Here is a country that has a huge surplus with us, and we will allow them to have a huge deficit with them. We negotiate an agreement with them and say: Oh, yes, by the way, we will allow you to impose tariffs on automobiles 10 times higher than those we impose on you.

I am told that we have, in the last 8 years, negotiated 304 trade agreements, our trade deficit has increased over 300 percent. At the time when we have negotiated 304 trade agreements, negotiations cannot be located in the offices of the Trade Representative, let alone get them enforced. At the time when we have negotiated 304 trade agreements, our trade deficit has increased over 300 percent. At the time when we have negotiated 304 trade agreements, negotiations cannot be located in the offices of the Trade Representative, let alone get them enforced. At the time when we have negotiated 304 trade agreements, our trade deficit has increased over 300 percent.

I am also told, that some of the agreements cannot even be located in the offices of the Trade Representative, let alone get them enforced. At the time when we have negotiated 304 trade agreements, the incompetence of these negotiators, let alone the fact that once we agree to these agreements, as bad as they are for this country, they are not enforced. Do you know how many people we have enforcing our trade agreements? Yes, even the bad trade agreements with China? Seven. There used to be 10; now there are 7. China has done little to comply with any of our trade agreements. So now we have gone and negotiated a new bilateral agreement that is poorly designed and at the same time decreased the number of people monitoring and investigating how China is not playing by the rules. Our staff for China went from 10 to 7.

At some point we have to realize, that ballooning trade deficits we currently have in this country, are unhealthy for our country, our future and our economy. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields time?

Mr. BAUCUS. Mr. President, might I inquire how much time remains on both sides?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana has 25 minutes 7 seconds remaining. The Senator from Iowa has 22 minutes 24 seconds.

Mr. BAUCUS. I yield 10 minutes to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I thank my colleague on the floor the presence of my good friend and colleague from Louisiana. It was actually her idea that drew me over here. I am glad she is here. I will try and be brief in my remarks and then defer to the Senator from Louisiana to share some of her thoughts.

Let me say, first of all, I am a strong supporter of Bob Zoellick to be the new U.S. Trade Representative. I think he is qualified and is an excellent Trade Representative. We worked very closely together over the years on other matters. He was at the State Department. I know him to be tremendously thoughtful, a good listener, one who is not afraid of taking tough stands and is attentive to a wide diversity of interests dealing with some of the issues affecting some of the very regions of the world I will address some remarks to, and that is Central America and Latin America back in the 1980s.

So I am a strong supporter of Bob's. He will do a great job. The President is lucky to have his willing services in this administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Louisiana is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Who yields to the Senator?

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I have the authority to yield time, but I think Senator Baucus would be comfortable yielding 10 minutes.

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Louisiana for her work.

Mr. President, I support Mr. Zoellick. I am not here to oppose his nomination at all, but I would like to express my great reservations about the direction of our trade policy. Unless I am mistaken, I think I heard the majority leader today out on the floor saying that we need to, of course, have the trade but we need for it to be fair trade. I was pleased to hear his very strong remarks.

I guess it was about maybe a month ago that I was on the Iron Range of Minnesota with the taconite workers at a gathering at Hoyt Lakes. There were about 1,000 workers there, although 1,300 of them have lost their jobs since the LTV Steel Company closed down. They shut down the taconite operation. Fourteen-hundred workers on the Iron Range lost their jobs. Other workers, by the way, are being laid off at other mines. It is not just those workers. It is the subcontractors. It is their families. It is the people in the community.

I never mind saying this because it is just true. Even though you talk about one region of the State, you never want to act as if you don't care about other regions, and I am attentive to all of these. Northeastern Minnesota is like a second home to Sheila and I. This is where our campaign started back in 1989. They supported me when no one
thought I ever had a chance. These are people with the greatest work ethic in the world. They are just incredible people. There are a lot of broken lives, broken dreams, and potentially broken families in northeastern Minnesota. I always go to high school just to stay in touch with the students there. I have been there about three or four times in the last year or two. The discussions with the students are so poignant. They want to know if they can afford college. They want to know what is going to happen to their mom or dad, and whether or not there will be any jobs for them. These are good jobs that pay probably $65,000 a year, counting health benefits. There are not a lot of other jobs such as that. Of course, there will be a future because when you have people with such a strong work ethic and who are so self-reliant and self-sufficient it will happen.

But I want to say this on the floor of the Senate. When I was at this gathering, I was looking over about 1,000 workers. And I thought to myself: These are industrial workers. All too often in our trade policy and all too often on the floor of the Senate and on the floor of Representatives, they have been out of sight and out of mind. I could add the auto-workers to the steelworkers, and a lot out of mind. I could add the auto-workers, they have been out of sight and often on the floor of the Senate and on the floor of Representatives. They want to know what is going to happen to their mom or dad, and whether or not there will be any jobs for them. These are good jobs that pay probably $65,000 a year, counting health benefits. There are not a lot of other jobs such as that. Of course, there will be a future because when you have people with such a strong work ethic and who are so self-reliant and self-sufficient it will happen.

But I want to say this on the floor of the Senate. When I was at this gathering, I was looking over about 1,000 workers. And I thought to myself: These are industrial workers. All too often in our trade policy and all too often on the floor of the Senate and on the floor of Representatives, they have been out of sight and out of mind. I could add the auto-workers to the steelworkers, and a lot of industrial workers as well.

In this particular case, the import surge of steel—in the case of taconite workers, it is semifinished steel—slab steel from Brazil, from South Korea, from Russia, and from other countries way below our cost of production has essentially put them out of work. These steel workers on the Iron Range of Minnesota want to know where they fit into this international economy. I say this to Mr. Zoellick—and I will say it every day for the rest of my time in the Senate—why can’t we have a trade policy that recognizes the importance of trade but also works for working people in our country? If it is true that we live in an international economy—yes, it is true—then if you care about human rights, you have to care about it not only in our country but other countries. If you care about the right of people to join a union and make decent wages for their families— you have to care about that, not only in our country but other countries as well. If you care about the environment, you have to care about it in our country but other countries as well. If you care about the environment, you have to care about it in an international context. But from NAFTA to GATT to WTO to efforts to have fast track here and there, I have not seen an effort to really talk about a fair trade policy.

I am not an isolationist. I am an internationalist. My dad was born in Odessa, Ukraine. He fled persecution in Russia. He learned to speak three languages fluently. I grew up in a family where there was no other choice but to be an internationalist. But there has to be some new rules that come with this international economy.

This has to be an international economy and global economy that works for steelworkers—workers for autos, workers for family farmers, the environment, and human rights. That is not the case now. Lord, I have given enough speeches on the Senate floor about human rights violations in China and other countries as well. I will not do that today.

I must make an appeal to Mr. Zoellick and appeal to my colleagues that, whatever we do, let’s try to figure out some additional steps we can take that will give some assurance to hard-working people in our country so they don’t get the short end of the stick and get spit out of the economy because we have no level playing field.

That is what has happened to these steelworkers on the Iron Range. That is exactly what has happened to these taconite workers.

I think Senator DAYTON would say the same thing. We are desperately trying, with Congressman OBERSTAR and others, to get trade adjustments to people. We hope the taconite workers fit into that. We want to talk about the section 201 bill, the Metallurgical bill that deals with the whole problem of unfair trade in steel, and whether or not we have to say to the other countries we can’t deal with these import surges, especially if we think it is a dumping of steel, our steel well below the cost of production; especially when you talk about countries where people do not get decent wages, where there are no OSHA or any workplace safety rules, etc.

There has to be a way we can have some competition and a trade policy that makes sure steelworkers on the Iron Range of Minnesota and family farmers and people who care about the environment and people who care about human rights in this country and in the world, that those industrial workers are simply off the radar screen when it comes to politics in the Nation’s Capital today.

There are two Senators on the floor: Senator GRASSLEY from Iowa, who is chair of the Finance Committee, one of the best Senators in the Senate—he is wrong on every issue but he is one of the best Senators in the Senate—and Senator BAUCUS, who is also ranking member of the Finance Committee, who is very skilled. I say to both of my colleagues and other Senators, I hope maybe this year, since we are 50/50, and we will have a lot of passionate debates, there are certain areas where maybe we can work together. Maybe there are some things we can do to try to make this trade policy work a little better for some of the people in our country and in this particular case for some of the steelworkers on the Iron Range and some other people in my State much less other States. That is the appeal I make today.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa is recognized.

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

GRANT ALDONAS

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I rise for a very special purpose relating to the work of the Senate Finance Committee and the aspect of our work that deals with international and the high caliber of staff who have been on the International Trade Subcommittee over a long period of time. But I take special note of one of our staff people, our chief trade counsel, Grant Aldonas. He is right here.

He is going to soon be leaving the position that he has with our committee. It is going to be a loss for our committee, and particularly for me as a new chairman. It is going to be a tremendous loss because people of his caliber who are so successful in the private sector and are willing to come back into public service are few and far between. He is one who has done that. He has done it for 3/4 years as the Finance Committee’s top trade lawyer. He will be Chief Senator Roth before me with the greatest of professionalism and diligence; he has done a very good job.

Grant has left his mark on some of the Senate’s most significant trade policy initiatives—the passage of the Trade and Development Act of 2000, and the passage of the bill that has been on everybody’s mind over the last 3 or 4 years giving permanent normal trade relations status to the great country of China. This was chief among all the work that he did for that period of time on the Senate Finance Committee.

I think I can speak for members of the Senate Finance Committee on both sides of the aisle. They have come to rely upon Grant’s skill and judgment. Even though he is very skillful, a judgment is the greatest asset that he has when dealing with the policies of international trade, not only from the domestic standpoint but from the international standpoint. Judgment with good common sense is very important.

I have already referred to his success in the private sector. That is because he is a good lawyer. He is also a good public servant and just a plain good person.

I wish you, Grant, and your wife Pam all the best in your new life beyond the Hill. Thank you very much for your services.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BAUCUS. I yield myself such time as I might consume.

I join in the remarks of our distinguished chairman to Grant Aldonas. I am fond of saying I believe the most noble human endeavor is service—service to church, to family, to the community, State and Nation; whatever must be done must be done. One of us graced to be on the face of this Earth particularly public service—more particularly, public service where
you don’t get your name in the headlines or the evening news, public servants who don’t have huge egos but are working for the country in the best interests of the United States of America and all Americans. Grant certainly is in that category.

Grant is a guy who works behind the scenes to get results. Again, it is not headlines. It is talking to all the Senators, the Senators’ staffs, the administration, whoever it is he must talk to in order to get a result, legislation, something passed for the sake of the people.

He is a great bipartisan kind of a guy. He is particularly effective because of his professionalism, his common sense, a commodity which is probably one of the most important a person can have. We will miss you, Grant. We know you will go on to bigger and better things. We will miss you, Grant. We know you will go on to bigger and better things. We will miss you, Grant. We know you will go on to bigger and better things. We will miss you, Grant. We know you will go on to bigger and better things.

Our challenge is to build that consensus on trade policy in a global economy, not only in this country but around the world.

I look forward to working with Bob Zoellick, and my congratulations on the challenge we face in doing that constructively and successfully.

There are some key elements, in my view, for building that consensus. First, I believe one of the key and perhaps one of the fundamental approaches that will be required is a realization that expanded worker adjustment assistance is one way with which to ease the pain and address the problem. A more broad-based, flexible, and adjustable program is clearly needed, and I hope we all can accept that realization.

A smooth transition from displacement back into the workforce is important for communities and the overall economy, and such assistance is critical to building consensus on moving forward on greater trade liberalization. Bob Zoellick was a key member of the Trade Deficit Commission. The Commission did not agree on the underlying cause of the trade deficit or how to remedy it. The only area of broad bipartisan agreement was for expanded worker adjustment assistance. I look forward to working with Mr. Zoellick.
Zoellick in this area. I look forward to recognizing the possibility for bipartisan consensus on expanded worker adjustment assistance. I hope it will be an integral part of anything we do in the longer term with regard to trade policy.

A second element is increased support and emphasis on lifetime learning. A policy that waits until someone loses a job is doomed to failure. Over time, the goal has to be to embed the culture with an appreciation of learning and upgrading skills throughout one’s life. And that by doing so, economically and educationally, this new construction of lifelong learning can be an integrally important and extremely essential part of anything we do to advance the cause of world trade.

Let’s recognize that building those learning skills and upgrading them throughout life must not be viewed simply as an education issue but as a trade issue.

They must advance labor and environmental standards around the world. I believe this has to be done on a bilateral and multilateral basis. Recent bilateral trade pacts, such as the one with Jordan, have begun to make progress in critical areas. But there is so much more that needs to be done. We recognized it in the bilateral arrangement with Jordan. We ought to recognize it in any new bilateral arrangement. But, clearly, we have to recognize it in multilateral efforts as well.

We recognize how difficult it is. We recognize how challenging. We recognize how divisive. We recognize how much debate, and in some ways contentious, labor and the environment. I hope we can find common ground on those issues as well.

The President has made a strong nomination. I know my colleagues will be as supportive of this nominee as I can be. And expect it will be an overwhelming vote. But I also hope and expect that this is not the end but the beginning of the creation of an even more balanced trade policy with more consensus on international trade and globalization, and a realization that that consensus depends on how effectively we address myriad challenges that we have not addressed successfully so far. I look forward to working with our nominee and with my colleagues in that regard.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Thomas). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I intend to tell you that Robert Zoellick for U.S. Trade Representative. I believe he brings excellent credentials to this position. I do believe the new President, President George W. Bush, is entitled to discretion but, in any event, this is a qualified man. I would like to take a moment or two to talk about the enforcement of U.S. trade laws, especially as they relate to a very serious situation in my State with respect to the steel industry.

Steel has been victimized in the United States by illegal trade practices, trade practices which violate U.S. law and trade practices which violate international law. Steel has been the target of dumping in the United States which has cost the steel workers, in the past two decades, a reduction in employment from close to half a million steel workers to now less than 160,000 workers, and a situation where many steel corporations today are on the verge of bankruptcy.

We need to see to it that dumping is not permitted in this country. Simply stated: Dumping is where steel, for example, is sold in the United States at a price that is less than the cost of production or the cost of production plus a reasonable profit, and the union to go to Federal court and to get injunctive relief. That relief can be obtained very promptly.

It is possible, under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, to get a temporary restraining order on an ex parte basis on the filing of affidavits—there has to be a hearing within 5 days, evidence can be put into the record, equity actions can be tried very promptly, and that is an effective way to see to it that U.S. trade laws are enforced and that they are consistent with international trade laws.

Last year we legislated on a matter on a bill introduced by Senator DeWINE of Ohio and backed by quite a number of us and the leadership of Senator ROBERT BYRD of West Virginia. Then through the leadership of Senator ROBERT BYRD of West Virginia, with my concurrence in the Appropriations Committee, we put that bill into effect last year which provides that where duties are imposed for violations of U.S. trade laws, that those duties are paid to the injured parties instead of going into the U.S. Treasury.

Obviously, it is desirable to have funds go into the Treasury, but where it can be ascertained that the illegal foreign trade practices resulted from a violation of U.S. trade law and where it can be traceable to damages to specific companies or individuals, the duty is where those duties ought to be paid.

A question has arisen as to whether the United States will fight to retain that legislation against complaints by some of the foreign countries where infractions have been found. I do hope our new Trade Representative will enforce that legislation which was passed by the Congress and was signed by the President.
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President under an appropriations bill last year. I make these comments because U.S. jobs, U.S. industrial interests ought not to be sacrificed for foreign policy or for defense policy. Not too long ago, which was somewhat anxious to back up the Russian economy, we permitted tremendous dumping of steel by Russia in the United States. While I am concerned about the stability of the Russian economy, I am candidly more concerned about the stability of the Pennsylvania economy and the U.S. economy. But fair is fair. When the laws are on the books, they ought to be enforced and they ought not to be sacrificed for collateral U.S. interests on foreign policy or on defense policy.

I make these comments with the hope that our new Trade Representative will be a vigorous enforcer of U.S. trade laws and that my colleagues will consider the legislation, which I will introduce later in this session, which will provide for that private right of action.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is a sufficient second.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Robert B. Zoellick to be United States Trade Representative?

The yeas and nays are ordered and the clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. REID. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. BREAUX) and the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. INOUYE) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 98, nays 0, as follows:

[Roll Call Vote No. 9 Ex.]

YEAS—98

Akaka        Chafee, L        Emt
Allard       Clingan          Feingold
Allen        Clinton          Feinstein
Baucus       Cochran          Fitzgerald
Bayh         Cosby            Frist
Bennet       Conrad           Graham
Biden        Corinne          Gramm
Bingaman     Craig            Grassley
Bond          Cran          Gregg
Boxer         Daschle        Hagel
Brownback     Dayton          Harkin
Bunning      DeWine          Hatch
Burns         Dodd            Holms
Byrd          Donnelly        Hollings
Campbell     Dorgan           Hutchinson
Cantwell     Durbin           Hutchinson
Carnahan     Edwards          Inhofe
Carper        Ensign          Jeffords

Miller        Smith (ND)
Mukwowski     Smith (OH)
Murray        Snowe
Kohl          Specter
Kyl           Stabenow
Landrieu      Nickles
Leahy         Reid
Levin          Roberts
Lieberman     Rockefeller
Lott            Santorum
Lugar          Sessions
McCaIN        Shelby
McConnell     Smith (LA)
Mikulski

NOT VOTING—2

Breaux

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will return to legislative session.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT REQUEST

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I have a series of unanimous consent requests that I will proceed with. I ask unanimous consent that at 1 p.m. on Wednesday, February 7, the Senate proceed to the U.N. dues bill if reported by the Foreign Relations Committee, and all amendments offered be relevant to the subject matter of the bill and cleared by both managers. I further ask consent that if the committee has not reported the bill by 1 p.m., it be immediately discharged and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Reserving the right to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senators from Wisconsin.

Mr. FEINGOLD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator yield?

Mr. CRAIG. I do not yield. I have another unanimous consent to put in for morning business.

Mr. FEINGOLD. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The objection is heard.

Mr. FEINGOLD. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho has the floor.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now be in a period of morning business with Senators speaking for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CELEBRATING PRESIDENT REAGAN’S 90TH BIRTHDAY

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, this is a remarkable day in American history. Today we celebrate the 90th birthday of Ronald Reagan, the 40th President of the United States. As a Senator, we send to him our heartfelt best wishes for his continued recovery from a recent surgery and we thank him for all that he has done to make America, the Shining City on the Hill, Ronald Reagan stands in the first rank of freedom’s pantheon. Happy Birthday, Mr. President.

I ask unanimous consent that an article highlighting Ronald Reagan’s early journey through politics, Rehearsals for the Lead Role, written by John Meroney, associate editor of The American Enterprise, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 4, 2001]

REHEARSALS FOR A LEAD ROLE

Ronald Reagan was a liberal, an actor; a labor chief, but some unscripted plot twists forged a new character

(John Meroney)

Hollywood.—All day, memories had been flooding back to him. Riding home from the airport across the west side of L.A., he was traveling the same streets he had driven years before. Back then he knew the town by heart, and used to drive it with the top down on his green Cadillac convertible.

As the car pulled into the residence of 688 St. Cloud Rd. in Bel Air, the U.S. was beginning to slip into the afternoon dusk. Millions of tiny lights would soon fill the L.A. basin, a scene he always thought remarkable. And looking out across it that January day when he became a private citizen 12 years ago, Ronald Reagan knew that had it not been for the events of his life in this place, he probably never would have been president.

This week, Ronald Reagan will join John Adams and Herbert Hoover as the only presidents to reach the age of 90 as this generation knows him only as president or as the ailing statesman living in seclusion. Even though Reagan was a movie star who appeared in 53 motion pictures, and is unique among presidents in that so much from his early years is preserved on film for posterity, that critical part of his life has largely become forgotten history.

His movies rarely appear on television. (During the 1980 presidential campaign, Federal Communications Commission officials banned them from broadcast because they asserted it gave him an unfair advantage.) Dozens of books have been written about him, but the three decades when he spent, as a movie star and labor leader are given scant attention in most.

This is remarkable given that Reagan’s life during the 1940s and ‘50s was often more dramatic than the parts he played. He lived in surroundings so compelling that they have formed the basis of many great films, such as “Chinatown” and “L.A. Confidential.” Writers from Raymond Chandler to James Ellroy have decades carved their stories from Reagan’s era in Hollywood. The town was at the height of its glamour, and was steeped in national political intrigue. And Ronald Reagan not only witnessed this, but was a central figure to much of it.

Recently, new details about his life have emerged, presenting a more accurate and deeper understanding of him. Last fall, Nancy Reagan published a collection of dozens of love letters and personal correspondence her husband wrote that reveal a creative and passionate side to him at the 40th president. A collection of 677 scripts for radio commentaries that Reagan wrote by hand during the 1970s was recently discovered by researchers, and is being published this week. They document a man with clear-
attain high office where he stumbled into the end of the Cold War. Even his conservative supporters have perpetuated this view. Reagan national security adviser Robert McNamara, "He knows so little and accomplishes so much."

But a close review of the historical record, and recent interviews with those who knew Reagan in his 1940s and ’50s, reveals a man profoundly affected by his experiences as a movie star and six-term president of the Screen Actors Guild. He emerges as a complex figure who shaped what he described as intense "philosophical combat"—changed his political ideology. Contrary to assertions (which Reagan often himself seemed to make) that he became a staunch liberal because the Democratic Party abandoned him, Reagan actually went from being a staunch liberal who participated in Communist front groups to a stalwart anti-communist because of his firsthand experiences dealing with Communist Party members.

Reagan best during the 1940s and 50s, years who know him best as the screen test, he took a liking to the young man from Dixon, Ill. Now, Reagan seemed to be exceeding expectations. For years, he had dreamed about making a movie based on the legendary Notre Dame football star George Gipp, whose death had become a rallying cry for the Fighting Irish. In his spare time, Reagan worked on a script for Warners to produce. When he heard that Warner had given the green light to a picture about Notre Dame coach Knute Rockne, he took his chance. "I've been a great fan of Gipp's throughout my career, and I've read just about everything that's been written on him and Rockne," Reagan said. "I'm signed to play Rockne. 'I can play the part. I won't let you down,'" he pledged. Studio records show that Reagan beat out both John Wayne and William Holden for the part of Gipp. "Knute Rockne, All American" was released in 1940. And the line "Win one for the Gipper" eventually became as synonymous with presidential politics as "I'd like you to join me in the fight for freedom and the Cold War." By the middle of 1941, Reagan was making almost $2,000 a week. He and Wyman had built a house on Cordell Drive, just above Sunset Boulevard, with a sweeping view of the city. (Record producer Richard Perry described as intense "philosophical combat"—changed his political ideology. Contrary to assertions (which Reagan often himself seemed to make) that he became a staunch liberal because the Democratic Party abandoned him, Reagan actually went from being a staunch liberal who participated in Communist front groups to a stalwart anti-communist because of his firsthand experiences dealing with Communist Party members.

Reagan's involvement with the Screen Actors Guild spanned more than a decade, and even before he became president of it in 1947 (a position that paid him no salary or benefits), he immersed himself in its work. He would often speak extemporaneously for extended periods on the labyrinthine matters of the industry workforce, impressing professional negotiators with his knowledge of thorny labor issues.

The nature of Reagan's role as labor leader isn't the only part of his life that runs counter to the popular perception. In the years after his divorce from actress Jane Wyman in 1948, Reagan was living a life that most who know him best as the grandfathers president would never recognize. Indeed, Reagan was handsome, rich (spending in excess of $750 a month on dinners and nightclub) and dating some of the most beautiful actresses in the business.

Hollywood was booming. It was, as David Niven once said, "a stew filled with personalities, but controlled by arrogant moles, overcrowded and smelly of despoticism, and blacklists. Los Angeles supported numerous private detectives per square mile than any other place in the world."

"THE GIPPER" IS BORN

When Reagan arrived in Hollywood in May 1937, the industry was still in the Depression, but L.A. still had a grand style about it. Virtually all of the residences Reagan had here still exist, and are largely unchanged. His first apartment, in the elegant One Monte Carlo apartment building on Franklin Avenue in Hollywood. Today, as one walks into the lobby and then the unit that he rented, the serenity and glamour of the era become obvious.

Barely 12 months later. Reagan’s career was in full flourish. By the end of 1938, he had two films: "The Talk of the Town," starring Myrna Loy, and "WildARING Rat," the story of cadets at the Virginia Military Institute, is perhaps the best among them. More important, he had fallen in love with actress Jane Wyman. The couple were married just over a year later. The Warner Bros. publicity machine was churning out press releases touting them as the new all-American couple.

Jack Warner typically knew a good thing when he saw it, and from the moment of Reagan's screen test, he took a liking to the young man from Dixon, Ill. Now, Reagan seemed to be exceeding expectations. For years, he had dreamed about making a movie based on the legendary Notre Dame football star George Gipp, whose death had become a rallying cry for the Fighting Irish. In his spare time, Reagan worked on a script for Warners to produce. When he heard that Warner had given the green light to a picture about Notre Dame coach Knute Rockne, he took his chance. "I've been a great fan of Gipp's throughout my career, and I've read just about everything that's been written on him and Rockne," Reagan said. "I'm signed to play Rockne. 'I can play the part. I won't let you down,'" he pledged. Studio records show that Reagan beat out both John Wayne and William Holden for the part of Gipp. "Knute Rockne, All American" was released in 1940. And the line "Win one for the Gipper" eventually became as synonymous with presidential politics as "I'd like you to join me in the fight for freedom and the Cold War." By the middle of 1941, Reagan was making almost $2,000 a week. He and Wyman had built a house on Cordell Drive, just above Sunset Boulevard, with a sweeping view of the city. (Record producer Richard Perry..."
Knows Best”) is one example of someone who was inadvertently caught up in organizations that eventually turned out to be Communist front groups, Wyatt was blacklisted, and in 1960, he had to publicly criticize the party.

Director John Huston, who worked at Warner Brothers during his time there, was sympathetic to those on the blacklist. In his memoirs of Hollywood published in 1980, he wrote: “There is no doubt in my mind that the Communist Party has, in the past, proven to be a force and an influence. Hargrave mentioned the remark to Chaplin and, to him, a galling. Hargrave that considering Chaplin and his name introduced to the Soviet Union. “Thank God for Communism,” Chaplin was quoted as saying. “They say a comfortable life in America may spread all over the world. I say, So what?”

In addition, Hefner had also published an article about the Academy Awards by screenwriter Dalton Trumbo, a member of the Communist Party from 1943 to 1948. He famously refused to answer questions from the House Un-American Activities Committee and served 10 months in prison in 1947 for refusing to testify. He rejoined the party briefly in 1964.

Starting in November 1947—in response to charges that the industry was infiltrated by subversives—the studios adopted an industry-wide policy forbidding the hiring of any one suspected of communist sympathies. For Trumbo, the blacklist period was a financial hardship, but like many on the blacklist, he continued to write scripts under pseudonyms. And in 1960, he again began to work under his own name when Otto Preminger hired Trumbo to write the script for “Exodus.”

When Trumbo wrote his story for us, he was just starting to come out of the shadows,” Hefner said. “Hearst, who once had both been members of the liberal Hollywood Independent Citizens Committee of the Arts, Sciences and Professions (HICASP, as Reagan called it, “pronounced like the cough of a dying man”), later revealed to be secretly supported by the Communist Party. At the dinner, Reagan told Hefner that considering Chaplin and Trumbo’s defiant attitudes about communism, he found Hefner’s support for them galling. Hargrave mentioned the remark to Hefner.

“When I heard what Reagan said, I wrote to him,” says Hefner. “I liked ‘Kings Row’ and all that, but I was also unhappy about what had happened during the blacklist era. And so I told him.”

What Hefner received in response—six pages, handwritten on Reagan’s personal stationery—is, perhaps, a more precise rendering of the former president’s personal and ideological transformation than has ever appeared in the legion of books and articles written about him. It surfaces very briefly in Morris’s book on Reagan, but until now the 1960 letter has never been published in its entirety.

DEAR MR. HEFNER: I’ve been a long time answering your letter of May 13 and my section of—The 4th as an answering date is coincidence plus the fact that Holidays are—free time—days around our house: Your letter has been very much on my mind and I have yet to answer in a way that will make sense to you. First because I once thought exactly as you think, and second because no one could have changed my mind. It took seven months of meeting communists and communist influence people across a table in almost daily sessions while pickets raged in front, houses were bombed and a great industry almost ground to a halt.

You expressed lack of knowledge about my views, political back ground etc. Because so much doubt has been cast on “anti-communist,” inspired by the radicalism of ex-communists and every “cause.” I feel I should reveal where I have stood and now stand. My first four votes were cast for F.D.R., my fifth for Harry Truman, Following World War II my interest in liberalism and my fear of “neo-fascism” led to my serving on the board of directors of an organization later known as the “American Committee to Aid Russia” (also known as the “Hollywood Independent Citizens Comm. of the Arts, Sciences & Professions”;”) Incidentally Mr. Trumbo was also on that board. Now there were many so-called organizations—every one a “cause.” It was no crusading committee of Congress, the D.A.R. or the American Legion. A small group of board members were doing the things one hears in the organization’s name introduced to their fellow board members a mild statement approving our Dem. system and free enterprise economy and repudiating communism as a desirable form of govt. for this country. The suggestion was that by adopting such a policy the country would emerge stronger and that our membership were liberal but not a “front.” The small group who introduced this measure were such “witch hunters” as James Roosevelt, Dore Schary, Don Hartman, Olivia de Havilland, Johnny Green & myself. Leaders of the opposition to our statement included Dalton Trumbo, John Howard Lawson and a number of others who have since attained some fame for their refusal to answer questions. I remember one of their statements which was that the board would reassure the membership that my feeling now is not prejudice born of anti-communists. I feel I should reveal where I have stood and now stand.

Now my apologies for having taken so long in answering your letter and my appreciation for your having taken the time to write in the first place.

Sincerely,
RONALD REAGAN.

I asked Hefner whether he took Reagan’s advice. “Growing up,” he answered, “FBI agents were my heroes. I saw Cagney in G-Men. I figured that if I had already had visits from them, and they had harassed my ex-wife. So to say that Reagan’s suggestion fell on deaf ears is an understatement.”

STANDING UP AGAINST COMMUNISM

A scene from 1966, once recounted by Reagan: The setting is the posh residence of a top star, a meeting of the HICASP. Reagan, running in for a seat next to MGM studio head Dore Schary. “Lots of people here I didn’t think I’d see,” he said.

“Stick around,” answers Schary. FDR’s son James stands to propose adopting a statement denouncing communism and the Soviet state as an “incurable disease,” he said. “That’s a reaction,” remembered Reagan. One musician stands to assert that the Soviet constitution is superior to the American one. A screenwriter says he’d volunteered for Russia if war broke out. “I decided that an Irishman couldn’t stay out, and took the floor and endorsed the anti-communism. Reagan recalled one woman having a heart attack.
The meeting breaks up. Schary tells Reagan, "We’re meeting up at Olivia de Havilland’s apartment."

Reagan goes over to find about a dozen HFCA members celebrating how they’d just smoked out the Communists.

Reagan is looking at de Havilland, grinning.

"What’s so funny?" she asks him.

"Nothing," he says, "except I thought you were one. Until tonight, that is."

RIVAL UNIONS

Aside from Dales, the man Reagan worked mostly closely with during his days as FDR New Dealer, Brewer had grown up in Grand Island, Neb., and at age 19, as a projectionist at the Capital Theater, ran the 1927 version of "The Jazz Singer," all 15 reels of it.

Brewer became a top labor official in Nebraska, and rose quickly to prominence in the International Alliance of Theatrical and Stage Employees (IATSE), part of the American Federation of Labor. When he arrived in Hollywood in 1945 on a mission to mediate what appeared to be a jurisdictional strike, he walked into a dispute between his IATSE members and a rival labor group, the Conference of Studio Unions, headed by Herbert Sorrell. Reagan later in life would describe discovering was an industry that during the war had attracted a wide variety of characters—some who thought Hollywood was their ticket to fame and fortune, and by small minority who were pushing political agendas.

Reagan was initially on the side of the strikers, but after he became convinced that the real objectives of those behind the strike were detrimental to the industry, he became a fast ally with Brewer. The two were soon confidants, and were featured together in Fortune magazine as two of the most influential figures in the business. By 1948, Reagan and Brewer were co-chairing the Hollywood campaign for Harry S Truman’s re-election.

Reagan and Brewer believed Sorrell’s group was trying to force the entire film community to accept an industry-wide union headed by Harry Bridges, leader of the International Longshore and Warehouse Union, who had attained fame from organizing the San Francisco longshoreman’s strike of 1934. Records that have emerged since the end of the Cold War seem to support this claim, and that the way he approached the unions, his discussions "were far above the level there was nothing left to sustain our marriage."

Said Reagan: "Perhaps I should let someone else take the whole world and saved my own home."

MOVING ON

By the early 1950s, with the back of the Communist Party in Hollywood now essentially broken, Reagan found that securing work for former Communists and others who were innocently caught up in the blacklist was one of the responsibilities of his volunteer job. Along with Brewer and Dales, Reagan worked closely with others in the industry who publicly broke ranks with the party. It was this role that partly accounted for his first substantive meeting with actress Nancy Davis in 1949. Of course, Reagan was an eligible bachelor, and Nancy knew it.

But she also wanted Reagan to protect her, and make sure industry leaders knew she wasn’t politically controversial. "I told her director, Mervyn LeRoy, that I’d take care of it—hang up from Ronald Reagan, actor, regretfully to Ronald Reagan, SAG president," she once wrote. Davis herself tried to make sure that politics never jeopardized her career. An member of the guild’s board of directors in August 1950, a position she would keep for more than a decade. The Reagans’ first real date, though, is now to the stuff of legend. It began with both of them saying they needed to be home early and ended sometime after 3 a.m. In 1952, they married.

Shortly thereafter, Reagan, who had a ranch at the beach, landed his first position in public office: honorary mayor of Malibu Lake. Within hours, California car dealer Holmes Thomas turned to him, and others were prepared to back Reagan for the U.S. Senate. On that occasion, Reagan turned him down.

Hollywood has remained a constant in Ronald Reagan’s life since the day he arrived here in 1937. Often it appears in the most curious ways. Screenwriter and producer Doug Morrow once tried to find Reagan a role when no one else seemed to be offering one. Years later, in 1979, Morrow, who had connections in the aerospace industry, arranged for Reagan to make a secret visit to the North American Defense Command headquarters deep in the mountains of Colorado. Seeing firsthand that the United States had a defense system capable of deterring a missile attack, Reagan always seemed to especially relish the industry people who would appear at his parties."

On Tuesday, in a house high above the city, Nancy Reagan will mark her husband’s 90th birthday with him, without fanfare. And perhaps, at the end of it, as the sun goes down and the lights of the City of the Angels come up, Ronald Reagan will have a fleeting glance of the town where an American president for 8 years was turned down.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, today, we celebrate the birthday of a giant, Ronald Reagan. America is indebted to President Reagan for reviving our national spirit and ensuring that we preserve, for ourselves, that "longing ittle struggle" against Soviet totalitarianism. His leadership not only revitalized our economy, but gave us a rebirth of patriotism and national greatness.

My fellow Vietnam Prisoners of War share a special affection for Ronald Reagan. Word of his steadfastness against aggression even reached us in our cells thousands of miles away from freedom. When we were released, he befriended and supported us. He understood and appreciated the "noble cause" for which so many brave Americans made the ultimate sacrifice.

Today, America enjoys unprecedented peace and prosperity largely due to the policies of Ronald Reagan. So, on his 90th birthday today, we salute you President Reagan, a brave soldier in the battle for freedom.

Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire. Mr. President, I rise today to recognize and celebrate the 90th birthday of our 40th President, Ronald Wilson Reagan.

It is ironic that today this body is debating the merits of a tax cut. Almost twenty years ago, President Reagan introduced and helped to pass the largest tax cut in our Nation’s history. Nearly two decades later, we are still enjoying the economic benefits of that tax cut. Our economy has had real growth every year since 1982, with the exception of a tiny 1.2 percent dip in 1991.

Thanks to President Reagan’s tax cut, we have experienced by far the longest run of economic growth in American history.

President Reagan’s main reason for supporting tax relief was not to provide an economic stimulus, although that was an inevitable result. His main reason was to promote freedom from the heavy hand of Government. Freedom to spend one’s own hard earned money on whatever one wanted.

When Washington conservatives were nervous about President Reagan giving away the store to the Soviets at Reykjavik, and sent Lyn Nofziger in to urge him to be cautious about the size of the proposed cuts, the President responded: "Don’t worry. I still have the scars on my back from fighting the communists in Hollywood."

HOLLYWOOD’S GUIDING LIGHTS

When he came back from Washington, Reagan was approached about possibly returning to films for a special cameo, but always politely declined the overtures.

Reagan’s personal office now overlooks the 20th Century Fox studios, and is in a building that has served as the site for numerous films. A parade of dignitaries from Gorba- chov’s Kremlin to Thatcher’s Downing Street, but Reagan always seemed to especially relish the industry people who would appear at his parties.
Back in our country’s colonial days, the colonists would tar and feather tax collectors because they had to pay around one percent of their wages. One percent! The famous Boston Tea Party was another way that our forefathers protested a relatively small, by our modern standards, tax increase.

But by 1980, our highest tax rate was an enormous 70 percent!

President Reagan understood that such a tax rate was indefensible. It was unjust, oppressive and against everything for which our Nation stands. He supported and got a 25 percent across the board tax cut. He knew that the American people, not the American Government, knew best how to spend their own money. Pretty revolutionary thinking.

President Reagan also took office at the height of Communist expansion around the world. The Soviet Union had just invaded Afghanistan. Southeast Asia was still experiencing the dreadful repercussions of Pol Pot. Communist insurgents were wreaking havoc all over Central America. The embroyonic Solidarity movement in Poland was being brutally repressed. The voice of Democracy was being drowned out by the globes. Our own armed forces were in a shambles, both in terms of morale and military readiness.

But our President did not waver. He knew that as the most visible leader of the free world, he must stand up for freedom and democracy. And despite facing strong opposition, at home and abroad, that “Government is not the solution—Government is the problem.” He gave us hope for the future. He gave us hope for our country. He gave us hope in ourselves.

He told us that it was “morning in America” again and that our great Nation is a “shining city on the hill.”

Although President Reagan’s voice has been silenced by Alzheimer’s, we can still hear the echoes of freedom ringing from his writings and his presidency.

We can still pay homage to his deeds by recognizing the woman behind the man, his wife, Nancy. Mrs. Reagan, we salute you.

Today we honor the life and leadership of our President, Ronald Reagan. Without his shining example, our country, and our world, would be a much darker place.

Happy Birthday Mr. President!

ONLINE ACCESS TO CONGRESSIONAL DOCUMENTS

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I am pleased to join today with Senator MCCAIN to introduce a Senate resolution to provide Internet Access to important Congressional documents.

Our bipartisan resolution makes certain Congressional Research Service products, lobbyist disclosure reports and Senate gift disclosure reports are available over the Internet to the American people.

The Congressional Research Service, CRS, has a well-known reputation for producing high-quality reports and information briefs that are unbiased, concise, and accurate. The taxpayers of this country, who pay $767 million a year to fund the CRS, deserve speedy access to these public resources and have a right to see that their money is being spent well.

The goal of our legislation is to allow every citizen the same access to the wealth of CRS information as a Member of Congress enjoys today. CRS performs invaluable research and produces first-rate reports on hundreds of topics. American taxpayers have every right to direct access to these wonderful resources.

Online CRS reports will serve an important role in informing the public. Members of the public will be able to read these CRS products and receive a current overview of the issues before the Congress. As elected representatives, we should do what we can to promote an informed, educated public. The educated voter is best able to make decisions and petition us to do the right things here in Congress.

Our legislation follows the model online CRS program in the House of Representatives and ensures that private CRS products will also be provided by the CRS Director to any public online access to invaluable CRS products.

In addition, the bipartisan resolution would provide public online access to lobbyist reports and gift disclosure forms. At present, these public records are available in the Senate Office of Public Records in Room 232 of the Hart Building. As a practical matter, these public records are accessible only to those inside the Beltway and the Office of Public Records for recently making technological history in the Senate by providing for lobbyist registrations through the Internet. The next step is to provide the completed lobbyist disclosure reports on the Internet for all Americans to see.

The Internet offers us a unique opportunity to allow the American people to have everyday access to this public information. Our bipartisan legislation would harness the power of the Information Age to allow average citizens to see these public records of the Senate in their official form, in context and without editorial comment. All Americans should have timely access to the information that we already have voted to give them.

And all of these reports are indeed “public” for those who can afford to hire a lawyer or lobbyist or who can afford to travel to Washington to come to the Office of Public Records in the Hart Building and read them. That is not very public. That does not do very much for the average voter in Vermont or the rest of this country outside of easy reach of Washington. That does not meet the spirit in which we voted to make these materials public, when we voted “disclosure” laws.

We can do better, and this resolution does better. Any citizen in any corner of this country with access to a computer at home or the rest of this country outside of easy reach of Washington. That does not meet the spirit in which we voted to make these materials public, when we voted “disclosure” laws.

We can do better, and this resolution does better. Any citizen in any corner of this country with access to a computer at home or the rest of this country outside of easy reach of Washington. That does not meet the spirit in which we voted to make these materials public, when we voted “disclosure” laws.

We can do better, and this resolution does better. Any citizen in any corner of this country with access to a computer at home or the rest of this country outside of easy reach of Washington. That does not meet the spirit in which we voted to make these materials public, when we voted “disclosure” laws.

We can do better, and this resolution does better. Any citizen in any corner of this country with access to a computer at home or the rest of this country outside of easy reach of Washington. That does not meet the spirit in which we voted to make these materials public, when we voted “disclosure” laws.
As Thomas Jefferson wrote, “Information is the currency of democracy.” Our democracy is stronger if all citizens have equal access to at least that type of currency, and that is something which Members on both sides of the aisle can celebrate and join in.

This bipartisan resolution is an important step in informing and empowering American citizens. I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting this legislation to make available useful Congressional information to the American people.

NONPROLIFERATION REPORT CARD

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, I rise today to discuss a recent report released by The Russia Task Force entitled “A Report Card on the Department of Energy’s Nonproliferation Programs with Russia.” This bipartisan Task Force was co-chaired by Lloyd Cutler and Howard Baker. The report concludes that proliferation of weapons of mass destruction or weapons-usable material is “the most urgent unmet national security threat for the United States today.”

This conclusion restates similar conclusions of other reports and analyses done over the past several years. The book Avoiding Nuclear Anarchy published in 1996 drew a similar conclusion. A January 2000 Center for Strategic and International Study report, “Managing the Global Nuclear Materials Threat,” provided a concise analysis and numerous policy recommendations of this “most devastating security threat.”

The U.S. response has not been and still is not commensurate to the threat.

The Cooperative Threat Reduction programs have achieved much and contributed greatly to U.S. security. Still there is always room for innovative approaches to remaining issues and faster progress.

The Department of Energy programs—from Materials Protection, Control and Accounting to the Initiatives for Proliferation Prevention—have also enhanced U.S. security. But their work is not even close to complete, and a “clear and present danger” looms.

I have repeatedly suggested that we have a very simple choice: we can either spend money to reduce the threat or spend more money in the future to defend ourselves. I am a strong believer that threat reduction is now underfunded and is the first-best approach in this case.

The report estimated the cost at $30 billion to be provided not only from the U.S. budget, but also by Russia and other countries. The national security benefits to U.S. citizens from securing 80,000 nuclear weapons and potential nuclear weapons would constitute the highest return on investment of any current national security program.

How do we get there? One recommendation of the report is the dire need for a White House-level nonproliferation czar. Not just the Department of Energy and the Defense Department are involved in Russia. We have a number of federal agencies chipping away at specific, isolated aspects of the problem.

But we do not have a coherent, integrated agenda. Overlaps and shortfalls exist. But no one person—with budgetary responsibility and requisite authority—can view the entire spectrum and identify the gaps, remedy inter-agency turf battles and bring the necessary coordination to get the job done efficiently and quickly.

A nonproliferation czar should be given access to the President and the necessary budgetary powers. This person should be charged with formulating a cohesive strategy. This would allow us to coordinate and streamline our efforts. This person would identify which programs are ripe for more resources and which ones are already adequate to address the immediate need.

The Nunn-Lugar-Domenici legislation enacted in 1996 required that such nonproliferation efforts be ongoing. Also, Section 3174 of the FY2001 Defense Authorization bill expressed again Congressional will to have one person accountable for our nonproliferation efforts. The Clinton Administration refused to adhere to the statute and repeatedly ignored other Congressional attempts to address the coordination problem. Other Commissions have also recommended this remodeled executive office. I hopeful that the national security team within the new Administration will see the merits of this recommendation and act on it soon.

The Task Force also offered several other important insights and recommendations. These included:

The threat today arises from Russia’s weakened ability to secure its nuclear arsenals. Contributions delays in paying those who guard nuclear facilities, breakdown in command structures and inadequate budgets for stockpile protection.

I would go even further than that. I believe that economics that drives many of the threats and areas of potential conflict that the U.S. faces with Russia today. They sell nuclear technologies to Iran not because they like the Iranians and want to suborn the Americans. The Russians are also aware that Iran could present a threat should it acquire the requisite nuclear and ballistic missile capabilities. However, the Russian decision is driven by economics—not by ideology, not by historical ties, but by necessity. If we don’t attempt to address the underlying economics of the situation, cooperation with Iran may continue and many other programs may eventually fail.

The President should develop a strategic plan, consulting Congress and cooperating with the Russian Federation, to secure all weapons-usable material located in Russia. We have a large outflow of weapons of mass destruction-related scientific expertise.

We can only move so fast as the Russians allow. We can only achieve sufficient transparency and get access so long as Russia agrees. However, I believe several existing programs, such as the Plutonium Disposition Agreement, have demonstrated that a serious U.S. commitment, especially in financial terms, is exactly the appropriate incentive to get action.

Repeatedly, however, our nonproliferation programs with Russia are in a Catch-22 situation. Congress will not adequately fund them until they demonstrate success. A trickle at the tap is insufficient to persuade Russians of the seriousness of our intent. So, the U.S. programs stumble along unable to achieve the gains necessary because the Russians are reticent to play ball. And, in turn, Congress becomes even more leery of providing any funding at all in light of the meager gains. It’s in our immediate national security interest to remedy this situation.

The plan should review existing programs, identifying specific goals and measurable objectives for each program, as well as providing criteria for success and an exit strategy.

It would be reasonable to propose that one plan be geared toward addressing the fundamental linkages between economic and social instability in Russia and specific proliferation threats. Without addressing the relationship of Russians’ economic situation to a decaying nuclear command and control infrastructure, threats of diversion from within, rather than from outside, will reemerge. And, many other tight relationships, we will fail to prevent proliferation.

The report envisions an 8-10 year time-frame. At that point, Russia will hopefully be in a position to take over any remaining work.

In the next decade we could eliminate the greatest security challenge we currently face. Inaction will only drive up costs to defend ourselves against unknowables that we could have solved had we greater foresight.

I believe President Bush and his team have foresight. President Bush repeatedly mentioned the importance of these programs as an integral part of his national security strategy.

To quote our new National Security Advisor, Condoleezza Rice:

American security is threatened less by Russia’s strength than by its weakness and incoherence. This suggests immediate attention to the safety and security of Moscow’s nuclear forces and stockpile.

I believe this recent report reiterates this clear fact and sets forth several very important policy recommendations for tackling this challenge. I look forward to working with the new Administration to ensure that a decade from now we have protected U.S. citizens from this proliferation threat and secured a more peaceful future.

RETIREMENT OF THE HONORABLE
BUD SHUSTER

Mr. SPECKER, Mr. President, I have sought recognition today to honor my
colleague, Congressman Bud Shuster, who retired from Congress last week after serving fifteen terms in the United States House of Representatives. I am grateful to have had the opportunity to serve with Congressman Shuster since 1981, when I first came to the United States Senate. Bud Shuster has worked tirelessly on behalf of his constituents in the 9th Congressional District of Pennsylvania, the entire state, and the nation.

During his time in office, Congressman Shuster consistently reached across party lines to work with his colleagues on the other side of the aisle to pass some of the most important public works bills in our nation’s history. Over the years he built up a remarkable level of clout in Congress, affording him a great deal of success in enacting his legislative priorities.

The name Bud Shuster is synonymous with transportation, and I have worked closely with Congressman Shuster on a number of transportation challenges facing Pennsylvania and the nation, including the ISTEA and TEA-21 highway authorization bills, the effort to take the highway trust fund off-budget, and the AIR-21 airport authorization bill. As Chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, he brought a level of insight and tenacity into infrastructure, highways and airports that was really remarkable. Congressman Shuster’s expertise in the field of transportation and public works projects was second to none, and I valued his advice and counsel on a number of issues over the years.

Few may know that Congressman Shuster graduated Phi Beta Kappa from the University of Pittsburgh, holds an MBA from Duquesne University and a Ph.D. in business from the American University. While these academic accomplishments have suited him well in his role as a legislator, they also served him in his role as an accomplished author, penning two acclaimed novels about life in small-town Pennsylvania.

Bud Shuster’s legislative skill and almost thirty years of dedicated service to his constituency will be sorely missed in Pennsylvania and in America. We will be hard pressed to replace such a distinguished public servant and I wish him the best of luck in his future.

IN MEMORY OF ALAN CRANSTON

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, it is an honor for me to pay tribute to my former Senate colleague Alan Cranston. With Senator Cranston’s passing, we lost a gifted leader, a shrewd politician and a dedicated reformer. It seemed significant that Senator Cranston passed away on New Year’s Eve 2000 because his life encompassed, literally, the 20th Century. He experienced the entire span of the year World War I began, grew up during the Depression, covered the rise of fascism in Europe as a foreign corresponendent and led the fight for a nuclear arms freeze during the Cold War. He called luminaries of the age among his friends, most notably Albert Einstein. Alan Cranston arrived in the Senate shortly after I did and we served together for 24 years until his retirement. We even hit the Presidential campaign trail together, both running for the White House on the Democratic ticket in 1984.

Those of us who served with Senator Cranston brought to the tally the thousands of letters and post cards he carried around to count votes. We will also remember the talent he had for carefully preserving his own liberal ideologies while working effectively with those on the opposite end of the political spectrum. He may have offended some with his push for disarmament, but more often than not he disarmed them with his own friendly manner. Senator Cranston left an indelible mark on environmental, civil rights and global security policy. His legacy in this country is a testament to his accomplishments as a U.S. Senator and his dedication to the people of California. He will be missed, but a political giant like Alan Cranston will not be forgotten.

RURAL AMERICA NEEDS COMPETITION

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, on Monday, January 22, introduced S. 142, the Rural America Needs Competition Act, to help every rancher act, legislation to prohibit meatpackers from owning livestock prior to slaughter. My bill enjoys bipartisan support from Republican Senators CHUCK GRASSLEY of Iowa and CRAIG THOMAS of Wyoming. Senator Tom DASCHLE cosponsored my bill, as well. We believe this proposal will help restore a competitive bidding process to the cash slaughter-livestock marketplace by strengthening the meatpackers dominated the market with (Armour, Swift, Morris, Wilson, and Cudahy) in 1919 stating that the monopoly to determine if they were levering too much power over the marketplace. The growing, unabated trend of agricultural concentration—a problem really sweeping across this entire nation—is one of the prime concerns of South Dakota family farmers and ranchers. However, concern about meatpacker concentration is not new in the United States. Newspaper cartoons in the 1880s depicted companies that forced the pooling of livestock prior to any purchase agreement as counterproductive. The Federal Trade Commission on this matter makes it imperative for Congress to act.

I recently met with executives of Tyson and IBP to discuss the ramifications of this merger. The CEO of Tyson made a provocative promise that Tyson will not replicate the current practice of owning livestock—they now own swine and poultry—after buying IBP. Essentiallty, Tyson alleges they will not own cattle before slaughter. Yet, it has been reported that Tyson would prefer to do this years into the future, and the company has declined to comment on what purchasing practices a merged Tyson-IBP would utilize after that time.

While this may be a short-term panacea to satisfy Federal agencies and elected officials, livestock producers—particularly cattle ranchers—are in business for the long-term. Ten years can go by awfully quickly in the cattle industry. Moreover, I believe—as do many South Dakota ranchers—that saying are two very different things. Indeed, Lee Swenson, President of the National Farmers Union, has called upon Tyson to issue a written commitment to the Securities and Exchange Commission that Tyson won’t go into the cattle owning business.

Consequently, my bill to forbid packer ownership of livestock restores healthy competition to the cash marketplace and ensures that Tyson and other vertical integrators don’t engage in packer ownership. Agricultural concentration is not inevitable, it is sweeping the rural landscape because of the choices we make. Given the Justice Department’s reluctance to address this merger, Congress must take swift action to recommend ways to strengthen our competition and anti-trust laws. I believe S. 142 is one step Congress can take.

Last year, several major farm organizations endorsed my bipartisan effort to prohibit meatpackers from owning livestock prior to slaughter. I would like to thank them for their support. These grassroots groups include the
As one of 420 Navajos selected by the military, Howard quickly excelled, and was appointed as one of the first instructors of the Navajo Code Talkers. With other young Navajos, Howard helped to create an unbreakable code that baffled the Japanese. Military experience and the code-talking efforts shortened the war in the Pacific by at least one year—and some have even speculated that the war may have turned out differently, had it not been for their heroic deeds. Howard's efforts were recognized by his participation in every campaign of the 2nd Marine Division including the invasions of Saipan, Tinian, the Battle of Okinawa, and the occupation of Japan at Nagasaki. Howard did not seek credit nor praise, but quietly and modestly amassed a memorable record of brave acts and passionate service to his country and family. As a tribute for his valiant service, Howard received numerous awards and honors including the Medal of Honor, a Presidential Unit Citation with Star for Combat Action at Tarawa, the Navy/Marine Corps Occupation Service Medal, and the Purple Heart for wounds received in combat. He was honorably discharged as a Corporal on January 18, 1946.

After returning to the Navajo reservation, Howard settled down at Buell Park and then Sawmill, where he raised 10 children with his spouse, Mary Louise. He later became a proud grandfather of 22 grandchildren. In later years, as a member of the Navajo Code-Talkers Association, Howard received several more awards during travels with the group to Philadelphia and Washington, D.C. He was the last surviving original Navajo Code Instructor.

Until recently, the American public was not aware of the tremendous sacrifice and contribution of Howard and other Code Talkers. Without the Navajo Code Talkers, we can only imagine what tragedies might have occurred at that pivotal time in history. As Americans, we owe a debt of gratitude to the selfless patriots like Howard whose noble service teaches us valuable lessons of duty and honor.

Howard Billiman, Jr. will be missed by his family and friends, but his remarkable courage and patriotism will be long remembered by his country.

TRIBUTE TO WHITTEN PETERS

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, It is an honor to take this opportunity to recognize Carol DiBattiste, Under Secretary of the Air Force, F. Whitten Peters has lead his Service to new heights of achievement, and the world is better for it. At a time when the global security environment became less predictable with each passing day, Whit Peters understood the need for the Air Force to become more responsive, more versatile, and more powerful—all at the same time. With boundless energy and enthusiasm, he set out to help the United States Air Force do those things and more.

As the leading architect of aerospace power, Whit Peters drove a fundamental re-examination of the relationship between air, space, and information systems. As a result, the Cold War Air Force he inherited was well on its way to becoming a modern, integrated aerospace force, designed to meet the challenges of a new millennium.

During Secretary Peters’ tenure, in the troubled skies over Serbia, a war was won for the first time with aerospace power alone—and we did it without losing a single American to enemy
action. Today, despots and dictators hesitate to act because they know America’s Air Force can bring power to bear at the point of decision in a matter of minutes or hours. And, millions of people, the world over, live better lives because the humanitarian missions undertaken by our United States Air Force in the last four years.

While busy guiding the evolution of the Air Force’s operational capabilities, Secretary Peters also directed significant improvements in acquisition, logistics, and support programs to ensure the best possible use of defense resources. He presided over the development of the Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle—a revolutionary pairing of Russian propulsion technology with the best US commercial space-launch capabilities—which will drastically lower the cost of placing commercial and defense payloads in earth orbit. He led the consolidation of five Air Force aircraft depots into three, reducing depot over-capacity by 40 percent and saving the taxpayers over $700 million a year. And, he arrested a 10-year drop in aircraft readiness rates by putting two billion dollars worth of additional spares on the shelf where they will be useful to aircraft maintainers.

Most important, Whit Peters took care of his people. As every member of this body knows, he fought hard for improved pay, housing, and medical benefits for every member of America’s Air Force. He fought for better re-enlistment bonuses for people in hard-to-fill skills such as air traffic control, computer network administration, and over a hundred others. He pushed relentlessly for better child-care facilities to meet the demands of working families, and today 95 percent of all Air Force child care centers meet federal accreditation standards, compared to just 10 percent of child care facilities nationwide.

No wonder the enlisted men and women of the Air Force honored him with the most prestigious recognition: induction into the Air Force Order of the Sword. In the 53-year history of America’s youngest service, no other Air Force Secretary has ever been so honored. Nor has any service secretary been so respected by the men and women he leads.

Like the men and women of the Total Air Force—the Air National Guard, the Air Force Reserve, and the Regular Air Force—we hate to see Whit Peters go, and I know my colleagues will join me in wishing him the fondest of farewells. He is a rare leader and an even rarer person in this town: a true gentleman who cares more about others than himself. As the Air Force slogan says, “No one comes close.”

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Ms. Evans, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

As in executive session the Presiding Officer laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting a nomination which was referred to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

(The nomination received today is printed at the end of the Senate proceedings.)

REPORT ON THE OPERATION OF THE ANDEAN TRADE PREFERENCE ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT—PM 3

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, together with an accompanying report; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

To the Congress of the United States:


GEORGE W. BUSH


MEASURE PLACED ON THE CALENDAR

The following bill was read the second time and placed on the calendar:

S. 235. A bill to provide for enhanced safety, public awareness, and environmental protection in pipeline transportation, and for other purposes.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire:

S. 245. A bill to repeal the moratorium on the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (U.S.C. 1382) by changing the date for the beginning of the moratorium, as amended by the Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972, as part of the Bull Run Watershed Management Act of 1996, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

S. 246. A bill to extend the moratorium on the imposition of taxes on the Internet; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire:

S. 247. A bill to protect the credit for electricity produced from certain renewable resources; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BIDEN (for himself, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. LOTTF, Mr. DASCHEL, Mr. KERRY, Mr. BAUCUS, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. BURNS, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CHAFEE, Mr. CLELAND, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. CORZINE, Mr. DEWINE, Mr. DODD, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. FINKGOLD, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. GRAHAM,Mr. HELMS, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KOHL, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LIBERMAN, Mrs. LINCOLN, Mr. MIKULSKI, Mr. MILLER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. RIEI, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. SPRINGER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TOURECCELLI, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. NUCORDINO):

S. 250. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit to holders of qualified bonds issued for the construction of community transportation systems and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. HUTCHISON (for himself, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. DEWINE, and Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire):

S. 251. A bill to require the Food and Drug Administration to establish restrictions regarding the qualifications of physicians to prescribe the abortion drug commonly known as RU-486; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. VOINOVICH:

S. 252. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to authorize appropriations for State water pollution control revolving funds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Ms. COLLINS (for herself, Mr. CONRAD, Mr. GREGO, Mr. BURNS, Mr. HUTCHISON, Mr. ENZI, Mr. ROBERTS, Mr. ALLARD, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. THOMAS, and Mr. JOHNSON):


By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. SMITH of Oregon):

S. 254. A bill to provide further protections for the watershed of the Little Sandy River in Oregon by authorizing the construction of a wastewater treatment facility; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. SNOWE (for herself, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mr. JOHNSON):

S. 255. A bill to require that health plans provide coverage for a minimum hospital stay for mastectomies and lymph node dissection for the treatment of breast cancer and coverage for secondary consultations; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. SNOWE:

S. 256. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to protect breastfeeding by low income mothers; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. SNOWE:

S. 257. A bill to permit individuals to continue health plan coverage of services while participating in approved clinical studies; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. SNOWE (for herself and Mrs. LINCOLN):

S. 258. A bill to amend title XVII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the medicare program of annual screening pap smear and screening pelvic exams; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. BIDEN (for himself, Mr. DOMENICII, and Mrs. MURRAY):
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S. 259. A bill to authorize funding the Department of Energy to enhance its mission areas through Technology Transfer and Partnerships for fiscal years 2002 through 2006, for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

By Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself and Mr. DODD):

S. 260. A bill to authorize the President to provide international disaster assistance for the reconstruction of permanent single family housing for those who are homeless as a result of the effects of the earthquake in El Salvador on January 13, 2001; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. SNOWE:

S. 261. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide, with respect to research on breast cancer, for the increased involvement of advocates in decisionmaking at the National Cancer Institute; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Mr. CLELAND (for himself and Ms. LANDRIEU):

S. 262. A bill to provide for teaching excellence in America’s classrooms and homes; to the Committee on Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. SNOWE (for herself and Mr. TORRICELLI):

S. 263. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to ensure that coverage of bone mass measurements is provided under the health benefits program for Federal employees; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

By Ms. SNOWE (for herself and Mr. TORRICELLI):

S. 264. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to expand coverage of bone mass measurements under part B of the Medicare program to all individuals at clinical risk for osteoporosis; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. FITZGERALD (for himself, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. KOHL, and Mr. DODD):

S. 265. A bill to prohibit the use of, and provide for remediation of water contaminated by, methyl tertiary butyl ether; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. SMITH of Oregon (for himself and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 266. A bill regarding the use of the trust fund of the Forest Service with respect to Oregon; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. AKAKA (for himself, Mr. REID, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GREGG, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire):

S. 267. A bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921, to make it unlawful for any marketing agency, dealer or operator of livestock market facilities, or dealer to transfer or market nonambulatory livestock, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mrs. LINCOLN (for herself, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. Kyl, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. COCHRAN, and Mr. BAYH):

S. 268. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow nonrefundable personal credits, the standard deduction, and personal exemptions in computing alternative minimum tax liability, to increase the amount of the individual exemption from such tax, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. BROWNBACK (for himself and Mr. TORRICELLI):

S. Res. 17. A resolution congratulating President Chandrika Bandaranaike Kumaratunga and the people of the Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka on the celebration of 53 years of independence; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Ms. LANDRIEU (for herself and Mr. DODD):

S. Res. 18. A resolution expressing sympathy for the victims of the devastating earthquake that struck El Salvador on January 13, 2001; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. HARKIN (for himself, Mr. L. CHAFEE, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. BINGAMAN, and Mr. JOHNSON):

S. 247. A bill to provide for the protection of children from tobacco; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. SNOWE (for herself and Mr. TORRICELLI):

S. 248. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to expand coverage of bone mass measurements under part B of the Medicare program to all individuals at clinical risk for osteoporosis; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. FITZGERALD (for himself, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. KOHL, and Mr. DODD):

S. 249. A bill to prohibit the use of, and provide for remediation of water contaminated by, methyl tertiary butyl ether; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. SMITH of Oregon (for himself and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 250. A bill to provide for teaching excellence in America’s classrooms and homes; to the Committee on Education, Labor, and Pensions.

By Ms. SNOWE (for herself and Mr. TORRICELLI):

S. 251. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to expand coverage of bone mass measurements under part B of the Medicare program to all individuals at clinical risk for osteoporosis; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. FITZGERALD (for himself, Mr. BAYH, Mr. BROWNBACK, Mr. KOHL, and Mr. DODD):

S. 252. A bill to prohibit the use of, and provide for remediation of water contaminated by, methyl tertiary butyl ether; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. SMITH of Oregon (for himself and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 253. A bill regarding the use of the trust fund of the Forest Service with respect to Oregon; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. AKAKA (for himself, Mr. REID, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GREGG, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire):

S. 254. A bill to amend the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921, to make it unlawful for any marketing agency, dealer or operator of livestock market facilities, or dealer to transfer or market nonambulatory livestock, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mrs. LINCOLN (for herself, Mr. LUGAR, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. Kyl, Ms. LANDRIEU, Mr. COCHRAN, and Mr. BAYH):

S. 255. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow nonrefundable personal credits, the standard deduction, and personal exemptions in computing alternative minimum tax liability, to increase the amount of the individual exemption from such tax, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

These regulations were an investment in the future of our kids. They also provided consumers with critical protections against false advertising and health claims by tobacco manufacturers.

Tobacco companies are making harm reduction claims about new products with no real independent examination or oversight. This deceptive, self-interested behavior is not part of a new pattern. The history of tobacco companies is rife with examples of deceptive practices designed to addict both adults and children with their harmful products. Our bill will ensure that this type of behavior is stopped.

Our legislation re-affirms the FDA’s authority over tobacco products. It classifies nicotine as a drug and tobacco products as drug delivery devices. It allows FDA to implement a “public health” standard in its review and regulation of tobacco products. Companies will be prevented from making claims of reduced risk unless the FDA is able to show scientific evidence their product is actually safer.

By codifying FDA’s regulation of 1996, our legislation also allows for continuation of the critically important youth ID checks. It provides needed youth access restrictions such as requiring tobacco products to be kept behind store counters and ban vending machines. It also includes sensible advertising limits to reduce teen access to tobacco.

I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting this legislation. I hope we can work with Senators on both sides of the aisle to move this important issue forward.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 247

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 “Kids Deserve Freedom from Tobacco Act of 2001” or the “KIDS Act”.

TITLE I—PROTECTION OF CHILDREN FROM TOBACCO

Subtitle A—Food and Drug Administration Jurisdiction and General Authority

SEC. 101. REFERENCE.

Whenever in this title an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 301 et seq.).

SEC. 102. STATEMENT OF GENERAL AUTHORITY.

The regulations promulgated by the Secretary of Health and Human Services in the rule dated August 28, 1997, on tobacco use, and the April 13, 2001, Order of this court, applying to that rule, are hereby declared consistent with the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 301 et seq.).
SEC. 103. NONAPPLICABILITY TO OTHER DRUGS OR DEVICES.

Nothing in this title, or an amendment made by this title, shall be construed to affect the use, advertising, promotion, or distribution of drugs and devices that are not tobacco products by the Secretary of Health and Human Services under the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

SEC. 104. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS TO CONFORM JURISDICTION.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—

(1) DRUG.—Section 201(g)(1) (21 U.S.C. 321(g)(1)) is amended by adding at the end the following: "(2) any substance not regulated as a drug under such Act that is intended for human consumption.

(b) PROHIBITED ACTS.—Section 301 (21 U.S.C. 331) is amended by adding at the end the following: "(2) in paragraph (2)—

(A) by redesignating subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) as clauses (i), (ii), and (iii), respectively.

(B) by striking "(2) For" and inserting "(2)(A) For"; and

(C) by adding at the end the following: "(B) For purposes of paragraph (1)(B), subsections (c)(2)(C), (d)(2)(B), (e)(2)(A), (f)(3)(B)(i), and (f)(3)(C)(i), and sections 514, 515, and 516, a tobacco product, as defined in section 321(h) is amended by adding at the end the following:

(3) OTHER DEFINITIONS.—Section 201 (21 U.S.C. 321) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(1) regulations issued under this Act; or

"(2) the KIDS Act, or regulations issued under such Act.

(c) RESTRICTED DEVICES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 501 of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (21 U.S.C. 351) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(1) a device which is not a tobacco product, the use, advertising, and access described in Title IA, regardless of whether such device is intended for human consumption; or

"(2) a device which is a tobacco product, the use, advertising, and access described in Title IA, regardless of whether such device is intended for human consumption.

(d) SEC. 571. MAIL-ORDER SALES.

SEC. 570. PROMULGATION OF REGULATIONS.

"Any regulations necessary to implement this subchapter shall be promulgated not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this subchapter.

SEC. 571. MAIL-ORDER SALES.

NOTICE. —Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize the Secretary to change the text or layout of the warning statements, or any of the labeling provisions, under this Act or any of the warning statements, or any of the labeling provisions, under such Act as determined necessary by the Secretary.

SEC. 572. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROPOSED RESOLUTION.

"(a) ADDITIONAL RESTRICTIONS ON MARKETING, ADVERTISING, AND ACCESS.—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this subchapter, the Secretary shall promulgate regulations to require warnings on cigarette and smokeless tobacco advertising and advertising, and access described in Title IA and Title IC of the Proposed Resolution entered into by the tobacco manufacturers and the State attorneys general on June 20, 1997, except that the Secretary shall not include an additional restriction on marketing or advertising in such regulations if its inclusion would violate the First Amendment to the Constitution.

"(b) WARNINGS.—Not later than 18 months after the date of the enactment of this subchapter, the Secretary shall promulgate regulations to require warnings on cigarette and smokeless tobacco labeling and advertising, and access described in Title IA and Title IC of the Proposed Resolution entered into by the tobacco manufacturers and the State attorneys general on June 20, 1997.

"(c) RULES OF CONSTRUCTION.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to authorize the Secretary to change the text or layout of any of the warning statements, or any of the labeling provisions, under this Act or any of the warning statements, or any of the labeling provisions, under such Act as determined necessary by the Secretary in order to make...
such statements or labels larger, more prominent, more conspicuous, or more effective.

(2) UNFAIR ACTS.—Nothing in this section (other than amendments of subsections (a) and (b)) shall be construed to limit or restrict the authority of the Federal Trade Commission with respect to unfair or deceptive practices in the advertising of tobacco products.

(d) LIMITED PREEMPTION.—

(1) STATE AND LOCAL ACTION.—No warning label required under this subsection, or any other tobacco product for which warning labels have been required under this section, other than the warning labels required under this Act, may be required by any State or local statute or regulation to be included on any package of a tobacco product.

(2) EFFECT ON LIABILITY LAW.—Nothing in this section shall relieve any person from liability at common law or under State statutory law to any other person.

(e) VIOLATION OF SECTION.—Any tobacco product that is in violation of this section shall be deemed to be misbranded.

§ 573. GENERAL RESPONSIBILITIES OF MANUFACTURERS, DISTRIBUTORS AND RETAILERS.

Each manufacturer, distributor, and retailer shall ensure that the tobacco products it manufactures, labels, advertises, packages, offers for sale, or sells, or otherwise holds for sale comply with all applicable requirements of this Act.

§ 574. DISCLOSURE AND REPORTING OF TOBACCO AND NONTOBACCO INGREDIENTS AND CONSTITUENTS.

(a) DISCLOSURE OF ALL INGREDIENTS.—

(1) IMMEDIATE AND ANNUAL DISCLOSURE.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this subchapter, and annually thereafter, each manufacturer of a tobacco product shall submit to the Secretary an ingredient, constituent, or compound that was the subject of a safety assessment process within the 5-year period preceding the date of enactment of this subchapter, or for which there is reason to have concerns that the product may continue to use the ingredient, constituent, substance, or compound until such time as the Secretary makes a determination with respect to the ingredient or compound.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—The list described in paragraph (1) shall, with respect to each brand or variety of tobacco product of a manufacturer, include—

(A) a list of all ingredients, constituents, substances, and compounds that are found in or added to the tobacco or tobacco product (including the paper, filter, or packaging of the product if applicable) in the manufacture of the tobacco or tobacco product for the purpose of, or in the course of, manufacturing the tobacco product so manufactured, including, if determined necessary by the Secretary, any material added to the tobacco product in accordance with regulations promulgated under section 701(a) by the Secretary that is not a tobacco product constituent, substance, or additive during the period referred to in paragraph (1); and

(B) the quantity of the ingredients, constituents, substances, and compounds that are listed under subparagraph (A) in each brand or variety of tobacco product;

(C) the nicotine content of the product, measured in milligrams of nicotine;

(D) for each brand or variety of cigarette—

(i) the filter ventilation percentage (the level of air dilution in the cigarette as provided by the ventilation holes in the filter, described as a percentage);

(ii) the pH level of the smoke of the cigarette; and

(iii) the tar, unoxidized (free) nicotine, and carbon monoxide delivery level and any other smoking conditions established by the Secretary, reported in milligrams of tar, nicotine, and carbon monoxide per cigarette;

(E) for each brand or variety of smokeless tobacco products—

(i) the pH level of the tobacco;

(ii) the moisture content of the tobacco expressed as a percentage of the weight of the tobacco; and

(iii) the nicotine content—

(A) for each gram of the product, measured in milligrams of nicotine;

(B) expressed as a percentage of the dry weight of the tobacco; and

(C) for a product that is denominated (free) nicotine, expressed as a percentage per gram of the tobacco and expressed in milligrams per gram of the tobacco;

(F) any other information determined appropriate by the Secretary.

(b) SAFETY ASSESSMENTS.—

(1) APPLICATION TO NEW INGREDIENTS.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this subchapter, and annually thereafter, each manufacturer shall submit to the Secretary a safety assessment for each new ingredient, constituent, substance, or compound that was the subject of the safety assessment process within the 5-year period preceding the date of enactment of this subchapter, or for which there is reason to have concerns that the product may continue to use the ingredient, constituent, substance, or compound until such time as the Secretary makes a determination with respect to the ingredient or compound.

(B) METHOD OF FILING.—A safety assessment submitted under subparagraph (A) shall be signed by an officer of the manufacturer, professional member, or individual qualified by scientific training and experience who is able to certify among experts qualified by scientific training and experience that the information contained in the assessment is true, complete, and accurate.

(C) DEFINITION OF NEW INGREDIENT.—For purposes of subparagraph (A), the term ‘‘new ingredient, constituent, substance, or compound’’ means an ingredient, constituent, substance, or compound listed under subsection (a) that was not used in the brand or variety of tobacco product involved prior to January 1, 1998.

(2) DISCLOSURE OF PERCENTAGE OF DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN TOBACCO.—The regulations referred to in paragraph (1) shall require that the manufacturer disclose, with respect to the tobacco contained in the product, the percentage of domestic tobacco and the percentage of foreign tobacco used in the product.

(3) HEALTH DISCLOSURE.—Notwithstanding section 301(j), the Secretary may require the public disclosure of any ingredient, constituent, substance, or compound during the period for such review. The Secretary may, for good cause, extend the period for such review. The Secretary shall provide notice to the manufacturer of an action under this subparagraph.

(c) DISCLOSURE TO THE PUBLIC.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (3), a package of a tobacco product shall disclose all ingredients, constituents, substances, or compounds contained in the product in accordance with regulations promulgated under section 701(a) by the Secretary.

(2) DISCLOSURE OF PERCENTAGE OF DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN TOBACCO.—The regulations referred to in paragraph (1) shall require that the percentage of a tobacco product disclose, with respect to the tobacco contained in the product, the percentage that is domestic tobacco and the percentage that is foreign tobacco.

(3) HEALTH DISCLOSURE.—Notwithstanding section 301(j), the Secretary may require the public disclosure of any ingredient, constituent, substance, or compound during the period for such review. The Secretary may, for good cause, extend the period for such review. The Secretary shall provide notice to the manufacturer of an action under this subparagraph.

§ 575. REDUCED RISK PRODUCTS.

(a) PROHIBITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—No manufacturer, distributor, or retailer of tobacco products may make any direct or implied statement in advertising or on a product package that could reasonably be interpreted as implying a reduced health risk associated with a tobacco product unless the manufacturer demonstrates to the Secretary in such form as the Secretary may require, that based on the best available scientific evidence the product significantly reduces the overall health risk to the public when compared to other tobacco products.

(2) SUBMISSION TO SECRETARY.—Prior to making any statement described in paragraph (1), a manufacturer, distributor, or retailer shall submit to the Secretary, in such form as the Secretary determines appropriate for such disclosure, a statement to the Secretary, who shall review such statement to ensure its accuracy and, in the case of advertising, to prevent such statement from being made with respect to an ingredient, constituent, substance, or compound that was the subject of the assessment under paragraph (2).

§ 576. REVIEW OF ASSESSMENTS.

(A) GENERAL REVIEW.—Not later than 180 days after the receipt of a safety assessment under subsection (b), the Secretary shall review the findings contained in an assessment and approve or disapprove of the safety of the ingredient, constituent, substance, or compound that was the subject of the assessment.

(B) DISCLOSURE TO THE PUBLIC.—The Secretary shall provide notice to the manufacturer of an action under this subparagraph.

§ 577. REVIEW OF ASSESSMENTS.

(A) GENERAL REVIEW.—Not later than 180 days after the receipt of a safety assessment under subsection (b), the Secretary shall review the findings contained in an assessment and approve or disapprove of the safety of the ingredient, constituent, substance, or compound that was the subject of the assessment.

(B) DISCLOSURE TO THE PUBLIC.—The Secretary shall provide notice to the manufacturer of an action under this subparagraph.
“(b) DECTERMINATION BY SECRETARY.—If the Secretary determines that a statement described in subsection (a)(2) is permissible because the tobacco product does present a significant risk to public health as determined by the Secretary, the Secretary shall permit such statement to be made.

“(c) DEVELOPMENT OR ACQUISITION OF RESEARCH; TESTING.—The manufacturer of tobacco products shall establish procedures to ensure the confidentiality of any proprietary information submitted to the Secretary under this subsection during such development.

“SEC. 576. ACCESS TO COMPANY INFORMATION.

“(a) COMPLIANCE PROCEDURES.—Each manufacturer of tobacco products shall establish procedures to ensure compliance with this Act.

“(b) REQUIREMENT.—In addition to any other disclosure obligations under this Act, the KIDS Act, or any other law, each manufacturer of tobacco products shall, not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of the KIDS Act and thereafter as required by the Secretary, disclose to the Secretary all nonpublic information and research in its possession or control relating to the addiction or dependency, or the health or safety of tobacco products, including (without limitation) all research relating to processes to make tobacco products less hazardous to consumers and the research and documents described in subsection (c).”

“(c) RESEARCH AND DOCUMENTS.—The documents described in this section include any documents concerning tobacco product research relating to—

“(1) nicotine, including—

“(A) the interaction between nicotine and other components in tobacco products including individual substances in the tobacco and smoke components;

“(B) the role of nicotine in product design and manufacture, including product charters, in product development, the tobacco blend, filter technology, and paper;

“(C) the role of nicotine in tobacco leaf purchasing;

“(D) reverse engineering activities involving nicotine (such as analyzing the products of other companies);”

“(E) an analysis of nicotine delivery; and

“(F) the biology, psychopharmacology and any other health effects of nicotine;

“(2) other ingredients, including—

“(A) any effect of ingredients in tobacco products and constituents in smoke, including additives used in product components such as paper, filter, and wrapper;

“(B) any research on the health effects of ingredients; and

“(C) any research or other information explaining what happens to ingredients when they are heated or burned.

“(3) less hazardous or safer products, including any research or product development information on activities involving reduced risk, such as filter, low-tar, low-nicotine, and other reduced-risk tobacco products, and

“(4) tobacco product advertising, marketing, and promotion, including—

“(A) documents related to the design of advertising campaigns, including the desired demographics for individual products on the market or being tested;

“(B) documents concerning the age of initiation of tobacco use, general tobacco use behavior, including smoking, smokeless tobacco, and new smokers;

“(C) documents concerning the effects of advertising; and

“(D) documents concerning future marketing options or plans in light of the requirements and regulations to be imposed under this chapter or the KIDS Act.

“(d) AUTHORITY.—With respect to tobacco product manufacturers, the Secretary shall have the same access to records and inspection authority as is available with respect to manufacturers of other medical devices.

“SEC. 577. OVERSIGHT OF TOBACCO PRODUCT MANUFACTURING.

“The Secretary shall by regulation prescribe good manufacturing practice standards for tobacco products. Such regulations shall be modeled after good manufacturing practice regulations for medical devices, food, and other items under section 520(c). Such standards shall be directed specifically toward tobacco products, and shall include—

“(1) a quality control system, to ensure that tobacco products comply with such standards;

“(2) a system for inspecting tobacco product materials to ensure their compliance with such standards;

“(3) requirements for the proper handling of finished tobacco products;

“(4) strict tolerances for pesticide chemical residues in or on tobacco or tobacco product components in the possession of the manufacturer, except that nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to affect any authority of the Environmental Protection Agency;

“(5) authority for officers or employees of the Secretary to inspect any factory, warehouse, or other establishment of any tobacco product manufacturer, and to have access to records, files, papers, processes, controls and facilities related to tobacco product manufacturing, in accordance with appropriate authority and rules promulgated under this Act; and

“(6) a requirement that the tobacco product manufacturer maintain such files and records the Secretary requires, as well as that the manufacturer report to the Secretary such information as the Secretary shall require, in accordance with section 519.

“SEC. 578. PREVENTION OF STATE AND LOCAL AUTHORITY.

“Notwithstanding section 521 and except as otherwise provided in section 521(e), nothing in this chapter shall be construed as prohibiting a State or locality from imposing requirements, prohibitions, penalties or other measures to further the purposes of this subchapter that are in addition to the requirements, prohibitions, or penalties required under this subchapter. State and local governments may impose additional tobacco product control measures that involve the production of tobacco leaf without the written consent of the manufacturer, except that nothing in this Act, or an amendment made by this Act, shall be construed to apply to the Secretary to inspect any factory, warehouse, or other establishment of any tobacco product manufacturer, the producer shall be subject to the provisions of this Act, and the amendments made by this Act, in the producer’s capacity as a manufacturer.

“(c) MANUFACTURER ACTING AS PRODUCER.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, the term “controlled by” means a producer that is a member of the same controlled group of corporations, as that term is used for purposes of section 52(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, or under control within the meaning of the regulations promulgated under section 52(a) of such Code.

“SEC. 202. EQUAL TREATMENT OF RETAIL OUTLETS.

“The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall promulgate regulations to require that retail establishments that are accessible to individuals under the age of 18, for which the predominant business is the sale of tobacco products, comply with any advertising restrictions applicable to such establishments.

“By Mr. REID:

S. 249. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the credit for electricity produced from certain renewable resources; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, the bill I have introduced expands the existing production tax credit for renewable energy technologies to include all renewable energy technologies.

We have a crisis in America today. It is called electricity. It is called power. What took place and is taking place in California is only a preview of things that are going to happen all over America unless we do something about it. It is time to recognize the present system isn’t working.

We can criticize California and what they did. It is obvious to everyone that their deregulation program simply was not workable. It wasn’t workable because they were energy inefficient. They did not produce enough energy inside the State of California for the
deregulation bill they passed to work. The only time a deregulation bill such as they had would work is if you have a State that produces more electricity than it uses. There are some examples of that. California, however, decided they were going to deregulate, even though they had more electricity produced within the State. They figured they could buy cheap power elsewhere and have it brought into California. It was a recipe for disaster. The disaster hit. They are now trying to work their way out of the problem.

There is no question that the current energy crisis in California has demonstrated that America must diversify its energy mix. Already in Nevada electricity rates have risen six times; the natural gas price has increased more than 75 percent. This is a real problem. All we have to do is look around. I have a letter from a man named Ronald Feldstein from Carson City, NV. Among other things, he said: I was horrified to read that Southwest Gas was increasing our gas bills 35 percent effective February 1. Nevada is a poor State, mostly composed of senior residents. I add editorially, that it isn’t true, but we do have lots and lots of senior citizens. To the author of this letter, it seems the State of Nevada is composed mostly of senior citizens.

Last month, he says, his Southwest Gas bill was over $100; a 35-percent increase will mean an additional $35 on his electricity bill. The only way a senior can afford such a huge increase is to give up something. In other words, lower his standard of living. That usually means giving up a certain prescription drug or lowering his food bill.

He went on to say other things, but I think that conveys the problem we have in Nevada, and people all over America are about to have; that is, a huge increase in the price of fuel energy.

Ensuring that the lights and heat stay on is critical to sustaining America’s economic growth and our quality of life. The citizens of Nevada and of this Nation demand a national energy strategy to ensure their economic well-being and security, and to provide for the quality of life they deserve.

It is a sad state of affairs that people like Mr. Feldstein, which can be multiplied by millions of Nevadans and thousands of times, have to make significant sacrifices to pay their energy bills. People are saying: I’m going to have to cut back on my prescriptions. I will have to cut back on the food I buy because I have a fixed income and these power bills must be paid because I can’t go without heat. Carson City, NV, is a cold place in the winter.

Nevadans understand that a national energy strategy must encompass something about which we all agree. What we are doing now does not work. We are depending mostly on importing oil, and people who import the oil are manipulating the price and that price is going sky high. We have to do something different. Of course, we have to do something about conservation. We must be more efficient. We must also expand our generating capacity. How are we going to do that? There are many ways, and one of the ways is to do something with clean coal technology. That is something I am willing to take a look at, hopefully, so we can reduce the global warming problem when it is necessary to use coal. But it is difficult to significantly reduce harmful emissions with coal.

I have supported clean coal technology. We have a plant near Reno, NV, that started out with clean coal technology. It is important we do that. We are not going to develop any more nuclear powerplants in America in the foreseeable future. There are too many problems. It is too expensive. We have no way of disposing of the waste.

What else can we do? We have powerplants for wind. The only way they can be constructed is if they are fueled by natural gas. The cost of natural gas has gone way up.

What else can we do? I think one of the things we can do is develop renewable energy in the United States. It is possible to expand our power capacity without compromising air or water quality.

Fossil fuel plants pump out over 11 million tons of pollutants into our air each year. This is not 11 million pounds, but tons, into our air each year. Powerplants in the United States are responsible for 35 percent of our national carbon dioxide emissions which contribute to global climate change, global warming. Powerplants in the United States are responsible for 66 percent of sulphur dioxide, which causes acid rain, 25 percent of nitrogen oxides, which lead to smog, and 21 percent of mercury, which poisons fish and other animals. That is what powerplants in the United States do. There is no disputing that. That is a fact.

The legislation I have introduced will renew the wind power production tax credit, expand the credit to additional renewable technologies, including solar, open-loop biomass, poultry and animal waste, geothermal, and incremental hydropower facilities. There is so much that can be done.

We are constructing, as we speak, 90 miles southwest of Las Vegas at the Nevada Test Site, wind-generating capacity that in 3 years will produce from windmills enough electricity, 265 megawatts, to power a quarter of a million homes.

These renewable energy sources can enhance America’s energy supply on a scale of 1 to 3 years, considerably shorter than the time required for a fossil fuel powerplant.

The proposed production tax credit for all these renewable energy sources should be made permanent. One of the problems we have with many of our tax credits is we do them for a short period of time. People don’t know whether they are going to be in existence, and therefore they are unwilling to commit long term. This proposed production tax credit, if it is made permanent, will encourage use of renewable energy and signal America’s long-term commitment to clean energy, to a healthy environment, and to our energy independence.

My bill also allows for coproduction credits to encourage blending of renewable energy with traditional fuels and provides a credit for renewable facilities on Native American and Native Alaskan lands.

Renewable energy is poised to make major contributions to our Nation’s energy needs over the next decade. It is so important we recognize that within 3 years one wind-generating farm in Nevada will produce 8 percent of all the electricity needs of the State. We can multiply that by 6 years to 20 percent. It is remarkable what can be done.

Nevada has already developed 200 megawatts of geothermal power with a longer term potential of more than 2,500 megawatts, enough capacity to meet the State’s energy needs. Growing renewable energy industries in the United States will also help provide growing employment opportunities in the United States and help U.S. renewable technologies compete in world markets.

In States such as Nevada, expanded renewable energy production will provide jobs in rural areas that have been largely left out of America’s recent economic boom.

The Department of Energy has estimated we could increase our generation of geothermal energy almost tenfold, supplying 10 percent of the energy needs of the West, and expand wind energy production to serve the electricity needs of 10 million homes.

Renewable energy, as an alternative to traditional energy sources, is a commitment to the American people that they can have a reliable source of power at an affordable price.

The United States needs to move away from its dependence on fossil fuels that pollute the environment and undermine our national security interests and balance of trade.

If there were ever a national security interest that we have, it would be doing something about the importation of fossil fuel. We have to do something to stop our dependence on these countries that manipulate the price of oil and other fuels. We have to do that; it is essential for our national security.

We need to send the signal to utility companies all over America that we are committed in the long term to the growth of renewable energy. We must accept this commitment for the energy security of the United States, for the protection of our environment, and for the health of the American people and literally the world.

By Mr. BIDEN (for himself, Mrs. HUTCHISON, Mr. LOTT, Mr. 
DASCHLE, Mr. KERRY, Mr. BACHUS, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. BREAUX, Mr. BURNS, Mr. BYRD, Mr. CARPER, Mr. L. CHAFEE, Mr. CLELAND, Mrs. CLINTON, Mr. COCHRAN, Ms. COLLINS, Mr. CONROY, Mr. DODD, Mr. DORGAN, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. FEINGOLD, Mrs. FIESENFELD, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. HELMS, Mr. HOLLINGS, Mr. INOUYE, Mr. JEFFORDS, Mr. JOHNSON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. LARSON, Ms. LEAHY, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LIEBERMAN, Mrs. LINCOLN, Ms. MIKULSKI, Mr. MILLER, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. REID, Mr. ROCKEFELLER, Mr. SANTORUM, Mr. SARBAVES, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. SNOWE, Mr. SPECTER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. WELLSTONE):

S. 250. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a credit to holders of qualified bonds issued by Amtrak, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce, along with Senator HUTCHISON, Senator LOTT, Senator DASCHLE, Senator BROWNSTONE, and other cosponsors of the High Speed Rail Investment Act of 2001. With this legislation we continue the work begun by our former colleagues, Senator Bill Roth, Senator Pat Moynihan, and especially Senator Frank Lautenberg, who worked so hard in the last Congress to support high speed intercity passenger rail.

Since the very first steam locomotive in this country rolled in New castle, Delaware, railroading has been a capital-intensive industry. From the rolling stock to the right of way, railroads require major long-term investments. But unlike every other passenger rail system in the world, Amtrak has lacked a secure source of public support for its capital needs. Over the years, along with many of my colleagues here in the Senate, I have looked for ways to right that wrong.

The bill that Senator HUTCHISON and I introduce today is designed to provide Amtrak with the capital funds to establish a truly national high speed passenger rail system. The idea is simple, and it is modeled on a program we already have in place to support another important public priority, public school construction. Under this legislation, Amtrak is authorized to issue, over the next ten years, up to $12 billion in bonds. Instead of an interest payment, the holders of those bonds will be paid by a rebate on their federal income taxes.

The funds generated from the sale of the bonds will be available for investments in high speed rail corridors throughout the country, from the established and profitable Northeast Corridor to planned corridors from Florida to the Northwest. One thing I learned from my days on the County Council in Delaware was that each route on a bus system supports and sustains the others. Cut one route, and ridership will fall off on the others as the whole system becomes less useful. Conversely, the more complete the system the more people will find that it meets their needs.

Another thing I learned on the county council, Mr. President, is that if state and local governments are required to put up some of their own funds to match assistance from the federal government, they will think long and hard about the best use of their monies. That is why legislation requires a twenty percent match by the state before a high speed rail project can qualify for the support this bill provides. This provision not only provides an additional safeguard that high speed rail investments meet the many real needs the states have, but it also assures that the funds will be there to pay off the bonds as they come due.

Before a project is eligible for the funds raised under this bill, it must be reviewed by the Secretary of Transportation for its financial soundness, its role in a national passenger rail system, and its contribution to balance among the many regional corridors in the national system.

I know I don't have to tell my colleagues about the growing chorus of public complaints about air travel in this country. All over the country, overworked and over booked airports and flyways keep passengers sitting in terminals or out on the runways, waiting for some movement in a clogged system. The vast majority of our most crowded airports are located near rail lines that could take some of those passengers where they need to go faster, safer, and more comfortably.

But only if we make the same investment in passenger rail that every other advanced economy does, Mr. President. Today, those tracks carry no passengers while our airports are bursting at the seams.

The same is true for the major highway corridors between our nation's cities. Those arteries are clogged with every kind of traffic, from freight haulers to vacationers to business travelers. Many of them run parallel to major rail corridors, that could share some of that load. But only, Mr. President, if we make the same investment in passenger rail that every other advanced economy does.

The best way to look at the lack of balance in our transportation spending, Mr. President, we spend $80 billion a year on our highways. We spend a billion just to reach full operating self sufficiency by that artificial deadline. But what ever we make of that deadline on operating support, Mr. President, it is clear that the very least we can do is provide Amtrak with the capital funds to become the passenger rail service this nation needs.

With the commitment of the leadership in both parties, with the support of over half of the Senate on the day of its introduction, this legislation is off to a great start. We need all of these resources and more to see this through to final passage, and to get a real, world-class passenger rail system for the United States under way.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 250

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, SEC. 1. SHORT TITLE; AMENDMENT OF 1986 CODE.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “High-Speed Rail Investment Act of 2001.”

(b) AMENDMENT OF 1986 CODE.—Except as otherwise expressly provided, whenever in this Act an amendment or repeal is expressed in terms of an amendment to, or repeal of, a section or other provision, the reference shall be considered to be made to a section or other provision of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986.

SEC. 2. CREDIT TO HOLDERS OF QUALIFIED AMTRAK BONDS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 relating to credits against tax) is amended by adding at the end the following new subpart:
“Subpart H—Nonrefundable Credit for Holders of Qualified Amtrak Bonds

“SEC. 54. Credit to holders of qualified Amtrak bonds.

“(a) ALLOWANCE OF CREDIT.—In the case of a taxpayer who holds a qualified Amtrak bond on a credit allowance date of such bond which is a part of the taxable year, there shall be allowed as a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter for such taxable year an amount equal to the sum of the credits determined under subsection (b) with respect to credit allowance dates during such year on which the taxpayer holds such bond.

“(b) AMOUNT OF CREDIT.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The amount of the credit determined under this subsection with respect to any credit allowance date for a qualified Amtrak bond is 25 percent of the annual credit determined with respect to such bond.

“(2) ANNUAL CREDIT.—The annual credit determined with respect to any qualified Amtrak bond is the product of—

“(A) the applicable credit rate, multiplied by

“(B) the outstanding face amount of the bond.

“(3) APPLICABLE CREDIT RATE.—For purposes of paragraph (2), the applicable credit rate shall be equal to an average market yield (as of the day before the date of sale of the issue) on outstanding long-term corporate bond obligations determined under regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

“(4) SPECIAL RULE FOR ISSUANCE AND REDEMPTION.—In the case of a bond which is issued during the 3-month period ending on a credit allowance date, the amount of the credit determined under this subsection with respect to such credit allowance date shall be a ratable portion of the credit otherwise determined based on the portion of the 3-month period during which the bond is outstanding. A similar rule shall apply when the bond is redeemed.

“(c) LIMITATION BASED ON AMOUNT OF TAX.

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The credit allowed under subsection (a) for any taxable year shall not exceed the excess of—

“(A) the sum of the regular tax liability (as defined in section 26(b)) plus the tax imposed by this chapter for such taxable year, over (as defined in section 26(b)) plus the tax imposed by this chapter for such taxable year, over

“(B) the credits allowable under this part (other than this subpart and part C).

“(2) CARRYOVER OF UNUSED CREDIT.—If the credit allowable under subsection (a) exceeds the limitation imposed by paragraph (1) for such taxable year, such excess shall be carried forward to the succeeding taxable year and added to the credit allowable under subsection (a) for such taxable year.

“(d) QUALIFIED AMTRAK BOND.—For purposes of this section—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘qualified Amtrak bond’ means any bond issued as part of an issue if—

“(A) 10 percent or more of the proceeds of such issue are to be used for any qualified project,

“(B) the bond is issued by the National Railroad Passenger Corporation,

“(C) the issue—

“(i) designates such bond for purposes of this section,

“(ii) certifies that it meets the State contribution requirement of paragraph (3) with respect to such project and that it has received the required State contribution payment for any portion of such bond,

“(iii) certifies that it has obtained the written approval of the Secretary of Transportation for such project, including a finding by the Inspector General of the Department of Transportation that there is a reasonable likelihood that the proposed project is not a part of the excessive Federal contribution to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation and that the investment evaluation process included a reasonable analysis of the financial contribution to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation and the investment evaluation process includes a reasonable analysis of the financial contribution to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation and the

“(iv) certifies that it has obtained written certification from the Secretary, after consultation with the Inspector General of Transportation, that, in the case of a qualified project which results in passenger trains operating at speeds greater than 79 miles per hour, the issuer has entered into a written agreement with the rail carriers (as defined in section 24102 of title 49, United States Code) the properties of which are to be improved by such project as to the scope and estimated cost of such project and the impact on freight capacity of such rail carriers; Provided: That the National Railroad Passenger Corporation is allowed to carry such projects for the portion of such project included in the categories described under section 24308(a) of such title 49 to resolve disputes with respect to such project or the cost of such projects.

“(D) the terms of such bond which is part of such issue does not exceed 20 years,

“(E) the payment of principal with respect to such issue is determined based on the portion of the 3-month period during which the bond is outstanding. A similar rule shall apply when the bond is redeemed.

“(2) TREATMENT OF CHANGES IN USE.—For purposes of paragraphs (1)(A), (2)(A), and (3)(A), the term ‘qualified project’ means—

“(a) the acquisition, financing, or refinancing of equipment, rolling stock, and other capital improvements, including rehabilitation or construction, track or signal improvements, or the elimination of grade crossings, for the northeast rail corridor between Washington, D.C. and Boston, Massachusetts,

“(b) the acquisition, financing, or refinancing of equipment, rolling stock, and other capital improvements, including rehabilitation or construction, track or signal improvements, or the elimination of grade crossings, for the improvement of train speeds or safety (or both) on the high-speed rail corridors designated under section 104(d)(2) of title 23, United States Code, and

“(c) the acquisition, financing, or refinancing of equipment, rolling stock, and other capital improvements, including rehabilitation or construction, track or signal improvements, or the elimination of grade crossings, for the improvement of train speeds or safety (or both) on the high-speed rail corridors designated under section 9503.

“(D) STATE MATCHING CONTRIBUTIONS MAY NOT INCLUDE FEDERAL FUNDS.—Except as provided in subparagraph (C), for purposes of this paragraph, State matching contributions shall not be derived, directly or indirectly, from Federal funds, including any transfers from the Highway Trust Fund under section 9503.

“(E) NO STATE CONTRIBUTION REQUIREMENT FOR CERTAIN QUALIFIED PROJECTS.—With respect to any qualified project described in subparagraph (D), the State contribution requirement of this paragraph is zero.

“(3) APPLICABLE CREDIT RATE.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘qualified project’ means—

“(i) the acquisition, financing, or refinancing of equipment, rolling stock, and other capital improvements, including rehabilitation or construction, track or signal improvements, or the elimination of grade crossings, for the Northeast Corridor for the purpose of increasing freight and passenger railroad speeds to at least 90 miles per hour,

“(II) to redeem other qualified bonds, or

“(III) for the purposes of subparagraphs (A)(i) and (II).

“(B) STATE CONSERVATION AREA REQUIREMENT FOR CERTAIN QUALIFIED PROJECTS.

“(I) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, with respect to any qualified project on the high-speed rail corridors designated under section 106(d)(2) of title 23, United States Code, the State contribution requirement of this paragraph may include the value of land to be contributed by a State for right-of-way and may be determined based on the Federal Government’s cost of the use of Federal funds, including transfers from the Highway Trust Fund under section 9503.

“(II) SPECIAL RULES REGARDING USE OF BOND PROCEEDS.—Proceeds from the issuance of bonds for such a qualified project may be used to the extent necessary for the purpose of subparagraph (B)(i), and any such proceeds included into the trust account required under subsection (j) shall be deemed expenditures for the qualified project under subsection (j).

“(D) STATE MATCHING CONTRIBUTIONS MAY NOT INCLUDE FEDERAL FUNDS.—Except as provided in subparagraph (C), for purposes of this paragraph, State matching contributions shall not be derived, directly or indirectly, from Federal funds, including any transfers from the Highway Trust Fund under section 9503.

“(E) NO STATE CONTRIBUTION REQUIREMENT FOR CERTAIN QUALIFIED PROJECTS.—With respect to any qualified project described in subparagraph (D), the State contribution requirement of this paragraph is zero.

“(4) QUALIFIED PROJECT.

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘qualified project’ means—

“(I) the acquisition, financing, or refinancing of equipment, rolling stock, and other capital improvements, including rehabilitation or construction, track or signal improvements, or the elimination of grade crossings, for the Northeast Corridor for the purpose of increasing freight and passenger railroad speeds to at least 90 miles per hour,

“(II) to redeem other qualified bonds, or

“(III) for the purposes of subparagraphs (A)(i) and (II).

“(B) STATE CONSERVATION AREA REQUIREMENT FOR CERTAIN QUALIFIED PROJECTS.

“(I) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, with respect to any qualified project on the high-speed rail corridors designated under section 106(d)(2) of title 23, United States Code, the State contribution requirement of this paragraph may include the value of land to be contributed by a State for right-of-way and may be determined based on the Federal Government’s cost of the use of Federal funds, including transfers from the Highway Trust Fund under section 9503.

“(II) SPECIAL RULES REGARDING USE OF BOND PROCEEDS.—Proceeds from the issuance of bonds for such a qualified project may be used to the extent necessary for the purpose of subparagraph (B)(i), and any such proceeds included into the trust account required under subsection (j) shall be deemed expenditures for the qualified project under subsection (j).

“(D) STATE MATCHING CONTRIBUTIONS MAY NOT INCLUDE FEDERAL FUNDS.—Except as provided in subparagraph (C), for purposes of this paragraph, State matching contributions shall not be derived, directly or indirectly, from Federal funds, including any transfers from the Highway Trust Fund under section 9503.

“(E) NO STATE CONTRIBUTION REQUIREMENT FOR CERTAIN QUALIFIED PROJECTS.—With respect to any qualified project described in subparagraph (D), the State contribution requirement of this paragraph is zero.

“(4) QUALIFIED PROJECT.

“(A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘qualified project’ means—

“(I) the acquisition, financing, or refinancing of equipment, rolling stock, and other capital improvements, including rehabilitation or construction, track or signal improvements, or the elimination of grade crossings, for the Northeast Corridor for the purpose of increasing freight and passenger railroad speeds to at least 90 miles per hour,

“(II) to redeem other qualified bonds, or

“(III) for the purposes of subparagraphs (A)(i) and (II).

“(B) STATE CONSERVATION AREA REQUIREMENT FOR CERTAIN QUALIFIED PROJECTS.

“(I) IN GENERAL.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, with respect to any qualified project on the high-speed rail corridors designated under section 106(d)(2) of title 23, United States Code, the State contribution requirement of this paragraph may include the value of land to be contributed by a State for right-of-way and may be determined based on the Federal Government’s cost of the use of Federal funds, including transfers from the Highway Trust Fund under section 9503.

“(II) SPECIAL RULES REGARDING USE OF BOND PROCEEDS.—Proceeds from the issuance of bonds for such a qualified project may be used to the extent necessary for the purpose of subparagraph (B)(i), and any such proceeds included into the trust account required under subsection (j) shall be deemed expenditures for the qualified project under subsection (j).

“(D) STATE MATCHING CONTRIBUTIONS MAY NOT INCLUDE FEDERAL FUNDS.—Except as provided in subparagraph (C), for purposes of this paragraph, State matching contributions shall not be derived, directly or indirectly, from Federal funds, including any transfers from the Highway Trust Fund under section 9503.

“(E) NO STATE CONTRIBUTION REQUIREMENT FOR CERTAIN QUALIFIED PROJECTS.—With respect to any qualified project described in subparagraph (D), the State contribution requirement of this paragraph is zero.

“(4) QUALIFIED PROJECT.
"(2) BONDS FOR RAIL CORRIDORS.—Not more than $3,000,000,000 of the limitation under paragraph (1) may be designated for any 1 rail corridor described in clause (1) or (2) of subsection (A).

"(3) BONDS FOR OTHER PROJECTS.—Not more than $100,000,000 of the limitation under paragraph (1) for any fiscal year may be allocated to projects described in subsection (d)(4)(A)(iii).

"(4) BONDS FOR ALASKA RAILROAD.—The Secretary of Transportation may allocate to the Alaska Railroad a portion of the qualified Amtrak limitation for any fiscal year in order to allow the Alaska Railroad to issue bonds after the requirements of this section for use in financing any project described in subsection (d)(4)(A)(iii) (determined without regard to the requirement of increasing railroad speeds). For purposes of this section, the Alaska Railroad shall be treated in the same manner as the National Railroad Passenger Corporation.

"(5) CARRYOVER OF UNUSED LIMITATION.—If for any fiscal year—

"(A) the limitation amount under paragraph (1), exceeds

"(B) the amount of bonds issued during such year which are designated under subsection (d)(1)(C)(i), the limitation amount under paragraph (1) for the following fiscal year (through fiscal year 2015) shall be increased by the amount of such excess.

"(6) ADDITIONAL SELECTION CRITERIA.—In selecting projects for allocation of the qualified Amtrak bond limitation under this subsection, the Secretary of Transportation—

"(A) may give preference to any project with a State matching contribution rate exceeding 20 percent, and

"(B) shall consider regional balance in freight transportation and the national interest in ensuring the development of a nation-wide high-speed rail transportation network.

"(7) OTHER DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection—

"(1) BOND.—The term ‘bonds’ includes any obligation.

"(2) CREDIT ALLOWANCE DATE.—The term ‘credit allowance date’ means—

"(i) March 15,

"(ii) September 15, and

"(iii) December 15.

"(8) PROGRAM.—The term ‘program’ means 1 or more projects implemented over 1 or more years to support the development of intercity passenger rail corridors.

"(9) AMOUNT INCLUDED IN GROSS INCOME.—Gross income includes the amount of the credit allowed to the taxpayer under this section (determined without regard to subsection (b)(2)(A) of such section) and any interest so included shall be treated as interest income.

"(10) SPECIAL RULES RELATING TO AMTRAK.—

"(10) OTHER DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this subsection if as of the date of issuance, the issuer reasonably expects—

"(A) to spend at least 95 percent of the proceeds of the issue for 1 or more qualified projects within the 5-year period beginning on the date of issuance, an issue shall be treated as continuing to meet the requirements of this subsection if either—

"(i) the issuer uses all unspent proceeds of the issue to redeem bonds of the issue within 90 days after the end of such 5-year period, or

"(ii) the following requirements are met:

"(I) the issuer pays at least 75 percent of the proceeds of the issue for 1 or more qualified projects within such 5-year period beginning on the date of issuance.

"(II) the issuer has proceeded with due diligence to spend the proceeds of the issue within such 5-year period and continues to proceed with due diligence to spend such proceeds.

"(III) the issuer pays to the Federal Government any earnings on the proceeds of the issue that accrue after the end of such 5-year period.

"(iv) Either—

"(I) at least 95 percent of the proceeds of the issue is expended for 1 or more qualified projects within the 6-year period beginning on the date of issuance.

"(II) the issuer uses all unspent proceeds of the issue to redeem bonds of the issue within 90 days after the end of such 6-year period.

"(1) BONDS FOR ALASKA RAILROAD.—The Secretary of Transportation may allocate to the Alaska Railroad a portion of the qualified Amtrak limitation for any fiscal year in order to allow the Alaska Railroad to issue bonds after the requirements of this section for use in financing any project described in subsection (d)(4)(A)(iii) (determined without regard to the requirement of increasing railroad speeds). For purposes of this section, the Alaska Railroad shall be treated in the same manner as the National Railroad Passenger Corporation.

"(5) CARRYOVER OF UNUSED LIMITATION.—If for any fiscal year—

"(A) the limitation amount under paragraph (1), exceeds

"(B) the amount of bonds issued during such year which are designated under subsection (d)(1)(C)(i), the limitation amount under paragraph (1) for the following fiscal year (through fiscal year 2015) shall be increased by the amount of such excess.

"(6) ADDITIONAL SELECTION CRITERIA.—In selecting projects for allocation of the qualified Amtrak bond limitation under this subsection, the Secretary of Transportation—

"(A) may give preference to any project with a State matching contribution rate exceeding 20 percent, and

"(B) shall consider regional balance in freight transportation and the national interest in ensuring the development of a nation-wide high-speed rail transportation network.

"(1) BOND.—The term ‘bonds’ includes any obligation.

"(2) CREDIT ALLOWANCE DATE.—The term ‘credit allowance date’ means—

"(i) March 15,

"(ii) September 15, and

"(iii) December 15.

"(3) SPECIAL RULES.—

"(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (b) of section 41(d) shall be applied without regard to subsections (A), (H), (I), (J), (K), and (L)(i).

"(2) USE OF REMAINING FUNDS IN TRUST ACCOUNT.—Upon the repayment of the principal of all qualified Amtrak bonds issued under this section, any remaining funds in the trust account described in paragraph (1) shall be available—

"(A) to the taxpayer described in paragraph (1) to meet any remaining obligations under any guaranteed investment contract used to secure earnings sufficient to repay the principal of such bonds, and

"(B) to the issuer, for any qualified project.

"(K) OTHER SPECIAL RULES.—

"(1) PARTNERSHIP, S CORPORATION, AND OTHER PASS-THRU ENTITIES.—Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary, in the case of a partnership, trust, S corporation, or other pass-thru entity, rules similar to the rules of section 41(g) shall apply with respect to the credit allowable under subsection (a).

"(2) BONDS HELD BY REGULATED INVESTMENT COMPANIES.—If any qualified Amtrak bond is held by a regulated investment company, the credit determined under subsection (a) shall be allowed to shareholders of such company under procedures prescribed by the Secretary.

"(3) CREDITS MAY BE STRIPPED.—Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary—

"(A) there may be a separation (including at issuance) of the ownership of a qualified Amtrak bond and the entitlement to the credit under this section with respect to such bond. In case of such separation, the credit determined under subsection (a), shall be allowed to the person to whom the credit allowance date holds the instrument evidencing the entitlement to the credit and not to the holder of the bond.

"(B) CERTAIN RULES TO APPLY.—In the case of a separation described in subparagraph (A), the rules of section 1296 shall apply to the qualified Amtrak bond as if it were a stripped bond and to the credit under this section as if it were a stripped coupon.

"(4) TREATMENT FOR ESTIMATED TAX PURPOSES.—For purposes of sections 6654 and 6655, the credit allowed by this section to a taxpayer by reason of holding a qualified Amtrak bond on a credit allowance date shall be treated as if it were a payment of estimated tax made by the taxpayer on such date.

"(5) CREDIT MAY BE TRANSFERRED.—Nothing in any law or rule of law shall be construed to limit the transferability of the credit allowed by this section through sale and repurchase agreements.

"(6) REPORTING.—Issuers of qualified Amtrak bonds shall submit reports similar to the reports required under section 149(e)."

"(b) REPORTING.—Subsection (d)(5), as amended by section 505(d), is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

"(7) REPORTING OF CREDIT ON QUALIFIED AMTRAK BONDS.—

"(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of subsection (a), the term ‘interest’ includes amounts includible in gross income under section 54(g) and such amounts shall be treated as paid on the credit allowance date (as defined in section 54(f)(2)).

"(B) REPORTING TO CORPORATIONS, ETC.—Except as otherwise provided in regulations, in the case of any interest described in subparagraph (A) of this paragraph, subsection (d)(5) shall be applied without regard to subparagraphs (A), (H), (I), (J), (K), and (L)(i).
Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I am proud to join our esteemed majority and minority leaders in sponsoring the High Speed Rail Investment Act of 2001. I am proud that our two leaders have been willing and able to work in a bipartisan manner to fulfill a promise this legislation makes to intro-
duce this critical legislation. I thank them, and I thank Senator BIDEN and Senator HUTCHISON for their strong leadership as well. Their commitment to this bill cannot be overstated.

This legislation will allow Amtrak to sell $12 billion in bonds over the next ten years and permit the federal government to provide tax credits to bondholders in lieu of interest pay-
ments. Amtrak would use this money to upgrade existing rail lines to high-
speed rail capability. This bill has sup-
porters from both parties and all re-
gions of the country.

Mr. President, high speed rail is not a partisan issue. It is not a regional issue. It is not an urban issue. The High-Speed Rail Investment Act has the support of the National Governors Association, the U.S. Conference of Mayors and the National Conference of State Legislatures. Thirty newspapers, from the New York Times and the Provi-
dence Journal, to the Houston Chron-
icle and Seattle Post Intelligencer, have called for the enactment of this legislation.

It is in our national interest to con-
struct a national infrastructure that is truly intermodal. Rail transportation helps alleviate the stress placed on our environment by air and highway trans-
portation. It is a sad fact that Amer-
icas’s rail transportation, and its lack of a national high-speed rail system, lags well behind rail transportation in most other nations—we spend less, per capita, on rail transportation than Es-
tonia and Greece.

Mr. President, I know I made many of these same points on the floor of the Senate in December when we discussed a similar version of the High Speed Rail Investment Act. However, I be-
lieve that this legislation is critical to our nation’s transportation infrastruc-
ture needs, and these facts bear repeat-
ing:

The federal government has invested $380 billion in our highways and $160 billion in airports since Amtrak was created. Amtrak would be the next ten years and permit the federal government to provide tax credits to bondholders in lieu of interest pay-
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The federal government has invested $380 billion in our highways and $160 billion in airports since Amtrak was created. By contrast, the federal gov-
ernment has spent only about $30 bil-
on Amtrak. We have spent just four percent of our transportation budget on rail transportation in the last 30 years. The Congress has man-
dated that Amtrak continue and Seattle Post Intelligencer.
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dated that Amtrak continue and Seattle Post Intelligencer.

Mr. President, I am proud to join our esteemed majority and minority leaders in sponsoring the High Speed Rail Investment Act of 2001. I am proud that our two leaders have been willing and able to work in a bipartisan manner to fulfill a promise this legislation makes to intro-
duce this critical legislation. I thank them, and I thank Senator BIDEN and Senator HUTCHISON for their strong leadership as well. Their commitment to this bill cannot be overstated.

This legislation will allow Amtrak to sell $12 billion in bonds over the next ten years and permit the federal government to provide tax credits to bondholders in lieu of interest pay-
ments. Amtrak would use this money to upgrade existing rail lines to high-
speed rail capability. This bill has sup-
porters from both parties and all re-
gions of the country.

Mr. President, high speed rail is not a partisan issue. It is not a regional issue. It is not an urban issue. The High-Speed Rail Investment Act has the support of the National Governors Association, the U.S. Conference of Mayors and the National Conference of State Legislatures. Thirty newspapers, from the New York Times and the Provi-
dence Journal, to the Houston Chron-
icle and Seattle Post Intelligencer, have called for the enactment of this legislation.

It is in our national interest to con-
struct a national infrastructure that is truly intermodal. Rail transportation helps alleviate the stress placed on our environment by air and highway trans-
portation. It is a sad fact that Amer-
icas’s rail transportation, and its lack of a national high-speed rail system, lags well behind rail transportation in most other nations—we spend less, per capita, on rail transportation than Es-
tonia and Greece.

Mr. President, I know I made many of these same points on the floor of the Senate in December when we discussed a similar version of the High Speed Rail Investment Act. However, I be-
lieve that this legislation is critical to our nation’s transportation infrastruc-
ture needs, and these facts bear repeat-
ing:

The federal government has invested $380 billion in our highways and $160 billion in airports since Amtrak was created. By contrast, the federal gov-
ernment has spent only about $30 bil-
on Amtrak. We have spent just four percent of our transportation budget on rail transportation in the last 30 years. The Congress has man-
dated that Amtrak continue and Seattle Post Intelligencer.

Mr. President, I am proud to join our esteemed majority and minority leaders in sponsoring the High Speed Rail Investment Act of 2001. I am proud that our two leaders have been willing and able to work in a bipartisan manner to fulfill a promise this legislation makes to intro-
duce this critical legislation. I thank them, and I thank Senator BIDEN and Senator HUTCHISON for their strong leadership as well. Their commitment to this bill cannot be overstated.

This legislation will allow Amtrak to sell $12 billion in bonds over the next ten years and permit the federal government to provide tax credits to bondholders in lieu of interest pay-
ments. Amtrak would use this money to upgrade existing rail lines to high-
speed rail capability. This bill has sup-
porters from both parties and all re-
gions of the country.
maintain its trademark quality service.

There is a compelling need to invest in high-speed rail. Our highways and skyways are overburdened. Intercity passenger miles traveled have increased 90 percent since 1988, but only 5.5 percent have come from increased rail travel. Meanwhile, our congested skies have become even more crowded. The result, predictably, is that air travel delays are up 58 percent since 1995. Things have gotten so bad in Chicago that O'Hare airport maintains 1,500 cots for snow-bound travelers. This summer, the airport had to order additional cots to accommodate passengers left stranded by myriad delays and cancellations.

Amtrak ridership is on the rise. More than 22.5 million passengers rode Amtrak in Fiscal Year 2000, a million more than the previous year. Nearly six million riders took Amtrak in the first quarter of this fiscal year, the best first quarter performance in this company’s 30-year history. Ridership for the quarter was up 8.5 percent, while ticket revenue climbed almost 14 percent over the first quarter of FY99. We should welcome that increased use and support it by giving Amtrak the resources it needs to provide high-quality, dependable service.

The High-Speed Rail Investment Act is critical to the future of Amtrak. For about the cost of the new Denver International Airport, we can improve intercity transportation in the Northeast Corridor. Amtrak captures almost 70 percent of the business rail and air travel market between Washington, D.C., and 30 plus cities. The market share between New York and Boston. True high-speed rail will undoubtedly increase that market share. These new trains, like the Acela Express that debuted in the Northeast this year, currently run at an average of only 82 miles per hour, but with track improvements, will run at 130 miles per hour.

As a nation, we have recognized the importance of having the very best communication system, and ours is the envy of the world. That investment is one of reasons our economy is the strongest in the world. And we should do the same for our transportation system. It should be equally modern and must be fully intermodal. Rail transportation is a part of that network and I hope that we can pass this critical, cost-efficient legislation this year.

By Mr. VOINOVICH:
S. 232. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to authorize appropriations for State water pollution control revolving funds, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

Mr. VOINOVICH. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Clean Water Infrastructure Financing Act of 2001, legislation which will reauthorize the High-Speed Rail Investment Act and capitalize the Clean Water State Revolving Loan Fund, SRF Program administered by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, EPA.

As many of my colleagues know, the Clean Water SRF Program is an effective and immensely popular source of funding for wastewater collection and treatment projects. Congress created the Clean Water SRF Program in 1987 to replace the direct grants program that was enacted as part of the landmark 1972 Federal Water Pollution Control Act, or, as it is known, the Clean Water Act. State and local governments have used the Federal Clean Water SRF to help meet critical environmental infrastructure needs without resorting to the long and costly process of bond raises and other public financing options. A community bank, where each state determines which projects get built.

The performance of the Clean Water SRF Program has been spectacular. Total federal capitalization grants to date have leveraged non-federal funding sources, including state contributions, leveraged bonds, and principal and interest payments. Communities of all sizes are participating in the program, and approximately 7,000 projects nationwide have been approved to date.

As in many states, Ohio has needs for public wastewater systems improvements which greatly exceed typical Clean Water SRF funding levels. For instance, in fiscal year 2001, a level of $1.35 billion was appropriated for the Clean Water SRF. However, in Ohio alone, about $4 billion of improvements have been identified as necessary to address combined sewer overflow, CSO, and CSO problem areas which the latest state assessment was revised upward to near-$248 million to implement—nearly 20 percent of the total SRF level appropriated in fiscal year 2001. Because of Akron’s CSO problem, city sewer rates will more than double without outside funding.

Further, estimates indicate that among Ohio towns with a population of less than 10,000, there exists $1.2 billion in CSO needs. Recent years, Ohio cities and villages have been spending more on maintaining and operating their systems in order to stave-off the inevitable upgrades. Nevertheless, their systems are aging and will need to be replaced.

While the Clean Water SRF Program’s track record is excellent, the condition of our nation’s overall environmental infrastructure remains alarming. A 20-year needs survey conducted by the EPA in 1996 documented $139 billion worth of wastewater capital needs nationwide. In 1999, the national assessment was revised upward to nearly $200 billion, in order to more accurately account for expected sanitary sewer needs. This amount may be too small; private studies demonstrate that total needs are closer to $300 billion when anticipated replacement costs are considered.

Authorization for the Clean Water SRF expired at the end of fiscal year 1994, and the continued failure of Congress to reauthorize the program sends an implicit message that wastewater collection and treatment is not a national priority. The longer we have an absence of authorization for the program, the longer it creates uncertainty about the program’s future in the eyes of borrowers, which may delay or, in some cases, prevent project financing. In order to allow any kind of substantial increase in spending, reauthorization of the Clean Water SRF is necessary in the 107th Congress.

The bill that I am introducing today will authorize a total of $15 billion over the next five years for the Clean Water SRF. It will reauthorize and extend a program that has a proven track record of providing an implicit message that wastewater collection and treatment is not a national priority. The longer we have an absence of authorization for the program, the longer it creates uncertainty about the program’s future in the eyes of borrowers, which may delay or, in some cases, prevent project financing. In order to allow any kind of substantial increase in spending, reauthorization of the Clean Water SRF program is necessary in the 107th Congress.

The bill that I am introducing today will authorize a total of $15 billion over the next five years for the Clean Water SRF. It will reauthorize and extend a program that has a proven track record of providing an implicit message that wastewater collection and treatment is not a national priority. The longer we have an absence of authorization for the program, the longer it creates uncertainty about the program’s future in the eyes of borrowers, which may delay or, in some cases, prevent project financing. In order to allow any kind of substantial increase in spending, reauthorization of the Clean Water SRF program is necessary in the 107th Congress.

The bill that I am introducing today will authorize a total of $15 billion over the next five years for the Clean Water SRF. It will reauthorize and extend a program that has a proven track record of providing an implicit message that wastewater collection and treatment is not a national priority. The longer we have an absence of authorization for the program, the longer it creates uncertainty about the program’s future in the eyes of borrowers, which may delay or, in some cases, prevent project financing. In order to allow any kind of substantial increase in spending, reauthorization of the Clean Water SRF program is necessary in the 107th Congress.
Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Rural Education Improvement Act. I am pleased to be joined by Senators Conrad, Gregg, Hutchison, Enzi, Haga, Roberts, Dorgan, Thomas, Allard, Burns, and Johnson, as original cosponsors of this common sense, bipartisan proposal to help rural schools make better use of federal education funds. I also want to acknowledge the valuable assistance provided over the past two years by the American Association of School Administrators.

Last Congress, I introduced the Rural Education Initiative Act—the foundation for today’s legislation. I am pleased that the REIA was largely incorporated into the final appropriations bill, thus allowing small, rural school districts to combine funds from four formula grant programs, giving them the flexibility to target funds toward their students’ most pressing needs. While the passage of this bill represented substantial progress, it was a one-year authorization only, and no appropriations were provided for the supplemental grant program authorized by the new law.

Mr. President, the bill we introduce today strengthens the legislation enacted last year. The Collins-Conrad bill would provide a 5-year authorization of the new supplemental grant program last year and authorize $150 million annually for the supplemental grant program.

Our legislation would benefit school districts with fewer than 600 students in rural communities. More than 35 percent of all school districts in the United States have 600 or fewer students. In Maine, the percentage is even higher: 56 percent of our 284 school districts have fewer than 600 students. Our legislation would help them overcome some of the most challenging obstacles they face in participating in federal education programs.

By way of background, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act authorizes formula, and competitive grants that help many of our local school districts to improve the education of their students. These federal grants support such laudable goals as the professional development of teachers, the infusion of technology into the classroom, gifted and talented programs, and class size reduction. Schools receive categorical grants, each with its own authorized activities and regulations, each with its own red tape and paperwork. Unfortunately, as valuable as these programs may be for many large urban and suburban school districts, they often do not work well in rural areas for two major reasons.

First, formula grants often do not reach small, rural schools in amounts sufficient to achieve the goals of the programs. These grants are based on school district enrollment, and, therefore, smaller districts often do not receive enough funding from any single grant to carry out a meaningful activity. One Main district, for example, received a whopping $28 to fund a district-wide Safe and Drug-Free School program. This amount is certainly not sufficient to achieve the goals of that federal program; yet the school district could not use the funds for any other purpose.

To give school districts more flexibility to meet local needs, our legislation would allow rural districts to combine the categorical funds of four programs and use them to address the school district’s highest priorities.

The second problem facing many rural school districts is that they are essentially shut out of the competitive programs because they lack the grant-writers and administrators necessary to apply for, win, and manage competitively awarded grants. The Rural Education Improvement Act would remedy this program by providing small, rural districts with flexibility in lieu of eligibility for the competitive programs of the ESEA.

A district would be able to combine this new supplemental grant with the funds from the formula grants and use the combined funds however my districts think that would improve student achievement or teaching quality. Districts might use these funds to hire a new reading or math teacher, fund professional development, offer a program for gifted students, purchase computers or library books.

Let me give you a specific example of what these two initiatives would mean for one school Maine School District in Northern Maine with 400 students from the towns of Frenchville and St. Agatha receives four separate formula grants ranging from $1,904 for Safe and Drug Free Schools to $9,542 under the Class Size Reduction Act. You can see the problem right there. The amounts of the grants are so small that they really are not useful in accomplishing the goals of the program. The total for all four programs is just under $10,000. Yet, each must be applied for separately, used for different—federally mandated—purposes, and accounted for independently.

Superintendent Jerry White told me that he needs to submit eight separate reports, for four programs, to receive this $10,000. Under our bill, this school district would be freed from the multiple reports and would have $16,000 to use for its educational priorities.

Moreover, since this district does not have the resources to apply for the competitive grant programs, our legislation would result in a supplemental grant of $34,000 as long as the District foregoes its eligibility for the competitively awarded grants. Under the Rural Education Improvement Act, therefore, the District will have $50,000 and the flexibility to use these funds for its most pressing needs.

But with this flexibility and additional funding come responsibility and accountability. In return for the advantages our bill provides, participating districts would be held accountable for demonstrating improved student performance over a 3-year period. Schools will be held responsible for really improved—rather than merely maintaining—student achievement—rather than for time-consuming paperwork. As Superintendent White told me, ‘‘Give me the resources I need plus the flexibility to use them, and I am happy to be held accountable for improving student performance. It will happen.’’

Mr. President, we must improve our educational system without requiring every school to adopt a plan designed in Washington and without imposing costly and burdensome federal regulations and unnecessary paperwork.

Congress took an important step last year by recognizing that small, rural districts face challenges in using federal programs to help provide a quality education for their students. Due to our efforts last year, the law now reflects Congress’ intention to provide these districts more flexibility and additional funding. This legislation will move us from intention to implementation by providing sustained support, flexibility, and funding for our rural schools.

I am pleased that this legislation has been endorsed by the American Association of School Administrators, the National Rural Education Association, the Association of Educational Service Agencies, and the National Education Association, and I ask unanimous consent that endorsement letters be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Dear Senator Collins: The National Rural Education Association would like to applaud your recognition of the unique hardships that face small, rural schools in respect to their federal funding. Along with U.S. Senators Kent Conrad, D-ND; Judd Gregg, R-NH; Conrad Burns, R-MT; Chuck Hagel, R-NE; Michael Enzi, R-WY; and Tim Johnson, D-SD, and Byron Dorgan, D-ND, you have reintroduced legislation that would ensure that small rural schools get a baseline amount of federal funding.

Currently, many small and rural schools are at a disadvantage when they receive their ESEA funding. Federal funding formulas are based on enrollment, which prevent small schools from receiving adequate resources. Due to the small numbers of students, these schools rarely receive enough combined funds to hire a teacher. Small schools also lack the administrative capacity to apply for competitive grants. This puts small rural schools on unequal federal footing with many of their urban and suburban counterparts.
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Last December, your Rural Education Initiative was included in the omnibus appropriations bill. The new law allows districts to commingle some of the federal funds they receive and use them to improve student achievement and professional development. In addition, it included legislation that would provide a minimum of $20,000 to schools of 600 or less. These are some of the small schools that are typically receiving approximately $5,000 from the federal government.

By setting a baseline amount and allowing schools, one school district can have the opportunity to hire a specialist, provide signing bonuses to teachers, extend after school opportunities and expand many other aspects of the small school budget. Most of all, it would enable the school to provide an education consistent with local needs.

Once again, I would like to extend our grateful thanks for your leadership on this issue. We urge the full Senate to reauthorize and fully fund this legislation on behalf of those schools that are too small to be heard.

Sincerely,

MARY CONK, Legislative Analyst.


Hon. SUSAN COLLINS, U.S. Senator, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR COLLINS: On behalf of the American Association of School Administrators, representing more than 14,000 school system leaders, we would like to express our support of your bill reauthorizing the Rural Education Initiative. Your hard work and commitment to rural schools last congress improved federal education programs for all of the small isolated rural school districts of rural America. The changes proposed in your reauthorization bill would improve upon last year’s effort by providing more flexibility and increased funding for small isolated schools. Thank you for your continuing advocacy on behalf of rural schoolchildren and rural communities.

Currently small and rural school districts find it difficult to compete with larger districts for hundreds of millions of dollars in federal education competitive grants. Small, isolated districts do not have the often necessary funds to line up competitive grants, usually because they lack the administrative staff to apply for grants. The problem is compounded by a skewed federal formula that favors larger school districts. Federal education programs allocate funds based on enrollment, typically providing very little revenue to the smallest schools. The Collins-Conrad Rural Education Initiative would level the playing field by ensuring that each small district receives at least enough funding to hire a teacher or a specialist.

Studies in individual states and the National Assessment of Educational Progress document the difficulties of small, rural school districts:

- Difficulty attracting and retaining quality teachers, and administrators.
- Inability to offer advanced academic or vocational courses.
- Disproportionate spending on transportation.
- Loss of a sense of community when schools are consolidated, and
- Inability to process all the federally required paperwork normally required of reipients.

The Rural Education Initiative would help small/rural districts by providing enough school improvement funds to implement real change. Rural and small school districts would be eligible for grants of $20,000 to $60,000 depending upon enrollment. Although the program was passed into law last year, it has not yet been funded. More than 4,000 small and rural school districts benefit from the flexibility provided under last year’s program; those same 4,000 districts will be able to advance even greater improvements when the program is reauthorized and appropriated.

The funds would be used to enhance the reading and math proficiency of students; to provide an education consistent with local needs; to support initiatives to prepare young people to compete in the emerging knowledge-based economy.

The Association is grateful to you, Kent Conrad, R-ND; Judd Gregg, R-NH; Conrad Burns, R-MT; Chuck Hagel, R-NE; Michael Enzi, R-WY; Pat Roberts, R-KS; Tim Johnson, D-SD; and Byron Dorgan, D-ND for their advocacy on behalf of rural school children. We urge the full Senate to embrace and fund this important legislation.

Sincerely,

JORDAN CROSS, Legislative Specialist.


Hon. SUSAN COLLINS, U.S. Senator, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR COLLINS: On behalf of the Association of Education Service Agencies, we write to urge the full Senate on behalf of your work on the Rural Education Initiative.

Your efforts during the 106th Congress helped rectify many of the inequalities that disadvantaged small school districts. By increasing the flexibility of federal education programs, local districts can now make better use of federal dollars. This year, you have taken a first step towards the reauthorization of the Rural Education Initiative. The Collins-Conrad reauthorization proposal would complete last year’s goal by ensuring that small rural schools are treated fairly by federal formula programs and funded at an adequate level.

Educational Service Agencies (ESAs) are intermediate units that frequently provide assistance to small and rural schools that do not have the administrative staff to operate some education programs in-house. When a small rural school district receives a tiny federal education, ESAs often facilitate consortia to make better use of federal funds. ESAs are the primary source of professional development and assistance to rural schools. The members of our association understand first-hand the particular needs of rural districts; your proposal offers the best hope for accommodating those needs and the best means for improving rural education.

Rural schoolchildren deserve to benefit from the federal education programs enjoyed by urban and suburban students. We thank you for your work on the Rural Education Initiative, and we offer our full support.

Sincerely,

BRUCE HUNTER, Legislative Specialist.


STATEMENT OF THE NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION IN SUPPORT OF THE RURAL EDUCATION INITIATIVE

The National Education Association’s (NEA) supports the concepts included in the Rural Education Initiative (REI), introduced today in the United States Senate by Senators Susan Collins and Judd Gregg.

NEA research demonstrates the need for increased emphasis on meeting the needs of rural schools. For example, 49 percent of the nation’s public schools, teaching 40 percent of the nation’s students, are located in rural areas and small towns. Yet, schools in rural towns receive a mere 2 percent of total federal, state, and local education spending. In addition, federal funding formulas often provide rural and small towns with more district funds than needed, to the point of no actual assistance but require significant paperwork.

The Rural Education Initiative represents an important step toward addressing the unique problems associated with education in small towns and rural areas. We encourage its passage into law.

Mr. CONRAD, Mr. President, I am very pleased to join my distinguished colleagues, Senator SUSAN COLLINS and Senator JUDD GREGG, to introduce the Rural Education Initiative (REI). We introduced similar legislation, S. 1225, during the 106th Congress to respond to a number of challenges facing small, rural schools, and I am pleased that we were successful in incorporating some of the major the provisions of S. 1225 in the FY 2001 Omnibus Appropriations bill. This Congressional action will provide flexibility for school officials from small, rural schools to make better use of Federal education funds for critical educational needs at the local level.

Under Public law 106-1033, Congress authorized school districts with fewer than 600 students, and a Department of Education (DOE) Locale Code designation of 7 or 8 to combine funding from Federal education programs (Titles II, IV, VI and Class Size Reduction) and use that funding to supplement Federal education programs under Titles I, IV, and VI. Congress also authorized, although was not able to fund, supplemental grants of up to $60,000 to assist small, rural school districts to develop programs to improve academic achievement and the quality of instruction. Funding the supplemental grants program in the Rural Education Initiative was a priority during consideration of the Elementary and Secondary Reauthorization in the 107th Congress.

Today, we are re-introducing legislation to extend the authority under the Rural Education Initiative in P.L. 106-1033 for a five-year period to permit small, rural school districts to continue to have flexibility in the use of funds from a limited number of Federal education programs. This bill will also advance up to $150 million supplemental grants of up to $60,000 to rural schools to improve student achievement, provide professional development opportunities for educators or undertake education reform activities. School districts with fewer than 600 students and with a DOE Locale Code of 7 or 8 will be eligible to participate in the REI program.

I am particularly pleased that the Rural Education Initiative has received bipartisan support and is cosponsored today by Senators CONRAD, GREGG, HAGEL, ENZI, HUTCHINSON, DORGAN, ROBERTS, BURNS, JOHNSTON, and THOMAS. The Rural Education Initiative is
also being endorsed by the American Association of School Administrators, the National Education Association, the National Rural Education Association, and the Association of Educational Service Agencies.

Mr. President, small rural schools face a growing number of unique challenges because of declining school age populations, aging facilities, and significant distances and remote locations for many rural school districts. While increased federal education funding and targeting of these funds has been very helpful for rural school districts, these efforts alone are not responding sufficiently to the needs of many small, rural schools.

Many rural schools, for example, while recognizing the importance of new initiatives like Class Size Reduction, are already at the levels recommended under the Class Size Reduction Initiative. Under current law, rural schools have only limited flexibility; Size funds are required to meet other local education priorities. In many instances, the Class Size funds and allocations from a number of other Federal formula programs are not sufficient to permit effective use of the funds.

Additionally, although rural schools are able to apply for DOE competitive grant programs, rural schools are not able to compete as effectively as some urban and suburban schools because limitations do not permit many smaller, rural districts to hire specialists to prepare grant applications to compete for these funds. In some cases, the only option for a smaller district is to form a consortium with other schools to qualify for sufficient funding.

The difficulties accessing DOE competitive grant funds by rural schools are summed up well by Elroy Burkle, Superintendent of the Starkweather Public School District, a district with 131 students. Burkle remarked, “schools districts have lost their ability to access funds directly, and as a form of resulting these consortiums in order to access these monies, it is my opinion, we have lost our individual ability to utilize these monies in an effective manner that would be conducive to promoting the educational needs of our individual schools.”

Mr. President, the Rural Education Initiative addresses many of the concerns of Elroy Burkle and thousands of other school officials from smaller, rural school districts. The REI authorizes flexibility for local schools officials to more effectively use certain DOE formula funds. The legislation also authorizes support for local school improvement funds to implement real change. Rural and small school districts would be eligible for grants of $20,000 to $60,000 depending upon enrollment. Although the program was passed into law last year, it has not yet been funded. More than 4,000 small and rural school districts benefit from the flexibility provided in last year’s program; those same 4,000 districts will be able to advance even greater improvements when the program is reauthorized and appropriated.

The funds would be used to enhance the reading and math proficiency of students; to provide an education consistent with local needs; and to enable small/rural communities to prepare young people to compete in the emerging knowledge-based economy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the endorsements of the Rural Education Initiative from the American Association of School Administrators, the National Education Association the National Rural Education Association, and the Association of Educational Service Agencies be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION IN SUPPORT OF THE RURAL EDUCATION INITIATIVE

The National Education Association’s (NEA) supports the concepts included in the Rural Education Initiative (REI), introduced today in the United States Senate by Senators Collins and Conrad. NEA research demonstrates the need for increased emphasis on meeting the needs of rural schools. The Department of the nation’s public schools, teaching 40 percent of the nation’s students, are located in rural areas and small towns. Yet, schools in rural and small towns receive only 22 percent of total federal, state, and local education spending. In addition, federal funding formulas often provide rural and small towns with smaller amounts that afford little or no actual assistance but require significant paperwork.

The Rural Education Initiative represents an important step toward addressing the unique problems associated with education in small towns and rural areas. We encourage its passage into law.

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS, Arlington, VA, February 6, 2001

Hon. KENT CONRAD, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENO R CONRAD: On behalf of the American Association of School Administrators, representing more than 14,000 school system leaders, we would like to express our support for your bill reauthorizing the Rural Education Initiative and your commitment to rural schools last congress improved federal education programs for all of the small isolated schools throughout rural America. The changes proposed in your reauthorization bill would improve upon last year’s effort by providing more flexibility and increased funding for all rural schools. Thank you for your continuing advocacy on behalf of rural schoolchildren and rural communities.

Currently small and rural school districts find it difficult to compete with larger districts for hundreds of millions of dollars in federal education competitive grants. Small, isolated districts receive well below their share of competitive grants, usually because they lack the administrative staff to apply for funds. The program is marred by shortcomings of federal formula programs. Federal education programs allocate funds based on enrollment, typically providing very little revenue to rural schools.

The Collins-Conrad Rural Education Initiative would level the playing field by ensuring that each small district receives at least enough funding to hire a teacher or a specialist.

Studies in individual states and the National Assessment of Educational Progress document the difficulties of small, rural school districts: Difficulty attracting and retaining quality teachers, and administrators, inability to offer advanced academic or vocational courses, disproportionate spending on transportation, loss of a sense of community when schools are consolidated, and inability to process all the federally required paperwork normally required of recipients.

The Rural Education Initiative would help small rural districts by providing enough school improvement funds to implement real change. Rural and small school districts would be eligible for grants of $20,000 to $60,000 depending upon enrollment. Although the program was passed into law last year, it has not yet been funded. More than 4,000 small and rural school districts benefit from the flexibility provided in last year’s program; those same 4,000 districts will be able to advance even greater improvements when the program is reauthorized and appropriated.

The funds would be used to enhance the reading and math proficiency of students; to provide an education consistent with local needs; and to enable small/rural communities to prepare young people to compete in the emerging knowledge-based economy.

The National Rural Education Association would like to applaud our recognition of the unique hardships that face small, rural schools in respect to their federal funding. Along with U.S. Senators Kent Conrad, R–ND; Judd Gregg, R–NH; Conrad Burns, R–MT; Chuck Hagel, R–NE; Michael Enzi, R–WY; Pat Roberts, R–KS; Tim Johnson, D–SD; and Byron Dorgan, D–ND, you have reintroduced legislation that would ensure that small rural schools get a baseline amount of federal funding.

Currently, many small and rural schools are at a disadvantage when they receive
their ESEA funding. Federal funding formulas are based on enrollment, which prevents small schools from receiving adequate resources. Due to the small numbers of students, these schools rarely receive enough combined funds to hire a teacher. Small schools also lack the administrative capacity to apply for competitive grants. This puts small rural schools on unequal federal footing with many of their urban and suburban counterparts.

Last December, your Rural Education Initiative was included in the omnibus appropriations bill. The new law allows districts to commingle some of the federal funds they receive and allows them to use these funds to improve student achievement and professional development. In addition, it included legislation that would allow rural districts to commingle funds to schools of 600 or less. These are the same schools typically receiving approximately $5,000 form the federal government.

By setting a baseline amount and allowing schools to commingle the funds, the local school district will have the opportunity to hire a specialist, provide ongoing professional development, extend after school opportunities, and allow small rural districts to obtain access to competitive grants. This bill provides a formula grant as an option instead of limiting districts to the lengthy and involved application process for ESEA competitive grant programs. Under this formula, districts don’t have to strain their resources simply applying for federal funds.

With this reform and flexibility there will be accountability. Districts will be required to demonstrate improved student performance using tests they already administer to assess student achievement. This bill abolishes undue obstacles rural districts face as they try to improve the quality of education in their own schools. I urge my colleagues to support this common sense legislation and allow small rural districts to obtain federal funds and use them to meet their own objectives.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I would like to take this opportunity to express my support for the Senate Labor and Pensions Committee’s approval of the Rural Education Improvement Act, a bill that would allow school districts in my state and across the nation to more fully benefit from the use of federal grant monies. In current formula-based federal grants, some of the amounts rural districts receive are so small that grant money can be used effectively to meet local education priorities. Districts are granted the freedom to spend the funds as they see fit.

Second, small rural districts do not have the manpower to apply for competitive grants. This bill provides a formula grant as an option instead of limiting districts to the lengthy and involved application process for ESEA competitive grant programs. Under this formula, districts don’t have to strain their resources simply applying for federal funds.

With this reform and flexibility there will be accountability. Districts will be required to demonstrate improved student performance using tests they already administer to assess student achievement. This bill abolishes undue obstacles rural districts face as they try to improve the quality of education in their own schools. I urge my colleagues to support this common sense legislation and allow small rural districts to obtain federal funds and use them to meet their own objectives.
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Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-
tives of the United States of America in Congress as-
sembled,

SECTION 1. INCLUSION OF ADDITIONAL PORTION OF THE LITTLE SANDY RIVER WA-
TERSHED IN THE BULL RUN WATER SHED MAN-
AGEMENT UNIT. (a) In General.—Public Law 95–200 (16
U.S.C. 482b note; 91 Stat. 1425) is amended by strik-
ing section 1 and inserting the follow-
ing:

"SEC. 1. ESTABLISHMENT OF SPECIAL RE-
sources Management Unit; Defi-
nition of Secretary.—(a) Defini-
tion of Secretary.—In this
Act, the term ‘Secretary’ means—

"(1) with respect to land administered by the Secre-
tary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Agricul-
ture; and

"(2) with respect to land administered by the Secre-
tary of the Interior, the Secretary of the
Interior.

(b) Establishment.—(1) In General.—There is estab-
lished, subject to valid existing rights, a special re-
sources management unit in the State of Ore-
gon, comprising approximately 98,272 acres, as
depicted on a map dated May 2000 and
titled ‘Bull Run Watershed Management Unit’.

(2) Map.—The map described in paragraph
(1) shall be on file and available for public in-
pection in the offices of—

(A) the Regional Forester-Pacific North-
west Region of the Forest Service; and

(B) the Oregon State Director of the Bu-
reau of Land Management.

(3) Boundary Adjustments.—The Secre-
tary may periodically make such minor adjust-
ments in the boundaries of the unit as are
necessary, after consulting with the city and
providing for appropriate public notice and
hearings.

(4) Conforming and Technical Amend-
ments.—(1) Secretary.—Public Law 95–200 (16
U.S.C. 482b note; 91 Stat. 1425) is amended by strik-
ing ‘Secretary of Agriculture’ each place it appears (except subsection (b) of sec-
tion 1, as added by subsection (a), and except
in the amendments made by paragraph (2)) and
inserting ‘Secretary’.

(2) Applicable Law.—(A) Section 2(a) of Public
is amended by striking ‘Bureau of Land Man-
agement’ in the administrative jurisdiction of the
Bureau of Land Management (in the case of land ad-
ministered by the Secretary of the Interior)
and inserting ‘Secretary of the Interior’.

(B) Management Plans.—The first sen-
tence of section 2(c) of Public Law 95–200
(16 U.S.C. 482b note; 91 Stat. 1426) is amended—

(i) by striking ‘subsection (a) and (b)’ and
inserting ‘(a) and (b)’; and

(ii) by striking ‘, through the main-
tenance’ and inserting ‘(in the case of land
administrated by the Secretary of Agri-
culture)’.

(c) RECLASSIFICATION.—(1) In General.—The first sen-
tence of section 2(b) of Public Law 95–200 (16 U.S.C. 482b
note; 91 Stat. 1426) is amended by striking ‘subject
to the distribution provision of title II of the Act
of August 28, 1937 (43 U.S.C. 1181f), within the
boundaries of the special resources management
unit described in section 1 of Public Law 95–200
(as amended by section 1(a)).’

(2) Public Domain Land.—(1) Definition of Public
Domain Land.—(A) In General.—In this subsec-
tion, the term ‘public domain land’ means the
property described in section 1 of Public Law 95–200
(43 U.S.C. 1181a et seq.).

(B) Exclusion.—The term ‘public domain
land’ does not include any land

(a) managed by the Act of August 28, 1937 (43 U.S.C.
1181a et seq.).

(2) Identification.—Not later than 18
months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secre-
tary shall identify public domain land within the Medford,
Roseburg, Eugene, Salem, and Coos Bay Dis-

(B) Oregon and California Railroad Land.—Not
later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secre-
tary shall identify a portion of the Oregon and California
Railroad land that is subject to the distribu-
tion provision of title II of the Act of August 28,
1937 (43 U.S.C. 1181f), within the boundaries of the
special resources management unit described in section 1 of Public Law 95–200
(as amended by section 1(a)).

(c) Repeal of Duplication.—Section 1026 of division I of the Omnibus
Public Law 95–200 (16 U.S.C. 482b note; 91 Stat. 1426) is amended by striking
section 1026 (110 Stat. 3009–545).

(d) Water Rights.—Nothing in this section strengthens, diminishes, or has any other ef-
fect on water rights held by any person or

entity.

SEC. 3. LAND RECLASSIFICATION.

(2) Oregon and California Railroad Land.—Not
later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secre-
tary shall identify public domain land within the Medford,
Roseburg, Eugene, Salem, and Coos Bay Dis-

(B) Oregon and California Railroad Land.—Not
later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secre-
tary shall identify a portion of the Oregon and California
Railroad land that is subject to the distribu-
tion provision of title II of the Act of August 28,
1937 (43 U.S.C. 1181f), within the boundaries of the
special resources management unit described in section 1 of Public Law 95–200
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1181a et seq.).

(2) Identification.—Not later than 18
months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secre-
tary shall identify public domain land within the Medford,
Roseburg, Eugene, Salem, and Coos Bay Dis-

(B) Oregon and California Railroad Land.—Not
later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secre-
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tary shall identify a portion of the Oregon and California
Railroad land that is subject to the distribu-
tion provision of title II of the Act of August 28,
1937 (43 U.S.C. 1181f), within the boundaries of the
special resources management unit described in section 1 of Public Law 95–200
(as amended by section 1(a)).
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(B) Exclusion.—The term ‘public domain
land’ does not include any land

(a) managed by the Act of August 28, 1937 (43 U.S.C.
1181a et seq.).

(2) Identification.—Not later than 18
months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secre-
tary shall identify public domain land within the Medford,
Roseburg, Eugene, Salem, and Coos Bay Dis-

(B) Oregon and California Railroad Land.—Not
later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secre-
tary shall identify a portion of the Oregon and California
Railroad land that is subject to the distribu-
tion provision of title II of the Act of August 28,
1937 (43 U.S.C. 1181f), within the boundaries of the
special resources management unit described in section 1 of Public Law 95–200
(as amended by section 1(a)).

(c) Repeal of Duplication.—Section 1026 of division I of the Omnibus
Public Law 95–200 (16 U.S.C. 482b note; 91 Stat. 1426) is amended by striking
section 1026 (110 Stat. 3009–545).
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fect on water rights held by any person or

entity.

SEC. 3. LAND RECLASSIFICATION.

(a) Oregon and California Railroad Land.—Not
later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secre-
tary shall identify public domain land within the Medford,
Roseburg, Eugene, Salem, and Coos Bay Dis-

(B) Oregon and California Railroad Land.—Not
later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secre-
tary shall identify a portion of the Oregon and California
Railroad land that is subject to the distribu-
tion provision of title II of the Act of August 28,
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special resources management unit described in section 1 of Public Law 95–200
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These are the kind of decisions that come with a breast cancer diagnosis. These are the kind of questions women must answer, and they must do so under some of the most stressful and frightening circumstances imaginable. The last question a woman should have to consider is whether or not their health insurance plan will pay for appropriate care after a mastectomy. A woman diagnosed with breast cancer in many ways already feels as though she has lost control of her life. She should not feel as though she has also lost control of her course of treatment.

The evidence for the need for this bill—especially when it comes to so-called “drive through mastectomies”, is more than just allegorical. Indeed, the facts speak for themselves—between 1986 and 1995, the average length of stay for a mastectomy dropped from about six days to about 2 to 3 days. Thousands of women across the country are undergoing radical mastectomies on an outpatient basis and are being forced out of the hospital before either they or their doctor think it’s reasonable or prudent.

This decision must be returned to physicians and their patients, and all Americans must face the possibility of a cancer diagnosis must be able to make informed decisions about appropriate and necessary medical care.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill and work towards passing it this year.

By Ms. SNOWE:

S. 256. A bill to amend the Civil Rights Act of 1964 to protect breastfeeding by new mothers; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce a bill that is very important to working women and their families. I urge my colleagues to consider the possibility of a cancer diagnosis must be able to make informed decisions about appropriate and necessary medical care.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill which will help those suffering from life-threatening diseases and their families.

By Ms. SNOWE (for herself and Mrs. LINCOLN):

S. 258. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for coverage under the Medicare program for annual screening pelvic exams; to the Committee on Finance.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Providing Annual Pap Tests to Save Women’s Lives Act of 2001. I am pleased to be joined by my friend, Senator LINCOLN of Arkansas, as an original cosponsor of this bill.

According to the American Cancer Society, cervical cancer is one of the most successfully treatable cancers when detected at an early stage. In fact, 88 percent of cervical cancer patients survive one year after diagnosis, and 70 percent survive five years.

In the 32 years since use of the pap test became widespread, the cervical cancer mortality rate has declined by an astonishing 70 percent. There is no question that this test is the most effective cancer screening tool yet developed.

The Pap smear can detect abnormalities before they develop into cancer. Having an annual Pap smear is one of the most important things a woman can do to help prevent cervical cancer.
Congress has recognized the incomparable contribution of the Pap smear in preventing cervical cancer and nine years ago directed Medicare to begin covering preventive Pap smears. Under this law Medicare beneficiaries were eligible for one test every three years, although the frequent interval is followed for women at high risk of developing cervical cancer. And through the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, Congress expanded the Pap smear benefit to also include a screening pelvic exam once every three years. Last year as a part of the Medicare, Medicaid, and SCHIP Benefits Improvement and Protection Act, P.L. 106-544, we brought the screening down to once every other year.

However, the American Cancer Society screening guidelines recommend that all women who are or have been sexually active or who are 18 and older should have an annual Pap test and pelvic examination. After three or more consecutive satisfactory examinations with normal findings, the Pap test may be performed less frequently at the physician’s discretion. Unfortunately, Medicare guidelines do not reflect this recommendation.

Women understand the usefulness and life-saving benefit of the Pap smear. The U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention reported that 83.3 percent of women between the ages of 18 and 44 have received a pap test within the preceding three years. However, over 65 and over—only 72.3 percent have received a pap test within the preceding three years.

The bill Senator Lincoln and I are introducing today will bring Medicare guidelines in line with the American Cancer recommendations, and it will encourage Medicare beneficiaries to utilize this screening benefit more regularly.

The Pap test has contributed immeasurably to the fight against cervical cancer. We cannot risk erasing our advancements in this fight because of an inadequate Medicare screening benefit.

By Mr. BINGAMAN (for himself, Mr. DOMENICI, and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 259. A bill to authorize funding the Department of Energy to enhance its mission areas through Technology Transfer and Partnerships for fiscal years 2002 through 2006, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce a bill authorizing the Secretary of Energy to provide for technology transfer. This bi-partisan bill which is referred to as the “National Laboratories Partnership Improvement Act of 2001” is co-sponsored by my colleagues Mr. DOMENICI and Mrs. MURRAY. I will summerize the bill. First, I will outline the Department’s commitment to science and how it has admirably worked to transfer its technology in light of a serious resource decline. I then will discuss how tech transfer naturally complements the Department’s mission oriented R&D. I will review the legislation we introduced in the last session which is the right mix and I will conclude by proposing how this bill by leveraging existing efforts, should move the Department in the right direction to support technology transfer without disrupting its R&D mission focus.

The Department of Energy is about science. For FY 2001, the Department’s R&D budget was roughly $8 billion out of the $183.3 billion appropriated. Science programs account for 43 percent of the Department’s budget. In the area of the physical sciences, DOE provides roughly half of all of the federal R&D. In mathematics and computer sciences, DOE is second after the DOD. In engineering, the DOE ranks third after NASA and the DOD. DOE affiliated scientists have won more than 71 Nobel prizes for fundamental research; they garner the largest number of R&D 100 awards for applied research. The Department has more than 60 multipurpose laboratories and primary user facilities in the U.S on high energy physics, materials science, nuclear science and engineering, waste management, biosciences, robotics, advanced scientific computing, microelectronic and materials fabrication. Each year DOE funded facilities are used by more than 18,000 researchers from universities and industry.

Yet with this surprising portfolio of research, the Department in FY 2001 only line allocates $10 million while its work for the transfer of technology. In 1995 this allocation was over $200 million. That is not to say DOE is not transferring its technology. In FY 1998, which is our last set of good statistics from the Department of Commerce’s Office of Technology Assessment, DOE was second only to the DOD in the number of CRADA’s granted from its federal facilities, the DOD had 1424 and the DOE had 888. The in-kind funds from industry to DOE for these CRADA’s averages about $100 million while its work for others from non-federal sources was $145 million. In FY 1998, the DOE had 168 licenses granted to use its technology, the DOD had 34 and HHS had 215. In FY 1998, the DOE had 512 patents granted as compared to 1150 while the DOD had 579, the next closest was HHS with 171. In FY 1998, 50 companies were established as a result of DOE technology transfer. To put these numbers in perspective, the DOD R&D budget for FY 1998 was $37.5 billion, HHS was $13.8 billion, while DOE’s was $6.3 billion. These statistics are impressive because in FY 1998 the DOE had line allocated about 1 percent of its R&D budget to tech transfer. Today, that number is 0.14 percent of its R&D budget.

Given that tech transfer is not the Department’s primary mission, the question is what is the right mix and what is the optimal technology to transfer? For the NNSA, the primary mission is ensuring a safe and reliable nuclear stockpile. The Office of Science’s primary mission is advancing the frontiers of basic R&D. The Office of Environmental Management’s primary mission is cleaning up contaminated DOE sites. The Fossil Energy Program’s mission is developing cleaner and more efficient fossil fuels. The list goes on. Nor do I think that tech transfer given the above numbers will be the principal engine for direct economic growth in the tech heavy new economy. Let me explain this premise by examining the pattern of economic and technological growth in a little more detail. In the year 2000, the National Science Foundation estimates that total U.S. R&D was $264 billion, a 7.9 percent increase over 1999 which itself was a 7.5 percent increase over 1998. Technology R&D has a growth rate exceeding 15 percent in the last two years alone. What counts is the make up of these R&D trends. In the year 2000, the industry contribution to the total R&D was $179 billion, a 10.3 percent increase over 1999 while federal R&D increased by only 2.9 percent. Given the investment the federal government makes in R&D, technology transfer from federal labs does not contribute directly to these amazing growth rates. In industries like telecommunications and computer design, the life cycles from research to product ranges from 1 to 3 years. The government is simply too slow to contribute directly to industrial driven short term needs that are so clearly evident in these national trends of R&D funding. On the other end of the spectrum, basic and applied R&D are areas where industry finds it difficult to invest given the short term equity demands on their profits. The right mix then is for the government to maintain basic and applied R&D so that it can transfer this knowledge to industry over the long term.

If we agree that the government best transfers long term R&D we must ask the next question which is how do the Department’s mission focused R&D programs transfer technology to the private sector and how can the Department ensure its continued success with minimal disruption to its mission areas? Mission focused DOE programs like the NNSA, Environmental Management, Fossil Energy, Nuclear Energy and the Office of Science all advance the frontiers of science at different stages. All of these programs in carrying out their missions naturally perform different degrees of tech transfer. The Fossil Energy, Nuclear and Renewable programs work closely with industry and usually cannot start without an industry partner through a CRADA. The NNSA with their advanced computing requirements naturally push the state of the art forward. The NNSA CRADA’s provide to the NNSA a fresh influx of the outside world’s advancing technology into their national security
missions. The Office of Science with their wonderful user facilities and broad basic energy research mandate provide a fertile R&D base by which industry can stay competitive ten years out into the future. CRADA’s smooth and soften that transition CRADA arrangements are a natural outgrowth of the DOE mission programs. A CRADA or License simply makes the tech transfer process smoother. So the issue is not how much money do we need to line item for the formation of a CRADA or a license—the CRADA is simply a by product of a organic tech transfer process in the Department’s R&D programs. The issue is what kind of organizational structure in the DOE do we need to keep track of these tech transfer activities and how to insure that it is easily accessible for potential partnerships.

If as I have just described that tech transfer occurs organically to the Department’s R&D mission areas we need to look at the infrastructure that moves beyond the single contract framework which a CRADA represents? Tech transfer is not so much a static contract but it is a multi-dimensional transactional process. In some select cases we should stimulate the transactional tech transfer process by regional technology clusters. Technology clusters will allow industry to locate around these wonderful pools of scientific knowledge. In turn they will build the R&D infrastructure surrounding the laboratory itself. We all too often think that the internet can solve the distance problem of connecting business transactions thus negating the need for regional technology clusters—that’s actually wrong. Very wrong. Successful utilization of R&D technology starts because many small business are nearby to each other in a supportive state business climate. The technology clusters that have been formed the interface to exchange ideas and data that they generate from face-to-face collaboration on short notice. People to people transactions initiate business and wealth in a rather spontaneous event; the internet is simply a tool to make it more efficient. You see such natural clustering occurring in Wall Street for financial markets, Palo Alto for information technology, Detroit for automobiles and right here in Bethesda for genetics around CRADA’s enabling organizations technology clusters rather than focusing on the static contractual CRADA process should be the next step in the evolution of federal technology transfer.

The bill I am introducing today addresses the issues I have just outlined. It establishes a headquarters level Technology Transfer Coordinator as the Secretary’s lead advocate for developing DOE technology transfer policy across its many missions. This Coordinator will also disseminate tech transfer data to Congress, the interagency and public. I have provided a ceiling limit of about $1 million per year to collect this data and prepare the reports as required by law. I have provided additional funding for the Coordinator to help out the administrative tasks associated with the Interlaboratory Technology Partnerships Working Group. This Working Group is staffed by members from the DOE laboratories and entities such as R&D consortia or state and local communities in encouraging the role that a laboratory infrastructure will have in their economic development. I have authorized $10 million for these clusters while requiring a 50 percent in-kind funding contribution from the proposed partner. The clustering partner can be a state, university, R&D consortia or business entity. I have given the Secretary discretion to stop this clustering program if the NNSA labs proves unworkable. I have authorized a small-business advocate, to support DOE wide, for what has been a lab by lab policy. Such a small business provision is needed to accommodate the unique needs for R&D collaboration of start up businesses. I have proposed modifying the Department of Energy Organization Act to make it more flexible in entering into alternative research contracts with entities such as R&D consortia. Finally I ask the Secretary to examine the need for a policy to move people across the lab fence to start up companies. This policy is balanced against the unique mission areas of each lab. In some cases implementing such a policy may yield an unacceptable based upon a lab’s mission requirement. If such a policy proves unreasonable based upon a particular lab’s mission, I have given Secretary the discretion to not to implement it. I must emphasize though that half of tech transfer activities are naturally occurring in all these various science mission areas and leverages them with small amounts of funding—about 0.06 percent of DOE’s overall budget.

Let me summarize once more what I have just outlined is in the proposed bill. First, a small Technology Transfer Coordinator is proposed to be the Secretary’s advocate across the Department for uniform policy development and reporting. Second, a small business interface would help the public easily access and leverage the R&D activities at all the DOE labs and facilities. Third, I’ve proposed to help seed technology clusters local to the labs under merit review and with the intention not to proceed forward if the FY 2001 NNSA pilot program proves unworkable. Technology clusters are the next evolutionary stage past a static CRADA. Fourth, I’ve asked the Secretary to implement, where it’s feasible, a policy where laboratory personnel can move with the technology to start up a company outside the fence. Fifth, I asked the Secretary to ensure where its reasonable a uniform policy to help small businesses with their unique needs access DOE technology. Like most government programs that come under close scrutiny by Congress, their intent is worthy but the program’s size oscillates greatly over time. The pendulum for tech transfer at the DOE is one such program. This program has swung from a $200 million program in the mid 1990’s to essentially zero funding in FY 2001 with a minimal headquarters office to help policy development across its diverse mission areas. This bill establishes what I feel is the right level of tech transfer in a R&D organization by leveraging the existing industrial collaboration that naturally occurs in carrying out their missions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of this bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 259

Be in 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 “National Laboratories Partnership Improvement Act of 2001”.

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

For purposes of this Act—

(1) the term “Department” means the Department of Energy;
(2) the term ‘departmental mission’ means any of the functions vested in the Secretary of Energy by the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7151 et seq.); and

(3) the term ‘institution of higher education’ has the meaning given such term in section 123(a)(4) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 (a)(4)); and

(4) the term ‘National Laboratory’ means any of the following multi-purpose laboratories owned by the Department of Energy—

(A) Argonne National Laboratory;
(B) Brookhaven National Laboratory;
(C) Idaho National Engineering and Environmental Laboratory;
(D) Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory;
(E) Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory;
(F) Los Alamos National Laboratory;
(G) National Renewable Energy Laboratory;
(H) Oak Ridge National Laboratory;
(I) Pacific Northwest National Laboratory; or
(J) Sandia National Laboratory;

(5) the term ‘facility’ means any of the following primarily single purpose entities owned by the Department of Energy—

(A) Ames Laboratory;
(B) Fort St. John Technology Park;
(C) Environmental Measurement Laboratory;
(D) Fernald Environmental Management Project;
(E) Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory;
(F) Kansas City Plant;
(G) National Energy Technology Laboratory;
(H) Nevada Test Site;
(I) Oak Ridge National Laboratory;
(J) Pantex Weapons Facility;
(K) Princeton Plasma Physical Laboratory;
(L) Savannah River Technology Center;
(M) Standard Linear Accelerator Center;
(N) Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator Facility;
(O) Y-12 facility at Oak Ridge National Laboratory; or

(P) other similar organization of the Department of Energy designated by the Secretary that engages in technology transfer, partnering, or licensing activities;

(6) the term ‘nonprofit institution’ has the meaning given such term in section 4 of the Stevenson-Wydler Technology Innovation Act of 1980 (15 U.S.C. 3709 (b));

(7) the term ‘Secretary’ means the Secretary of Energy;

(8) the term ‘small business concern’ has the meaning given such term in section 3 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 632); and

(9) the term ‘technology-related business concern’ means a for-profit corporation, company, association, firm, partnership, or small business concern that—

(a) conducts scientific or engineering research;
(b) develops new technologies;
(c) manufactures products based on new technologies;
(d) performs technological services;
(e) the term ‘technology cluster’ means a concentration of—

(A) technology-related business concerns;
(B) institutions of higher education; or
(C) other nonprofit institutions,

that reinforce each other’s performance in the area of technology development through formal or informal relationships;

(11) the term ‘socially and economically disadvantaged small business concerns’ has the meaning given such term in section 8(a)(4) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 657(a)(4)); and

(12) the term ‘NNSA’ means the National Nuclear Security Administration established by title XXXII of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2000 (Public Law 106-29)

(13) the term ‘Technology Partnerships Working Group’ refers to the organization of technology transfer representatives of DOE laboratories and the Secretary of which is to coordinate technology transfer activities occurring at DOE laboratories and facilities, exchange information about technology, infrastructure, and develop and disseminate to the public and prospective technology partners information about DOE technology transfer opportunities and procedures.

SEC. 3. TECHNOLOGY INFRASTRUCTURE PROGRAM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary, through the appropriate officials of the Department, shall establish a Technology Infrastructure Program in accordance with this section.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the program shall be to improve the ability of National Laboratories or facilities to support departmental missions by—

(1) stimulating the development of technology clusters that can support the missions of the National Laboratories or facilities;
(2) improving the ability of National Laboratories or facilities to leverage and benefit from commercial research, technology, products, processes, and services; and
(3) encouraging the exchange of scientific and technological expertise between National Laboratories or facilities and—

(A) institutions of higher education;
(B) technology-related business concerns,
(C) nonprofit institutions, and
(D) agencies of State, tribal, or local governments, that can support the mission of the National Laboratories and facilities.

(c) PROGRAM.—In each of the first three fiscal years after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary may provide no more than $10,000,000 to National Laboratories or Facilities designated by the Secretary to conduct Technology Infrastructure Program Programs.

(d) PROJECTS.—The Secretary shall authorize the Director of each National Laboratory or facility designated under subsection (c) to conduct Technology Infrastructure Program Programs at such National Laboratory or facility through projects that meet the requirements of subsections (e) and (f).

(e) Projects.—Each project funded under this section shall meet the following requirements:

(1) MINIMUM PARTICIPANTS.—Each project shall at a minimum include—

(A) a National Laboratory or facility; and
(B) one of the following entities—

(i) a business,
(ii) an institution of higher education,
(iii) a nonprofit institution, or
(iv) an agency of a State, local, or tribal government.

(2) COST SHARING.—

(A) MINIMUM AMOUNT.—Not less than 50 percent of the costs of each project funded under this section shall be provided by non-Federal sources.

(B) QUALIFIED FUNDING AND RESOURCES.—

(i) The calculation of costs paid by the non-Federal sources to a project shall include personnel, services, equipment, and other resources expended on the project.

(ii) Independent research and development expenses of government contractors that qualify for reimbursement under section 205-18(e) of the Federal Acquisition Regulations issued pursuant to section 25(c)(1) of the Office of Federal Procurement Policy Act (41 U.S.C. 421(c)(1)) may be credited towards costs paid by non-Federal sources to a project, if the expenses meet the other requirements of this section.

(iii) No funds or other resources expended either before the start of a project under this section or outside the project that are connected to the project shall be credited toward the costs paid by the non-Federal sources to the project.

(3) COMPETITIVE SELECTION.—All projects will be competitively selected by a National Laboratory or facility receiving funding under this section shall, to the extent practicable, be selected by the National Laboratory or facility using procedures determined to be appropriate by the Secretary or his designee.

ACCOUNTING STANDARDS.—Any participant receiving funding under this section, other than a National Laboratory or facility, may use generally accepted accounting principles for maintaining accounts, books, and records relating to the project.

(l) LIMITATIONS.—No federal funds shall be made available under this section for—

(A) construction; or
(B) any project for more than five years.

(2) SELECTION CRITERIA.—

(1) THRESHOLD FUNDING CRITERIA.—The Secretary shall authorize the provision of Federal funds for under this section only when the Director of the National Laboratory or facility managing such a project determines that the project is likely to improve the participating National Laboratory or facility’s ability to achieve its departmental mission or success in meeting departmental missions.

(2) ADDITIONAL CRITERIA.—The Secretary shall also require that the National Laboratory or facility managing a project under this section to consider the following criteria in selecting a project to receive Federal funds:

(A) the potential of the project to succeed, based on its technical merit, team members, management approach, resources, and project plan;

(B) the potential of the project to promote the development of a commercially sustainable technology cluster, one that will derive most of the demand for its products or services from the private sector, that can support the missions of the participating National Laboratory or facility;

(C) the potential of the project to promote the use of commercial research, technology, products, processes, and services by the participating National Laboratory or facility to leverage and benefit from commercial research, technology, products, processes, and services; and

(D) the commitment shown by non-Federal organizations to the project, based primarily on the nature and amount of the financial and other resources they will risk on the project.

(e) the extent to which the project involves a wide variety and number of institutions of higher education, nonprofit institutions, and technology-related business concerns that can support the mission of the participating National Laboratory or facility and that will make substantive contributions to achieving the goals of the project;

(f) the extent to which the project is supported by agencies of State, tribal, or local governments that will make substantive contributions to achieving the goals of the project;

(g) the extent to which the subsection on non-Federal sources to a project, if the expenses meet the other requirements of this section.

(iii) No funds or other resources expended either before the start of a project under this section or outside the project that are connected to the project shall be credited toward the costs paid by the non-Federal sources to the project.

(3) COMPETITIVE SELECTION.—All projects will be competitively selected by a National Laboratory or facility receiving funding under this section shall, to the extent practicable, be selected by the National Laboratory or facility using procedures determined to be appropriate by the Secretary or his designee.

ACCOUNTING STANDARDS.—Any participant receiving funding under this section, other than a National Laboratory or facility, may use generally accepted accounting principles for maintaining accounts, books, and records relating to the project.

(l) LIMITATIONS.—No federal funds shall be made available under this section for—

(A) construction; or
(B) any project for more than five years.

(2) SELECTION CRITERIA.—

(1) THRESHOLD FUNDING CRITERIA.—The Secretary shall authorize the provision of Federal funds for under this section only when the Director of the National Laboratory or facility managing such a project determines that the project is likely to improve the participating National Laboratory or facility’s ability to achieve its departmental mission or success in meeting departmental missions.

(2) ADDITIONAL CRITERIA.—The Secretary shall also require that the National Laboratory or facility managing a project under this section to consider the following criteria in selecting a project to receive Federal funds:

(A) the potential of the project to succeed, based on its technical merit, team members, management approach, resources, and project plan;

(B) the potential of the project to promote the development of a commercially sustainable technology cluster, one that will derive most of the demand for its products or services from the private sector, that can support the missions of the participating National Laboratory or facility;

(C) the potential of the project to promote the use of commercial research, technology, products, processes, and services by the participating National Laboratory or facility to leverage and benefit from commercial research, technology, products, processes, and services; and

(D) the commitment shown by non-Federal organizations to the project, based primarily on the nature and amount of the financial and other resources they will risk on the project.

(e) the extent to which the project involves a wide variety and number of institutions of higher education, nonprofit institutions, and technology-related business concerns that can support the mission of the participating National Laboratory or facility and that will make substantive contributions to achieving the goals of the project;

(f) the extent to which the project is supported by agencies of State, tribal, or local governments that will make substantive contributions to achieving the goals of the project;

(g) the extent to which the project focuses on promoting the development of technology-related business concerns that are small business concerns or involves such small business concerns substantively in the project.
as appropriate, in determining whether projects should be funded under this section.

(g) REPORT TO CONGRESS ON FULL IMPLEMENTATION.—Not later than 120 days after the start of fiscal year after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary shall report to Congress on whether the Technology Infrastructure Program should be implemented, if so, how it will be implemented and the program should be managed.

SEC. 4. SMALL BUSINESS ADVOCACY AND ASSISTANCE

(a) ADVOCACY FUNCTION.—The Secretary shall direct the Director of each National Laboratory, and may direct the Director of each facility the Secretary determines to be appropriate, to carry out an advocates function that is organizationally independent of the procurement function at the National Laboratory or facility. The advocacy function shall—

(1) work to increase the participation of small business concerns, including socially and economically disadvantaged small business concerns, in procurement, collaborative research, technology licensing, and technology development activities conducted by the National Laboratory or facility;

(2) report to the Director of the National Laboratory or facility on the actual participation of small business concerns in the procurement and collaborative research along with recommendations, if appropriate, on how to improve participation;

(3) make available to small business concerns training, mentoring, and clear, up-to-date information on how to participate in the procurement and collaborative research, including how to submit effective proposals;

(4) increase the awareness inside the National Laboratory or facility of the capabilities and opportunities presented by small business concerns;

(5) establish guidelines for the program under subsection (b) and report the effectiveness of such program to the Director of the National Laboratory or facility.

(b) ESTABLISHMENT OF SMALL BUSINESS ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.—The Secretary shall direct the Director of each National Laboratory, and may direct the Director of each facility the Secretary determines to be appropriate, to establish a program to provide small businesses with—

(1) assistance directed at making them more effective and efficient subcontractors or suppliers to the National Laboratory or facility;

(2) general technical assistance, the cost of which shall not exceed $10,000 per instance of assistance, to improve the small business concern’s products or services;

(c) USE OF FUNDS.—None of the funds expended under subsection (b) may be used for direct grants to the small business concerns.

SEC. 5. POLICY CONTINUITY FOR PARTNERSHIPS, AND TECHNOLOGY TRANSFER

(a) The Secretary shall establish within the Office of Policy, in conjunction with that Office’s research and development, an Administrator of the National Laboratory and facilityolicy development for technology transfer activities at the Department of Energy.

(1) The Secretary through the Technology Transfer Coordinator shall, to the extent feasible, ensure that the recommendations from the Report as generated by the Secretary of Energy Advisory Board in Sec. 316 of the “National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001” are coordinated and carried out by the National Laboratory and facilities consistent with the statutory authority of the Administrator of the NNSA.

(2) No funds under Section 5b for partnerships shall be allocated under this Act until the Secretary through the Technology Transfer Coordinator has submitted to Congress an implementation plan that adequately addresses concerns outlined by the Energy Advisory Board in Sec. 316 of the Technology Infrastructure Pilot Program of collaborative projects as outlined in Section 316(b) of the “National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001” that may retain the discretion to not implement the partnership program defined by Section 3 if the implementation concerns cannot be reasonably addressed.

(3) The Technology Transfer Coordinator shall prepare a report to Congress for each fiscal year of funding under this Act outlining any shortfalls, proposed remedies and expenditure of funds related to DOE Technology Transfer.

(b) AUTHORIZATION.—The Secretary shall direct the Director of each National Laboratory or facility the Secretary determines to be appropriate, to establish a small business advocacy function that is organizationally independent of the procurement function, to the extent feasible.

SEC. 6. OTHER TRANSACTIONS AUTHORITY

(a) NEW AUTHORITY.—Section 646 of the Department of Energy Organization Act (42 U.S.C. 7256) is amended adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(g) ORGANIZATIONS AUTHORITY.—(1) In addition to other authorities granted to the Secretary to enter into procurement contracts, leases, cooperative agreements, grants, and other similar arrangements, the Secretary may enter into other transactions with public agencies, private organizations, or persons on such terms as the Secretary may deem appropriate in furtherance of basic, applied, and advanced research functions now or hereafter vested in the Secretary. Such other transactions shall not be subject to the provisions of the Federal Nonnuclear Energy Research and Development Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 5960).

(2) The Secretary of Energy shall ensure that—

(i) to the maximum extent practicable, no transaction entered into under paragraph (1) provides for research that duplicates research being conducted under existing programs carried out by the Department of Energy; and

(ii) the extent that the Secretary determines practicable, the funds provided by the Government under a transaction authorized by paragraph (1) do not exceed the total amount to be provided by other parties to the transaction.

(b) Authorization.—The following sums are authorized to be appropriated under subsection (a) for each of the fiscal years:

- 2002: $1,500,000
- 2003: $2,200,000
- 2004: $2,800,000
- 2005: $2,800,000
- 2006: $2,800,000

SEC. 7. MOBILITY OF TECHNICAL PERSONNEL

(a) GENERAL POLICY.—Not later than two years after the enactment of this Act, based on the report generated by the Secretary (a) of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001, the Secretary through the Technology Transfer Coordinator shall determine whether it is reasonable to ensure whether each contractor operating a National Laboratory or facility has policies and procedures that do not create disincentives to the transfer of scientific, technical and business personnel among the contractor-operated National Laboratory or facility.

(b) IMPLEMENTATION.—Not later than six months after the date of enactment of this section, the Department shall establish guidelines for the use of the other transactions. Other transactions shall be made available, if needed, in order to implement projects funded under Section 5.

SEC. 8. CONFORMANCE WITH NNSA STATUTORY AUTHORITY

All actions taken by the Secretary in carrying out this Act with respect to National Laboratories and facilities that are part of the NNSA shall be through the Administrator for Nuclear Security in accordance with the requirements of title XXXII of the United States Code, if obtained from a person other than a Federal agency.

By Ms. SNOWE:
S. 261. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide, with respect to research on breast cancer, for the increased involvement of advocates in decisionmaking at the National Cancer Institute; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I rise today to reintroduce a bill which builds on progress made in the last few years in the difficult and challenging fight against breast cancer.

Our challenge was summed up by one breast cancer advocate when she stated, simply and eloquently, "We must
make our voices heard, because it is our lives.”

A diagnosis of breast cancer is something that every woman dreads. Over 192,000 American women, and 1,000 in my home state of Maine—will face a diagnosis of breast cancer this year. Over 40,000 women in the country will die from this tragic disease. The fact is, one in nine women will develop breast cancer during their lifetime, and for women between the ages of 35 and 54, there is no other disease which will claim more lives.

This bill will give breast cancer advocates a voice in the National Institutes of Health’s, NIH’s research decision-making. The Consumer Involvement in Breast Cancer Research Act urges NIH to follow the Department Of Defense’s lead and include lay breast cancer advocates in breast cancer research decision-making.

The involvement of these breast cancer advocates at DOD has helped foster new and innovative breast cancer research funding designs and research projects. While maintaining the higher level of quality assurance through peer review, breast cancer advocates have helped to ensure that all breast cancer research reflects the experiences and wisdom of the individuals who have lived with the disease, as well as the scientific community.

I hope that my colleagues will join me in supporting this bill.

By Mr. CLELAND (for himself and Ms. LANDRIEU):

S. 262. A bill to provide for teaching excellence in America’s classrooms and homes, to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

Mr. CLELAND. Mr. President, this nation was rocked by the publication, in 1983, of the landmark report, A Nation at Risk. The findings were devastating: educational performance in our national system was being “eroded by a rising tide of mediocrity that threatens our future as a nation and a people.” That report went on to say that if “an unfriendly foreign power” had tried to impose on America our “mediocre educational performance,” “we might well have viewed it “as an act of war.”

A Nation at Risk sounded a wake-up call to our educators, parents, businesses, community leaders and officials at all levels of government. Since its publication in 1983, a number of states have strengthened their commitment to educational improvements. Many tightened high school graduation requirements. They pushed for more achievement testing for students and higher standards for teachers.

As a result of these efforts, we have seen improvement. Our dropout rate is down, and student achievement is up. Performance on the National Assessment of Educational Progress, NAEP, has improved in the key subjects of reading, math, and science. Yet still, in America, 2,800 high school students drop out every single day.

Each school year, more than 45,000 under-prepared teachers, teachers who have not even been trained in the subjects they are teaching, enter the classroom. Clearly, this is not acceptable.

The positive news is that eighteen years after A Nation at Risk, there is widespread agreement that the improvement of our educational system must be a priority and hope that there will be consensus on education reform.

Key to the success of any effective education reform is the issue of teacher quality. What teachers know and can do are the single most important influences on what students learn, according to the National Commission for Teaching and America’s Future Teachers.

Three years after A Nation at Risk, the Carnegie Task Force on Teaching as a Profession issued a seminal report, A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century. Its leading recommendation called for the establishment of a National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. Founded in 1987, the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards is an independent, non-profit, and non-partisan organization whose mission is to establish high and rigorous standards for what accomplished teachers should know and be able to do.

To date, over 9,500 teachers from all 50 states and the District of Columbia have completed certification, validated by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards—the most rigorous assessment process that a teacher can go through and the highest professional credential in the field of teaching. And more than 12,000 teachers have applied for National Board Certification in the 2000–2001 school year. Recognizing the value of qualified teachers in the classroom, 39 states and 181 local school districts have enacted financial incentives for teachers seeking National Board Certification, including fee support to candidates and salary increases for teachers who successfully complete the certification process.

Georgia, for example, provides a 10 percent salary increase to teachers who achieve National Board Certification as well as full reimbursement of the $2300 fee upon certification. The State of Louisiana provides an annual salary adjustment of $5,000 for its National Board Certified Teachers. And in addition, the State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education has allocated a $300,000 supplement over a three-year period to provide fee support for National Board Certification.

North Carolina, which has over 2,900 National Board Certified Teachers, has a particularly strong support program. Among its incentives, the State pays the fee for up to 1,500 teachers who complete the National Board Certification process; offers up to three days to work on their portfolios and prepare for the assessment center exercises; and provides a 12 percent salary increase for those who achieve National Board Certification. Florida, with 1,267 National Board Certified Teachers, has passed legislation appropriating $12 million to pay 90 percent of its candidates’ certification fee. In addition, the State provides $150 to candidates to offset National Board Certification expenses.

The incentives offered by Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, Florida and the remaining 35 states clearly demonstrate that state leaders recognize and understand the value and contribution of National Board Certification to their own efforts to enhance quality teaching and improve school performance. In an effort to assist states’ efforts and to encourage participation, the 1994 Improving America’s Schools Act authorized federal assistance to the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. To date, the Board has provided over $18 million to the states according to a formula based on teacher population. In FY 2000, $2.5 million was appropriated. States and local schools districts subsidize the certification fee for National Board Certified candidates.

In each and every year since funding was authorized, candidates have outpaced the money available. Therefore in an effort to encourage and promote teacher quality in the classroom, I am joined today by my colleague, Senator LANDRIEU, in introducing the Teaching Excellence in America’s Classrooms and Homerooms (TEACH) Act. According to a new study by the National Education Association, teacher salaries have remained stagnant over the past decade, and two-thirds of the states do not meet the national average of $40,582 for teacher salaries. Therefore to help teachers pay the $2300 certification fee, our bill would double the candidate subsidy funding, from the current $2.5 million to $5 million. Further, our legislation would provide an additional $1 million for outreach and educational activities to heighten teachers’ awareness of the National Board Certification process, with a priority given to teachers in school districts serving special populations, including low-income, economically disadvantaged children, and economically and educationally disadvantaged children.

Teachers who successfully complete the arduous requirements for National Board Certification should not be penalized. Therefore, our legislation would provide that any financial benefit, such as a bonus, which a teacher receives solely as a result of achieving National Board Certification would be tax-free. And teachers who pay out of pocket expenses for advanced certification, such as fees, travel, and supplies, should be reimbursed for these costs.
America's Classrooms and Homerooms would allow candidates to take an above-the-line deduction for their certification expenses. This will allow these teachers who do not itemize their deductions to still be able to benefit from tax-favorable treatment for their National Board Certification.

A study by researchers at the University of North Carolina at Greensboro has recently concluded that teachers who are certified by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards significantly outperform their peers who are not National Board Certified on 11 of 13 key measures of teaching expertise, including an extensive knowledge of subject matter, the capacity to create optimal environments for learning, and the ability to inspire students and to promote in them problem-solving skills. The Accomplished Teaching Validation Study, released in October, was originally designed as a means of independent validation for the National Board’s assessment process, and it is based on criteria which two decades of research have deemed to be the measures of effective teaching. Among its conclusions, the study clearly draws out that over one-third of the National Board Certified Teachers produced students whose work reflected deep understanding of the subject being studied compared with less than one-quarter of non-certified teachers.

Christa McAuliffe, selected to be the first schoolteacher to travel in space, said, “I touch the future,” she said, “I teach.”

If we are to improve student achievement and success in school, the United States must encourage and support the training and development of our nation’s teachers, the single most important in-school influence on student learning, who play a major role in our school systems and are a direct investment in quality education—and as Benjamin Franklin said, “on education all our lives depend.”

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill and the letter of support from the National Education Association be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

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

TITLE I—NATIONAL BOARD CERTIFICATION TO ENCOURAGE INNOVATION

SEC. 101. NATIONAL BOARD CERTIFICATION AUTHORIZATION.

Part A of title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 6621 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

""SEC. 204. NATIONAL BOARD CERTIFICATION AUTHORIZATION.

"'(a) Short Title.—This section may be cited as the “Teaching Excellence in America’s Classrooms and Homerooms Act” (TEACH).

"'(b) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

"'(1) Accomplished teachers are an essential resource for schools and key to the success of any effective education reform initiative. The teacher is the single most important influence on what students learn, according to national studies.

"'(2) Three years after the landmark 1983 report, A Nation at Risk: A Force on Teaching as a Profession issued a seminal report entitled 'A Nation Prepared: Teachers for the 21st Century.' Its leading recommendation was the establishment of a National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. Founded in 1987, the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards is an independent, nonprofit and nonpartisan organization whose mission is to establish high and rigorous standards for what accomplished teachers should know and be able to do.

"'(3) Over 9,500 teachers from all 50 States and the District of Columbia have completed advanced certification by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, which certification is the most rigorous assessment process that a teacher can go through and the highest professional credential in the field of teaching. Over 20,000 teachers have applied for National Board Certification in the 2000-2001 school year.

"'(4) Teacher salaries have remained stagnant over the last decade. According to a new study by the National Education Association, and 5% of the States do not meet the national average of $40,382 for teacher salaries.

"'(5) The full fee for National Board Certification is $2,300. Thirty-nine States and 181 local school districts have enacted financial incentives for obtaining National Board Certification, including fee support to candidates and salary increases for teachers who achieve National Board Certification.

"'(6) Recent data from the Accomplished Teaching Validation Study have demonstrated that teachers who are certified by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards significantly outperform their peers who are not National Board Certified on 11 of 13 key measures of teaching expertise.

"'(7) If we are to improve student achievement and success in school, the United States must encourage and support the training and development of our nation’s teachers, the single most important in-school influence on student learning.

"'(c) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to provide a Federal subsidy and support to eligible teachers, to certain elementary school and secondary school teachers who pursue advanced certification provided by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

"'(d) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

"'(1) BOARD.—The term ‘Board’ means the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

"'(2) ELIGIBLE TEACHER.—The term ‘eligible teacher’ means an individual who is a pre-kindergarten through grade 12 classroom teacher, including special education teacher, or a kindergarten through grade 12 classroom teacher, instructor, counselor, aide, or principal in an elementary school or secondary school on a full-time basis for an academic year ending during a taxable year.

"'(c) ELIGIBLE FINANCIAL BENEFIT.—For purposes of this section, the term ‘eligible financial benefit’ means any financial benefit, including in-kind payment, for services, training or expenses for the purpose of the successful completion by the eligible teacher of the requirements for advanced certification provided by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. Such completion shall be verified in such manner as the Secretary shall prescribe by regulation.

"'(d) AMOUNTS MUST BE REASONABLE.—Amounts excluded under subsection (a) shall
By Ms. SNOWE (for herself and Mr. TORRICELLI):

S. 263. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to ensure that coverage of bone mass measurements is provided under the health benefits program for Federal employees; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

S. 264. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to expand coverage of bone mass measurements under the Medicare Program. Osteoporosis will be eligible for osteoporosis to all individuals at clinical risk for osteoporosis; to the Committee on Governmental Affairs.

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce two bills which, in my view, will provide for outreach will help bring information about Board Certification to many more teachers.

We thank you for your leadership in introducing the TEACH Act and look forward to working with you in support of our nation's teachers.

Sincerely,
MARY ELIZABETH TEASLEY,
Director of Government Relations.
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DEAR SENATOR CLELAND: On behalf of the National Education Association (NEA), we write to express our support for the Teaching Excellence in America's Classrooms and Homerooms (TEACH) Act. The TEACH Act would ensure that all students are exposed to a high-quality teacher in every classroom.

As you know, no single factor will have a greater impact on improving student achievement than the quality of our nation's teaching force. National Board Certification offers the highest credential in the teaching profession, taking teachers through a rigorous assessment and evaluation process. An October 2000 study found that Board Certified teachers significantly outperformed their peers on 11 of 13 measures of teaching expertise. In addition, the study found that 74 percent of students from students of Certified teachers reported "high levels of comprehension," compared with 29 percent of students whose teachers did not have national certification.

Unfortunately, the high cost prohibits many teachers from seeking Board Certification. By providing funding to states and local districts to help teachers pay Board Certification fees, your legislation will enable more teachers to participate in this important profession. The resources provided for outreach will help bring information about Board Certification to many more teachers.

We urge you to pass the TEACH Act and look forward to working with you in support of our nation's teachers.

Sincerely,
MARY ELIZABETH TEASLEY,
Director of Government Relations.

February 6, 2001

We thank you for your leadership in introducing the TEACH Act and look forward to working with you in support of our nation's teachers.

Sincerely,
MARY ELIZABETH TEASLEY,
Director of Government Relations.
S. 265. A bill to prohibit the use of, and provide for remediation of water contaminated by, methyl tertiary butyl ether; to the Committee on Environ-
ment and Public Works.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. President, I rise to introduce the "MTBE Elimination Act of 2001." I thank my colleagues—Senators BAYH, BROWN,
BACK, KOHL, and DURBIN for joining me as original co-sponsors of this impor-
tant legislation. I have become deeply concerned by the use and ultimate misuse of the gasoline additive methyl ter-
tiary butyl ether, MTBE, a nonrenew-
able fuel derivative, and its potential adverse health effects on those who come in contact with it. As my col-
leagues may remember, I introduced the "MTBE Elimination Act of 2000" last Congress, but no action was taken in the 106th Congress to eliminate the use of this potentially hazardous chem-
ical additive.

Specifically, the "MTBE Elimination Act of 2001" will phase out MTBE use across the United States over the next three years, ensure proper labeling of all fuel dispensaries containing MTBE enriched reformulated gasoline, pro-
vide grant awards for MTBE research, and express the sense of the Senate that the Administrator of the Environ-
mental Protection Agency should pro-
vide assistance to municipalities to test for MTBE in drinking water sources, as well as provide remediation where appropriate. This bill represents an important first step toward nation-
wide safe and healthy drinking water.

Despite the potential damaging ef-
fects of MTBE, research of this chem-
ical is still in its preliminary stages. In February of 1996, the Health Effects In-
stitute reported that MTBE could be classified as a neurotoxicant for its acute impairment effects on humans. Further, the Alaska Department of Health and Social Services and the Center for Disease Control System Moni-
tored concentrations of MTBE in the air and in the blood of humans. These studies showed that people with a higher concentration of MTBE in their bloodstream have a much greater tendency toward headaches, eye irrita-
tion, nausea, disorientation, and vom-
itng. Finally, the January 16, 2000 broadcast of the "60 Minutes" show reported, "the EPA's position is that MTBE is a human carcinogen." Mr. President, we must re-
move this kind of chemical from our Nation's drinking water supply.

Widespread pollution of water sys-
tems by MTBE has been perpetuated by a lack of knowledge, as well as indiffer-
ence, to this potentially hazardous sub-
stance. MTBE does not readily attach to soil particles, nor does it naturally biodegrade, making its movement from gasoline to water extremely rapid. The physical properties of MTBE, coupled with its adverse health ef-
fects, make the use of this specific oxy-
genate dangerous to the American peo-
ple.

The elimination of the use of MTBE in reformulated gasoline should not mean the removal of the oxygenate re-
quirement set forth under the Clean Air Act of 1990—which requires refo-
rmatled gasoline to contain two per-
cent oxygen by weight. We believe it be reasonable for our nation to expect both clean air and clean water, without having to eliminate the reformulated gasoline market or sacrifice our na-
tional health.

According to the United States De-
partment of Agriculture study entitled "Economic Analysis of Replacing MTBE with Ethanol in the United States," replacing MTBE with the corn-based oxygenate additive ethanol would create approximately 12,000 new jobs in rural America, increase farm in-
come by more than $1 billion annually over the next ten years, and reduce farm program costs and loan deficiency payments through an expanded value-
added market for grain. Furthermore, the U.S. Department of Agriculture has concluded that within three years, eth-
anol can be used as a substitute oxy-
genate for MTBE in nationwide mar-
kets without price increases or supply disruptions.

Ethanol has proven to be a viable, en-
vironmentally-friendlier alternative to MTBE. The Chicago reformulated gas program (RFG) has used ethanol for years, and according to the American Lung Association, Chicago has estab-
lished the most successful RFG programs in the country. Ethanol is vi-
tally important to my home state since Illinois is the number one producer of ethanol in the nation. Each year, 274 million bushels of Illinois corn are used to produce about 678 million gallons of ethanol. At a time when agricultural prices are at near-record lows, this in-
creased demand is sorely needed.

Recently, Tosco Corporation, one the nation's largest independent oil refin-
eries, announced its intention to sell ethanol-blended fuel from its 1,600 retail outlets throughout California. This decision will result in the replacement of MTBE with ethanol in one-fifth of California's reformu-
lated gasoline by the end of this year, thereby helping to protect California's water supply for future generations, while keeping its air clean. The bill that I introduce today paves the way for this important bio-based fuel to be used not only in California and the Midwest, but nationwide. By sup-
porting bio-based fuel through legisla-
tive measures such as this bill, we are taking positive and decisive steps to-
ward cleaning our nation's water, and the environment we will leave for our children and grandchildren.

This legislation will send a signal that the Senate strongly supports bio-
based fuels research and recognizes the need to find viable ways to reduce our dependency on fossil fuels. Through research, localized testing, and proper labeling we can help assure that MTBE is properly identified in gasoline, extracted from groundwater, and phased out of use thereby reducing the risk of future MTBE contamination.

By phasing out MTBE over a three year period and replacing it with eth-
anol, we can help secure an ample sup-
ply of reformulated gasoline, clean water and clean air for future genera-
tions. This bill should enjoy bipartisan support. I urge my colleagues to join me in co-sponsoring this bill that is so important to the well being of the envi-
ronment as well as our nation's farm-
ers.

I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD. 

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 265

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "MTBE Elimination Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS; SENSE OF THE SENATE.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) MTBE contains one percent oxygen by weight; and

(2) MTBE significantly reduces the efficiency of modern spark igni-
tion engines, thereby reducing the fuel mileage of new vehicles.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—The Senate finds that—

(1) the average cost of a single industrial cleanup involving MTBE contamination is approximately $150,000;
(12) the average cost of a single cleanup involving MTBE contamination that is conducted by a small business or a homeowner is approximately $37,000;

(13) reformulated gasoline program under section 211(k) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7545(k)) has resulted in substantial reductions in the emissions of a number of air pollutants from motor vehicles, including volatile organic compounds, carbon monoxide, and mobile-source toxic air pollutants, including benzene;

(14) in assessing oxygenate alternatives, the Blue Ribbon Panel of the Environmental Protection Agency determined that ethanol, made from domestic grain and potentially from recycled biomass, is an effective fuel blending component that—

(A) provides carbon monoxide emission benefits and high octane; and

(B) appears to contribute to the reduction of the use of aromatics, providing reductions in emissions of toxic air pollutants and other air quality benefits;

(15) the Department of Agriculture concluded that ethanol production and distribution could be expanded to meet the needs of the reformulated gasoline program in 4 years at a price that are highly competitive with gasoline containing methyl tertiary butyl ether at retail shall be required under regulations promulgated by the Administrator to label the fuel dispensing system with a notice that—

(A) specifies that the gasoline contains methyl tertiary butyl ether; and

(B) provides such other information concerning methyl tertiary butyl ether as the Administrator deems appropriate;

(16) because the reformulated gasoline program is a source of clean air benefits, and ethanol is a viable alternative that provides air quality and economic benefits, research and development efforts should be directed to assess infrastructure and meet other challenges necessary to allow ethanol use to expand sufficiently to meet the requirements of the reformulated gasoline program as the use of MTBE is phased out.

(b) sense of the Senate.—It is the sense of the Senate that the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency should provide technical assistance, information, and matching funds to help local communities—

(1) test drinking water supplies; and

(2) remediate drinking water contaminated with methyl tertiary butyl ether.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act—

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term ‘‘Administrator’’ means Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(2) ELIGIBLE GRANTEE.—The term ‘‘eligible grantee’’ means—

(A) a Federal research agency;

(B) a national laboratory;

(C) a college or university or a research foundation maintained by a college or university;

(D) a private research organization with an established and demonstrated capacity to perform research or technology transfer; or

(E) a State environmental research facility.

(3) MTBE.—The term ‘‘MTBE’’ means methyl tertiary butyl ether.

SEC. 4. USE OF METHYL TERTIARY BUTYL ETHER AS A FUEL ADDITIVE.

Section 6 of the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2605) is amended by adding at the end the following:

‘‘(f) USE OF METHYL TERTIARY BUTYL ETHER.—

‘‘(1) PROHIBITION ON USE.—Effective beginning on the date that is 3 years after the date of enactment of this subsection, a person shall not use methyl tertiary butyl ether as a fuel additive.

‘‘(2) LABELING OF FUEL DISPENSING SYSTEMS FOR MTBE.—Any person selling oxygenated gasoline containing methyl tertiary butyl ether at retail shall be required under regulations promulgated by the Administrator to label the fuel dispensing system with a notice that—

‘‘(A) specifies that the gasoline contains methyl tertiary butyl ether; and

‘‘(B) provides such other information concerning methyl tertiary butyl ether as the Administrator deems appropriate.

‘‘(3) REGULATIONS.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this subsection, the Administrator shall establish a schedule for the implementation of this subsection.

‘‘(d) USE OF METHYL TERTIARY BUTYL ETHER.

‘‘(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a MTBE research grants program within the Environmental Protection Agency.

‘‘(2) PURPOSE OF GRANTS.—The Administrator may make a grant under this section to an eligible grantee to pay the Federal share of the costs of research on—

(A) the development of more cost-effective and accurate MTBE ground water testing methods;

(B) the development of more efficient and cost-effective remediation procedures for water sources contaminated with MTBE; or

(C) the potential effects of MTBE on human health.

‘‘(b) ELIGIBLE GRANTEES.—The term ‘‘eligible grantee’’ means—

(A) a Federal research agency;

(B) a national laboratory;

(C) a college or university or a research foundation maintained by a college or university;

(D) a private research organization with an established and demonstrated capacity to perform research or technology transfer; or

(E) a State environmental research facility.

‘‘(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this legislation $37,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2002 through 2005.

‘‘(d) MANAGEMENT OF FUNDING.—The Administrator shall ensure that competition is included in evaluating proposals.

SEC. 5. GRANTS FOR RESEARCH ON MTBE GROUND WATER CONTAMINATION AND REMEDIATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established a MTBE research grants program within the Environmental Protection Agency.

‘‘(2) PURPOSE OF GRANTS.—(A) The Administrator shall make a grant under this section to an eligible grantee to pay the Federal share of the costs of research on—

(A) the development of more cost-effective and accurate MTBE ground water testing methods;

(B) the development of more efficient and cost-effective remediation procedures for water sources contaminated with MTBE; or

(C) the potential effects of MTBE on human health.

(b) ADMINISTRATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In making grants under this section, the Administrator shall—

(A) seek and accept proposals for grants;

(B) determine the relevance and merit of proposals;

(C) award grants on the basis of merit, quality, and relevance to advancing the purposes for which a grant may be awarded under subsection (a); and

(D) give priority to those proposals the applicants for which demonstrate the availability of matching funds.

(2) COMPETITIVE BASIS.—A grant under this section shall be awarded on a competitive basis.

(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this legislation $10,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2002 through 2005.

By Mr. SMITH of Oregon (for himself and Mr. WYDEN):

S. 266. A bill regarding the use of the Pelton Dam Project, the Warm Springs Project, and the Deschutes River. It also provides a model for how the Department of the Interior (Department). This agreement is shared ownership responsibilities and authority SMITH to carefully craft this legislation to authorize the Department to solicit applications. The Administration provides Federal approval for only the aspects of the Agreement that affect tribal lands, resources, or other tribal assets. Section 2(b)(1) makes it clear that the legislation shall not affect the normal Federal and State regulatory approvals that would be required for an agreement of this type. Section 2(b)(2) was included to address a Departmental concern that this legislation will not be interpreted to mean that legislative approval of future similar agreements will be necessary. In addition, this bill authorizes a 99-year leasing authority for the Warm Springs that is shared by countless other tribes.

This bill is supported by the PGE, the Warm Springs Tribe and Jefferson County.

By Mr. AKAKA (for himself, Mr. REID, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. GREGG, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mrs. BOXER, and Mr. SMITH of New Hampshire):

S. 267. A bill that amends the Long Term Global Settlement and Compensation Agreement (Agreement). The Agreement creates shared ownership responsibilities and benefits between PGE and the Warm Springs for all three Pelton Project dams and facilities located both on and off the Warm Springs Reservation.

The Warm Springs, PGE and the Department worked with myself and Senator SMITH to carefully craft this legislation to authorize the Department to solicit applications. The Administration provides Federal approval for only the aspects of the Agreement that affect tribal lands, resources, or other tribal assets. Section 2(b)(1) makes it clear that the legislation shall not affect the normal Federal and State regulatory approvals that would be required for an agreement of this type. Section 2(b)(2) was included to address a Departmental concern that this legislation will not be interpreted to mean that legislative approval of future similar agreements will be necessary. In addition, this bill authorizes a 99-year leasing authority for the Warm Springs that is shared by countless other tribes.

By Mr. AKAKA, Mr. President, today I am reintroducing the Downed Animal Protection Act, a bill to eliminate inhumane and improper treatment of downed animals after death. Senators CARL LEVIN, CHARLES SCHUMER, ROBERT TORRICELLI, JUDD GREGG, BOB GRAHAM, BOB SMITH, HARRY REID and BARBARA BOXER have joined me in sponsoring this bill. The legislation will prohibit the sale or transfer of downed animals unless they have been humanely euthanized.

Downed animals are severely distressed remnants of animals that are too sick to rise or move on their own. Once an animal becomes recumbent, it must remain where it has fallen, often without receiving the most basic assistance. Many of these downed animals...
that survive the stockyard are slaughtered for human consumption.

These animals are extremely difficult, if not impossible, to handle humanely. They have very demanding needs, and must be fed and watered individually. The suffering of downed animals is so severe that the only humane solution to their plight is immediate euthanasia. It is important to note that downed animals compromise a tiny fraction, less than one-tenth of one percent, of animals at stockyards. Banning their sale or transfer would cause no economic hardship.

While I commend the major livestock organizations such as the United Stockyards Council, the National Cattlemen’s Association, and the National Pork Producers Council, the Colorado Cattlemen’s Association, and the Independent Cattlemen’s Association of Texas, along with responsible and conscientious livestock producers throughout the country, for their efforts to address the issue of downed animals, this lamentable problem still exists. Not only is this suffering inhumane and unnecessary, it is eroding public confidence in the industry.

The Downed Animal Protection Act will prompt stockyards to refuse crippled and distressed animals, and will make the prevention of downed animals a priority for the livestock industry. The bill will complement and reinforce the industry’s effort to address this problem by encouraging better care of animals at farms and ranches.

The bill will remove the incentive for sending downed animals to stockyards in the hope of receiving some salvage value for the animals and would encourage greater care during loading and transport. By eliminating this incentive, animals with impaired mobility will receive better treatment in order to prevent them from becoming incapacitated. In addition, the bill will also discourage improper breeding practices that account for most downed animals.

My legislation would set a uniform national standard, thereby removing any unfair advantages that might result from differing standards throughout the industry. Furthermore, no additional bureaucracy will be needed as a consequence of my bill because inspectors of the Packers and Stockyard Administration regularly visit stockyards to enforce existing regulations. Thus, the additional burden on the agency and stockyard operators will be insignificant.

As I stated before, this bill will stop the inhumane and improper treatment of downed animals at stockyards and I encourage my colleagues to support this important legislation. I ask unanimous consent at the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,
Resolved. That the Senate—
(1) congratulates President Chandrika Bandaranaike Kumaratunga and the people of the Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka on the celebration of 53 years of independence;
(2) expresses best wishes to the Government and the people of the Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka as they celebrate their national day of independence on February 4, 2001; and
(3) looks forward to continued cooperation and friendship with the Government and people of the Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka in the years ahead.

S. RES. 18

Whereas, on the morning of January 13, 2001, a devastating and deadly earthquake of a magnitude of 7.6 on the Richter scale shook the entire nation of El Salvador, killing more than 700 people, injuring more than 3,000 and leaving more than 50,000 homeless;
Whereas the earthquake of January 13, 2001, has left thousands of buildings in ruins, caused deadly landslides, and destroyed highways and other infrastructure;
Whereas the strength, courage, and determination of the people of El Salvador has been displayed since the earthquake;
Whereas El Salvador is still recovering from years of civil war, hurricane damage, and flood damage;
Whereas the people of the United States and El Salvador share strong friendship and mutual interests and respect;
Whereas some United States specialists from Costa Rica and Miami, including specialists from the Miami-Dade Fire Rescue Department, were deployed to assist disaster relief efforts in El Salvador;
Whereas United States military personnel from the United States Southern Command are providing some technical assistance;
Whereas the USAID/Disaster Assistance Response Team (DART) has set up an office in El Salvador’s National Emergency Committee (COEN) to assist the office in its coordination efforts and to ensure access to the latest information; and
Whereas the United Nations launched an appeal for humanitarian assistance and initial rehabilitation to address the devastation caused by the powerful earthquake: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved. That the Senate—
(1) expresses its deepest sympathies to the people of El Salvador and other Central American countries for the tragic losses suffered as a result of the earthquake of January 13, 2001;
(2) expresses its support for the people of El Salvador as they continue their efforts to rebuild their cities and their lives;
(3) expresses support for disaster assistance being provided by the United States Agency for International Development and other relief agencies;
(4) recognizes the important role that is being played by the United States and other countries in providing assistance to alleviate the suffering of the people of El Salvador; and

(5) encourages a continued commitment by the United States and other countries to the long-term, sustainable development of El Salvador.

Ms. LANDRIEU. Mr. President, I thank my colleague for his tremendous leadership in this area for many years as it relates to Latin America. He is usually the first one on the floor to outline a strategy for U.S. assistance because he knows that we share mutual benefits in opening trade lines and expanding our cultural ties to this particular part of the world. I thank him for his leadership.

On behalf of the Senator from Connecticut and myself, I send a resolution to the desk and a bill that I will briefly describe.

Mr. President, the resolution simply calls the attention of the Congress to this particular piece of his legislation, a country that has been wracked for decades by war, only to be hit 2 years ago by one of the largest and most destructive hurricanes. And now to face an earthquake is almost too much to describe.

As the Senator from Connecticut pointed out, the devastation has totaled about $1 billion. To put that into perspective, that is 5 percent of El Salvador’s entire GDP. The equivalent of 5 percent of the United States’ GDP is $500 billion. When hurricane Andrew struck, it was the largest natural disaster in our history at $7 billion. So it is hard for us in America to understand what a natural disaster can do to a country whose economy is so fragile.

We are blessed in this Nation with an abundance of resources. We have the means and structures in place to deal manage such crises. When devastation like this hits other countries, they just reel. If we are not there quickly with assistance, very difficult, if not impossible, for them to recover.

Let me be quick to point out that the people of El Salvador will do everything they can to help themselves; they will work hard and struggle. But the U.S. must be quick to aid them. That is what our resolution calls for.

Our bill specifically calls for quite a modest amount, but a start, to aid the over 50 thousand people who lost their homes. There is an immediate need for shelter. That is why our bill will help in some way to complement what USAID is doing now.

I am happy to urge my friends and Members in the Senate and the House to come quickly to the aid of a country that needs so much help.

Mr. President, like many of my colleagues, I have watched the humanitarian calamity unfurl in El Salvador, with horror and sorrow. In the wake of a 7.6-size earthquake, the people of Central America will struggle very difficult to re-build their lives. Still marred by hurricane and flood damage, they are desperate for help: to heal the wounded, feed the hungry, and shelter the displaced. And now, my colleagues, tragedy has struck these people once again.

Crisis has not spared the men, women and children of El Salvador.

Of course most of the destruction is difficult to quantify. The death toll is over 700, with nearly 3,000 people injured, over 50,000 estimated homeless, 46,000 evacuated, and 91,000 homes damaged or destroyed. In fact, as President Francisco Flores pleaded for international aid, he requested an additional 3,000 coffins.

As our Latin American neighbors desperately seek comfort in their faith and family, let us find solace in a passage from the Second Book of Corinthians: “Blessed be God... God of all comfort; Who comforts us in all our affliction so that we will be able to comfort those who are in any affliction with the comfort which we ourselves are comforted by God.”

The United States must rise to the occasion, and respond with aid. Perseverance has proven a critical trait for Salvadorans these last few weeks; we shouldn’t count it to become a way of life.

Already, our ties with El Salvador run deep along both cultural and historic lines. On one score, El Salvador has stood by the U.S. as a strategic ally and crucial trading partner during and after the Cold War. On another, the U.S. remains home to millions of immigrants, and millions more who immigrate from El Salvador. And so, we call this calamity in Central America. Helping Central America rebuild is of special concern in Louisiana. It may come as some surprise to my colleagues to learn that New Orleans, with one of the largest Honduran and Salvadoran communities in the U.S., is often cited as one of the largest Central American cities outside Latin America. And with organizations like Partners of the Americas, we are continuing to foment opportunities for El Salvador and the U.S. to work together. We have been active in helping the U.S. to work with communities on future aid rebuilding.

It was these strong connections and long history of humanitarian aid which included us to respond to pleas for help after Hurricane Mitch in 1998. And for that reason, the second piece of legislation today, the first is a resolution to raise awareness of the circumstances in El Salvador. Simply put, I am sure that my colleagues will join me and Senator Dodd in expressing sympathy for the victims of the devastating earthquake that struck El Salvador January 13, 2001.

The second piece of legislation is meant to complement USAID’s current efforts to provide short term relief and establish preventative measures to prepare for future disasters. At USAID and the State Department help draft long term strategies for Central America, let us not neglect some immediate concerns. One of the most pressing problems afflicting the Honduran people is lack of shelter. In the last Congress, I authored legislation with several senators on both sides of the aisle that provided $10 million for the home building program for Central American refugees and more than 50,000 persons through El Salvador. Time is of the essence.

In the last Congress, we witnessed a historic meeting in the Capitol’s LBJ Room hosted by Senators Lott and the late Paul Coverdell. There, four Central American Presidents made it clear to us that permanent housing along with opening trade opportunities were among the highest priorities for their recovery. The Republican leader and the Democratic leader were very helpful in providing housing aid after Hurricane Mitch.

And yet, here we are, in the beginning of an entirely new Congress. People are once again homeless, and have no sustainable means to protect themselves from future natural disasters. I will be working along with other colleagues on both sides of the aisle—to see that we do all we can in the area of housing in Central America. Let us begin today with El Salvador. Then we shall extend our efforts throughout the region, to try and stop such devastation from occurring again. Let me assure our Central American friends of one thing, we will not turn our backs on you.

Mr. DODD. Mr. President. I rise today to speak on behalf of the people of El Salvador and India who are working so bravely towards recovery in the wake of the devastating earthquakes that recently struck those nations.

In the case of El Salvador, the death toll has exceeded 700, and countless numbers have been left injured and homeless. More than 68,000 people have been evacuated with no promise of ever returning, and 60,000 are living in temporary shelters. Indeed, in addition to the 74,000 homes that were so suddenly destroyed last month, another full 118,000 may have been damaged beyond repair, and in some areas, Mr. President, the percentage of homes destroyed can be completely destroyed. While the cost of rebuilding is still being calculated, the El Salvador National Emergency Committee estimates that it most certainly will run to over $1 billion, with an estimated $100 million loss in agricultural revenue alone.

At the time of the quake the people of El Salvador were already hard at work rebuilding their country after the 12 years of civil conflict that had claimed the lives of 70,000 men, women, and children during the 1980’s. Their suffering, as they struggle toward stability and development, has only been compounded by the natural disasters of
the past two years. After a dozen years of civil strife, the people of El Salvador were able to reach a political settlement of their differences. This speaks volumes about their commitment and courage. Since the 1992 peace accords, they have worked to build a peaceful and democratic country. This is what people tested well beyond what they should be asked to bear. At each step on the path to recovery they have faced a new challenge, and each time they have responded tenaciously and stepped forward again.

Mr. President, this earthquake is not the first time in recent memory that a natural disaster has brought devastation on such a wide scale to the people of El Salvador. In addition to this terrible earthquake, there has also been a serious outbreak of dengue fever, a serious and debilitating disease. And it was only two years ago that Hurricane Mitch tore through Central America, exacting an unbearable toll on an already hard-pressed country. In the countries of El Salvador, Honduras, and Nicaragua, more than 11,000 lives were swept away in the rain, winds, and massive landslides that Mitch wrought. In some areas, more than 70 percent of crops were lost, and the price tags on the devastating hurricane soared to more than $4 billion once a full accounting was made.

Mr. President, the people of El Salvador did not simply wring their hands in despair as disaster struck. They worked to improve their lives— they rebuilt roads, and schools, and homes. They began to address the needs of citizens dealing with painful losses and an uncertain future. They began to address the needs of citizens dealing with painful losses and an uncertain future. They began to address the needs of citizens dealing with painful losses and an uncertain future. They began to address the needs of citizens dealing with painful losses and an uncertain future. They began to address the needs of citizens dealing with painful losses and an uncertain future. They began to address the needs of citizens dealing with painful losses and an uncertain future. They began to address the needs of citizens dealing with painful losses and an uncertain future. They began to address the needs of citizens dealing with painful losses and an uncertain future. They began to address the needs of citizens dealing with painful losses and an uncertain future.

Mr. President, the story unfolding right now in India is no less compelling and deserves our equal attention and concern. January 26th is traditionally a day of celebration in India, a day when people gather with their families in their homes to celebrate Republic Day, their constitution, and their country. This January, the clamor of parades and cheers was replaced by the roar of collapsing buildings torn down by an earthquake registering 7.9 on the Richter scale, once again threatens to break the back of an already struggling nation.

Mr. President, the story unfolding right now in India is no less compelling and deserves our equal attention and concern. January 26th is traditionally a day of celebration in India, a day when people gather with their families in their homes to celebrate Republic Day, their constitution, and their country. This January, the clamor of parades and cheers was replaced by the roar of collapsing buildings torn down by an earthquake registering 7.9 on the Richter scale, once again threatens to break the back of an already struggling nation.

Hardest hit was Bhuj, a city of 150,000 in the Gujarat state, only 43 miles from the epicenter. The government of India places the official death toll at more than 16,000, but estimates this figure could climb to a ghastly 100,000 in the days and weeks to come. Six hundred thousand people have been left homeless, many of whom are sleeping out in the open, with too few blankets among them, for fear of returning to unsteady buildings. Many others simply have no place to go. As many as 35 million people have been affected in India, a figure so staggering it is almost impossible to comprehend. The United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (UNOCHA) places the cost of re habilitation and reconstruction at $1.3 billion.

The daunting task that now lies before us is to bring some measure of relief and care to those who were spared, including an estimated 3,000 orphaned children. Tragically, the state of Gujarat was particularly vulnerable to a natural disaster such as this, as one quarter of its citizens live below the poverty line and almost one half of households rely on public food distribution under normal conditions. In an emergency such as this, that situation becomes exponentially more dire than before. In addition to the desperate need for food, medicine, and shelters, many Indian officials now fear epidemics of cholera and typhoid if access to clean, safe, drinking water is not quickly restored. This task has been made all the more difficult because it comes in the midst of a 3 year drought in India which affected almost 3 million people in the state of Gujarat last year. The majority of water supply cells are still not functioning and temporarily out of service, promoting concerns that some who managed to survive the earthquake may instead succumb to disease while they wait for clean water. Certainly, the survivors of this earthquake should not be exposed to further suffering and injury.

Mr. President, we cannot and should not ask the governments of El Salvador and India, or their people, to walk the path toward recovery alone. At a time when these countries seek peace and development, we must be there as both an ally and a partner. We must not turn away from their suffering, but rather must respond swiftly and effectively.

In fact, international relief efforts are already in full operation in both El Salvador and India, providing basic necessities such as drinking water, food, blankets and temporary shelter to the quake’s victims. The United States government is participating in these international efforts through the work of USAID. At the time of the quake, USAID personnel in El Salvador immediately began meeting with Salvadoran relief agencies to evaluate the extent of the damage and the level of aid necessary. By date, USAID assistance to El Salvador totals more than $5 million, the majority of which was allocated for temporary shelter programs. In addition, the World Food Programme has provided 900 metric tons of food. The International Federation of the Red Cross has released $100,000 of disaster relief funds as well as sent a delegation of relief workers to assist the 1,200 person Salvadoran Red Cross. Medicines for hospitals and temporary clinics are pouring in from the Pan-American Health Organization, and the International Development Bank is considering a $20 million emergency food loan. Moreover, and other contributions from additional organizations continue to arrive as well.

In India, USAID has pledged $9 million in emergency relief, including emergency food distribution, airlifts, and temporary shelter equipment. Indeed, more than 38 countries have responded to India’s cries, as well as several hundred non-governmental organizations including UNICEF, The International Federation of the Red Cross, and the World Food Programme.

It is my hope, Mr. President, that the Bush administration will recognize how desperately our help is still needed in El Salvador and India and will respond not only with continued short-term emergency relief, but also with a comprehensive plan for long term reconstruction and development. In the case of India that will require that waiver authority be exercised by the Administration to permit broader categories of assistance. Despite existing sanctions against that country, I would urge the Administration to do so.

I am confident that our colleagues in the Senate join me in extending our prayers and our hands to the people of two nations who must persevere at very difficult moments in their histories. I am confident that with our help the lives of the peoples of these two nations will improve day by day.

PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Peter Winokur be granted the privilege of the floor during today’s session of the Senate.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mark Peters be granted floor privileges for the purpose of this debate. He is a fellow from the Commerce Department.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LORETTA F. SYMMS

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, let me take a few additional moments to speak to the Senate about a friend of ours who has worked with us in the Senate for a good number of years. This week marks the last week of work for the Senate in the career of Loretta Symms. Loretta, who has become a friend of all of us while she has worked in the Senate, Loretta, who is originally from Coeur d’Alene, ID, moved to Washington in the mid-seventies and began her career working for then-Congressman Steve Symms as executive assistant and office manager. In 1981, after Congress man Symms was elected to the Senate,
Loretta became his executive secretary and then office manager. Most in the Senate got to know Loretta in 1987 when Senator Bob Dole appointed her as the Republican representative to the Sergeant at Arms Office. In 1988, she went on to fill a number of positions within that organization. As its director, she restructured the Capitol Facilities Department, providing career ladders, formal position descriptions, instituting reading programs, basic computer classes for employees, and other training programs—clearly, an effort to build a more professional staff within the Sergeant at Arms Office.

Loretta also participated in the renovation and the opening of Webster Hall, the first and current Senate page dormitory. Like you, Mr. President, I have had the privilege now of having several Senate pages, and I know they appreciate the facilities that are made available to them while they serve us in the Senate.

Loretta worked closely with the Office of the Secretary of the Senate and has been actively involved in the oversight and the management of the Senate page program.

In 1996, Senator Trent Lott named Loretta Deputy Sergeant at Arms, the post in which she still serves. As deputy, Loretta has managed the day-to-day operations of that employees of the Sergeant at Arms organization. In addition to assisting Presidents, Vice Presidents, and foreign heads of state on official visits to our Senate, Loretta has led Senate delegations to the funerals of former President Richard Nixon, the late Senator John Heinz, the late Senator John Chafee, the late Senator Paul Coverdell, and a good number of other Senators.

During her tenure as deputy, and working closely with the Assistant Secretary of the Senate, Loretta was instrumental in the formation of the Joint Office of Education and Training which provides a wide variety of professional seminars and training for the staff of the Senate offices and committees.

Loretta is married to former U.S. Senator Steve Symms. They have 7 children and 10 grandchildren. Retirement plans, she tells me, include building a more professional staff within the Sergeant at Arms Office.

As a fellow Idahoan, I stand before you today to say how proud I am of Loretta Symms for the work she has done for all of us and to make the Senate a better place to be and to work.

I yield the floor, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. Smith of Oregon). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, we have had a number of conversations over the past several days with Senator McCain and Senator Feingold, with the Democratic leadership, Senator McConnell, Senator Hollings, Senator Nickles, a whole number of Senators have been involved in this, Senators Dodd and Levin, in coming to an agreement on how to proceed on the election campaign reform issue. We have come to agreement here that everybody seems to be satisfied with at this time. I would like to enter this unanimous consent agreement.

I actually have three. One is dealing with how to handle the campaign finance reform issue. The next one is the Hollings constitutional amendment, and then also a consent regarding the U.N. dues and its consideration on the floor.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, would the Senate like to be heard at this point? I will be glad to yield to Senator McCain for comment before I go to the next consent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader and the Democratic leader, without whose strenuous efforts we would not have been able to enter into this unanimous consent agreement.

I want to make one thing clear: This campaign finance reform will be before the Senate bumping up against the April recess. It would be very good if we could, over a 2-week period, dispose of amendments and move to final passage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The unanimous consent agreement of—

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, we have had a number of conversations over the past several days with Senator McCain and Senator Feingold, with the Democratic leadership, Senator McConnell, Senator Hollings, Senator Nickles, a whole number of Senators have been involved in this, Senators Dodd and Levin, in coming to an agreement on how to proceed on the election campaign reform issue. We have come to agreement here that everybody seems to be satisfied with at this time. I would like to enter this unanimous consent agreement.

I actually have three. One is dealing with how to handle the campaign finance reform issue. The next one is the Hollings constitutional amendment, and then also a consent regarding the U.N. dues and its consideration on the floor.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader and the Democratic leader, without whose strenuous efforts we would not have been able to enter into this unanimous consent agreement.

I want to make one thing clear: This campaign finance reform will be before the Senate bumping up against the April recess. It would be very good if we could, over a 2-week period, dispose of amendments and move to final passage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader and the Democratic leader, without whose strenuous efforts we would not have been able to enter into this unanimous consent agreement.

I want to make one thing clear: This campaign finance reform will be before the Senate bumping up against the April recess. It would be very good if we could, over a 2-week period, dispose of amendments and move to final passage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate from Arizona.

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I thank the majority leader and the Democratic leader, without whose strenuous efforts we would not have been able to enter into this unanimous consent agreement.

I want to make one thing clear: This campaign finance reform will be before the Senate bumping up against the April recess. It would be very good if we could, over a 2-week period, dispose of amendments and move to final passage.
Mr. LOTT. I believe that colloquy also includes Senator DASCHLE. I think the three of us are included.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I would like to see a copy of that colloquy.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, if I could get a clarification, the Senator is reserving the right to object?

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, if Article I of the Constitution is going to be amended to permit a full and open debate on any of the issues, while ensuring that campaign, political, and election reform is addressed early, it is my hope that we will be able to move expeditiously on both education reform and the budget resolution in the next 2 months.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Under this agreement, the President will have some time to introduce his agenda to the American people and to the Congress. I believe that the agreement we have reached will allow us to begin work on some of these issues, while ensuring that campaign, political, and election reform is addressed early. It is my hope that we will be able to move expeditiously on both education reform and the budget resolution in the next 2 months. To that end, should we have a budget resolution ready for floor consideration prior to March 19, we will consider the resolution first. If the budget is not itself, we will consider campaign, political, and election reform first, to be followed by consideration of the budget in early April.

Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. Leader, I just want to add that I am very pleased that this agreement has been worked out in a cooperative way with Senator MCCAIN and also the Democratic leader. I also want to thank Senator LEVIN for his contribution to this agreement. We look forward to having a full and fair debate on our bill for the first time.

Mr. McCAIN. It is important that there is a full and open debate on campaign reform. I am pleased that the majority leader has agreed to use S. 27, the McCain-Feingold bill, as the legislation that will be considered by the Senate.

Mr. LOTT. It is my intention to call up S. 27, the McCain-Feingold bill, within the time frame within which we should have a full and open debate. I expect that many of my colleagues have ideas on campaign reform, political reform...
and election reform that warrant consideration by the Senate. The amendments, I hope, should be on the subject of campaign reform, political reform and election reform. In addition, I do not anticipate a circumstance arising that will compel me to use my prerogative as majority leader to fill up the amendment tree. I anticipate that we will have a full, open and spirited debate on any amendment offered to the Senate for consideration. Let me be clear, we intend to allow an opportunity for all amendments to be considered. Therefore, I do not expect that any major striking amendments, or the so-called wrap around amendments will be offered toward the end of the Senate’s consideration. I intend to complete action on the bill, working long hours if necessary, within 2 weeks.

Mr. MCCAIN. I appreciate the majority leader’s assurances that all amendments will be considered by the Senate. It is also my intention to let the will of the Senate prevail. I share the majority leader’s intention that all amendments be fairly considered and voted on prior to final passage, and I agree that a wrap around amendment would be a show of bad faith. I will work with the majority leader to ensure that all amendments are voted on and the bill is ready for final action within the 2 weeks that the leader anticipates. In order to facilitate this, it would be my hope and expectation that the bill would not be filibustered.

Mr. LOTT. As the Senator from Arizona is aware, every Senator has rights in this regard. However, I would discourage any efforts to filibuster this measure, and do not anticipate a filibuster of this bill. In fact, it is my expectation that the Senate will finish deliberations of campaign, political and election reform within 2 weeks of commencing action on it. I am determined to stick to this schedule, even if we must work through the weekend to complete action.

Mr. FEINGOLD. I thank the leader for his comments, and I want to assure him that supporters of this bill are ready to work through the weekend and into the evenings to make sure that this bill passes the Senate in a timely manner. I think the American people will applaud the leader’s statement that he does not anticipate a filibuster on this important legislation. I think we have reached a fair and balanced agreement.

Mr. LOTT. I thank my colleague from Arizona.

Mr. MCCONNELL. I congratulate the majority leader and the Senator from Arizona on this win-win compromise. The deal will allow the President’s top agenda items to be center stage prior to a discussion on campaign and election reform. And I agree that we will all work to keep the debate focused on these issues and that a wrap-around amendment would be a show of bad faith.

We may disagree on the public’s interest in campaign reform, but I think that we can all certainly agree that there is a true public demand for election reform and political reform. The upcoming debate will in many respects be the equivalent of a bill mark-up on the Senate floor. I think we all agree that there should be a full opportunity for everyone who wants to offer an amendment to be allowed to do so and to get a vote on that amendment without any games played by either side. So I want to thank the majority leader and my colleague from Arizona for their willingness to ensure that an open and robust debate will occur on this matter. I also appreciate the willingness of my colleague from Arizona to work with the majority leader to ensure that no vote on final passage occur until all amendments are voted on. I, too, believe that this is a fair agreement and again, I congratulate the leader and the Senator from Arizona.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—HOLLINGS-SPECTER CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during or immediately following the disposition of the McCain-Feingold legislation, S. 27, the Hollings-Specter constitutional amendment legislation then become the pending business and that it be considered under the following limitations:
That no amendments be in order to the constitutional amendment; 5 hours to be divided as follows: 2 hours under the control of Senator HOLLINGS, 2 hours under the control of Senator HATCH or his designee, and 1 hour equally divided between the Republican and Democratic leaders or their designees; that upon the Senate’s yielding back of time, the Senate, without intervening action, motion, or debate, proceed to vote on passage of the constitutional amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—U.N. DUES

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at 1 p.m. Wednesday, February 7, the Senate proceed to the U.N. dues bill, if reported by the Foreign Relations Committee, and all amendments offered be relevant to the subject matter and cleared by both managers.

I further ask consent that if the committee has not reported the bill by 1 p.m., it be immediately discharged and the Senate proceed immediately to its consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—H.J. RES. 7

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, when the Senate receives from the House H.J. Res. 7 relating to the birthday of former President Ronald Reagan, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered in the following fashion: The time be reserved for the two leaders be reserved for the consideration of the resolution with the party managers.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDERS FOR WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 2001

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until the hour of 10 a.m. on Wednesday, February 7, for the purpose of considering the resolution that on Wednesday, immediately following the prayer, the Journal of the proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for the use later in the day, and the Senate then proceed to a period for morning business until 1 p.m. to be divided in the following fashion: The time between 10 a.m. and 11 a.m. be divided as follows: Senator LOTT or designee under 30 minutes, Senator LIEBERMAN in control of 15 minutes, Senator DURBIN or designee in control of 15 minutes, Senator THOMAS or designee controlling the time between 11 and 12
noon, Senator BYRD controlling the time between 12 and 1 p.m.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PROGRAM
Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, on Wednesday, the Senate will be in a period of morning business until 1 p.m. under the order. At 1 p.m., the Senate will begin consideration of S. 248, the U.N. dues legislation. A minimal amount of debate is expected on the legislation. Therefore, it is expected that a vote will occur during tomorrow afternoon's session.

On Thursday, the Senate will begin consideration of the pipeline safety bill. I hope the Senate can complete consideration of that bill prior to the week's adjournment.

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT
Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order following the remarks of the distinguished Democratic leader.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE RETIREMENT OF OUR FRIEND “TINKER,” ARTHUR MALAN ST. CLAIR
Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, a special guest joined us at our caucus lunch this afternoon. His name is Arthur Malan St. Clair. We know him better as “Tinker.”

“Tinker St. Clair has spent 55 years in public service. He has worked in the Senate—for the Sergeant at Arms—for the last 22 years. This Friday, he is retiring.

His leaving was inevitable. He is, after all, 85 years old, although you would never guess it. Even so, Tinker’s departure will leave a void for all of us.

Every Member of this Senate knows how dedicated Tinker is to his work. We all know how much he loves this Senate, and this Nation. We have all benefitted—at some time—from Tinker’s kind smile, and from his quiet words of encouragement, which always seemed to come exactly when we needed them. We will all miss him.

Tinker St. Clair was born in a coal miner’s camp in McDowell County, West Virginia. His father worked in the mines. All together, his parents had six sons and one daughter.

He got his nickname from his grandfather, because he was a curious little boy—always “tinkering” with something, she said.

While some of his brothers followed their father into the coal mines, Tinker knew he wanted to do something different with his life. After graduating from high school in 1937, he went to work as a school bus driver, and then a commercial bus driver. He later owned his own small taxi business.

In 1940, Tinker had the good sense and good fortune to marry Elnora Hall. They would remain married for 55 years, until her death.

Tinker and Elnora had two daughters, Patty and Linda. In 1948, when the girls were little, Tinker began his life in public service. He became Deputy Sheriff for McDowell County.

Over the next 20 years, he would serve as: court bailiff; criminal investigator for the McDowell County prosecuting attorney; and justice of the peace.

In 1968, Tinker was elected McDowell County Clerk, running on the slogan: “the man to give the office back to the people.” In 1974, he was re-elected—with 89 percent of the vote. He might have won 100 percent of the vote had he chosen to run for a third term.

As a local office holder, Tinker helped many a national leader through the back roads of West Virginia. He walked through the coal fields with President Truman. In 1960, he campaigned with a charismatic young Senator from Massachusetts, John Kennedy. He greeted President Johnson during LBJ’s visit to West Virginia. He was at Robert Kennedy’s side in 1968 when Senator Kennedy sought to bring hope to places prosperity had overlooked. He has been a constant help over the years to his fellow West Virginians, Robert Byrd—the only man in the Senate with hair as nice as Tinker’s own.

He also spoke about his friendship with the man seated to his right: Ted Kennedy. They first met in 1960—two years before Ted Kennedy was elected to the Senate. Recently, as a token of their friendship, Senator Kennedy gave Tinker a framed photograph. It shows the three Kennedy brothers John, Bobby and Ted all standing together, smiling and young.

“It’s really something,” Tinker told us.

We feel that same way about you, Tinker. You’re really something.

On behalf of the Senators and staff, I want to say: We’re proud to have had the chance to work with you and to know you. You are a treasured member of our Senate family. You take with you our best wishes as you begin this next chapter of your life.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW
The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now stand in adjournment.

Thereupon, the Senate, at 5:32 p.m., adjourned until Wednesday, February 7, 2001, at 10 a.m.

NOMINATION
Executive nomination received by the Senate February 6, 2001:
FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY
JOE M. ALLBAUGH, OF TEXAS, TO BE DIRECTOR OF THE FEDERAL EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT AGENCY.

CONFIRMATION
Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate February 6, 2001:
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
ROBERT R. ZOELLICK, OF VIRGINIA, TO BE UNITED STATES TRADE REPRESENTATIVE, WITH THE RANK OF AMBASSADOR EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY.
INTRODUCTION OF THE MOUNT NEBO WILDERNESS BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT ACT

HON. JAMES V. HANSEN
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 6, 2001

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Mount Nebo Wilderness Boundary Adjustment Act.

The Mount Nebo Wilderness Area is located in the Uinta National Forest in Juab County, Utah. This is a very beautiful area, rich in biological diversity. Inside the Wilderness Area are streams teeming with Rainbow Trout, colonies of wildflowers during Spring and Summer, and beautiful mountain scenery. This area is also home to mule deer, elk, and moose. The Mount Nebo area undoubtedly deserves Wilderness protection.

Mount Nebo was designated a Wilderness Area in the Utah Wilderness Act of 1984, which I sponsored. However, during the legislative process, various oversights occurred because a map of the area was not adequately reviewed at the committee level. Errorneously included inside the boundaries were various preexisting developments to the water systems that have supplied clean water to Juab County since the late 1800s. These systems are in need of constant maintenance and care, and due to the restrictions on motorized vehicles in Wilderness Areas, it became very difficult—and sometimes impossible—to adequately maintain these facilities. In addition to these maintenance problems, the Wilderness Area includes a very small portion of private land that should not be inside the boundaries.

This bill will remedy this situation by adjusting the current boundary to exclude these water developments, and the small portion of private land. The boundary will then be modified to include an area of roadless Forest Service land to compensate for the boundary adjustment, resulting in a ten acre net-gain in the Wilderness Area. Thus, this bill results in a net gain of Wilderness acreage within the Mount Nebo Wilderness Area.

As this bill is non-controversial, I urge all of my colleagues to support the Mount Nebo Wilderness Boundary Adjustment Act.

STATEMENT BY CONGRESSMAN ALCEE L. HASTINGS IN TRIBUTE TO AND IN MEMORY OF MRS. EULA GANDY JOHN HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 6, 2001

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in order to express condolences for one of Florida’s best known and most respected civil rights activists who passed away earlier this month. I am deeply saddened by the loss of Mrs. Eula Gandy Johnson, a longtime personal friend and confidant, political supporter, and civil rights mentor.

Eula Gandy Johnson, well known to many as “Miss Eula,” started her pioneering leadership in civil rights in Statenville, Georgia. A short time after, she moved on to Fort Lauderdale where she then lived for 62 years, bringing with her strong beliefs and passion for politics. She was simply a bold woman, who through her many contributions to human dignity, became an educator, opening our minds to the endless possibilities of an educated community. She was an immense resource for the National Conference of Community and Justice, to which she served as a strong supporter. Additionally, she was quite a strong force behind aspects of racial desegregation and discrimination to the African American community in Broward County.

Miss Eula was a graceful lady who epitomized dignity and charm. She had a deep, abiding faith in God, being a Sunday School teacher at First Baptist Church in Piney Grove and always enlightened those with her words of inspiration. She was remembered as having a keen mind with a way of achieving her goals with a certain fearless attitude.

It is often said that everyone is expendable, no matter their greatness. Eula Gandy Johnson, for her greatness, for the unselfish contributions that she made to the African American community throughout Florida, to her friends, and to all those who had the privilege to know her, is uniquely irreplaceable.

RECOGNIZING CONSTITUENT SURVEY RESULTS FROM COLORADO

HON. BOB SCHAFFER
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 6, 2001

Mr. SCHAFFER. Mr. Speaker, today I speak about Colorado’s Fourth Congressional District and the opinions of my constituents concerning the direction their country is taking.

Four District Coloradans, more than two-to-one, oppose partial birth abortions and need for parental involvement; smaller classroom sizes; school funds not reaching the classroom; worried about drugs and violence in schools and the demand for more local control. While the answers are varied, the message is the same: Parents expect quality public education and deserve to get the most for their tax dollar.

Fourth District constituents are also concerned with a number of different tax issues. Last year I fought to repeal the death tax and marriage penalty taxes. Despite bipartisan support, Bill Clinton vetoed both these bills. Recently, I signed the National Taxpayer Protection Pledge promising to oppose all tax increases and continue opposing any efforts to spend Social Security funds on other government programs. Tax increases of any shape, size or form are wrong at a time when we have a budget surplus. My constituents expect me to balance the federal budget, provide needed tax relief, eliminate waste, and save Social Security. I believe Coloradans should keep more of their hard-earned money for themselves and their children’s futures, and I will continue to fight for this just cause.

As one of my constituents said, “P.S.—Thanks for asking.” The voice of the people is the cornerstone of our political system and I encourage constituents throughout the country to share their thoughts with their elected officials. As a public servant, I asked, and as always will listen and work for the betterment of Colorado and this great nation.

INTRODUCTION OF THE TAX RELIEF AND MARRIAGE PENALTY ELIMINATION ACT OF 2001

HON. SAM JOHNSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 6, 2001

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation that will provide substantial tax relief to all American taxpayers and entirely eliminate the marriage penalty.

The federal government taxes Americans too much. In fact, Washington is taxing our citizens at the highest rate ever during peacetime. This high level of over-taxation is helping to generate ever-larger surpluses. Not surprisingly, many Washington politicians want to use • This “bullet” symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.
these tax overcharges to increase the size and scope of the federal government. Like President Bush, I believe that a government with unlimited funds becomes a government with unlimited reach. Thus, he is correct when he states that the solution is stop taking this excess money from the people who earn it in the first place.

At the same time the federal government is taking more than its fair share from our hard working Americans, our federal tax laws have become so confusing as to make it tempting to manipulate individual behavior and increase our collective national wealth by taking more than its fair share from our hard earning workers.

Time and again, history has demonstrated that across-the-board tax relief has significant, positive economic benefits. Each time in the last century that tax rates were lowered, an economic boom followed. This was most recently demonstrated in the last 20 years. Under the leadership, the malaise and stagnation of the 1970s melted into the prosperity of the 1980s. And the economic growth of the 1980s provided the venture capital to seed the technology revolution of the 1990s.

The turning point of this remarkable economic transformation came on August 13, 1981, when President Reagan signed into law the largest tax relief bill in American history. The transformation came on August 13, 1981, when President Reagan signed into law the largest tax relief bill in American history. The second part of my bill will immediately eliminating the marriage penalty in our tax laws.

HONORING SENATOR ALAN CRANSTON OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 2001

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, today I remember an icon in California public service and a true role model for elected officials. Senator Alan Cranston embodied many attributes that symbolize his dedication and commitment to serving the constituents he represented.

Senator Cranston spent 32 years in public office, including twenty-four as a United States Senator and rose to become a powerful force in the Democratic Party. After founding the California Democratic Council and winning two terms as state Controller, Alan Cranston was elected to the United States Senate in 1968, where he served until his retirement in 1993. Always a defender of the less fortunate, Senator Cranston fought for citizens of all races, ethnicities and income brackets, firmly believing that part of the American Dream was equality and opportunity for all.


One of Senator Cranston’s most admirable causes was his passionate advocacy of arms control. He was a profound believer in the United Nations and joined with former Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev Foundation USA, dedicated to eliminating nuclear weapons.

On a personal note, Senator Cranston was a frequent visitor to my 34th Congressional district where he would attend receptions at the Whittier home of our mutual constituents Kauzo and Mary Miyashita in support of the California Democratic Party. That is where my husband Frank and I first met the Senator in the mid 1980’s.

Alan Cranston will be remembered as a superb mechanic of the political process and for standing up for his principles. He was the nation’s most devout public servants. His leadership should inspire us all and I am proud to celebrate his life and his causes.
 showcasing that, as a Senator, he has repeatedly used tactics to block and delay votes on qualified women and minorities nominated to the federal courts.

Senator Ashcroft’s divisive role in sabotaging the nomination of a well qualified African American, Judge Ronnie White, to the federal bench points to his disregard for judicial independence and his willingness to use ideological litmus tests in the judicial selection process. Ashcroft spearheaded the party-line vote to defeat Judge Ronnie White’s confirmation to a federal district court judgeship. He did this by misrepresenting Judge White’s record, labeling him pro-criminal because of his death penalty record even though White voted to uphold the death penalty over 70% of the time.

The Attorney General should have the temperament, objectivity and commitment to fairness necessary to carry the awesome responsibilities of Attorney General. Ashcroft’s fervent and long-term commitment to his extremist political beliefs call into question his ability to suppress those political beliefs and enforce the constitutional principles with which he so profoundly disagrees. This extremist ideology also raises questions about his objectivity. As a member of the Senate he made racially insensitive comments to Southern Partisan magazine that were divisive. Ashcroft applauded the magazine for its “heritage of doing that, of defending Southern part of this country, like Robert E. Lee, Stonewall Jackson, and Jefferson Davis.” Southern Partisan has printed articles stating that African Americans, Hispanics, Asians, and other immigrants have “no temperament for democracy, never had, [and] never will!” and that these groups have dissipated the nation’s “genetic race pool.”

He also demonstrated his racial insensitivity when, as a United States Senator from a state with over 500,000 African Americans, he gave the commencement address and received an honorary degree from Bob Jones University, a school known for its racist policies and anti-Catholic bigotry. Although Ashcroft has claimed that he did not know about the policies of the University, he has refused to return the degree. The credibility of his denial is called into question when as governor he declined to appoint a judge to a state judgeship who had made supportive comments of the University in a law review article.

We are communicating our opposition to Senator Ashcroft’s nomination to the University of Southern Partisan as a member of the Senate Judiciary Committee. We urge our membership to oppose vigorously this nomination. We join the multitude of organizations opposing this nomination.

EXPRESSING SYMPATHY FOR VICTIMS OF EARTHQUAKE IN INDIA ON JANUARY 26, 2001, AND SUPPORT FOR ONGOING AID EFFORTS

SPEECH OF HON. ROD R. BLAGOJEVICH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 31, 2001

Mr. BLAGOJEVICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my sympathy for the victims of the earthquake in Gujarat state in India, and I am proud to be a co-sponsor of this resolution, which demonstrates our commitment here in Congress to the victims of this tragedy.

Over the past few days, Americans have been confronted with images of the devastation in Western India. Of course, Americans of Indian descent have been concerned for their family and friends. But no American who saw the extent of the tragedy in Gujarat could be unmoved by the fate of the citizens of our sister democracy. Indians share a bond forged by shared values. And that bond has motivated Americans to ask their government to play an active role in assisting the victims of this earthquake.

Thankfully, the administration has been quick to respond. By Sunday morning, an assessment team from the United States Agency for International Development was on the ground in Gujarat, determining needs and offering immediate comfort to victims. Since that time, the United States has provided generators, water purification equipment, tents and food to assist the survivors. The United States is continuing to work with relief agencies to get more critical assistance into the crisis zone as soon as possible. My colleagues and I in the Caucus for India and Indo-Americans have been working with the administration to minimize any roadblocks which could prevent the delivery of assistance.

I commend the administration for their quick response. But we here in Congress must ensure that the immediate shock of this tragedy fades, our commitment to the victims does not fade along with it. Long after this earthquake passes from the headlines of American papers, we need to remember that people in Gujarat will be working to rebuild their homes, their businesses, and their lives. The leaders of our nation, the world’s oldest democracy, must never forget our bond with the people of India, the world’s largest democracy. I have written to the President and the Director of the United States Agency for International Development to urge them to show their commitment to assist India in the aftermath of this crisis. I will be working over the coming months to ensure that the United States provides what ever is necessary to ease the suffering of the victims of the Gujarat earthquake.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS MINUTEMAN MARCHING BAND

HON. JOHN W. OLVER
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 6, 2001

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the University of Massachusetts Minuteman Marching Band on its appearance in the 2001 Presidential Inaugural Parade. The Minuteman Marching Band was nominated by the Governor of Massachusetts and was selected by the Inaugural Committee to appear in the parade.

The Minuteman Marching Band has long been recognized for its excellence, receiving the prestigious Sudler Trophy in 1998. In addition, the band has a history of participation in Presidential inaugural festivities. The Minutemen marched in the 1981 Presidential Inaugural Parade and performed at the Inaugural Ceremonies in 1997.

The band, made up of 300 students, represents 16 states and over 90 Massachusetts communities. These talented students provide an invaluable service to the student body of UMass-Amherst, and to the citizens of the state of Massachusetts. They performed admirably in the 2001 Inaugural Parade, and everyone from the UMass community is proud of their achievement. I am pleased to recognize the band’s director, George Parks, and all the students in the band for their outstanding performance.

SUPPORT THE MONTGOMERY G.I. BILL IMPROVEMENTS ACT

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 6, 2001

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to join my colleague and fellow veteran, LANE EVANS, in reintroducing the Montgomery G.I. Bill Improvements Act. H.R. 1671 had the support of 160 of my colleagues in the 106th Congress, all of whom recognized, like our new Secretary of Veterans Affairs Anthony Principi, that improving the military’s primary education benefit, the Montgomery G.I. Bill, is wise policy for a number of reasons. It will reverse the military’s deteriorating ability to recruit the needed quantity and quality of soldiers; it provides veterans the tools necessary to reenter the workforce; and, it expands access to higher education to the young men and women in uniform.

In 1999, the Congressional Commission on Service Members and Veterans Transition Assistance, chaired by now Secretary of Veterans Affairs Anthony Principi, recommended overhauling and greatly improving the G.I. Bill. Our legislation is modeled on the Commission’s recommendation, and I am encouraged and hopeful that the new Administration will work with us to pass this important bill. Clearly, Sec. Principi’s appointment is a positive development.

America’s military supremacy has been unquestioned since the end of the Cold War. In the Gulf War, Bosnia, and Kosovo we proved that our armed forces set the world standard for excellence. While much of our battlefield success has to do with the superiority of our weapons systems, weapons are only as good as the people who operate them. Our success on the battlefield boils down to the quality and ability of our troops.

Today, Mr. Speaker, the military is having increasing difficulty recruiting the quantity and quality of troops it needs to meet today’s challenges. Recruiting shortfalls are a serious problem, and as statistics have grown worse, recruiting budgets have soared. In addition to new advertising campaigns, the services have resorted to gimmicks, including sponsoring drag racers, deploying psychedelic humvees, and offering emergency cash giveaways. I do not criticize the armed forces for these efforts, but they highlight the need for a greater, more effective recruiting tool.

The best recruiting tool is education, and we would best help our armed forces by modernizing the military’s primary education benefit, the Montgomery G.I. Bill.

The Department of Defense’s Youth Attitude Tracking Studies (YATS) confirm that fewer young men and women are considering serving. This shouldn’t come as a surprise. “Money for college” is the top reason young
men and women choose to serve. College costs have quadrupled in the last 20 years, but the G.I. Bill hasn’t. At the same time, more nonservice financial assistance has become available, which has benefited society but not the military.

Today’s G.I. Bill does not provide enough assistance to attract the number of high quality high school graduates the armed forces need, especially when considering the risks of service. Today’s military is fortunate to accept lower quality recruits. Statistics tell us that lower quality recruits, as measured by aptitude tests, have a much greater attrition rate. Troops that fail to make it through training or tests, have a much greater attrition rate.

The Montgomery GI Bill Improvements Act ensures that our all volunteer armed forces have the ability to attract quality recruits, and provides veterans with skills to better our economy and their lives. In exchange for four years of service, our legislation would provide service members a benefit covering the full cost of tuition, fees and books and provide a subsistence allowance. Those opting for a shorter enlistment or enrolled in the current subsistence allowance. Those opting for a shorter enlistment or enrolled in the current program would earn a basic benefit of $900/month. Our legislation is not inexpensive, but we must invest to stay the best. The young men and women who will benefit from this legislation will have to earn it through service to our country.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join us in standing up for our armed forces, servicemembers and veterans by supporting this much needed legislation.

HIGH-ACHIEVEMENT FOR SILVER GROVE HIGH SCHOOL

HON. KEN LUCAS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 6, 2001

Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Silver Grove High School. This is a success story about a local high poverty district that has overcome adversity and has become one of the models in education reform.

Silver Grove High School is one of eight schools to be recognized by Kentucky’s Commissioner of Education for its outstanding performance in Kentucky’s state testing program. Silver Grove High performed so well that it has become a model of the best Kentucky’s public schools have to offer.

I rise today to commend Silver Grove High School and all of the educators, staff and students of this fine educational institution. I ask you to join me in congratulating Silver Grove High School and the entire community of Silver Grove on their achievements.

TRIBUTE TO MAYOR AND MRS. BILL HEXT

HON. LARRY COMBEST
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 6, 2001

Mr. COMBEST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend Mayor Bill Hext and Jane Hext for their tremendous contributions to the city of Odessa, Texas. They were recently honored by being named “ Outstanding Citizen(s) of the Year” for 2000.

The “Outstanding Citizen of the Year” award was established some 44 years ago to recognize those who dedicate their time, talent and resources to improve the quality of life for the community. Mayor and Mrs. Hext are more than civil servants, but also leaders and role models.

Their commitment to public and community service and their adherence to family- and faith-based principles truly make them ideal for such an honor. Mayor Hext has been actively involved in such organizations as the Texas Municipal League, the MOTRAN policy advisory committee and Grace Christian Fellowship, serving in various leadership positions.

He was inducted into the Business Hall of Fame in 1995 in recognition of his entrepreneurial ventures in two successful businesses and served as a member of the City Council for two years. Last May Mayor Hext was elected mayor of Odessa with the focus to continue the successes and build upon new opportunities in education, health care and the economy.

Mrs. Hext has dedicated her time and talents over the years to the Ector County Independent School District schools, Meals on Wheels, the Boys and Girls Club of Odessa, and the Girls Scouts, Operation Blessing, and the Boys and Girls Club of Odessa. Mayor and Mrs. Hext went above and beyond the call to service when they established the Hext Family Foundation committed to providing resources to foster educational, medical and faith-based organizations in Odessa.

It is with great pride that I commend Mayor Bill Hext and Jane Hext for their active involvement and leadership in the community and congratulate them on being awarded the “Outstanding Citizen(s) of the Year.”

CELEBRATING THE CONTRIBUTIONS OF MRS. MARY COOK, CONGRESSIONAL LIAISON, V.A. REGIONAL OFFICE, DECATUR, GEORGIA

HON. MAC COLLINS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 6, 2001

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mrs. Mary Cook for her contributions to the veterans of the State of Georgia. Over the past 34 years, Mrs. Cook, who works in the V.A. Regional Office in Decatur, Georgia, has gone above and beyond the call of duty. She has always assisted my office and other legislative offices in providing courteous, expedient and judicial treatment of veterans in the Southeast area.

Mrs. Cook began her career in federal service in 1960 with the Federal Aviation Agency. In 1970, she came on board with the Veterans Administration, where she has remained for the last 30 years. In all our dealings Mrs. Cook has never allowed cases to languish in government red tape. She has always been very aggressive in pursuing these cases and making sure our office was kept informed of all developments.

She has taken on many special projects over the years, including serving as the VA Regional Office Women’s Veterans Coordinator from January 1993 to March 2000. As the WVC, Mrs. Cook interviewed, counseled and provided help to women veterans seeking specialized assistance. She also worked with the Women Veterans Committees at the Georgia VA Medical Centers to insure coordinated services and assistance were provided to women veterans.

Mr. Speaker, we often overlook the daily sacrifices and dedication of federal employees. Mrs. Cook is an example of a federal employee who not only takes pride in her work, but has a true dedication to the people she is charged with serving. As she retires from federal service and goes on to another phase of her life, please join me in congratulating her on a job well done and wishing her the very best in the future.

TRIBUTE TO RETIRING CARRIER EXECUTIVE T. HUME LAIDMAN

HON. JAMES T. WALSH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 6, 2001

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, today I want to congratulate a man from my New York’s 25th Congressional District whose distinguished career has contributed to the growth and prosperity of a major employer in Central New York. This month, Mr. T. Hume Laidman will retire from the Carrier Corporation division of United Technology after 44 dedicated years of service.

Since 1957, Mr. Laidman has served in five different divisions of Carrier, participating in the company’s growth from a largely domestic supplier to a truly global leader in its industry. Mr. Laidman has personally overseen the opening of manufacturing plants on five continents, and since 1997 as Vice President of Operations for Carrier Refrigeration, he has played a key role in establishing its refrigeration division, which has its worldwide headquarters in Syracuse, as a $3 billion operation.

Raised in Florida, Mr. Laidman spent summers as a youth visiting his godmother in Cazenovia, New York. After graduating from the University of Miami, Mr. Laidman decided to pursue his career and raise his family in Central New York. While his vocation frequently took him to various countries, Mr. Laidman still found time to volunteer locally for the ski patrol at Song Mountain for more than 40 years.

Mr. Laidman’s leadership at Carrier has contributed greatly to the organization’s success and to its ability to support a large employee base, community organizations and civic betterment. On behalf of the people of the 25th Congressional District, it is my honor to congratulate Mr. Laidman on his well-deserved retirement and to thank him for 44 years of service to Central New York. We wish him and his family the very best.
PROBLEMS FOR TEENS WHO WORK: WE NEED THE "YOUNG AMERICAN WORKERS BILL OF RIGHTS"

HON. TOM LANTOS
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 6, 2001

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, during the 106th Congress, over 60 Members of Congress joined me in support of comprehensive domestic child labor law reform which would protect our children in the workplace. This bipartisan legislation—entitled "The Young American Workers' Bill of Rights Act" (H.R. 2119 in the 106th Congress)—would assist both families and teenagers' struggling with the competing interests of holding a job while gaining an education. The legislation will also reduce the incidence of injuries and deaths of minors at the workplace. I look forward to reintroducing this important bill early in the 107th Congress.

As we continue our efforts to combat the injustice of international child labor, we must not forget our own children here. The exploitation of child labor is unfortunately a thing of the past in our country. It has become a growing problem. This debate continues to jeopardize the health, education, development and lives of many of our children.

People often associate the evils of child labor only with Third World countries. But American teenagers are also negatively impacted by exploitation on the job. Our economy has changed considerably since the days when teenagers held after school jobs at a "Mom and Pop" corner drug store or soda fountain. In today's low unemployment economy, teenagers are hired to work part-time to fill-in or to hold jobs previously held by adults in full-time positions. Many high-school students are working 30 and even 40 hours a week, and often they are working well past midnight on school nights. Research shows that long hours on the job take away time needed for schoolwork and family responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, studies have shown that the majority of children and teenagers who hold jobs in the United States are not working to support their families, but rather are employed to earn extra spending money. Employment is important in teaching young people the value of work, and I see nothing wrong with minors working to earn extra spending money. I think it is a serious problem, however, when teenagers work more hours for spending money than they spend working for their education. It is important to children to learn the value of work, but a solid education, not after school jobs, are the key to a successful future. We need to set sensible limits on the hours that minors are permitted to work during the school year so that our children can focus on their primary job—earning a good education.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an article which appeared in the New York Times recently entitled "Problems Seen For Teenagers Who Hold Jobs" which was written by Steven Greenhouse. The article discusses the pervasive problems many teenagers face when they hold a job during the school year. According to the article, a study of the National Academy of Sciences found that when teenagers work more than 20 hours a week, it often leads to lower grades, higher alcohol use and too little time with parents and families.

Mr. Speaker, I will place the entire text of this article in the Record, but I would like to call special attention to a couple of paragraphs that are particularly indicative of the problems we face:

"One recent Friday, Alicia, a waitress at a senior at Governor Livingston Regional High School in Berkeley Heights, N.J., acknowledged that she had cut back on her hours and work in a grueling week. Alicia, who works at the Short Hills Mall, had missed one day of school during the week and arrived late to school on the other day. The reason that she was that she had to work past midnight on Tuesday and Thursday, and that after she worked from 10:30 a.m. until 12:30 a.m. on Saturday and Sunday. "It's fun, and I get a lot of money—I made $240 on Saturday alone," she said, noting that she sometimes earns $40 in tips in an hour when her shifts are packed. "Because of work, I only go into school late or I stay home because I'm too tired." "I can't do both," one of Alicia's teachers said. "She's tired when she comes into school, and by sixth period she's too tired to work on problems in class. I've talked to Alicia about how she's going to help her in school, and she says, 'I'm making a lot of money, Mrs. Tonto.'"

Mr. Speaker, it is clear to me from reading these excerpts and from reviewing a recent study by the National Academy of Sciences, that it is time for us to carefully weigh the benefits of children working against the costs that too much work can take on a child's academic performance and healthy development. At what point does the desire to earn extra spending money negatively affect the ability of a child to perform to her or his learning potential at school? According to Steven Greenhouse, 16- and 17-year-old workers are working 40 hours a week on top of 30 hours in the classroom and in many cases education is taking a back seat to a job.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the entire article "Problems Seen For Teenagers Who Hold Jobs" be placed in the Record. I urge my colleagues to read this article and to join me in opposing the "Young American Workers' Bill of Rights Act." We must ensure that the job opportunities available to our youth are meaningful, safe, and healthy, and our bill will encourage—not discourage—their healthy development and will give them the tools to help prepare them for a productive adult life.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 29, 2001]

PROBLEMS SEEN FOR TEENAGERS WHO HOLD JOBS

(By Steven Greenhouse)

Some weekdays, Alicia Gunther, 17, works past midnight as a waitress at a New Jersey McDonald's restaurant. But she recently admitted that her work often hurts her grades and causes her to sleep through first period.

Jason Ferry, a high school junior, loves working 30 hours a week as a cashier at a Connecticut supermarket, but he acknowledges that when he gets home from work at 9:30 p.m. he usually does not have enough time to study for big tests.

For decades, the conventional wisdom has been that it is great for teenagers like these to have a job. They earn money and are responsible for the money they earn. They learn responsibility, provide pocket money and keep the teenagers out of trouble.

But in a nation where more than five million teenagers under 18 work, a growing body of research is challenging the conventional wisdom and concluding that working long hours can undermine teenagers' education and overall development. In the most important study, two arms of the National Academy of Sciences and the National Research Council and the Institute of Medicine—found that when teenagers work more than 20 hours a week, the work often leads to lower grades, more and too little time with their parents and families.

Influenced by such studies, lawmakers in California, Massachusetts, and other states have pushed in recent years to tighten laws regulating how many hours teenagers can work and how late they can work. Massachusetts lawmakers are seeking to limit the maximum amount of time 16-year-olds and 17-year-olds can work to reduce the number of hours teenagers can work. "Somehow there is pressure against the bill from em-

In 1998, Connecticut lawmakers reduced the maximum number of hours 16-year-olds and 17-year-olds can work. A number of other states also have warm memories of their own first jobs in full-time positions. Many high-school students are working 30 and even 40 hours a week, and often they are working well past midnight on school nights. Research shows that long hours on the job take away time needed for schoolwork and family responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, studies have shown that the majority of children and teenagers who hold jobs in the United States are not working to support their families, but rather are employed to earn extra spending money. Employment is important in teaching young people the value of work, and I see nothing wrong with minors working to earn extra spending money. I think it is a serious problem, however, when teenagers work more hours for spending money than they spend working for their education. It is important to children to learn the value of work, but a solid education, not after school jobs, are the key to a successful future. We need to set sensible limits on the hours that minors are permitted to work during the school year so that our children can focus on their primary job—earning a good education.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to an article which appeared in the New York Times recently entitled "Problems Seen For Teenagers Who Hold Jobs" which was written by Steven Greenhouse. The article discusses the pervasive problems many teenagers face when they hold a job during the school year. According to the article, a study of the National Academy of Sciences found that when teenagers work more than 20 hours a week, it often leads to lower grades, higher alcohol use and too little time with parents and families.

Mr. Speaker, I will place the entire text of this article in the Record, but I would like to call special attention to a couple of paragraphs that are particularly indicative of the problems we face:

"One recent Friday, Alicia, a senior at Governor Livingston Regional High School in Berkeley Heights, N.J., acknowledged that she had cut back on her hours and work in a grueling week. Alicia, who works at Johnny Rockets, a 1950's-style diner at the Short Hills Mall, had missed one day of school during the week and arrived late to school on the other day. The reason that she was that she had to work past midnight on Tuesday and Thursday, and that after she worked from 10:30 a.m. until 12:30 a.m. on Saturday and Sunday. "It's fun, and I get a lot of money—I made $240 on Saturday alone," she said, noting that she sometimes earns $40 in tips in an hour when her shifts are packed. "Because of work, I only go into school late or I stay home because I'm too tired." "I can't do both," one of Alicia's teachers said. "She's tired when she comes into school, and by sixth period she's too tired to work on problems in class. I've talked to Alicia about how she's going to help her in school, and she says, 'I'm making a lot of money, Mrs. Tonto.'"

Mr. Speaker, it is clear to me from reading these excerpts and from reviewing a recent study by the National Academy of Sciences, that it is time for us to carefully weigh the benefits of children working against the costs that too much work can take on a child's academic performance and healthy development. At what point does the desire to earn extra spending money negatively affect the ability of a child to perform to her or his learning potential at school? According to Steven Greenhouse, 16- and 17-year-old workers are working 40 hours a week on top of 30 hours in the classroom and in many cases education is taking a back seat to a job.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the entire article "Problems Seen For Teenagers Who Hold Jobs" be placed in the Record. I urge my colleagues to read this article and to join me in opposing the "Young American Workers' Bill of Rights Act." We must ensure that the job opportunities available to our youth are meaningful, safe, and healthy, and our bill will encourage—not discourage—their healthy development and will give them the tools to help prepare them for a productive adult life.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 29, 2001]

PROBLEMS SEEN FOR TEENAGERS WHO HOLD JOBS

(By Steven Greenhouse)

Some weekdays, Alicia Gunther, 17, works past midnight as a waitress at a New Jersey McDonald's restaurant. But she recently admitted that her work often hurts her grades and causes her to sleep through first period.

Jason Ferry, a high school junior, loves working 30 hours a week as a cashier at a Connecticut supermarket, but he acknowledges that when he gets home from work at 9:30 p.m. he usually does not have enough time to study for big tests.

For decades, the conventional wisdom has been that it is great for teenagers like these to have a job. They earn money and are responsible for the money they earn. They learn responsibility, provide pocket money and keep the teenagers out of trouble.
school, but probably not such a good idea for them to work more than 20 hours,” said Lau-
rence Steinberg, a professor of psychology at Temple University. “That’s when we and other experts start find decreased academic performance and decreased engagement in school.”

But, many child development experts, teachers and parents said working a modest amount could be valuable for teenagers, teaching responsibility and how to work with others, contributing money to financially strapped households.

“It’s a positive thing,” said Ted Simonelli, a guidance counselor at Linden High School in New Jersey, “but once they’re learning to be responsible for their time, they’re learning to be good employees, they’re learning a skill that they can trade on when they graduate. Many of the students in the top half of our class work after school.”

For teenagers in poor city neighborhoods, several studies have found, a job can be especially beneficial because it fosters discipline and provides needed role models.

Supporters of teenage work point to success stories such as Alicia, a 16-year-old from Hartford, Conn., who took a job at an after-school child care center because it would help with the costs. “When she started, she had 20 hours a week pumping gas when his grades were suffering, that it was unwise to work 30 hours a week, large-
ly to pay for his car and gasoline. “The car will get you around to some degree,” he said, “but what’s going to get you beyond Southington High?” she said.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION
HON. RUBE´N HINOJOSA
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 6, 2001

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, on January 31, 2001 I was in my Congressional District and missed two yea and nay votes and one recorded vote. Had I been present I would have voted as follows:

Roll No. 6, H. Con. Res. 14, permitting the use of the rotonda of the Capitol for a cere-
mony as part of the commemoration of the days of remembrance of victims of the Holo-
cast, “yea”.

Roll No. 7, H. Con. Res. 15, expressing sympathy for the victims of the devastating earthquake that struck India on January 26, 2001, and support for ongoing aid efforts, “yea”.

Roll No. 8, Speaker’s approval of the Jour-
nal of Tuesday, January 30, “aye”.

A TRIBUTE TO STEPHEN J. HAWKINS

HON. CALVIN M. DOOLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 6, 2001

Mr. DOOLEY of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Stephen J. Hawkins, who is retiring from the city of Fresno after more than thirty-five years of service to the United States Postal Service.

Mr. Hawkins arrived in Fresno after a suc-
cessful career with the Postal Service in San Francisco, San Diego, and Los Angeles. Mr. Hawkins has served the Fresno community in numerous ways.

As the city of Fresno has grown exponenti-
ally over the past few years, Mr. Hawkins was instrumental in increasing the number of postal stations in Fresno.

Mr. Hawkins’ dedication to public service ex-
tends beyond his professional life. He was the chairman of the Fresno/Madera County Com-

dined Federal Campaign from 1994 through 1999 and helped raise more than five hundred thousand dollars for local charities.

Mr. Hawkins has been a leader in commu-

nity organizations, having served on the Board of Directors of Fresno United Way and Presi-
dent of the Federal Executive Association.

He has also encouraged postal employees to volunteer and contribute to the community to such events as the Juvenile Diabetes Walk and the American Cancer Society Run.

Mr. Hawkins has helped raise public awareness of commemorative stamps honors worth causes and notable Americans, including the breast cancer awareness stamp,
the stamp honoring those who serve, the hospice stamp, and the adoption stamp.

Mr. Hawkins has been active in Fresno’s civic life, working with the Sister Cities Organization and making a presentation and tour of the Fresno postal facilities to Fresno’s sister city in China.

In recognition of Mr. Hawkins’ outstanding communications and community outreach, he was awarded with the Postal Service’s prestigious Benjamin Award for four years in a row.

Mr. Speaker, please join me in congratulating Stephen J. Hawkins on his retirement and in wishing him continued success in the future.

LEADERSHIP WILKES-BARRE CELEBRATES 20TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. PAUL E. KANJORSKI
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 6, 2001

Mr. KANJORSKI. Mr. Speaker, today I honor Leadership Wilkes-Barre on the occasion of its 20th anniversary. The mission of this distinguished organization is to develop informed and committed leaders from all segments of the community who will serve, strengthen and improve Northeastern Pennsylvania, and it is doing exactly that.

Leadership Wilkes-Barre began in 1981, when then-Chamber of Commerce Director John Sheehan proposed the idea to community leaders Tom Bigler, John Conyngham, Ed Schechter and the late Tom Kiley, who together formed the steering committee.

The inaugural class of 20 graduated in June 1982. Since then, the program has grown and now has 648 graduates, with a depth of experience and a diversity of backgrounds from India and Iran to Clark’s Summit and Shickshinny. The graduates of Leadership Wilkes-Barre are putting their skills to work on hundreds of community projects and volunteer boards throughout the region and the state.

Since its founding, the organization has expanded by adding the Junior Leadership Wilkes-Barre program for high school students in 1986 and the Intercolligate Leadership Wilkes-Barre program in 1987. The Intercolligate program serves students from College Misericordia, Keystone College, King’s College, Luzerne County Community College, Penn State Wilkes-Barre and Wilkes University.

In 1999, the organization developed Masters Leadership Wilkes-Barre, designed to give retired and semi-retired members of the community a chance to become more involved in community service. Over the 20 years of Leadership Wilkes-Barre’s existence, there have been 2,013 participants in its programs.

Mr. Speaker, the driving force behind this record of accomplishment and service is Executive Director Sue Kluger, a founding board member who has led the organization since 1983. I am pleased to call her hard work and the many achievements of Leadership Wilkes-Barre to the attention of the House of Representatives, and I wish her and the fine organization she leads many more years of success.

RECOGNIZING THE MASSACHUSETTS DIVISION I STATE CHAMPIONS—LUDLOW HIGH SCHOOL BOYS SOCCER TEAM

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL
OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 6, 2001

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the accomplishments of the 2000 Ludlow High School boys soccer team. This past season the Ludlow boys team compiled a record of 19–0–3 en route to earning the Smith Division League Championship, the Western Massachusetts Division I Championship, and the Massachusetts Division I State Championship. Their efforts enabled them to earn a top five ranking nationally.

Not only did the boys team finish the season undefeated, but their 2000 campaign marked the first time in Massachusetts history that a boys soccer team won four consecutive Western Massachusetts Division I titles. Also, the Lions have won back to back State titles, the first time this has been done in Massachusetts in 35 years. Ludlow High School has a fine and proud tradition in boys soccer play. The school has earned thirteen State titles and twenty-six Western Massachusetts championships.

At the Lions’ coaching helm was Tony Goncalves. He and his staff have fine tuned their team’s athletic skill and have instilled poise, discipline, and sportsmanship into their players. Coach Goncalves and his staff have certainly earned their reputation as one of the finest coaching staffs in all of New England. I would also like to note that included in this year’s team are seven players that were named to the All-Western Massachusetts squad, three players named to the All-State team, and two players receiving All-New England honors.

Mr. Speaker, allow me to recognize here the players, coaches, and managers of the 2000 Ludlow High School boys soccer team. The seniors are: Helder Pires, Jay Devlin, Mike Pio, Joey Jorge, Ray Cheria, Brian Cochenour, Tim Romansky, Paulo Dias, Dennis Carvalho, Paulo Martins, Steve Jorge, Manny Goncalves, and Chris Chelo. Juniors include: Joe Shanley, Seth Falconer, Kevin Keough, and Sebastian Priest. The Sophomores are: Kevin Chelo, Sven Pfefferkorn, Michael Lima, Tyler Severyn, Josh Nagiewicz, Casey Siock, and Corey Mange. The Head Coach is Tony Goncalves. Assistant Coaches are Jack Vilaca, Greg Kolodziey, and Dan Pires. Team managers are Sarah Russell, Jill Dube, and Jenn Russell.

Mr. Speaker, once again, allow me to send my congratulations to the Ludlow High School boys soccer team on their outstanding season. I wish them the best of luck in the 2001 season.

EXPRESSING SYMPATHY FOR VICTIMS OF EARTHQUAKE IN INDIA

ON JANUARY 26, 2001, AND SUPPORT FOR ONGOING AID EFFORTS

SPEECH OF
HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS
OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 31, 2001

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it saddens me greatly to have to introduce this resolution along with my colleagues, our effort to support the victims of the catastrophic earthquake that struck India on January 26, 2001, on the very day the people of India were to celebrate the anniversary of their first constitution as an independent people.

On January 26, the people of Gujarat in western India were hit with an earthquake the size and devastation of that which hit San Francisco in 1906 killing more than 30,000.

As a fellow democracy we must provide the people of India immediate relief, economic assistance and the reconstruction efforts needed to rebuild the lives and the state of Gujarat.

I have had the pleasure of visiting India on a number of occasions and have established a candid and sincere relationship with the Indian community, both in my congressional district in Florida and abroad.

Several governments have taken action and are providing assistance to the people of India in determining what needs are to be met during this critical time of despair. Notably, the government and people of Pakistan have been quick to send aid and much needed supplies. I am hopeful that their friendship will continue far beyond this difficult period. Moreover, I believe it is America’s duty to lend a helping hand to our great neighbors.

India and its people need us and it is our duty to expedite immediate assistance in reconstructing their lives and concretely showing our continued friendship and support.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. MARY BONO
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 6, 2001

Mrs. BONO. Mr. Speaker, I was necessarily absent for all legislative business during the week of January 29, 2001 through February 2, 2001, due to a medical condition. As a result, I missed the following votes: On Tuesday, January 30, 2001—question “On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, as Amended” (Roll No. 5) for issue H.R. 93—Federal Firefighters Retirement Age Fairness Act. On Wednesday, January 31, 2001—question “On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Agree” (Roll No. 6) for issue H. Con. Res. 14—Permitting the Use of the Rotunda of the Capitol for a Ceremony as part of the Commemoration of the Days of Remembrance of Victims of the Holocaust, question “On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Agree” (Roll No. 7) for issue H. Con. Res. 15—Expressing Sympathy for the Victims of the Devastating Earthquake that Struck India, and question “On Approving the Journal” (Roll No. 8) for issue Journal. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” for
the question “On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Pass, as Amended” for the issue H.R. 93 (Roll No. 5), “yea” for the question “On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Agree” for the issue H. Con. Res. 14 (Roll No. 6), “yea” for the question “On Motion to Suspend the Rules and Agree” for the issue H. Con. Res. 15 (Roll No. 7), and “yea” for the question “On Approving the Journal” (Roll No. 8) for the issue Journal.

REINTRODUCTION OF THE NAMING OF THE GARDNER C. GRANT POST OFFICE BUILDING

HON. JOHN ELIAS BALDACCI
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 6, 2001

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Speaker, today I re-introduce legislation to rename the Post Office in Cherryfield, Maine after the town’s long-time Postmaster, Gardner C. Grant.

In rural Maine, as in rural areas all across the country, the Post Office is more than just a place to get your mail, and the Postmaster is more than just an employee. The Post Office is a gathering place, where neighbors catch up and exchange information. The Postmaster is part of the community, sharing news and helping everyone.

Gardner Grant served as Postmaster in Cherryfield for a remarkable 27 years. He also has been an active part of the community, serving as a Selectman, Academy Trustee, Planning Board member and an assessor. Gardner and his family—his wife Virginia and their two sons—are part of the very fabric of this Down East Maine town.

Gardner’s service has earned him the admiration and respect of the people of Cherryfield. To honor him, I have been asked to submit this legislation to designate the Gardner C. Grant Post Office Building. I am proud to do so. Gardner Grant has served Cherryfield with distinction, and I agree that naming the Post Office in his honor would be a fitting tribute. I look forward to working with my colleagues to pass this legislation into law.

100TH ANNIVERSARY OF ANSON IMPLEMENT, CO., OF HIGGINSVILLE, MO

HON. IKE SKELTON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 6, 2001

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, let me take this means to congratulate the Anson family and my friends at Anson Implement, Co., of Higginsville, Missouri, who recently celebrated the company’s 100th anniversary as a John Deere dealership.

The Anson family has contributed to the betterment of Lafayette County, MO, since they migrated from Kentucky and Tennessee in the 1830s. Born Moses Anson and later named “Mode”, the great grandfather of current owner Joe Anson cherished all aspects of farming. Mode recognized the need for a country store that would benefit those who worked on farms and other businesses in rural Missouri. In 1897, he opened a lumber, hardware, and building materials business in Aullville, MO, to assist these individuals. Four years later, in 1901, the Anson family, still committed to farming, opened a John Deere dealership that moved to Higginsville, MO, in 1917.

Through the years, Anson Implement, Co., has become an important part of the history of Higginsville. Established by Mode Anson, the implement dealership eventually passed into the hands of his son, Leslie Anson, then to his son, M.L. Anson. Both Leslie and M.L. worked in and learned the family business from a young age. In 1979, current co-owner Joe Anson began operating the implement company after attending Westminster College and working for six years at the Kansas City John Deere branch.

Indeed, through their commitments to farming, to their community, and to their country, four generations of Ansons have positively impacted the lives of many rural Missourians. As the residents of Lafayette County share in Anson Implement’s 100th anniversary, I am certain that all Members of the House will join me in paying tribute to this establishment and to the Anson family, Mary Lou Anson, Joe Anson, Jill Sutherland, Jan Weycker, and Jenny Gockel.

RECOGNIZING FREDDIE TIDWELL FOR HIS MANY YEARS OF SERVICE TO CRAWFORD COUNTY, GEORGIA

HON. SABY CHAMBLISS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 6, 2001

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize a distinguished gentleman from Georgia’s 8th District who has recently passed away, Freddie J. Tidwell.

Mr. Tidwell served four terms as Crawford County Commissioner and worked relentlessly to bring millions of dollars to Crawford County, Georgia. Additionally, he served Crawford County as Judge of Small Claims Court for 12 years, served in the U.S. Navy as an advisor to the South Korean Army during the Korean Conflict, and served as a Georgia State Representative.

Mr. Tidwell made a career of serving people, and we all know this world needs more people who are willing to put selfishness aside and dedicate themselves to serving their community and their country. As a Member of Congress from Georgia, I am fortunate to have known Mr. Tidwell and had many opportunities to work with him on issues facing both Crawford County and the state of Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, Georgia continues to be home to incredible leaders and public servants. Mr. Tidwell was one of those people. He was an outstanding American, and it is an honor to have known him.

SAN ANTONIO MOURNS THE LOSS OF POLICE OFFICER JOHN ANTHONY RIOJAS

HON. CIRO D. RODRIGUEZ
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 6, 2001

Mr. RODRIGUEZ. Mr. Speaker, today the San Antonio community mourns the loss of one of its young police officers, John Anthony Riojas. As his community grieves this week, not only should this officer’s story be remembered, but so should the story of every law enforcement officer who takes risks daily to protect us.

This past Friday, Officer Fiojas, a member of the Street Crimes Arrest Team unit and eleven-year veteran of the San Antonio Police force, was mortally shot while on duty. He was one of nine officers participating in an operation to stop a rash of property crimes plaguing an apartment complex. At the time of his fatal injury he was attempting to apprehend an individual on foot. He overlooked the suspect, who reportedly shot the young officer with his own weapon.

Sadly, John Riojas, known to his friends as “Rocky,” joins 42 other San Antonio police officers killed in the line of duty and is the fourth death of an officer in the past 45 days. We in this great House of Representatives join his family, fellow officers and many friends in mourning this tragic loss.

This 37-year old father of two was seen as a man who was tying to make the community a better place by those who worked with him. Officer Riojas graduated in 1982 from St. Gerard’s Catholic High School in San Antonio. A star football player, his friends recall Riojas’ excitement upon entering the police force because he wanted to make a difference.

Our condolences go out to his widow, two young children, and his entire family. His children, a two-year old daughter and a son of only eight weeks, have lost their father. Hopefully, they will always know his devotion and sacrifice on behalf of his community. All too often, we forget that our sense of safety is rooted in the work of law enforcement officers like John Riojas. His service and devotion to his family, community exemplify the best in our society. May his children and family always see the work he did in their community and be proud of the example he set.

INTRODUCTION OF VETERANS RESOLUTION

HON. JOHN ELIAS BALDACCI
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 6, 2001

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Speaker, today I offer a resolution regarding some of the neediest and most deserving citizens of our country: elderly veterans. I was pleased to support efforts in the 106th Congress to make long-term care for our veterans a priority, but more remains to be done. My resolution calls for additional resources to be directed towards addressing Alzheimer’s in the veteran population.

Alzheimer’s, a degenerative brain disease, gradually causes a person to forget recent
events or familiar tasks. Attempts to perform basic daily functions can turn into dangerous situations, and the disease eventually forces the afflicted to become totally dependent on others.

Dementia, an umbrella term used to describe the loss of cognitive or intellectual function, is commonly associated with Alzheimer’s. Caused by a number of diseases, dementia refers to memory loss, having difficulty making use of simple words, and poor or decreased judgment. In addition, dementia creates problems with abstract thinking and can result in personality changes.

Veterans are widely affected by dementia in general and Alzheimer’s specifically. Nearly 8 million, 37% of the total veterans population, suffer from dementia caused by Alzheimer’s. Due to the severity of this condition, and the inability of those afflicted to care for themselves, specialized care is needed.

Currently the Veterans Alzheimer’s/Dementia Program includes both inpatient and outpatient clinics. Ranging from short-term behavioral stabilization to long-term comfort and supportive care, these clinics are designed to treat patients while research is conducted on their condition and treatment. However, with an aging population and corresponding rise in dementia cases, the resources of our veterans nursing homes are being strained. Currently there are a very small number of facilities dedicated to treating patients with Alzheimer’s.

In addition, the traditional nursing home model does not provide the most effective method of treatment.

While Alzheimer’s remains incurable, progress is being made. Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) researchers have discovered a genetic association to the development of Alzheimer’s and they continue to pioneer dementia research. However, there are still only three FDA-approved drugs that may temporally relieve some symptoms of the disease. Clearly, more dedicated research should be encouraged.

Research and treatment provided through dementia-specific nursing homes will enhance the development of appropriate care options. To encourage such homes to be leased and constructed, the Veterans of Foreign Wars has urged the VA to establish a demonstration project for this purpose. I am pleased to support the VFW’s Resolution 639 by offering this resolution today. I urge our colleagues to join me in support of this effort.

TRIBUTE TO RETIRING MAYOR OF CROCKER, MO, THE HONORABLE NORMA LEA MIHALEVICH

HON. IKE SKELTON
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 6, 2001

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that a remarkable public servant, the Honorable Norma Lea Mihalevich, Mayor of Crocker, MO, will retire from her post on April 7, 2001.

A graduate of Waynesville High School and the Missouri State Teachers College, Norma Lea Mihalevich has dedicated her life to public service. For the past 23 years, she has diligently served the citizens of Crocker, MO, as their mayor. During her tenure in office, she has always unselfishly devoted her time and energy to the betterment of her community.

In addition to her service as mayor, Mrs. Mihalevich has been a member of the Crocker R-2 Board of Education, first being elected in 1952. During her time on the School Board, she served on the Board of Directors of the Missouri School Boards Association, receiving their 1998 “Recognition of Commitment” award. Additionally, in 1986, she was recognized as a “Pioneer in Education” by the Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education.

Mrs. Mihalevich, a member of the Crocker Baptist Church for 59 years, has also worked for community betterment by serving as a member of the Pulaski County Hospital Board, the Pulaski County Health Department Home Health Agency, and the Pulaski Board for the Handicapped.

Norma Lea Mihalevich is truly a role model for young public servants. As she prepares for quieter times with her husband, Dr. John Mihalevich, I am certain that all Members of the House will join me in tribute to Mrs. Mihalevich’s outstanding commitment to public service.

PRIME RECRUITING GROUND FOR ACADEMIES

HON. RODNEY P. FREILINGHUYSEN
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 6, 2001

Mr. FREILINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, every year, more high school seniors from the 11th Congressional District trade in their varsity jackets for Navy peacoats, Air Force flight suits, and Army brass buckles than any other district in the county. But this is nothing new—our area has repeatedly sent an above-average proportion of its sons and daughters to the Nation’s military academies for decades.

This shouldn’t come as a surprise. The educational excellence of our area is well known and has long been a magnet for families looking for the best environment in which to raise their children. Our graduates are skilled not only in mathematics, science, and social studies, but also have solid backgrounds in sports, debate teams, and other extracurricular activities. This diverse upbringing makes military academy recruiters sit up and take note—in deed, many recruiters know our towns and schools by name.

Since the 1830’s, Members of Congress have enjoyed meeting, talking with, and nominating these superb young people to our military academies. But how did this process evolve?

In 1843, when West Point was the sole academy, Congress ratified the nominating process and became directly involved in the makeup of our military’s leadership. This was not an act of an imperial Congress bent on controlling every aspect of the Government. Rather, the procedure still used today is, one further check and balance in our democracy. It was originally designed to weaken and divide political coloration in the officer corps, provide geographical balance to our armed services, and to the continued excellence of education in our area—many are veterans. Though from diverse backgrounds and professions, they all share a common dedication to being the best qualified and motivated graduates attend our academies. And, as is true for most volunteer panels, their service goes largely unnoticed.

I would like to take a moment to recognize these men and women and to thank them publicly for participating in this important panel. Being on the board requires hard work and an objective mind. Members have the responsibility of interviewing upwards of 50 outstanding high school seniors every year in the academy review process.

The nomination process follows a general timetable. High school seniors mail personal information directly to the Military Academy, the Naval Academy, the Air Force Academy, and the Merchant Marine Academy once they become interested in attending. Information includes academic achievement, college entry test scores, and other activities. At this time, they also inform their Representative of their desire to be nominated.

The academies then assess the applicants, rank them based on the data supplied, and return the files to my office with their notations. In mid-December, our Academy Review Board interviews all of the applicants over the course of 2 days. They assess a student’s qualifications and analyze character, desire to serve, and other talents that may be hidden on paper.

Last year, the board interviewed over 30 applicants. Nominations included 10 to the Naval Academy, 7 to the Military Academy, 4 to the Air Force Academy, and 5 to the Merchant Marine Academy—the Coast Guard Academy does not use the Congressional nomination process. The Board then forwards their recommendations to the academies by January 31, where recruiters review files and notify applicants and my office of their final decisions on admission.

It is both reassuring and rewarding to know that many of our military officers hail from our hometowns or close by. When we consider the role of these officers in our democracy, we can rest easier knowing that the best and brightest are in command. Wherever they are sent, be that Bosnia, Somalia, Haiti or the Persian Gulf, many of these officers have academy training.

And while a few people may question the motivations and ambitions of some young people, the academy review process shows that the large majority of our graduates are just as highly motivated as the guidance from loving parents, dedicated teachers and schools, and from trusted clergy and rabbis. Indeed, every time I visit a school, speak at a college, or meet a young academy nominee, I am constantly reminded that we as a nation are blessed with fine young men and women.
Americans today are less involved in their communities than they once were, it’s vital that we encourage and support the kind of selfless contributions this young citizen is making. As a former director of a youth leadership program myself, I know what an incredible difference these programs make in our community. Volunteers like Lanna are inspiring examples for us, and are among our brightest hopes for a better tomorrow.

I heartily applaud Lanna Walsh for making San Diego a better place to live, and for the positive impact she is making on the lives of others. She has demonstrated a level of commitment and accomplishment that is truly extraordinary in today’s world, and deserves our sincere admiration and respect. Her actions show that young Americans can, and do, play important roles in our communities, and that we as citizens have come to rely on them to hold tremendous promise for the future.

**INTRODUCED LEGISLATION THAT WILL IMPROVE VETERAN’S HEALTHCARE**

**HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR.**

**OF TENNESSEE**

**IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

Tuesday, February 6, 2001

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill that will improve veterans healthcare.

I speak with veterans in the Second District of Tennessee on a regular basis, and I have heard time and time again of their frustration with scheduling an appointment at a Veterans Administration Clinic. Many times, people have to wait weeks and months just to see a doctor. Mr. Speaker, this is not fair, and it is not right. Those who have laid their lives on the line for America deserve the utmost respect and assistance. They should not have to wait weeks and even months to be treated for a health problem.

When our Nation’s veterans signed up to serve in the military, they were promised that they would be taken care of when they retired. We have a responsibility to live up to that promise, and to provide veterans with good healthcare.

Under this legislation, if a veteran tried to get a doctor’s appointment at a Veterans’ Clinic and had to wait longer than six months, the VA would be required to provide healthcare outside of the VA Clinics.

I am sure all veterans would agree that something needs to be done to improve their access to healthcare at Veterans’ Clinics, and I am hopeful that this bill will be a step in the right direction.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill and improve healthcare for the loyal and committed veterans of our Nation.

**WOMT CELEBRATES 75 YEARS OF BROADCASTING**

**HON. THOMAS E. PETRI**

**OF WISCONSIN**

**IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

Tuesday, February 6, 2001

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I want to salute and congratulate WOMT Radio in Manitowoc, Wisconsin, as it celebrates 75 years of community-based programming. Over its proud 75 year history, WOMT has been a force for good in Manitowoc and the surrounding area.

WOMT has provided hours of listening pleasure to lakewide residents over the years as we drive to work, pick up the kids from school, run our errands on the weekend, or tune in to catch a high school game. I again want to congratulate all the people at WOMT, including longtime owner Don Seehafer, for their dedication and commitment to making our lives a little more enjoyable. Congratulations, WOMT, on your first 75 years and we look forward to at least 75 more.

**EXPRESSING SYMPATHY FOR VICTIMS OF EARTHQUAKE IN INDIA**

**HON. E. CLAY SHAW, JR.**

**OF FLORIDA**

**IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

Wednesday, January 31, 2001

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my deepest sympathy for the victims of the earthquake that recently struck the state of Gujarat in western India.

I am hopeful that this bill will be a step in the right direction.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate and honor a California student from my district who has been a leader in the community. Lanna Walsh of San Diego has just been named one of California’s top honorees in the 2001 Presidential Spirit of Community Awards program, an annual honor conferred on the most impressive student volunteers in the United States.

Lanna Walsh is being recognized for founding a tutoring and mentoring program that pairs high school students with elementary and middle school students through the county public library system. She is a senior at Patrick Henry High School.

In light of numerous statistics that indicate Americans today are less involved in their communities than they once were, it’s vital that we encourage and support the kind of selfless contributions this young citizen is making. As a former director of a youth leadership program myself, I know what an incredible difference these programs make in our community. Volunteers like Lanna are inspiring examples for us, and are among our brightest hopes for a better tomorrow.

I heartily applaud Lanna Walsh for making San Diego a better place to live, and for the positive impact she is making on the lives of others. She has demonstrated a level of commitment and accomplishment that is truly extraordinary in today’s world, and deserves our sincere admiration and respect. Her actions show that young Americans can, and do, play important roles in our communities, and that we as citizens have come to rely on them to hold tremendous promise for the future.
Of One Accord Ministry, making the lives of many people in the First Congressional District better. This weekend, Of One Accord Ministry will hold a celebration dinner in honor of the many volunteers who offered their time and assistance to help those whose lives are less fortunate. Last year, these efforts helped over 28,000 individuals in Hawkins and Hancock Counties.

The true heroes of this organization were over 200 volunteers from all walks of life such as young scouts, employees from local businesses and industries, members of civic clubs, local school groups, members of various church choirs. These individuals offered their services in collecting needed items, taking donations, delivering food and other items to needy families, serving a free medical clinic for those in need of basic medical attention, and many other tasks.

In the Congress, I have often advocated that the government cannot be the answer to all of the problems that exist in our society. We can do many things to help out those who need assistance, but real changes come about with the help of the local community, neighbors helping neighbors, one individual at a time. Local organizations like Of One Accord Ministry are our first line of defense against these social problems. Their efforts should be highlighted and commended for the results they have achieved.

Too often, we only hear and read about the negative news in our localities. Positive efforts such as those provided by local citizens often go unnoticed. I want to take this opportunity to recognize, congratulate, and bring to the attention of the Congress the great work that is being accomplished by the volunteers of Of One Accord Ministry. Tennesseans are long known for their selfless devotion, earning us the nickname the “Volunteer State.” These volunteers carry on that tradition and are truly deserving of our thanks today.

HON. TOM LANTOS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 6, 2001

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, I invite my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to former Senator Alan Cranston of California who passed away over the holiday break. In a career spanning most of the 20th century, both as a private citizen and a Member of Congress, he developed a reputation as a tireless advocate of worthy causes from the environment to veterans health, and most notably arms control. His passing gives us pause to remember and think deeply about the problems that we face.

Mr. Speaker, Alan Cranston worked long and hard for peace, and at his passing I join his many friends and admirers in paying tribute to his distinguished service, and it is with my hope that we may carry on his work with equal strength and conviction.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION
HON. SOLOMON P. ORTIZ
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 6, 2001

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, during rollcall vote Nos. 5, 6, 7 and 8 on January 30–31, 2001 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea.”

INTRODUCTION OF THE MAKE TAX CREDITS WORK FIX ALTERNATIVE MINIMUM TAX
HON. RICHARD E. NEAL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 6, 2001

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today badly needed legislation to make permanent the temporary provision of current law that allows all nonrefundable personal tax credits to be used against the alternative minimum tax. These credits include the child credit, the adoption credit, the HOPE credit, the lifelong learning credit, and the dependent child care credit.

I have introduced this bill in the two previous Congresses, H.R. 4489 and H.R. 1097. In 1998 Congress enacted a 1-year provision to solve the problem, and in 1999 Congress enacted a 3-year solution. Now is the time to permanently fix the problem, because the problem will get worse, and the revenue cost will increase every year we delay. According to the Joint Committee on Taxation, a permanent solution to this problem enacted in 1999 would have cost $6 billion over 2000–2004, and $29.6 billion over 2000–2009. This rapid escalation in cost demonstrates why it is important to deal with the problem now. It also indicates how rapidly this provision will affect American families if it is not solved permanently.

To date, two messages have come out of the Bush administration on this issue. The first message is that the alternative minimum tax is a problem to be thought about. The second message is that Congress ought to fix it. Refusing to face this problem directly, and taking credit for helping resolve it, is a recipe for continued temporary solutions in an era where budget surpluses demand real tax solutions to real tax problems. I have offered twice to work with the administration on permanent solutions, and I continue to hope a permanent solution will be incorporated into its tax proposals.

Without these temporary solutions, current law will not allow personal tax credits to be used against the alternative minimum tax. Since taxpayers must pay the higher of their regular federal income tax, or the alternative minimum tax, many families find some or all of these credits disallowed by the AMT. In 1998 the Department of the Treasury estimated that over 800,000 families would have been denied the full amount of the child credit or the education credits, and that the number would increase annually.

According to the Internal Revenue Service, the estimated average time it takes to fill out the alternative minimum tax form is 5 hours and 39 minutes. It would, of course, take much longer for hundreds of thousands of taxpayers who may be forced to fill out this form for the first time as a result of the credits Congress offered them in the name of child care, adoption, and education. And I cannot think of anything that would produce greater cynicism on the part of the American people than not enacting a permanent solution to this problem.

Mr. Speaker, I have never thought of this issue as a partisan issue. I have worked with the former chairman of the Ways and Means Committee Mr. Archer, and with the chairman of the Oversight Subcommittee AMO HOUGHTON, to bring this issue to the attention of Members of Congress, the administration, and the American people, and I will continue to pursue all avenues during the 107th Congress to defuse this hidden time bomb permanently.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, let me simply say that the AMT presents additional challenges to Congress. The interaction of the AMT and the nonrefundable personal tax credits is only the most immediate, most crucial, problem. A second problem is that over the next decade the fact that the AMT is not adjusted for inflation for this fiscal year, the regular federal income tax is adjusted, will push millions of families into the AMT and that should be dealt with as soon as possible. A third problem exists because the AMT will slash much of the tax relief that will be promised by President Bush this week, if it is not dealt with.

I, and others, have proposed various solutions to these problems and I will continue to press for solutions to all the problems presented by the AMT. But the most immediate problem is that caused by the interaction of the AMT and nonrefundable credits, and that must be dealt with no matter what this year.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION
HON. KAREN L. THURMAN
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 6, 2001

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was present and voting on Wednesday, January 6, 2001.
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HON. FORNEY PETE STARK
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 6, 2001

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, today I join my colleagues, Representative Matsui and several other colleagues to introduce the “Disabled Workers Opportunity Act.” This bill will remove a persistent employment barrier facing people with disabilities—the fear of losing their health insurance. It builds on the Work Incentives Improvement and Ticket to Work Act enacted last year. That law extended Medicare coverage for disabled, working beneficiaries who qualify for SSDI for eight and a half years. The legislation we are introducing today would make Medicare coverage permanent for these workers.

According to a recent survey commissioned by the National Organization on Disability, 79% of unemployed people with disabilities want to work. Yet, only one-third of them are actively working. Despite major advances in disability services and technologies, less than 1% of SSDI/SSI disability enrollees leave the rolls each year to return to work. In large part, this gap can be explained by the fact that SSI/SSDI disability beneficiaries risk losing health insurance coverage if they return to work—and many jobs lack the health benefits they require to maintain employment. Health insurance is vital for all workers, but for someone who is disabled, it can be a matter of life or death.

On December 17, 1999, the “Ticket to Work and Work Incentives Improvement Act” was signed into law (P.L. 106–170). This important piece of legislation extended and improved healthcare and vocational rehabilitation opportunities for people with disabilities. Yet it does not go far enough in one fundamental respect. Instead of allowing disabled workers to permanently retain access to Medicare, people with disabilities who have worked a total of 8.5 years (whether consecutive or not) will still lose their Medicare benefits under existing law.

While 8.5 years may sound like a sufficient transition period, let’s not forget an important fact—managing a physical or mental disability is often a lifelong process. Someone with a spinal cord injury or a serious mental illness can face health challenges and vulnerabilities throughout their lives. The original version of the Work Incentives bill—as introduced in the House with bi-partisan support—recognized this fact and extended Medicare coverage permanently.

Our legislation would improve the Ticket-to-Work and Work Incentive Improvement Act by making Medicare Part A coverage permanent for disabled, working beneficiaries who qualify for SSDI. This small but critical fix will help remove an ongoing barrier facing disabled workers—the threat of losing healthcare coverage after returning to work. It is time to give disabled workers the opportunity to succeed by providing permanent Medical coverage. Enacting this legislation will allow the Ticket to Work and Work Incentives Improvement Act to live up to its name and really make it possible for those on SSDI to become permanent, active members of our workforce.

Last week, President Bush announced his “New Freedom Initiative” which shares the same goal as our disabled workers bill—to help people with disabilities becoming working members of our community. I look forward to working with President Bush and my Congressional colleagues to pass disability coverage reforms, but an important piece of legislation that would make a real difference in the lives of these people on SSDI who are able and willing to remain in our workforce. I submit the following co-sponsor listing as well as a letter from the Consortium for “Citizens With Disabilities” into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The full list of original co-sponsors is as follows:

1. Mr. Stark.
2. Mr. Matsui.
4. Mr. Rangel.
5. Mr. Lewis of Georgia.
6. Mr. Cardin.
7. Mr. Coyne.
8. Mr. Doggett.
9. Ms. Thornm
10. Mr. Jefferson.
11. Mr. McNulty.
12. Mr. Waxman.
13. Mr. Bonior.
14. Mr. Kucinich.
15. Mr. Filoss.
16. Mr. Mth.
17. Mr. Holden.
18. Mr. Frank.
19. Mr. Kildee.
20. Mr. Hillard.
22. Mr. Berman.
23. Mr. Allen.
24. Mr. Hinches.
25. Mr. Baird.
26. Mr. Green.
27. Mr. Ch.ensen.
28. Mr. Lantos.
29. Mr. George Miller of California.
31. Mr. Abercrombie.
32. Mr. McDermott.
33. Mr. Rush.

A letter of support from the Consortium for Citizens with Disabilities follows:


Hon. Pete Stark,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

Dear Congressman Stark,
The undersigned members of the Consortium for Citizens with Disabilities (CCD) Work Incentives and Social Security Task Forces are pleased to support your legislation that would allow Social Security Disability beneficiaries who go back to work to permanently retain their Medicare coverage.

As you know, the lack of quality affordable health care is one of the largest disincentives facing disabled beneficiaries who want to work. Witnesses with disabilities have testified before the House Ways and Means and Commerce Committees and the Senate Finance Committee that the loss of healthcare or the inability to afford healthcare because of limited incomes prevents them from working. In addition, we know that this fear keeps people on the rolls who might try to go back to work simply because they might lose their healthcare coverage. This is wrong and it must be changed.

Congress and the President went to great lengths to remedy this problem with P.L. 106–170, the Ticket to Work and Work Incentives Improvement Act. This law improves access to rehabilitation services, eliminates many disincentives to work with SSA, and extends Medicare and Medicaid coverage for those who work.

Unfortunately, during last minute consideration of the bill, a limit was imposed on the Medicare coverage despite the fact that 249 members of the House and 79 Senators co-sponsored legislation that provided permanent coverage under Medicare.

We believe that this limit must be lifted so that beneficiaries can work without the fear that one day they will be left with the choice of either working without coverage or being forced back onto the disability rolls. That’s not fair and it’s not right. We urge Congress to support and pass this legislation.

Sincerely,
American Association on Mental Retardation.
American Association of University Affiliated Programs.
American Congress of Community Supports and Employment Services.
American Council of the Blind.
American Network of Community Options and Resources.
Association for Persons in Supported Employment.
Brain Injury Association.
Inter-National Association of Business, Industry and Rehabilitation.
International Association of Psychosocial Rehabilitation Services.
National Alliance for the Mentally Ill.
National Association of Developmental Disabilities Councils.
National Association of Protection and Advocacy Systems.
National Council for Community Behavioral Healthcare.
National Down Syndrome Congress.
National Mental Health Association.
National Organization of Social Security Claimants' Representatives.
NISH.
Paralyzed Veterans of America.
The Arc of the United States.
United Cerebral Palsy.

TRIBUTE TO BILL AND CLAUDIA COLEMAN

HON. MARK UDALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 6, 2001

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I wish to honor Bill and Claudia Coleman for donating the largest gift ever given an American public university—$250 million—to the University of Colorado to be used to fund advanced research and development of innovative technologies to enhance the lives of people with cognitive disabilities.

Today, approximately 20 million persons, or 7 percent of the U.S. population experience significant cognitive disabilities, such as mental retardation, autism, severe and persistent mental illness, traumatic brain injury, stroke, and Alzheimer's disease.

Based on the Coleman's generous donation, the University of Colorado will establish the
HONORING THE 2001 BEA CHRISTY AWARD NOMINEES

HON. MICHAEL ROGERS
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 6, 2001

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 2001 Bea Christy Award Nominees, who will be honored Friday, February 9, 2001 in Lansing, Michigan for their contributions to improve their communities and neighborhoods.

Bea Christy was a dedicated member of the Eastside Neighborhood Organization for more than ten years until her death. She also worked with other organizations to make the neighborhood and community a better place to live. She was the kind of individual who volunteered to do the "unglamorous" tasks, who worked quietly and diligently behind the scenes, who never sought recognition for her efforts.

First, she was a good neighbor in her immediate neighborhood, welcoming new people, planting flowers in the church yard across the street from her house, taking elderly folks to the doctor, and noticing where the sidewalk needed repair. She also helped edit and deliver the Eastside Neighborhood Organization newspaper, made soup for the annual fund raiser, and helped plant flowers in the bed on Michigan Avenue.

Bea was also an active member of her church, volunteered with Radio Talking Book as well as helped to initiate the Lansing area CROP Walk. She made these contributions in addition to being a devoted wife, mother, and grandmother.

It is quiet, committed, unsung people like Bea who make our neighborhoods and communities as a whole a better place to live. It is in this spirit that individuals are nominated for an annual award exemplifying the qualities of Bea Christy. The following six criteria must be considered when making a nomination for the Bea Christy Award: variety of activities in your neighborhood organization; unsung nature of contributions; overall good neighbor; reliability; willingness to talk on tasks; and, other service to the community.

Friday night, ten deserving individuals will be recognized as 2001 Bea Christy Award Nominees. I salute the following nominees for their outstanding service to their communities and neighborhoods: Dr. Calvin C. Anderson, Northwester Neighborhood Alliance; Chris Bobier, Potter/Walsh Neighborhood Association; Linda Hartman, River Forest Neighborhood Association; Chad Hutchinson, Downtown Neighborhood Association; Debra Kelley, Association for the Bingham Community; Rick Kibby, Eastside Neighborhood Organization; Antonia Miernik, Geneseo Neighborhood Association; Kathy Rogers, Old Forest Neighborhood Association; Leonard Earl Salisbury, Hosmer Neighborhood Organization; and Jane Sawyers, Neighbors United in Action.

INTRODUCTION OF THE HOUSING PRESERVATION MATCHING GRANT ACT OF 2001

HON. JERROLD NADLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 6, 2001

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Housing Preservation Matching Grant Act of 2001 previously championed by our esteemed colleague, the late Representative Bruce Vento.

With the recent rise in real estate prices, many owners of HUD-assisted and insured projects are finding it more lucrative to repay their mortgages and operate their buildings in the private market. The tendency to opt out of Section 8 contracts is placing hundreds of thousands of affordable housing units at risk. According to the National Housing Trust, there are over half a million Section 8 apartments in all 50 states that are below market and in danger of losing affordability. We simply cannot allow this vital housing stock to evaporate.

The Housing Preservation Matching Grant Act would provide assistance to states for operating costs, capital expenditures, debt re- structuring, and acquisition of projects with HUD-insured mortgages, Section 8 contracts, and resident ownership. This project-based assistance is a necessary complement to tenant-based approaches by preserving the units that accept vouchers, and ensuring that low-income families have a safe and affordable place to live. Federal matching grants with local contributions also give states a much needed incentive to either continue or create innovative programs to preserve their housing resources.

Before we can create new affordable housing we must preserve the resources we already have, and stop the rising tide of low-income rents to the private market. This legislation achieves both these goals, and hopefully will entice states to appropriate more money for public housing programs knowing that the federal government will provide a substantial share of the cost. By setting up a mechanism for federal matching grants today, this legislation fosters cooperation and coordination between all those responsible for administering and maintaining housing programs.
heroism which they represented and the countless other men and women who gave their lives in the name of our country must not be forgotten.

Nathaniel Hawthorne once wrote: "A hero cannot be a hero unless in a heroic world." Accordingly, it is fitting to note that the Four Chaplains perished in the midst of a conflict which called upon all Americans to make sacrifices in order to guarantee the preservation of our way of life and to eradicate tyranny from the world.

In my Congressional District, many veterans and patriotic organizations paid tribute to the Four Chaplains this month with appropriate ceremonies.

Mr. Speaker I invite our colleagues to join in commemorating these courageous remarkable American heroes . . . . The Dorchester's Four Chaplains.

GLOBAL GAG RULE

HON. MARK UDALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 2001

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, on his second day in office, also the 25th anniversary of Roe v. Wade—President Bush acted to reimpose the "global gag rule," a policy begun in the Reagan years to restrict international family planning assistance. I am seriously concerned about what this step will mean for the more than 150 million women worldwide who currently want access to family planning resources. I am concerned as well that President Bush's action might be only the first step in a longer-term effort to chip away at women's reproductive rights.

Not only would the reimposition of the "global gag rule," keep women's rights advocates around the world from working to prevent the suffering that results from unsafe abortions, but such restrictions would also prohibit international family planning organizations from spending their own, non-U.S.-funds to provide legal abortion services or to advocate for changes in abortion laws in their own countries.

In explaining this step, President Bush stated that he did not want taxpayer dollars to be spent to perform or promote abortions overseas. This is a misrepresentation of the nature of international family planning funding. Currently, no U.S. funds are spent to perform or promote abortions overseas, nor can they be under current U.S. law.

President Bush also stated that he hoped the reimposition of restrictions would help make abortions more rare. But when the policy was previously in effect, it didn't achieve this stated goal. Instead, according to the Center for Reproductive Law and Politics, it reduced access to health care and caused more unintended pregnancies and more abortions.

Anti-abortion activists remain adamantly opposed to using U.S. aid for international family planning programs. Yet as the Denver Post points out, an investment in these programs is important "not only to save women from horrible deaths, but also to quell the population explosion in impoverished nations. . . . Using tax dollars to prevent unwanted pregnancies is far more cost-effective than spending huge sums to feed starving populations who remain unenlightened about family planning."

Mr. Speaker, I agree, and for the benefit of our colleagues, I am submitting for inclusion in the RECORD the full editorial from the Denver Post, another editorial from the Boulder Daily Camera, and a letter to the Denver Post in opposition to the "global gag rule" written by former Colorado first lady Dotle Lamm, who also served as a delegate to the UN Conference of Population and Development in 1994.

[From the Denver Post, Jan. 24, 2001]

GLOBAL GAG RULE BACKFIRE

Nobody likes abortions—not the women who have them, nor the activists who believe in a woman's right to choose. Yet the most adamant anti-abortion activists were rejoicing Monday when President Bush instituted a ban that will likely spur even more abortions in Third World countries.

Bush banned federal aid from international organizations that perform or "actively promote" abortion as a family planning method. Yet those are the same groups that promote birth control so women can avoid abortions. And because illegal abortions are rampant in Third World countries, those organizations cannot eliminate abortion discussions from their services.

Such groups are able to counsel women who are seeking illegal abortions. Without such counsel, many women die during illegal abortions—and many don't learn about family planning methods that can make abortion unnecessary.

The only way to stem the high rate of abortions in such countries is to make family planning available. But when the U.S. strips money from family planning groups, it also strips hope that Third World women will have access to birth control.

So Bush's action, while oddly satisfying to anti-abortion forces, ironically guarantees that abortions will continue to increase.

Opponents denounced it as an "international gag rule" on discussion of abortions, a move that would be unconstitutional if imposed in the United States.

Yet some anti-abortion activists even question why the U.S. should provide any family planning to foreign countries. "I'm not sure it's an effective use of our tax dollars," said president of the Colorado Christian Coalition.

The Post, however, has historically upheld the need to support worldwide family planning—not only to save women from horrible deaths, but also to quell the population explosion in impoverished nations.

Using tax dollars to prevent unwanted pregnancies is far more cost-effective than spending huge sums to feed starving populations who remain unenlightened about family planning.

We deplore President Bush's action Monday, and we urge the administration to reconsider the ultimate effects of such a ban.

[From the Daily Camera, Jan. 25, 2001]

Bush the Divider

During his campaign, President George W. Bush sought to button issue of abortion off the radar screens of both the media and the voters. When pressed, he pointed to his long, strong pro-life record. But often he tempered that message by saying "good people can disagree" on the issue—as well he might, given his wife Laura's recent remarks in favor of keeping legal, and his mother's similar sentiments. He also suggested he might be a moderate on the issue when he said repeatedly that many hearts and minds would have to be changed before the nation was ready to overturn Roe v. Wade, the 1973 Supreme Court decision that made legal access to abortion a constitutional right.

Following the disputed election—in which pro-choice Al Gore won the popular vote by more than a half million votes but lost in the electoral college—both anti-abortion rights supporters hoped that Bush's lack of a mandate would keep his anti-abortion instincts in check.

Some of those same optimists even crossed their fingers and hoped that John Ashcroft, Bush's profoundly anti-abortion nominee for Attorney General, was telling the truth when he said his personal beliefs would not affect his enforcement of abortion-related laws, from clinic access to Roe v. Wade itself. Ashcroft went so far as to declare that he considers the landmark case "the settled law of the land."

Such hopes surely were dashed Monday—Bush's second full day in office—when he marked the 25th anniversary of Roe v. Wade by reinstating the "global gag rule," which prevents overseas family planning organizations that receive U.S. aid from even discussing abortion or referring for legalized abortion in their countries.

Using U.S. funds to pay for actual abortions, or even to promote abortion, already is prohibited under the recently-enacted Helms Amendment, adopted in 1973. This "gag rule" was tied on by President Reagan in 1984 and maintained by President George H.W. Bush. It was overturned in the opening days of Clinton's first term.

Bush's reinstatement is mostly a symbolic blow thrown to his anti-abortion supporters, since statistics show the gag rule hasn't reduced abortions in the past. But forcing family planning agencies to choose between desperately-needed dollars and providing full and accurate information that many women will go without any care at all.

Bush also took pains to issue encouraging words (albeit through a proxy) to an anti-abortion protest in the capital Monday: "... you are gathered to remind our country that one of those ideals is the infinite value of every life."

And, to complete a Monday trifecta, Bush's chief of staff Andrew Card told reporters that the new administration is "reviewing" the policy that recently forced the National Family Planning and Reproductive Health Service to suspend its annual review of the abortion pill, RU-486.

And so, despite recent public opinion polls that show about 60 percent of Americans believe that abortion should be legal in most cases, despite hopeful predictions that he would hew to a moderate line in the wake of his tenuous election victory, Bush the self-declared "unitary" has thrown down the abortion gauntlet from the outset.

Some political analysts have suggested he may be trying to fatten his supporters on the socially-conservative right with treats right now so they'll still be sated later on in the banquet, when the time comes to reach compromise with hungry Democrats. That may be. But surely Bush could have chosen a less contentious issue to mollify his conservative base. By rushing in to demonize his allegiance to those who would support his anti-abortion platform, the ban on abortion, he has demonstrated in his first week that he missed some important lessons of his sketchy victory.

[From the Denver Post, Jan. 24, 2001]

GAG RULE DECREED


President Bush's re-instatement of the gag rule on international family planning aid is
the worst example of “compassionate conservativism” possible.

As Sylvia Clark, a life-long Republican and president and CEO of Planned Parenthood of the Rocky Mountains, said Monday: “In short, the U.S. government will be telling the desperately poor women of the developing world, if you dare ask about abortion options, because if you do, you will lose access to the family planning that could prevent you from ever needing an abortion in the first place.”

Some history here: From 1986-1993 Ronald Reagan’s “Mexico City Policy” prohibited recipients of international family planning assistance from even discussing abortion, obtaining abortion information, or offering medical advice to women dealing with an unintended pregnancy.

President Clinton rescinded that policy in early 1993.

Right now, nearly two out of every five pregnancies worldwide are still unintended. Early and frequent pregnancy contributes significantly to the deaths of infants, children, and women in developing countries, where a woman dies literally every minute in childbirth or because of complications of pregnancy.

But, when contraceptive prevalence rates rise, rates of unintended pregnancies, maternal deaths and abortion go down.

Restrictions on international family planning assistance will do nothing to stop abortion. In fact they will increase the number of times women are forced to turn to abortion as a means to control family size.

Instead of reinstating the gag rule, Bush should have made good on his original promise to de-fund the gag rule. It will promote exactly the opposite. It will increase the number of abortions that happen.

Yet, President Bush’s gag rule policies will promote exactly the opposite. It will increase the number of abortions that happen.

For shame, Mr. President!

—

Ariel Sharon’s comment

HON. CYNTHIA A. Mckinney
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 6, 2001

Ms. MCKINNEY. Mr. Speaker, how dare Ariel Sharon comment about Condoleezza Rice’s legs. I wonder what his legs look like. And let me go on to say how “unsexy” some people might think he looks. But they don’t say it out loud. Probably they would be too busy thinking about that and unable to keep their mind on the issue.

Why would he say something like that out loud?

But does that have anything to do with his effectiveness as an Israeli leader? No.

Neither his legs nor his sexiness has anything to do with whether he will stand for peace, make war, or whether he is competent to do the job for which he has been chosen.

Likewise, Dr. Rice’s looks have nothing to do with her effectiveness as a leader or as National Security Advisor to President Bush.

The press seems to think this episode is cute.

But it’s an insult for all the women out there who go to school, study hard, then work long hours to break the glass ceiling. The last thing we need is for some boorish man who can control neither his libido nor his tongue to come on publicly to women he finds attractive.

I think Mr. Sharon owes all women, especially working women, an apology.
greater resources for investments in our nation’s highways, bridges, mass transit, and aviation system. He was actively involved with Chairman Robert Roe in crafting the Interstate Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (ISTEA) of 1991, which increased federal funding benefit for congestion relief initiatives. Chairman Cranston was the driving force behind the Transportation Efficiency Act for the 21st Century (TEA 21) and the Aviation Investment and Reform Act for the 21st Century (AIR 21). America will benefit from Congressman Cranston’s legislative initiatives for decades to come.

I want to wish Congressman Cranston well on the occasion of his retirement.
When praising someone of such wide and varied interests and talents, the tributes often end up listing accomplishment after accomplishment. And, as impressive as that may be, such tributes often miss the soul of the man. The life of Alan Cranston presents us with these goals. To put the good of country and of the people of our nation first. To work tirelessly for the causes we believe are important. To understand that, working together, we really can change the world! We will miss him deeply, but we pledge to remember his dedication and to carry on his work.

IN MEMORY OF SENATOR ALAN CRANSTON

HON. LYNN C. WOOLSEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 6, 2001

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, earlier today several of my colleagues gathered in the Senate to pay tribute and celebrate the life of former Senator Alan Cranston. Like my colleagues, I marvel at the passion and commitment Senator Cranston brought to the issues he cared about during his 86 years.

Senator Cranston’s wide-ranging life experiences gave him an incredible insight on some of the most important events in the 20th century. We are fortunate that he shared his experiences and perspective with us as a journalist and an author, most notably with his 1946 book, Killing the Peace, which was an account of the Senate’s failure to join the League of Nations. The Senator’s distinguished career also included time as President of the World Federals, comptroller of California, and as a leading figure in reforming the California Democratic party. His contributions will always be remembered in these fields by those who worked with him and benefitted from his work.

However, I am most thankful for his commitment and leadership on issues of peace and nuclear disarmament. As many of my colleagues know, Senator Cranston and I share a common perspective and commitment to these issues. His leadership on disarmament and the abolition of nuclear weapons is truly admirable. After leaving the Senate in 1993, Senator Cranston continued his push for nuclear arms reductions. He launched a much-needed effort at the 1995 State of the World Forum to abolish nuclear weapons worldwide through educating U.S. citizens and world leaders. Senator Cranston took his message and crusade far and wide, including to former Soviet Union President Mikhail Gorbachev. Locally, my congressional district—home to many caring and dedicated peace and environmental groups—was fortunate enough 2 years ago to have Senator Cranston join us for an event highlighting the need to abolish nuclear weapons. Once again, he reminded us all that while nuclear weapons will not be eliminated overnight, the United States must be a leader and take the first steps toward elimination of these weapons. As the founder of the Global Security Institute, he was able to forge ahead with this dream of abolishing nuclear weapons.

With his passing, the peace and nuclear disarmament community certainly lost a true friend and leading voice. On behalf of the thousands of citizen groups that will continue to campaign for the elimination of nuclear weapons, I thank him for his ground breaking work in this arena. And, everyone should know, we will continue in this shared quest to make the world safe from the dangers of nuclear weapons.

TRIBUTE TO LATE SENATOR ALAN CRANSTON

HON. DAVID DREIER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 6, 2001

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, I wish today to join my colleagues in paying my respects to one of California’s longtime, dedicated public servants, the late Senator Alan Cranston, who passed away last New Year’s Eve.

Alan Cranston’s career of public service spanned almost the entire 20th century. He was first elected State controller of California in 1958, and was sent to the Senate by California voters in 1968. He served there through 1993. Throughout his career, Cranston dedicated himself to a range of important causes—seeking to strengthen federal environmental laws, to expand assistance to the disadvantaged in society and to bolster civil rights. His commitment to arms control led him to work closely with President Reagan for the Intermediate Range Nuclear Force Treaty, even though the two agreed on little else. Senator Cranston was also respected for his advocacy of the interests of his State—for farmers, film makers, aerospace companies, financial institutions and independent oil producers.

Throughout his career and throughout his life, Alan Cranston distinguished himself with his hard work, his tenacity and his self-discipline. He was an Olympic-class runner who kept himself in shape throughout the end of his life. He took the time to make himself an expert in whatever issue he was working on. Whether it was arms control, housing, or the views and concerns of his Senate colleagues, Alan Cranston took the time to master the subject. It was this discipline that made him an extremely effective party-builder, coalition builder, advocate and legislator. That dedication and that commitment deserve our respect.

DEATH OF FORMER MAYOR JOHN V. LINDSAY

HON. MAJOR R. OWENS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 6, 2001

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, throughout the neighborhoods of New York, millions mourn the death of former Mayor John Lindsay. He is still remembered as the great patron of community empowerment who provided the opportunity for the people on the bottom to enter the mainstream of New York politics as well as civil service and government employment.

John Lindsay was a highly visible and articulate idealist and advocate for greater inclusion of minorities in the American dream. Although his direct impact on policy and practice never moved beyond New York City, he belongs in the category with Robert and John Kennedy and Franklin Roosevelt.

Assuming great political risks, Lindsay was one of the few leaders in the nation who seriously adopted Lyndon Johnson’s “Maximum feasible participation of the poor” policy. His administration made a Herculean effort to institutionalize power-sharing down to the local level. Instead of siphoning off dollars and resources from federal programs like the Community Action Program and the Model Cities initiative, Lindsay added city support and thus increased his own tax and budget burdens.

With ignorance and incompetence, the people on the bottom sometimes betrayed their mayoral advocate; however, it was the lack of vision and the resistance within the ranks of the city’s organized machine Democrats which blocked the realization of a new progressive movement or even his own partisan machine. But as a solo force, a lone Achilles of New York politics, he left a lasting legacy of new leadership within the poor and minority communities.

After serving as a commissioner appointed by John Lindsay, I was elected to the New York State Senate in 1974. When I entered the legislature for the first time, I noted that many minority members of the legislature had previously been in some way supported by the Community Action Program or the Model Cities Program, both empowerment vehicles sponsored by John V. Lindsay.

New York City mourns a great visionary leader and champion of the poor and powerless.

THE LINDSAY TRUMPET STILL SOUNDS
For the Great John Lindsay
The grave is not a period,
But a colon:
The good comes endlessly afterwards
In offspring never seen,
Achievements never footnoted;
John Lindsay’s trumpet sounds
In the heads
Of unknown urban soldiers;
The posterity of the powerless
Now hear the beat of new drums;
May still match the Lindsay dream.

Socrates for empowerment,
He spawned Plato and Aristotles;
Somewhere his Alexanders
Are mobilizing new young armies.
For the Great John Lindsay
The grave is not a decaying period
But a bright blossoming colon:
The movement is not yet murdered,
Its fervor only temporarily stolen;
The rivers of righteous anger
Again are fully swollen.
Alive nailed to an unjust cross
Big John bled away alone;
With resurrections of his disciplines
New Lindsay miracles of the City
Can still be carved in stone.
IN MEMORY OF MILTON ROEMER—ONE OF THE WORLD'S LEADING PUBLIC HEALTH ADVOCATES AND HEALTH POLICY THINKERS

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 2001

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, one of the world's most thoughtful health policy experts and advocates, Dr. Milton Roemer, has passed away. His brilliance and insights will be sorely missed by all those who were his students and who had the privilege of working with him.

Few of us in Congress ever get a law named after us, and even fewer people throughout the world get a law of nature or science named after themselves—but Roemer’s law is a law that all of us in health policy and finance must live and deal with daily. In popular language, Roemer’s law is “build it and they will come”—which he postulated way before the Internet, and dreamed of in health policy, means that in an insured population, if you add beds to a health care facility, they will get filled. In medicine and health care, supply can drive demand. The implications for health policy, costs, and financing are key to many of the problems we face and will be facing into the decades to come.

Roemer’s law is just one of the innumerable contributions he gave the world. Since earning his medical degree 60 years ago, he worked on public health problems in 71 nations, published as sole author 25 books,[1] co-authored 12 other books, and 430 articles. The doctor was obviously possessed of energy and talent almost beyond imagination.

Dr. Roemer earned the MD degree from New York University in 1940, along with a masters’ degree in sociology from Cornell University in 1939, and a public health degree from the University of Michigan in 1943. As a medical officer of the New Jersey State Health Department, he supervised 92 venereal disease clinics, as they were called in 1943. During World War II as a member of the commissioned corps of the US Public Health Service, he served as Assistant to the Chief Medical Officer of the War Food Administration and Associate in Medical Care Administration to the Chief of the State Relations Division. His 1948 book, written with F.D. Mott and F. Mott of Health Services Research.

Dr. Roemer is survived by his wife of 61 years, Ruth Roemer, his son, John E. Roemer, of New York City, his daughter, Beth Roemer Lewis, of Berkeley, California; and six grandchildren.

A memorial service will be held at UCLA in the spring. Contributions in Milton Roemer’s memory may be made to the American Public Health Association, Washington, DC, the Department of Health Services, UCLA School of Public Health, or Physicians for Social Responsibility.

To repeat, America and the world have lost a wonderful teacher who truly had a sense of the whole and of the oneness of mankind—and that a just and honorable society should join in helping ensure that every member of that society goes without health care.

HON. ROY BLUNT OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 2001

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend a law enforcement leader in Southwest Missouri.

John T. Pierpont has always had law enforcement blood running through his veins. John’s personal experience with law enforcement began early in life; his father was Sheriff of Greene County. During the last two decades of the 20th century, the Sheriff of Greene County in Missouri was again a Pierpont, this time John T. Pierpont, who started his law enforcement career as the U.S. Marshall for the 66 counties of western Missouri, a job he held for eight years.

Mr. PICKERING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of my friend and constituent R.P. “Bob” Stringer who passed away on January 15, 2001, at Scott Regional Hospital in Morton, Mississippi. Bob, as he was affectionately called by his close friends and colleagues, was preceded in death by his wife, Mrs. Mary Cooper Stringer, who died on the same date as Bob, two years ago.

Bob was a native of Noxubee County and lived in Forest, Mississippi, since 1960. He was a World War II veteran and was actively involved in veterans activities that enhanced and promoted esprit de corps among veteran organizations at the local, county, state, and national level. He was a member of the Forest Presbyterian Church, the Veterans of Foreign Wars (VFW) and the American Legion. He served as past county and district president of the Mississippi State University Alumni Association. He was also a past post commander of the VFW. As if this was not enough to keep him busy, he was a board member of the MFS&G Association and served on the Forest Board of Aldermen for sixteen years.

My predecessor, former Congressman G.V. “Sonny” Montgomery, was a very close friend of Bob’s and has been quoted as saying that “Bob Stringer was really an All-American. He loved his family and country very much. He served in the Marine Corp at Iwo Jima and after the War he was very active in the VFW and the American Legion. He was proud of his community and served both the City of Forest and Scott County in a commendable manner. I have lost one of my closest friends.”

Bob was survived by daughters, Anne Stringer Land and Jean Stringer Ellis; sons, Robert P. Stringer, Jr., and John Walter Stringer; their husbands and wives, thirteen grandchildren, one great grandchild, and one brother, John.

Bob was the originator of the G.V. “Sonny” Montgomery Annual Hunters Stew held in Forest and personally hosted it, along with members of the American Legion and VFW, for more than twenty-four years. He even continued this tradition after Congressman Montgomery stepped down from office in 1996 because he knew how much the community loved and respected “Sonny.”

The legacy that I am sure Bob would want us to remember him by is his love for the Lord, his family, his friends, his country, his state, and by all means his love for the City of Forest and Scott County. It is an honor for me to express my appreciation, and that of all the citizens of the Third Congressional District, for his life of service and contributions to the betterment of our world.

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE R.P. “BOB” STRINGER

HON. CHARLES W. “CHIP” PICKERING OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 6, 2001

Mr. PICKERING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of my friend and constituent R.P. “Bob” Stringer who passed away on January 15, 2001, at Scott Regional Hospital in
In 1981 voters choose him to be sheriff and they re-elected him four more times. During that period, the facilities for law enforcement in Greene County underwent major transformation and the approach to fighting crime got a new more pro-active philosophy. John embraced public participation in crime prevention and began placing a corps of “neighborhood watch” districts. The new sheriff also stepped up regular patrols to curb burglaries, thefts and vandalism. He made citizens partners with sheriff’s office in the fight against criminal activity.

Perhaps the most startling change guided by Sheriff Pierpont was in the Greene County jail. The old jail, built more than 40 years ago, housed a hundred inmates in 1981. Pierpont pushed for more facilities and new technology. The last of three major modernizations and additions were underway at the time of his retirement. The new jail will house five hundred inmates in the most secure environment available.

John’s leadership has also won him praise among his peers. He was elected President of both the Missouri Sheriff’s Association and the National Sheriff’s Association.

John has been an active leader at home, in our state and for the nation. You would find him in the field working on major crimes, directing manhunts and making sure that investigators had the tools to be thorough and professional. It’s been evident during his time in office, that John Pierpont has enjoyed being the Sheriff of Greene County. It is equally evident that John’s leadership has provided the citizens of this county a higher level of safety, law enforcement competence and protection for the future of the people he has served during his 20 years as sheriff.

I know that my colleagues from Missouri join me in thanking John Pierpont for his years of making our state a safer place to live and wishing him well as he leaves the Greene County Sheriff’s office and opens a new chapter in his life.

IN MEMORY OF JUDGE EARL B. GILLIAM

HON. BOB FILNER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 6, 2001

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I wish today to say a few words in the memory of one of the outstanding jurists of our nation who passed away on January 28, 2001, after a long illness. The Honorable Earl B. Gilliam served on the United States District Court for the Southern District of California, which includes the 50th Congressional District that I represent.

Judge Gilliam was born on August 17, 1931, in Clovis, New Mexico, and spent his early years in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma. As a boy, he moved to San Diego, California with his family where he attended local primary and secondary schools before graduating from San Diego High School and later San Diego State University, with a business degree, in 1953.

Judge Gilliam’s many years of distinguished service to the legal community began in 1957 when, having graduated from Hastings College of Law, he was admitted to the California Bar and appointed Deputy District Attorney for the County of San Diego. In 1961, he started his own general practice, and two years later Judge Gilliam was appointed to the Municipal Court, becoming the first African-American to sit on the San Diego bench. In 1971, Judge Gilliam became the Presiding Judge of the Municipal Court, and in 1975 he was elevated to the Superior Court by California Governor Jerry Brown. Five years later, President Jimmy Carter appointed him to serve on the United States District Court for the Southern District of California.

In his long and distinguished career, Judge Gilliam presided over numerous noteworthy cases of regional and national importance. Whether these cases dealt with drug trafficking, fraud, tax evasion, bribery or civil matters, Judge Gilliam’s fair and professional approach to the law laid the foundation for his solid reputation both within and outside the legal community.

In 1969, Western State School of Law in San Diego (presently known as Thomas Jefferson School of Law) recruited Judge Gilliam as an adjunct professor. With a background in business administration, economics, civil and criminal law, and trial practice, Judge Gilliam proved to be an inspirational and devoted instructor for the Contracts, Torts, Criminal Law, Trusts, Community Property and Trial Practice courses.

In civic activities, Judge Gilliam actively promoted the value of education for youth, for women, and for his fellow lawyers. He generously gave time and effort to his community in countless ways. He served on the boards of numerous civic, professional and charitable organizations, including the YMCA, the Urban League, the Salvation Army, Western State University and the University of California at San Diego.

The community in turn, has repeatedly acknowledged his contributions. He was named Young Man of the Year by the San Diego Junior Chamber of Commerce in 1965 and Golden Man of the Year in 1981. In 1982 he was honored twice—he was the recipient of the prestigious Trial Judge of the Year award by the San Diego Trial Lawyer’s Association and San Diego’s African American Lawyer’s Organization honored him by changing its name to the Earl B. Gilliam Bar Association. Judge Gilliam was named Legal Professional of the Year in 1994 by the City Club and Chamber of Commerce and in 1995 he earned the Sharp Hospital Foundation’s Eagle Spirit Award and the NAACP’s Civil Rights Pioneer Award.

Mr. Speaker, we have lost not only one of our nation’s great legal minds but a true friend who contributed so much to so many. He will be truly missed.

IN SUPPORT OF MIFEPRISTONE

HON. MICHAEL E. CAPUANO
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 6, 2001

Mr. CAPUANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a pro-choice member of Congress who supports the recent FDA approved use of mifepristone, and I strongly oppose any efforts to undermine the availability of the drug. Mifepristone, also known as RU-486, to women who are seeking a safe method to terminate a pregnancy.

I recognize that there is misinformation out there on the use and access of this drug. But, the truth is mifepristone pills must be prescribed by a doctor, and the treatment is done under strict supervision of a medical professional. The first dose is taken at the doctor’s office, and the second dose is taken 48 hours later. There are some doctors that allow women to take the second dose at home, but others require a clinic visit. It is also important to note that a woman can only take mifepristone up to 49 or 63 days from the date of her last menstrual period. This restriction is well within the laws of aborting a fetus in the first trimester.

Mifepristone has been laboriously studied and tested by FDA for 8 years. Nearly 10,000 American women have used this drug safely and effectively in clinical trials. Furthermore, Europeans have been using this drug for over 12 years.

Women in this country should have a choice to make decisions about their own fate. Abortion is legal, and women should be entitled to all medically proven safe options available, including mifepristone. Furthermore, I believe that women should be able to choose a less invasive procedure such as mifepristone rather than a surgical abortion.

Attempts to restrict a woman’s access to this drug are not done to protect her safety, but rather to influence her choice. By allowing mifepristone to be prescribed by her own doctor, a woman can preserve her anonymity and be comfortable with her choice.

I have advocated for the approval of RU–486 for several years, in my past and current position. I truly believe that all women should have the right to make their own choices, and I hope that they will not be denied any safe and proven methods to make those decisions.

INTRODUCTION OF THE FEDERAL ELECTION STANDARDS ACT OF 2001

HON. WILLIAM D. DELAHUNT
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 6, 2001

Mr. DELAHUNT. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join today with my colleague from South Carolina, Mr. GRAHAM, in introducing the Federal Election Standards Act of 2001.

Now that the dust has settled over the presidential election of 2000, I hope we will treat our recent experience as an opportunity to adopt long overdue reforms in the way we run our Federal elections. I hope we will enlist our brave and tireless State and local election officials with the wherewithal to take advantage of these improvements.

The Act seeks to advance these goals by establishing a bipartisan commission to study the accuracy, integrity, and efficiency of Federal election procedures and develop standards of best practice for the conduct of Federal elections. It further authorizes grants and technical assistance to States which wish to adopt measures consistent with the standards. Title I of the Act establishes the National Advisory Commission of Federal Election
Standards (the “Commission”). Twelve of the 24 voting members of the Commission are appointed by Congress; the other 12 by leading State and local government associations. The Attorney General and the Chairman of the Federal Election Commission serve ex-officio as non-voting members.

In addition to ensuring a balance among Federal, State and local interests, the Act requires that the members of the Commission include equal numbers of Republicans and Democrats, and that larger and smaller states from all geographic regions be fairly represented.

The Commission will have three responsibilities which it must discharge within one year of its appointment. First, it will examine and report to the President, the Congress, and the State Secretaries of State regarding the accuracy, integrity, and efficiency of Federal election procedures in the several States.

Second, the Commission will develop a set of standards for the conduct of Federal elections and make recommendations with respect to the periodic review and updating of the standards. Among the issues to be addressed by the standards are (1) procedures for voter registration and maintenance of lists of registered voters; (2) ballot design, voting equipment, the methods employed in counting and recounting votes, and the procedures for challenging the results; (3) factors that affect access to and the efficient and orderly operation of polling places, including hours of voting (which may include standards for a uniform national poll closing time for presidential elections); number and accessibility of polling stations; training of poll workers; methods of reducing delay; and steps to ensure that all voters who report to the polls have an opportunity to cast their vote; and (4) procedures for mail-in and absentee voting (including deadlines for receipt of mail-in and absentee ballots).

Third, the Commission will make additional recommendations to Congress in regard to certain procedural aspects of Federal elections that are governed by Federal law (and would therefore require Congressional action to alter), such as whether Federal law should be amended to authorize Federal elections to be conducted (1) on dates other than those prescribed by current Federal law so as to permit weekend elections, voting on multiple days, or expanded early voting options; or (2) by means of the Internet.

Title II of the Act authorizes the FEC to provide matching grants and technical assistance to the States to improve the accuracy, integrity, and efficiency of Federal election procedures. The Federal share may not exceed 75 percent of the total costs of the project, program, or activity, although the FEC may waive this requirement in whole or in part where appropriate.

Grants may be used for programs, projects, and other activities whose purpose is to bring the conduct of Federal elections into conformity with the standards for Federal elections developed by the National Advisory Commission. Specifically, grants may be used to (1) hire employees or consultants to design and implement systems and procedures that meet the standards; (2) procure equipment, technology, and administrative and managerial support systems which meet the standards; (3) provide training or retraining to election officials, employees and volunteers in the proper use and maintenance of new systems and procedures that meet the standards; (4) enhance public confidence and participation in the electoral process by increasing awareness of new systems and procedures that meet the standards; and (5) evaluate the effectiveness of new systems and procedures that meet the standards and make recommendations with respect to the periodic review and updating of the standards. Among the issues to be addressed by the standards are (1) procedures for voter registration and maintenance of lists of registered voters; (2) ballot design, voting equipment, the methods employed in counting and recounting votes, and the procedures for challenging the results; (3) factors that affect access to and the efficient and orderly operation of polling places, including hours of voting (which may include standards for a uniform national poll closing time for presidential elections); number and accessibility of polling stations; training of poll workers; methods of reducing delay; and steps to ensure that all voters who report to the polls have an opportunity to cast their vote; and (4) procedures for mail-in and absentee voting (including deadlines for receipt of mail-in and absentee ballots).

Third, the Commission will make additional recommendations to Congress in regard to certain procedural aspects of Federal elections that are governed by Federal law (and would therefore require Congressional action to alter), such as whether Federal law should be amended to authorize Federal elections to be conducted (1) on dates other than those prescribed by current Federal law so as to permit weekend elections, voting on multiple days, or expanded early voting options; or (2) by means of the Internet.

FEDERAL ELECTION STANDARDS ACT OF 2001

The Act establishes a bipartisan commission to study the accuracy, integrity, and efficiency of Federal election procedures and develop standards of best practice for the conduct of Federal elections. It further authorizes grants and technical assistance to the States which meet the standards and make recommendations with respect to the periodic review and updating of the standards.

National Advisory Commission on Federal Election Standards

Title I of the Act establishes the National Advisory Commission on Federal Election Standards (the “Commission”). Twelve of the 24 voting members of the Commission are appointed by Congress; the other 12 by State and local government associations. The Attorney General and the Chairman of the Federal Election Commission (the “FEC”), or their representatives, serve ex-officio as non-voting members of the Commission.

In addition to ensuring a balance among Federal, State and local interests, the Act requires that the members of the Commission include equal numbers of Republicans and Democrats, and that larger and smaller states from all geographic regions be fairly represented.

The Commission will have three responsibilities which it must discharge within one year of its appointment. First, it will examine and report the progress, and the State Secretaries of State regarding the accuracy, integrity, and efficiency of Federal election procedures in the several States. Second, the Commission will develop a set of standards for the conduct of Federal elections and make recommendations with respect to the periodic review and updating of the standards. Among the issues to be addressed by the standards are (1) procedures for voter registration and maintenance of lists of registered voters; (2) ballot design, voting equipment, the methods employed in counting and recounting votes, and the procedures for challenging the results; (3) factors that affect access to and the efficient and orderly operation of polling places, including hours of voting (which may include standards for a uniform national poll closing time for presidential elections); number and accessibility of polling stations; training of poll workers; methods of reducing delay; and steps to ensure that all voters who report to the polls have an opportunity to cast their vote; and (4) procedures for mail-in and absentee voting (including deadlines for receipt of mail-in and absentee ballots).

Title II of the Act authorizes the FEC to provide matching grants and technical assistance to the States to improve the accuracy, integrity, and efficiency of Federal election procedures. The Federal share may not exceed 75 percent of the total costs of the program, project, or activity, although the FEC may waive this requirement in whole or in part where appropriate.

Grants may be used for programs, projects, and other activities whose purpose is to bring the conduct of Federal elections into conformity with the standards for Federal elections developed by the National Advisory Commission. Specifically, grants may be used to (1) hire employees or consultants to design and implement systems and procedures that meet the standards; (2) procure equipment, technology, and administrative and managerial support systems that meet the standards; (3) provide training or retraining to election officials, employees and volunteers in the proper use and maintenance of new systems and procedures that meet the standards; (4) enhance public confidence and participation in the electoral process by increasing awareness of new systems and procedures that meet the standards; and (5) evaluate the effectiveness of new systems and procedures that meet the standards and make recommendations with respect to the periodic review and updating of the standards. Among the issues to be addressed by the standards are (1) procedures for voter registration and maintenance of lists of registered voters; (2) ballot design, voting equipment, the methods employed in counting and recounting votes, and the procedures for challenging the results; (3) factors that affect access to and the efficient and orderly operation of polling places, including hours of voting (which may include standards for a uniform national poll closing time for presidential elections); number and accessibility of polling stations; training of poll workers; methods of reducing delay; and steps to ensure that all voters who report to the polls have an opportunity to cast their vote; and (4) procedures for mail-in and absentee voting (including deadlines for receipt of mail-in and absentee ballots).
leader must be willing to use it. His leadership is then based on truth and character. There must be truth in the purpose and will power in the character."

While Vince Lombardi coached football, the same thoughts regarding his life and leadership can be applied to Coach Gene Bess of Three Rivers Community College. As a coach for Three Rivers, Gene has had amazing career that has spanned three decades. During that time, he has proven that a true leader leads not simply with words, but through example. Without a doubt, Gene Bess has lived his life—on and off the court—as an example of what many of us strive to achieve in life.

Now, Gene stands on the threshold of a remarkable accomplishment. This month, Gene will set a record that only few in coaching have reached when he secures his 880th win as the coach of the Three Rivers Community College Men’s Basketball Team. No longer will he be exactly like the 212 other coaches in the National JC Athletic Association Division I. Sure, like those coaches and the others who influence the lives of their players day in and day out, he will place a whistle around his neck, don a pair of athletic shoes, and stand on the sidelines coaching and cheering his players on to victory. But unlike those coaches, his hard work, determination, and dedication to being a positive influence in the lives of his players, has placed him in a special class that is set aside for coaches like John Wooden, Mike Krzyzewski, Dean Smith and Mizzou’s own Norm Stewart.

The leadership and dedication that Gene Bess demonstrates on the court does not end at the final buzzer. Instead, it translates into his personal and public life. He has been married for nearly 40 years and is a deacon at First Baptist Church of Poplar Bluff where he has attended Sunday Service in service to God for 30 years. He still lives on his same street—Sunset Avenue—that he has jogged nearly every morning for more than two decades. And most of all, he has an unwavering code that he lives by which reflects his common sense, nose to the grindstone attitude. As Tony Jimenez noted in the Juco Report, “Basketball is not number one in his life, in or out of the season, he puts faith first, family second, and the game third."

In a society where it oftentimes seems so difficult to find heroes, I am honored and privileged to have a man who exemplified the character of a leader, right here in our own community. Gene Bess is that type of man. He is a man of purpose who has a way of understanding that people, when working together—on the court, in their church or in their community—can have a positive and memorable impact on the lives of each and everyone they meet throughout the journey of life.

As the same article by Tony Jimenez mentions, Gene Bess has a reputation for winning that is build on a foundation of leadership, truth, and respect for all those who work with him. Jimenez stated, “What has bode well for Bess’ reputation is his unwillingness to bend to give certain issues when it comes to his team and the players. He doesn’t swear. He doesn’t just talk about an open door policy, the players know that his door is always open. He treats his players with the respect all coaches talk about, but not all of them follow through on. He carries himself with the aura of a major college coach, but he is just as a accessible, honest and down to earth as, well, a juco coach in a small town in Missouri.” It’s often been said that success is not measured by great wealth or material treasures. Instead, success is measured on the person you are, the life you live, and how your life influences the lives of others. If that is true, and I believe that it is, then we are all richer for knowing Gene Bess. Mr. Speaker, on this very special occasion, I ask that all of my colleagues join me in congratulating Coach Bess and the Three Rivers Raiders on this milestone and wish them every happiness for the future. Thank you.

PROVIDING GRANTS FOR 100,000 RESOURCE-BASED STAFF

HON. PATSY T. MINK
OF HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 6, 2001

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to re-introduce a bill that provides 100,000 Resource-Based Staff for our public schools to help students cope with the stress and anxieties of adolescence. This bill is similar to HR 2982, which I introduced in the 106th Congress.

None of us will ever forget the tragedy at Columbine High School in Littleton, Colorado, where two student gunmen killed 12 classmates and a teacher before taking their own lives. Why did this happen? What could make children from a seemingly typical upbringing turn so violent? And what can we do to ensure that our children will be safe at school? I don’t know if we will ever find all of the answers. I believe that ultimately, we must look to our culture and within our own families to find some of the answers. Congress owes it to our children to work on policies that can bring about change.

First, we must look to substantive preventative measures. Security guards, metal detectors, and expelling violent students all have their place in addressing this problem. But they do nothing to prevent tragedies from occurring.

Ultimately, we must work with children to ensure they can handle their anger and emotions without resorting to violence. Many of our children enter school with emotional, physical, and interpersonal barriers to learning. We need more school counselors in our schools, not only to help identify these troubled youths, but to work on developmental skill building.

Surgeon General Dr. David Satcher has said that appropriate interventions made during or prior to adolescence can direct young people away from violence toward healthy and constructive lives. The window of opportunity for effective interventions opens early and rarely, if ever, closes. Thus, prevention is the best guard against youth violence.

We have no real infrastructure of support for our kids when it comes to mental health services in our schools. The most recent statistics indicate that there are 90,000 guidance counselors for approximately 41.4 million students in our public schools. That translates to 1 counselor for every 513 students. In Hawaii, we have only 1 counselor for more than 1,000 students. That is simply not enough.

With current counselors responsible for such large numbers of students, they are unable to address the students’ personal needs. Instead, their role is more often administrative, scheduling, and job and college counseling. The child is forfeited for different goals.

My bill will put 100,000 new resource staff in our schools to focus on the mental health needs of students. This will make it easier for children to get the attention they need.

This resource staff will be hired to address the personal, family, peer level, emotional, and developmental needs of students, enabling them to detect early warning signs of troubled youth. They will improve student interaction and school safety. In a nutshell, they can help save children’s lives.

The resource staff can also consult with teachers and parents about student learning, behavior, and emotional problems. They can develop and implement prevention programs and deal with substance abuse. They can set up peer mediation, and they can enhance problem solving in schools. Resource staff will provide important support services to students, and to parents and teachers on behalf of the students.

This legislation should be the cornerstone of a much larger proposal. We must address the media’s impact on violence and the easy accessibility of guns. We must strengthen our programs for families and early childhood development, and we must develop character education programs.

If we really are serious about addressing school violence, we must address prevention.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.
HIGHLIGHTS

Senate confirmed the nomination of Robert B. Zoellick, of Virginia, to be United States Trade Representative.

The House passed measures recognizing the 90th birthday of Ronald Reagan and designating the “Ronald W. Reagan Post Office of West Melbourne, Florida”.

The House passed a resolution honoring the contributions of Catholic Schools.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S1027-S1095

Measures Introduced: Twenty-four bills and two resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 245-268, and S. Res. 17-18.

Campaign-Finance Reform—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that at a time to be determined by the Republican Leader, after consultation with the Democratic Leader, either on March 19, 2001 or March 26, 2001, the Rules Committee be immediately discharged from consideration of S. 27, as introduced, and the Senate shall turn to its immediate consideration. Further, that following the reporting of the bill, the bill become the pending business, to the exclusion of all other business, except for a motion to temporarily postpone consideration of the pending legislation, made by the Republican Leader, following approval of the Democratic Leader, and that no call for the regular order serve to displace this item, except one made by the Republican Leader, also after the approval of the Democratic Leader. Further, that when a first degree amendment is offered, there be up to 3 hours evenly divided in the usual form for debate only, after which a motion to table may be made. If a motion to table fails, the amendment then be fully debatable and amendable. Further, that if the motion to table is not made at the expiration of the 3 hours a vote occur on the amendment, without any intervening action, motion or debate, provided that no points of order be considered as having been waived by this agreement.

Hollings-Specter Constitutional Amendment—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that during or immediately following disposition of the McCain-Feingold legislation, S. 27, the Hollings-Specter Constitutional Amendment legislation then become the pending business and that it be considered under certain limitations.

United Nations Dues—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for consideration of S. 248, to amend the Admiral James W. Nance and Meg Donovan Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 2000 and 2001, to adjust a condition on the payment of arrearage to the United Nations that sets the maximum share of any United Nations peacekeeping operation’s budget that may be assessed of any country, if reported by the Committee on Foreign Relations, on Wednesday, February 7, 2001. Further, if the committee has not reported the bill by 1 p.m., it be immediately discharged and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

Recognizing Former President Ronald Reagan's 90th Birthday: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that when the Senate receives from the House H.J. Res. 7, recognizing the 90th birthday of Ronald Reagan, the resolution be considered read a third time and passed.

Appointments:

National Council on the Arts: The Chair, on behalf of the Democratic Leader, pursuant to Public
Law 105–83, announced the reappointment of Senator Durbin as a member of the National Council on the Arts.  

British-American Interparliamentary Group: The Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, and upon the recommendation of the Democratic Leader, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2761, as amended, appointed Senator Byrd as Co-Chairman of the Senate Delegation to the British-American Interparliamentary Group during the 107th Congress.  

James Madison Commemoration Commission: The Chair, on behalf of the Majority Leader, pursuant to Public Law 106–550, announced the appointments of Senators Warner and Sessions to serve as members of the James Madison Commemoration Commission.  

United States Aerospace Industry Commission: The Chair, on behalf of the Majority Leader, pursuant to Public Law 106–398, announced the appointments of William Schneider, Jr., of New York, and Robert J. Stevens, of Maryland, to serve as members of the Commission on the Future of the United States Aerospace Industry.  

Messages From the President: Senate received the following message from the President of the United States: Transmitting, pursuant to law, the report on the operation of the Andean Trade Preference Act; to the Committee on Finance. (PM 3)  

Nominations Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nomination: By unanimous vote of 98 yeas (Vote No. EX. 9), Robert B. Zoellick, of Virginia, to be United States Trade Representative, with the rank of Ambassador. (Prior to this action, Committee on Finance was discharged from further consideration.)  

Nominations Received: Senate received the following nomination: Joe M. Allbaugh, of Texas, to be Director of the Federal Emergency Management Agency.  

Messages From the President: Measures Placed on Calendar: Statements on Introduced Bills: Additional Cosponsors: Additional Statements: Privileges of the Floor: Record Votes: One record vote was taken today. (Total—9)  

Adjournment: Senate met at 9:30 a.m., and adjourned at 5:32 p.m., until 10 a.m., on Wednesday, February 7, 2001. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Majority Leader in today's Record on page S1095.)  

Committee Meetings (Committees not listed did not meet)  

LONG-TERM BUDGET ISSUES

Committee on the Budget: Committee concluded hearings to examine the General Accounting Office perspective on the long-range fiscal policy challenges facing this Congress and the nation, and the impact the surplus projections have on budgetary decision making, after receiving testimony from David M. Walker, Comptroller General of the United States, General Accounting Office.

---

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Bills Introduced: 2 public bills, H.R. 303 and H.R. 316, were introduced.  

Reports Filed: No reports were filed today.  

Speaker Pro Tempore: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he designated Representative Shimkus to act as Speaker pro tempore for today.  

Presidential Message: Read a message from President Bush wherein he transmitted the third report to the Congress on the Operation of the Andean Trade Preference Act—referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.  

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:  

90th Birthday of Ronald Reagan: H.J. Res. 7, recognizing the 90th birthday of Ronald Reagan (agreed to suspend the rules and pass by a yea and nay vote of 410 yeas with none voting "nay" and 7 voting "present," Roll No. 9);
Ronald W. Reagan Post Office, Melbourne, Florida: H.R. 395, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2305 Minton Road in West Melbourne, Florida, as the “Ronald W. Reagan Post Office of West Melbourne, Florida”; and

Contributions of Catholic Schools: H. Res. 28, honoring the contributions of Catholic Schools (agreed to by a yea and nay vote of 412 yeas with none voting “nay” and 1 voting “present”, Roll No. 10).

Consideration of Suspension: Agreed that it be in order for the Speaker to entertain a motion on Wednesday, Feb. 7, to suspend the rules and consider H.R. 132, to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 620 Jacaranda Street in Lanai City, Hawaii, as the “Goro Hokama Post Office Building.”

Recess: The House recessed at 3:11 p.m. and reconvened at 6 p.m.

Quorum Calls—Votes: Two yea-and-nay votes developed during the proceedings of the House today and appear on pages H186 and H186-87. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 2 p.m. and adjourned at 8:14 p.m.

Committee Meetings

No Committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 7, 2001

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: to hold hearings to examine how to establish an effective, modern framework for export controls, 10:30 a.m., SD-538.

Committee on the Budget: to hold hearings to examine the impact of demographic trends on the budget and long-term fiscal policy, 10 a.m., SD-608.

Committee on Foreign Relations: business meeting to consider committee rules of procedure, subcommittee jurisdiction and membership; S. 248, to amend the Admiral James W. Nance and Meg Donovan Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 2000 and 2001, to adjust a condition on the payment of arrearages to the United Nations that sets the maximum share of any United Nations peacekeeping operation's budget that may be assessed of any country; proposed legislation congratulating President Chandrika Bandaranaike Kumaratunga and the people of the Democratic Socialist Republic of Sri Lanka on the celebration of 53 years of independence; S. Con. Res. 6, expressing the sympathy for the victims of the devastating earthquake that struck India on January 26, 2001, and support for ongoing aid efforts; the nomination of Paul Henry O'Neill, of Pennsylvania, to be United States Governor of the International Monetary Fund; and Foreign Service Officer promotion lists, 10:30 a.m., SD-419.

Select Committee on Intelligence: to hold hearings to examine worldwide threats to national security, 10 a.m., SH-216. Full Committee, to hold closed hearings on intelligence matters, 2:30 p.m., SH-219.

Committee on the Judiciary: to hold hearings to examine airline consolidation implications, 9:30 a.m., SD-226.

House

Committee on Armed Services, to hold an organizational meeting, 1 p.m., 2118 Rayburn.

Committee on the Budget: to hold an organizational meeting, 10 a.m., 210 Cannon.

Committee on Education and the Workforce, to hold an organizational meeting, 10:30 a.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on Energy and Commerce, to hold an organizational meeting, 2 p.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on House Administration, to hold an organizational meeting, 3:30 p.m., 1310 Longworth.

Committee on International Relations, to hold an organizational meeting, 11:30 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Science, to hold an organizational meeting, 2 p.m., 2325 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, to hold an organizational meeting, 12 p.m., 2167 Rayburn.
Next Meeting of the SENATE
10 a.m., Wednesday, February 7

Senate Chamber

Program for Wednesday: After the recognition of certain Senators for speeches and the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond 1 p.m.), Senate is expected to consider S. 248, United Nations dues.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
10 a.m., Wednesday, February 7

House Chamber

Program for Wednesday: Consideration of H.R. 132, designation of the “Goro Hokama Post Office Building” in Lanai City, Hawaii.
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