United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 145 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, APRIL 12, 1999 No. 49

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
April 12, 1999.

I hereby appoint the Honorable EDWARD A. PEASE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.R. 98. An act to amend chapter 443 of title 49, United States Code, to extend the aviation war risk insurance program and to amend the Centennial of Flight Commemoration Act to make technical and other corrections.

H.R. 440. An act to make technical corrections to the Microloan Program.

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

S. 243. An act to authorize the construction of the Perkins County Rural Water System and authorize financial assistance to the Perkins County Rural Water System, Inc., a nonprofit corporation, in the planning and construction of the water supply system, and for other purposes.

S. 278. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands to the county of Rio Arriba, New Mexico.

S. 291. An act to convey certain real property within the Carlsbad Project in New Mexico to the Carlsbad Irrigation District.

S. 292. An act to preserve the cultural resources of the Route 66 corridor and to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide assistance.

S. 293. An act to direct the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior to convey certain lands in San Juan County, New Mexico, to San Juan College.

S. 334. An act to amend the Federal Power Act to remove the jurisdiction of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to license projects on fresh waters in the State of Hawaii.

S. 356. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain works, facilities, and titles of the Gila Project, and designated lands within or adjacent to the Gila Project, to the Wellton-Mohawk Irrigation and Drainage District, and for other purposes.

S. 382. An act to establish the Minuteman Missile National Historic Site in the State of South Dakota, and for other purposes.

S. 388. An act to authorize the establishment of a disaster mitigation pilot program in the Small Business Administration.

S. 422. An act to provide for Alaska state jurisdiction over small hydroelectric projects.

S. 756. An act to provide adversely affected crop producers with additional time to make fully informed risk management decisions for the 1999 crop year.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 19, 1999, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debate. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. STEARNS) for 5 minutes.

MISADVENTURE IN YUGOSLAVIA

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the ongoing military action against Yugoslavia and the reservations that many of us have concerning U.S. involvement.

Go back with me for a moment to Carl von Clausewitz, who probably has been quoted as the foremost military strategist in modern history, his writings were published posthumously on military strategy in 1832, one year after death, in a book entitled ''On War.'' One of the key principles advanced by him that I think has relevance today, even though it was written in 1832, was in regard to military action, what is the political objective and, more importantly, in regard to military action against Yugoslavia because he indicated that political objective is a prime organizer for war. He writes, quote:

> The political objective, the original motive for the war, will thus determine both the military objective to be reached and the amount of effort it requires.

What he was saying is that once you state what your political objective is to be, you then tailor your military strategy in order to achieve victory according to the original political objective, and this is the heart of my difficulties with our current military operation.

The President has propagated ever-shifting political objectives. By my own calculations, he has had at least three different stated political objectives in Kosovo.

The first stated objective by the administration was to prevent the ethnic cleansing of the ethnic Albanians in Kosovo by the Yugoslavian Serbs. So what was the military strategy created to achieve a victory by President Clinton? They decided we would bomb the Serbs in order to prevent the wiping out of the Kosovars.

Mr. Speaker, the result has been failure. The administration's plans set the table for failure, and it resulted in the removal of at least 500,000 Kosovars from their homes and the killing of countless men and women and children. The sad fact is that intelligence sources have leaked that they warned

Printed on recycled paper.

the President and the administration beforehand that the likely result of bombing would be to trigger the Serbian assault on the Kosovars.

So, did the President and his advisers take into account the advice of our intelligence services and create a strategy to achieve victory according to his first objective? No. They ignored their advice and began the bombing which resulted in the misery that has enveloped the Kosovars.

Now the second objective, Mr. Speaker, was then to reduce the Serbs' warmaking ability. Again, the strategy was to continue bombing. Well, the results have been mixed. The United States Air Force has successfully punished Serbian forces, destroyed the infrastructure assets, and attacked political objectives such as a foreign ministry building in Belgrade. The bombing has yet, however, to weaken the hold on the power of Milosevic, and it is difficult to tell at this point how much maximum damage has been done to the Serbian Army. They still fully occupy the Kosovar province.

Now the third objective was to repatriate the Kosovars back to their homes. The military strategy to achieve this objective apparently is to continue bombing. Many of us wonder whether bombing will accomplish this last objective.

So the results are still to be determined, and to my knowledge the U.S. Government has not even begun negotiations with the Yugoslav Government to bring about the return of the Kosovars, end the bombing, and create some sort of political solution to give the Kosovars a limited autonomous state.

The lack of diplomacy by this administration during this crisis has been counterproductive, and it has in addition greatly strained our relationship with Russia. The administration has even had a chance to have our three American soldiers released through a limited cease-fire during the Orthodox Good Friday, but the administration refused even to allow any discussions to take place to have our men released.

So finally, Mr. Speaker, many in Congress are probably wondering why people on this side of the aisle are a little hesitant to support the President during this military conflict. We remember the President's lack of military service and his written opinion of his dislike for the American military. Many of us remember when the President denied American soldiers the proper equipment and placed them under non-American command in Somalia, which resulted in the gruesome deaths of 18 young Americans.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are unsure that the President knows how to attain military victory in Kosovo against Yugoslavia.

LAWRENCE NYE STEVENS—UNSUNG HERO OF AMERICAN ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, there are many individuals who have led the way to give us progress, framework and choices we now have known as a quest for livable communities. One who has dedicated his professional life to enhancement of the environment and preserving the American quality of life is Lawrence Nye Stevens, who is here with us today in the Capitol with his family and friends, having just celebrated his 84th birthday. We are honored to have him seated with us in the East Gallery. His curiosity, vision and good old American ingenuity to make this a better place have put him years ahead of his time.

His experiences with soil erosion on a cattle ranch in Montana in the 1930's convinced him that something needed to be done to protect the land, and led him to earn a graduate degree in geography that focused on land utilization and soil and water conservation. This training was put to good use during World War II. Commissioned in the U.S. Navy, Larry was in charge of the study of military geography in the European Theater.

After the war, he was Administrative Assistant to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs where he started a long career working in the Department of Interior in various capacities. In 1968, he was recognized by his peers and honored with the Distinguished Service Award by the U.S. Department of Interior.

Under the leadership of Secretary Stewart Udall, Larry Stevens became Deputy Director of the Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission. This commission had a profound effect on America's ability to catalogue our resources. For example, in 1966 an Outdoor Recreation Commission report was prophetic. I quote:

> But parks and other recreation areas are only part of the answer. The most important recreation of all is the kind that people find in their everyday life. Do they find enough of it now? Do children have to be driven to school, or can they walk or cycle to it safely over wooded paths? Are there streams for an afternoon's fishing, or have they all been buried in concrete culverts? Are the stands of woods all gone, or are a few left for a picnic or a stroll? What this means, in short, is an environment. Thus our challenge: Can we shape future growth so that recreation is an integral part of it? It will require a fresh approach.

A third of a century ago is the first time that I found the word ''environment'' used in this fashion. It was the term President Nixon selected in the landmark National Environmental Policy Act.

We sometimes forget the leaders who have shown us the way and the people who provide key research analysis and advocacy like Larry Stevens. He is a man of strong convictions. He has long been concerned about the waste that we see around us, waste of taxpayer money, waste of energy, minerals, food and fiber, and by the loss of prime agricultural land to unwise land use. He has cautioned us throughout his life that we cannot afford a ''quick fix'' philosophy that increasingly pervades our economy and society. He has truly been a pioneer in the area of planning and smart growth.

He has also been a strong advocate in the use of cycling, and that is how I first met him. He was Executive Director of the Citizens' Advisory Committee on Environmental Quality when that committee authored a publication called ''From Rails To Trails.'' We all owe Larry and the citizens' committee appointed by the President a great debt of gratitude for highlighting this idea.

Recently Larry wrote in the Harvard 50th Anniversary Report that ''Each day I try to ride at least a few miles on my 10-speed bicycle, an ingenious and remarkably efficient machine.'' I agree with Larry and acknowledge his active participation in the creation of the nationwide network of ''rails to trails.''

We who are in the business of trying to make communities more livable, providing tools for our citizens to thrive in the global economy, where citizens and private institutions work in partnership with government at all levels to ensure safety, economic security and healthy communities, we are all still living with the challenge of how we shape our growth so that recreation is an integral part of it and the preservation of the American heritage is not lost. Larry Stevens is one of those unsung heroes.

It gives me particular pleasure to acknowledge Larry Stevens for his commitment to the environment as a private citizen, as a mentor to many of my friends and a professional public servant. His imagination, commitment to environmental quality and friendship have benefited our quest for more livable communities.

America is in his debt.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair reminds Members that pursuant to clause 7 of rule XVII it is not in order to introduce or bring to the attention of the House occupants of the gallery.

RECESS

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

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

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Reverend Douglas Tanner, Executive Director, Faith and Politics Institute, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we come before You this day aware that the 2 weeks since this House last convened have brought us into a new season. We have gathered with our families to celebrate Passover and Easter. The Tidal Basin has been graced by cherry blossoms and beavers, and buds have broken from the trees. We thank You that even on a cool, cloudy, windy day like this we can trust that in Washington the winter is past and spring has come.

We pray especially today for those in Balkan lands for whom the past 2 weeks have been so different, for those who have lived and continue to live every minute in terror, finding it hard to trust that anything is past except for their dreams, or that anything is coming except for more deprivation, despair, violence, and terror.

As we face this harsh reality, Lord, deliver us from shallowness and pomposity. Grant us the grace to accept the things we cannot change, the courage to change the things we can, and the wisdom to know the difference. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

Mr. GIBBONS led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 26, 1999.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the Permission granted to Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on March 26, 1999 at 11:00 a.m.

that the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 171.

that the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 193

that the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 705

that the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 1212

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

JEFF TRANDAHL,
Clerk.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to clause 4 of rule I, the Speaker signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions on Thursday, March 25, 1999:

H.R. 774, To amend the Small Business Act to change the conditions of participation and provide an authorization of appropriations for the Women's Business Center program;

H.R. 808, To extend for 6 additional months the period for which Chapter 12 of Title 11, United States Code, is reenacted;

H.J. Res. 26, Providing for the reappointment of Barber B. Conable, Jr. as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution;

H.J. Res. 27, Providing for the reappointment of Dr. Hanna H. Gray as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution;

H.J. Res. 28, Providing for the reappointment of Wesley S. Williams, Jr., as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution; and

S. 643, To authorize the Airport Improvement program for 2 months, and for other purposes;

And Speaker pro tempore WOLF signed the following enrolled bills on Wednesday, March 31, 1999:

H.R. 171, To authorize appropriations for the Coastal Heritage Trail Route in New Jersey, and for other purposes;

H.R. 193, To designate a portion of the Sudbury, Assabet, and Concord Rivers as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System;

H.R. 705, To make technical corrections with respect to the monthly reports submitted by the Postmaster General on official mail of the House of Representatives; and

H.R. 1212, To protect producers of agricultural commodities who applied for a crop revenue coverage plus supplemental endorsement for the 1999 crop year.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO NATIONAL HISTORICAL PUBLICATIONS AND RECORDS COMMISSION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to 44 U.S.C. 2501, the Chair announces his appointment of the following Member of the House to the National Historical Publications and Records Commission:

Mr. BLUNT of Missouri.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO BOARD OF VISITORS TO UNITED STATES AIR FORCE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 9355(a), the Chair announces his appointment of the following Members of the House to the Board of Visitors to the United States Air Force Academy:

Mr. YOUNG, Florida; and

Mr. HEFLEY, Colorado.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO BOARD OF VISITORS TO UNITED STATES COAST GUARD ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to 14 U.S.C. 194(a), the Chair announces his appointment of the following Member of the House to the Board of Visitors to the United States Coast Guard Academy:

Mrs. JOHNSON, Connecticut.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBER TO BOARD OF VISITORS TO UNITED STATES MERCHANT MARINE ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to 46 U.S.C. 1295(h), the Chair announces his appointment of the following Member of the House to the Board of Visitors to the United States Merchant Marine Academy:

Mr. KING, New York.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO BOARD OF VISITORS TO UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 4355(a), the Chair announces his appointment of the following Members of the House to the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy:

Mr. TAYLOR, North Carolina; and

Mrs. KELLY, New York.

APPOINTMENT OF MEMBERS TO BOARD OF VISITORS TO UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 6968(a), the Chair announces his appointment of the following Members of the House to the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy:

Mr. SKEEN, New Mexico;
Mr. GILCHREST, Maryland;
Mr. TANNER, Tennessee; and
Mr. HOYER, Maryland.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE HONORABLE RICHARD A. GEPHARDT, DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable RICHARD A. GEPHARDT, Democratic Leader:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
OFFICE OF THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER,
Washington, DC, April 12, 1999.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the provisions of section 4 of the Congressional Award Act (section 803, title 2, United States Code) I herewith appoint the following named persons to the Congressional Award National Board of Directors:

Representative Carlos A. Romero-Barceló of Puerto Rico,
Dolores M. Beilenson of California,
Timothy J. Keating of Pennsylvania,
Robert J. Kelley of Missouri.

Sincerely,

RICHARD A. GEPHARDT,
Democratic Leader.

RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Small Business:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 25, 1999.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Last week I was appointed to the Committee on Government Reform. As a result of this appointment, I hereby resign as a member of the Committee on Small Business.

Thank you for your attention to this request.

Sincerely,

JANICE D. SCHAKOWSKY,
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM DAVID M. DELQUADRO, ASSISTANT DIRECTOR, ADMINISTRATION AND INFORMATION DIVISION, CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from David M. Delquadro, Assistant Director, Administration and Information Division, Congressional Budget Office:

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, March 30, 19999.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House, that I received a subpoena for documents and testimony issued by the Superior Court of the District of Columbia.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined to comply with the subpoena to the extent that it is consistent with Rule VIII.

Sincerely,

DAVID M. DELQUADRO,
Assistant Director, Administration and Information Division.

CHINESE ESPIONAGE JEOPARDIZES SECURITY OF AMERICA AND ITS CITIZENS

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, the security of America and its citizens has been seriously jeopardized because of the nuclear weapons and missile transfer of technology to China. The American people deserve to know just how our Nation's goose has been cooked.

Newsweek recently reported that our top nuclear weapons expert practically fainted when briefed by CIA analysts on the preliminary damage assessment from Chinese espionage.

Additionally, I think the American people will also feel faint when they learn that the investigating officials believe that the Chinese spying, even into our most serious secret weapons programs, is described as almost total.

Mr. Speaker, nuclear warhead technology might be hard for most to conceive, but the fact that China could conceivably have the power to kill as many as seven million Americans with one missile is something that I think everyone can visualize.

This Chinese espionage has gone on far too long. I urge the Security Council to release the Cox report because this administration needs to stand up and take responsibility for release of this Top Secret technology, and the American people deserve to fully know what kind of mess we are actually in.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back any secrets we may have.

KOSOVO IS ONE BIG WAR CRIME

(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, rape, murder, torture. Kosovo is one big war crime. I say it is time to indict Slobodan Milosevic for his war crimes. I say it is time to arm the opposition forces in Kosovo so they can defend themselves. I say it is time for Europe, yes, Europe, to send in ground troops to help.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, Milosevic has lost all moral and legal authority to rule Kosovo. It is time to support and recognize independence for Kosovo.

Members of Congress, we can pay now or Congress and the world can pay much, much more later.

I yield back all of the crimes of Slobodan Milosevic.

MICROCREDIT LENDING

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak about a wonderful program which is transforming the lives of millions of poor families around the world. I am referring to microcredit lending.

Microcredit involves giving small, low-interest, start-up loans to poor but hard-working, aspiring entrepreneurs so that they can start their thriving small businesses known as microenterprises. It is a program which has demonstrated the potential to help the poorest family emerge from poverty and, by extension, to help create a more inclusive global economy. Results in Miami under the leadership of Gail Newman, Kathleen Gordon, and many other volunteers has helped dozens become entrepreneurs.

Microcredit works locally and it can work globally, as well. It is not a handout. It is an opportunity, an investment, an exercise in responsibility and accountability. In developing countries, the rate of repayment to these established programs range from 95 to 99 percent.

Foreign assistance used under the microcredit program is loaned and paid back with interest and is recycled and used for new loans, thus reaching an even greater percentage of the world's poor.

Microcredit is empowerment. It is a tool which builds upon the human spirit. It is the U.S. helping others to help themselves. Microcredit is action in support of our humanitarian instincts and objectives.

I support this program, and when the bill comes to the floor, H.R. 1143, I ask that my colleagues give their strong support. I know that results in Miami works, and it works internationally, as well.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Such rollcall votes, if postponed, will be taken after debate has concluded on all motions to suspend the rules but not before 6:30 p.m. today.

OTAY MOUNTAIN WILDERNESS ACT OF 1999

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 15) to designate a portion of the Otay Mountain region of California as wilderness.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 15

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 ''Otay Mountain Wilderness Act of 1999''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds and declares the following:

(1) The public lands within the Otay Mountain region of California are one of the last remaining pristine locations in western San Diego County, California.

(2) This rugged mountain adjacent to the United States-Mexico border is internationally known for its diversity of unique and sensitive plants.

(3) This area plays a critical role in San Diego's multi-species conservation plan, a national model made for maintaining biodiversity.

(4) Due to its proximity to the international border, this area is the focus of important law enforcement and border interdiction efforts necessary to curtail illegal immigration and protect the area's wilderness values.

(5) The illegal immigration traffic, combined with the rugged topography, also presents unique fire management challenges for protecting lives and resources.

SEC. 3. DESIGNATION.

In furtherance of the purposes of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), certain

public lands in the California Desert District of the Bureau of Land Management, California, comprising approximately 18,500 acres as generally depicted on a map entitled ''Otay Mountain Wilderness'' and dated May 7, 1998, are hereby designated as wilderness and therefore as a component of the National Wilderness Preservation System, which shall be known as the Otay Mountain Wilderness.

SEC. 4. MAP AND LEGAL DESCRIPTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, a map and a legal description for the Wilderness Area shall be filed by the Secretary with the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives. Such map and legal description shall have the same force and effect as if included in this Act, except that the Secretary, as appropriate, may correct clerical and typographical errors in such legal description and map. Such map and legal description for the Wilderness Area shall be on file and available for public inspection in the offices of the Director and California State Director, Bureau of Land Management, Department of the Interior.

(b) UNITED STATES-MEXICO BORDER.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall ensure that the southern boundary of the Wilderness Area is 100 feet north of the trail depicted on the map referred to in subsection (a) and is at least 100 feet from the United States-Mexico international border.

SEC. 5. WILDERNESS REVIEW.

The Congress hereby finds and directs that all the public lands not designated wilderness within the boundaries of the Southern Otay Mountain Wilderness Study Area (CA–060–029) and the Western Otay Mountain Wilderness Study Area (CA–060–028) managed by the Bureau of Land Management and reported to the Congress in 1991, have been adequately studied for wilderness designation pursuant to section 603 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1782), and are no longer subject to the requirements contained in section 603(c) of that Act pertaining to the management of wilderness study areas in a manner that does not impair the suitability of such areas for preservation as wilderness.

SEC. 6. ADMINISTRATION OF WILDERNESS AREA.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to valid existing rights and to subsection (b), the Wilderness Area shall be administered by the Secretary in accordance with the provisions of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), except that—

(1) any reference in such provisions to the effective date of the Wilderness Act is deemed to be a reference to the effective date of this Act; and

(2) any reference in such provisions to the Secretary of Agriculture is deemed to be a reference to the Secretary of the Interior.

(b) BORDER ENFORCEMENT, DRUG INTERDICTION, AND WILDLAND FIRE PROTECTION.—Because of the proximity of the Wilderness Area to the United States-Mexico international border, drug interdiction, border operations, and wildland fire management operations are common management actions throughout the area encompassing the Wilderness Area. This Act recognizes the need to continue such management actions so long as such management actions are conducted in accordance with the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.) and are subject to such conditions as the Secretary considers appropriate.

SEC. 7. FURTHER ACQUISITIONS.

Any lands within the boundaries of the Wilderness Area that are acquired by the United States after the date of enactment of this Act shall become part of the Wilderness Area and shall be managed in accordance with all the provisions of this Act and other laws applicable to such a wilderness.

SEC. 8. NO BUFFER ZONES.

The Congress does not intend for the designation of the Wilderness Area by this Act to lead to the creation of protective perimeters or buffer zones around the Wilderness Area. The fact that nonwilderness activities or uses can be seen or heard from areas within the Wilderness Area shall not, of itself, preclude such activities or uses up to the boundary of the Wilderness Area.

SEC. 9. DEFINITIONS.

As used in this Act:

(1) PUBLIC LANDS.—The term ''public lands'' has the same meaning as that term has in section 103(e) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976.

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

(3) WILDERNESS AREA.—The term ''Wilderness Area'' means the Otay Mountain Wilderness designated by section 3.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS) and the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS).

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

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, the Otay Mountains, near the U.S.-Mexico border, are a unique region with diverse natural values. The area has good opportunities for solitude and primitive recreation and is particularly important to the people of San Diego County. The area contains several sensitive species, including the only known U.S. populations of the Mexican flannel bush and Tecate cypress.

In the 1980s, the Bureau of Land Management recommended a large portion of these mountains as wilderness, and this recommendation has received strong public support. The Otay Mountain Wilderness Act of 1999, introduced by our distinguished colleague from California (Mr. BILBRAY), would designate about 18,500 acres of the Otay Mountain region as wilderness to protect its sensitive resources and preserve it for future generations.

During the negotiations and hearings on H.R. 15, several sources expressed concern that wilderness designation in the Otay Mountain region could adversely affect Border Patrol and drug interdiction activities.

□ 1415

The Border Patrol assured the committee that in light of the fact that the roads in the area were excluded from the wilderness area and given the language in section 6(b) of the bill, border operations would not be adversely affected by wilderness designation. Given these assurances, the committee decided not to amend section 6(b).

I want to emphasize once again that H.R. 15 has widespread support from environmental groups, the BLM, the DEA, the Border Patrol and the people of San Diego County. I commend the gentleman from California for his hard work on this important piece of legislation. This is good legislation that will protect an important area. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 15.

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

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 15 would designate 18,500 acres of the Otay Mountain area in eastern San Diego County as wilderness. Lands within and around the Otay Mountains are currently managed as wilderness study areas and form part of the U.S.-Mexico border.

Last Congress, in hearings on similar legislation, H.R. 3950, the administration testified in support of the wilderness designation but opposed language in the bill which would have allowed all law enforcement activities and fire management activities to occur without regard to the wilderness designation or without regard to the Wilderness Act of 1964.

The Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands, in adopting the bill last Congress, agreed to an amendment to address the problems with the bill. This new language recognized ongoing drug interdiction, border enforcement and fire management and the need to allow these activities to continue as long as they are in accordance with the Wilderness Act and subject to appropriate conditions as determined by the Secretary of the Interior.

H.R. 15 reflects the agreed upon language from the last Congress. While there are some individuals and organizations that would prefer no mention in the bill of border activities or fire activities, we believe the language of the bill is acceptable and will not undermine the administration of the area as wilderness. As such, we support passage of the bill and encourage our colleagues to vote for the bill.

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY), the sponsor of this piece of legislation.

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

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 15 will designate as wilderness area 18,500 acres of Otay Mountain, a rugged area along the U.S.-Mexico border in southern San Diego County. It is a stunning place, where people can still go and see how the neighborhood looked when Father Serra entered California over 200 years ago.

H.R. 15 is a bipartisan consensus effort made possible by strong support from many different interest groups in an effort to work together. Both local,

Federal and State agencies were involved, including the San Diego County Board of Supervisors, the Endangered Habitats League, the California Department of Forestry, the Border Patrol, the Departments of Justice and Interior, and Secretary Babbitt, who toured the area himself and addressed it in December.

I want to specifically thank the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN), the chairman of the subcommittee, and the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman of the full committee, for their strong support of H.R. 15. I also wish to sincerely thank my colleague from California, Senator FEINSTEIN, whose strong support of the Otay Mountain wilderness area and this legislation has been critical to its success. I look forward to working with her on the bill as it moves to the Senate.

The unique thing, Mr. Speaker, about H.R. 15 is it serves as an example of how we can dovetail two apparently conflicting strategies of State and Federal agencies and make them work together in a cooperative purpose. H.R. 15 gives the Border Patrol the continuing ability to conduct its essential law enforcement mission along the border in this region. This increased enforcement has proven to be a positive if not essential part of preserving the wildlife habitat and the unique natural fauna in this area.

The Border Patrol's increased level of interdictions in this area has resulted in a lessening of the impact on the Otay Mountain itself, fewer illegal trails, trash piles, human waste and campfires which have caused innumerable damage to the area. This includes wildfires that have been purposely set by smugglers as diversionary tactics while they smuggled drugs and illegal aliens into the area.

I have spoken directly with Bill Veale, the regional director of the Border Patrol in this region, and he strongly supports this bill. He assures me that the important task that he has been vested with will continue to be effective, especially with H.R. 15 designation.

Access to Otay Mountain by the Border Patrol, the California Department of Forestry and the public will not be diminished by H.R. 15. It will be guaranteed. The two main truck trails on Otay Mountain are completely excluded, called cherrystemmed, from the wilderness area, and other jeep trails and spur roads are not included within the wilderness boundary of H.R. 15.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 15 preserves a unique and rugged area of San Diego as wilderness for future generations to enjoy, and specifically ensures that both critical law enforcement activities and public access will continue in the region. It is my hope that this bill will serve as a blueprint for future situations where resource management and law enforcement activities must coexist and hopefully do so in a way that benefits all involved.

Mr. Speaker, this bill can be the blueprint for not only law enforcement and habitat preservation but for this Congress, that we can protect the public and protect the wildlife resources of this Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 15.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great satisfaction to rise in strong support of H.R. 15, the Otay Mountain Wilderness Act of 1999. H.R. 15 will designate as wilderness roughly 18,500 acres of the Otay Mountain region, in southern San Diego County along the U.S.-Mexico border. This is a rugged and stunning place, where people can still go to experience a sense of what this area looked like when Father Junipero Serra first explored it more than two hundred years ago.

H.R. 15 is a common-sense and bipartisan consensus effort, which was built from the ground level up, involving elected officials, agencies, and public interest stakeholders at the local, state and federal level. As a result of working together to address the needs and concerns of all participants, I am happy to be able to tell my colleagues that the broad support for H.R. 15 runs the gamut—from the San Diego County Board of Supervisors and the Endangered Habitats League (a respected local conservation organization), to the California Department of Forestry (CDF) and the Border Patrol, to the Departments of Justice and the Interior, including Secretary Babbitt.

I want to particularly thank Chairman JIM HANSEN and Chairman DON YOUNG, along with all my colleagues on the Resources Committee, for all their assistance to date on this legislation and their willingness to make it a priority. I am also grateful to my California colleague, Senator FEINSTEIN, for her support of this legislation. In the last several years, Senator FEINSTEIN has played a key role in facilitating access by the Border Patrol to Otay Mountain, which has resulted in dramatic reductions in illegal activity in this border region. She deserves a great deal of credit for the progress which has been achieved there to date, and I look forward to working with her as this legislation moves through the Senate.

In addition to protecting as wilderness a particularly unique and rugged area of San Diego County, H.R. 15 is important for the constructive precedent I hope it can set for future resource conservation and land management policy. By working together at all levels, the broad coalition of support for H.R. 15 has demonstrated that wilderness designation is not inherently incompatible with essential law enforcement activities in the same region, and vice versa. Where it is appropriate, we should take these opportunities to demonstrate that different agency missions or operating strategies can be made to complement each other, rather than to exist completely independently from one another, or worse, in conflict.

We have already seen the positive environmental and enforcement results of the Border Patrol's increased access to Otay Mountain and adjoining areas near the border. The reductions in illegal smuggling and immigration there have directly translated into a lessened impact on the resource itself, such as fewer illicit trails beaten through sensitive habitat, less discarded trash and human waste, and greatly lessened risk of damage from warming or diversionary fires set by smugglers, such as devastated much of the mountain several years ago. H.R. 15 will ensure that Border Patrol's access to this region will continue unhindered, with continued resulting benefit to both law enforcement and environmental protection concerns.

In addition to facilitating increased and continued law enforcement and resource protection for Otay Mountain, the ability of the general public to enjoy this beautiful region is maintained. When I first introduced this legislation, several of my colleagues expressed to me their strong interest in maintaining public access, and as this has also been a high priority of mine, H.R. 15 does so.

The two existing access roads on Otay Mountain (the Otay Truck trail and the Minnewawa Truck trail) have been ''cherrystemmed'' from the wilderness boundaries, to ensure that both the Border Patrol and the CDF will be able to continue their critical law enforcement and fire suppression activities in the region under H.R. 15, and that the history of access by the public to this tremendous resource will continue. Other roads in the vicinity, specifically the Otay Mountain Pack trail and the East and West Spur roads, are not included within the wilderness boundaries and so are not impacted by this legislation.

There may be other regions of extraordinary natural beauty elsewhere in our country, perhaps even in other border regions, where the critical individual missions of various state or federal law enforcement agencies have in the past been (or have been perceived to be) operating at ''cross purposes'' with equally important missions of resource conservation or environmental protection. It is my hope that H.R. 15 can serve as a blueprint for how a mutually beneficial working relationship can be established among such agencies, in order to best address the needs of a given region. I thank my colleagues for their support of this bipartisan bill, and would issue an open tour invitation for any of you that might like to visit this beautiful and rugged jewel of San Diego.

SAN DIEGO COUNTY BOARD
OF SUPERVISORS,
San Diego, CA, February 17, 1999.

To: Board of Supervisors

Subject: Resolution supporting wilderness area designation for Otay Mountain

Summary

Congressman Brian Bilbray has submitted H.R. 15, the Otay Mountain Wilderness Act of 1999, to the United States House of Representatives Committee on Resources. Otay Mountain possesses critically important natural resources that are unique to the Nation. A wilderness designation would provide long-term protection of this unique ecosystem while creating a comprehensive management framework which will enable the U.S. Border Patrol and the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection to improve public safety in the region.

Recommendation: Supervisor Jacob

Adopt the attached resolution supporting the Otay Wilderness Act of 1999.

Fiscal impact

None.

Background

Otay Mountain has long been recognized as a unique ecosystem. The mountain is composed of rock with unusual properties that benefit plant growth. As a result, the mountain supports a large number of endangered and sensitive species. Otay Mountain is also home to the world's largest strand of rare Tecate Cypress.

Designation of 18,500 acres on Otay Mountain as part of the National Wilderness Preservation System will ensure long-term protection of valuable natural resources and wildlife and opportunities for public recreation will be established. Furthermore, as this area has experienced extensive resource damage as a result of illegal immigrant activity and wildfires, designation as a Wilderness Area will help in coordinating and improving public safety.

Support of H.R. 15 authored by Congress Brian Bilbray would be consistent with San Diego County's efforts to protect threatened flora and fauna and continue its role as the Nation's leader in habitat planning.

Respectfully Submitted,

DIANNE JACOB,
Supervisor, Second District.

RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS SUPPORTING THE OTAY WILDERNESS ACT OF 1999

On the motion of Supervisor Horn, seconded by Supervisor Cox, the following resolution is adopted:

WHEREAS, Otay Mountain is a valuable ecosystem, consisting of 18,500 acres of rare, endangered and sensitive flora and fauna that is unique to this region; and

WHEREAS, the important biology existing on Otay Mountain includes the world's largest strand of rare Tecate Cypress; and

WHEREAS, preservation of this land will be consistent with the goals of the County of San Diego to protect its threatened natural resources and wildlife; and

WHEREAS, establishment of a Wilderness Area would create opportunities for public recreation at Otay Mountain; and

WHEREAS, designation of Otay Mountain as a Wilderness Area is supported by the U.S. Border Patrol, the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection, and the U.S. Attorney's Office;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the San Diego County Board of Supervisors hereby recommends to the United States Congress that H.R. 15, the Otay Mountain Act of 1999, sponsored by Congressman Brian Bilbray, be adopted designating Otay Mountain as part of the National Wilderness Preservation System.

On motion of Supervisor Horn, seconded by Supervisor Cox, the foregoing Resolution was passed and adopted by the Board of Supervisors, County of San Diego, State of California, on this 17th day of February, 1999, by the following vote:

AYES: Cox, Jacob, Slater, Horn.

ABSENT: Roberts.

State of California, County of San Diego.

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a full, true and correct copy of the Original entered in the Minutes of the Board of Supervisors.

THOMAS J. PASTUSZKA,
Clerk of the Board of Supervisors.

By Frank Galang, Deputy.

SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, DC, February 3, 1999.

Hon. BRIAN P. BILBRAY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. BILBRAY: Thank you for your letter of December 14, 1998, regarding the proposal to designate Otay Mountain in San Diego County as wilderness.

I regret that you were unable to join me on the Otay Mountain tour. I was pleased to meet the many individuals and local officials committed to preserving the special resources on Otay Mountain.

The conclusion of the group present was that the time was appropriate to designate Otay Mountain as part of the National Wilderness Preservation System. Bureau of Land Management Acting Director Tom Fry will be testifying on February 4, 1999, before the House Resources Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands on behalf of the Administration in strong support of H.R. 15.

I look forward to working with you to preserve the unique resources of this area as the legislation makes its way through Congress.

Sincerely,

BILL BABBITT.

ENDANGERED HABITATS LEAGUE,
Los Angeles, CA, February 1, 1999.

Re: Otay Mountain Wilderness Bill HR–15 (Bilbray).

Hon. BRUCE BABBITT,
Secretary,
Department of the Interior, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In 1993, you came to San Diego and announced a dramatic change of policy for the Department of the Interior. Your announcement that Bureau of Land Management holdings within the San Diego region would be managed for conservation consistent with the management directives of the Multiple Species Conservation Program (MSCP) was of fundamental importance. It underscored the fact that management of the biological systems that we are attempting to preserve and restore required regional consistency among agencies and jurisdictions responsible for land use and land management. At that time, however, we did not realize how difficult that would turn out to be on Otay Mountain, the heart of the largest biological core area in the MSCP.

When the combination of illegal immigration and interdiction began to destroy the resources on the mountain we met with you, Ed Hasty and others to consider possible solutions. After much discussion it was agreed that in exchange for our support in moving the interdiction skirmish line down to the border via the development of the spur roads, you would work for and support wilderness designation for the mountain. As we saw last month when we met with you on this site, the interdiction part of the strategy has worked better than any of us expected. The land is recovering, and the loss of human life on the mountain has been reduced dramatically. It is rare that a plan works out as well as this one has.

In our view, wilderness designation was the strongest assurance that the invaluable biological resources of Otay Mountain would be protected in perpetuity, Your handshake agreement with us has been good, and despite concern with section 6(b) of HR–15, we have an acceptable wilderness bill in front of us. We are very appreciative of your leadership on this issue.

The point of contention in section 6(b) has been the special language regarding border interdiction. As you know, the Endangered Habitats League and the Sierra Club have been working with the Wilderness Society and the Natural Resources Defense Council on this important issue. While the special circumstances of this particular border area are acknowledged, there remain concerns about the possibility of weakening The Wilderness Act by establishing a precedent that could be misused elsewhere in the future.

In our judgment, the language in section 6(b) is acceptable for our circumstance in San Diego. While we feel that the appropriate place for this language is in the report accompanying the bill, we are willing to accept its placement in the body of the bill based on our understanding of the last sentence of the section which reads: ''This Act recognizes the need to continue such management actions so long as such management actions are conducted in accordance with The Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.) and are subject to such conditions as the Secretary considers appropriate.'' We read this to mean that consistency with The Wilderness Act, as written, is mandatory.

We look forward to working with the wildlife agencies, BLM, and border and fire protection agencies on the development of the critically important biological management plan for Otay Mountain. Both the County and City of San Diego have species covered under their subarea plans that are dependent upon that management plan. It is my hope that we can begin the process this year.

The progress that has been made in the last six years for conservation in the South-County has been truly remarkable. The Otay Mountain Wilderness will be the heart of this conservation area and the bedrock of the MSCP. Speaking for myself and the endangered Habitats League, and, if I can presume to speak for the resources, you have our deep appreciation.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL BECK,
San Diego Director.

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER).

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Speaker, I also rise in support of H.R. 15, the Otay Mountain Wilderness Act. This area should be designated as a wilderness area so that we can preserve its natural wonders and safeguard the many treasures it has to offer for future generations.

The gentleman from California (Mr. BILBRAY) and I are part of the San Diego congressional delegation that has been working hard with the U.S. Border Patrol, the California Department of Forestry, the California Department of Fish and Game, the City of San Diego, the County of San Diego and the U.S. Attorney's office, all together, to try to make H.R. 15 a reality. All of us have come together despite our differences to make sure that we preserve the pristine beauty of this natural wilderness for our children and our grandchildren. Mr. Speaker, it would be truly a shame if future generations could not enjoy this natural gem.

What does it mean to designate the Otay Mountain region as a wilderness area? It means that the land will be protected by the Federal Government from any activities that could harm the plant and animal life or the landscape in general. This will ensure the protection of this land for all of us, both today and tomorrow.

The Otay Mountain region, which is located in southwestern California near the U.S.-Mexico border, is an extraordinary landscape with many diverse natural, scientific and scenic values. The amazing diversity of this land includes both desert and coastal areas and boasts a number of plant species which can grow only in this area.

In fact, the directory of Federal Natural Areas lists at least 15 plant species that are candidates for Federal listing as Threatened or Endangered Species. The Tecate Cypress, coastal sage shrub, oak woodlands and a number of other vegetative associations are only a few of the plant species which grow only in small isolated populations in California and Mexico. These species play a critical role in San Diego's

multi-species conservation plan, a national model for maintaining biodiversity. Not protecting these species would be a travesty.

The Otay Mountain region was designated as the Otay National Cooperative Land and Wildlife Management Area back in 1962, and later, in 1980, two wilderness study areas were designated by the San Diego County Board of Supervisors and the Bureau of Land Management. Many people in our community know and have known for years that the Otay Mountain region is a valuable asset that we cannot lose. My colleagues and I would like to take this a step further by designating it as a wilderness area.

There are other reasons why it is absolutely critical that we preserve this beautiful place in America. Because the area is located near the busy city of San Diego and on the U.S.-Mexico border, the danger of pollution not only from smog and other toxins but also from binational travelers is very real. Moreover, the border location of this region is the focus of important law enforcement and border efforts to curtail illegal immigration. These additional strains can cause very real degradation to our environment. Finally, the area presents unique fire management challenges. The designation as a wilderness area will actually help us to manage all of these issues.

The lands within the Otay Mountain region represent some of the last pristine wilderness areas in western San Diego County, California. There are many benefits to designating this area as a wilderness area. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 15, the Otay Mountain Wilderness Act.

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to support H.R. 15.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 15.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR COLLECTION OF FEES FOR MAKING OF MOTION PICTURES, TELEVISION PRODUCTIONS, AND SOUND TRACKS IN NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM AND NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE SYSTEM UNITS

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 154) to provide for the collection of fees for the making of motion pictures, television productions, and sound tracks in National Park System and National Wildlife Refuge System units, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 154

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

SECTION 1. FEE AUTHORITY AND REPEAL OF PROHIBITION.

(a) AUTHORITY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior (in this section referred to as the ''Secretary'') may permit, under terms and conditions considered necessary by the Secretary, the use of lands and facilities administered by the Secretary for the making of any motion picture, television production, soundtrack, or similar project, if the Secretary determines that such use is appropriate and will neither impair the values and resources of the lands and facilities nor result in a significant disruption of normal visitor uses.

(2) FEES.—(A) Any permit under this section shall require the payment of fees to the Secretary in an amount determined to be appropriate by the Secretary sufficient to provide a fair return to the government in accordance with subparagraph (B), except as provided in subparagraph (C). The amount of the fee shall be not less than the direct and indirect costs to the Government for processing the application for the permit and the use of lands and facilities under the permit, including any necessary costs of cleanup and restoration, except as provided in subparagraph (C).

(B) The authority of the Secretary to establish fees under this paragraph shall include, but not be limited to, authority to issue regulations that establish a schedule of rates for fees under this paragraph based on such factors as—

(i) the number of people on site under a permit;

(ii) the duration of activities under a permit;

(iii) the conduct of activities under a permit in areas designated by statute or regulations as special use areas, including wilderness and research natural areas; and

(iv) surface disturbances authorized under a permit.

(C) The Secretary may, under the terms of the regulations promulgated under paragraph (4), charge a fee below the amount referred to in subparagraph (A) if the activity for which the fee is charged provides clear educational or interpretive benefits for the Department of the Interior.

(3) BONDING AND INSURANCE.—The Secretary may require a bond, insurance, or such other means as may be necessary to protect the interests of the United States in activities arising under such a permit.

(4) REGULATIONS.—(A) The Secretary shall issue regulations implementing this subsection by not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(B) Within 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall review and, as appropriate, revise regulations issued under this paragraph. After that time, the Secretary shall periodically review the regulations and make necessary changes.

(b) COLLECTION OF FEES.—Fees shall be collected under subsection (a) whenever the proposed filming, videotaping, sound recording, or still photography involves product or service advertisements, or the use of models, actors, sets, or props, or when such filming, videotaping, sound recording, or still photography could result in damage to resources or significant disruption of normal visitor uses. Filming, videotaping, sound recording or still photography, including bona fide newsreel or news television film gathering, which does not involve the activities or impacts identified herein, shall be permitted without fee.

(c) EXISTING REGULATIONS.—The prohibition on fees set forth in paragraph (1) of section 5.1(b) of title 43, Code of Federal Regulations, shall cease to apply upon the effective date of regulations under subsection (a). Nothing in this section shall be construed to affect the regulations set forth in part 5 of such title, other than paragraph (1) thereof.

(d) PROCEEDS.—Amounts collected as fees under this section shall be available for expenditure without further appropriation and shall be distributed and used, without fiscal year limitation, in accordance with the formula and purposes established for the Recreational Fee Demonstration Program under section 315 of Public Law 104–134.

(e) PENALTY.—A person convicted of violating any regulation issued under subsection (a) shall be fined in accordance with title 18, United States Code, or imprisoned for not more than 6 months, or both, and shall be ordered to pay all costs of the proceedings.

(f) EFFECTIVE DATE.—This section and the regulations issued under this section shall become effective 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, except that this subsection and the authority of the Secretary to issue regulations under this section shall be effective on the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS) and the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS).

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

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 154 was introduced by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY). The gentleman from Colorado is to be commended for the hard work on this bill and his commitment to see this piece of legislation come to fruition.

H.R. 154 is a bipartisan bill which repeals the existing regulatory prohibition on collecting fees for commercial film productions on lands administered by the Department of the Interior, including units of the National Park System and National Wildlife Refuge Areas. H.R. 154 authorizes the Secretary to establish a fee schedule using a number of relevant factors, such as the number of people on-site and the duration of the filming activities. The bill would not affect newsreel or television news activities. Proceeds from these location fees would remain in the unit where the filming occurs as per the Recreational Fee Demonstration Program established under current public law.

This is a good bill which is long overdue. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 154.

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

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 154 provides for the collection of fees for the making of motion pictures, television productions and sound

tracks in the National Park System and the National Wildlife Refuge System.

This legislation is a good government and commonsense approach to an important matter. We should be charging appropriate commercial fees for the use of national parks and refuges, especially when such fees have a long established use on public lands and national forests. The regulation prohibiting movie and television fees for parks and refuges appears to have long outlived any usefulness it may have ever had.

Significant work was done on this legislation in the last Congress. Numerous meetings and discussions were held among Member and committee staffs, representatives of the Department of the Interior, the film industry and other interested parties. The results of these talks were very fruitful and led to the passage of bipartisan legislation last fall that unfortunately was not enacted into law prior to adjournment.

The hearing that was held before the Committee on Resources on H.R. 154 showed that wide support exists for this proposal. This bill is an example of both sides of the aisle, the administration, and interested parties working together to achieve a common good.

Mr. Speaker, everyone agrees that there should be fair and reasonable fees for the use of public resources for filming, including the film industry itself. We are greatly encouraged by the progress that has been made thus far in this bill and we look forward to seeing the legislation enacted into law.

□ 1430

We ask our colleagues to vote for this bill, Mr. Speaker.

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

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, many of the Nation's most famous and profitable motion pictures were filmed on public land. John Ford filmed his classic westerns around Moab, UT, and the opening scenes of ''Raiders of the Lost Ark'' were filmed on Park Service land in Hawaii.

Before 1948, the Interior Department charged filmmakers market prices for the use of these lands. But in that year, for reasons lost to time, Congress prohibited the Park Service and the Fish & Wildlife Service from collecting fees for commercial film making.

This has resulted in lost revenue. The 16 units of the National Park System most involved with the film industry welcomed 2,800 productions over the past 3 years. At the present time, no requirement for fee collection besides normal special use permits.

The Bureau of Land Management, which operates a film program under its existing permit system has processed approximately 1,000 requests per year. Estimated revenues of $300,000 per year; or about $1,000 to $1,100 per day. In contrast, production companies have paid as much as $8,500 a day to film on private land.

Our bill would repeal this prohibition. Interior would be directed to develop a policy for collecting fees. Eighty percent of those fees would remain in the unit involved for maintenance needs, the remainder for systemwide use.

There are also two Senate bills dealing with this: A. S. 338, Senator CAMPBELL's bill; B. S. 568, by Senator CRAIG THOMAS, which would extend the fee policy to the Forest Service, as well. In our discussions with the Forest Service that agency said it was satisfied with its existing policy and did not wish to be included at this time.

This bill is the result of extensive discussions between my office and Members on both sides of the aisle, the Interior Department and representatives of the film industry. It is as near to a consensus proposal as we are likely to see.

H.R. 154 provides the middle ground between the needs of the Interior Department and those of the film industry while providing our natural resources. The film would like the certainty of a fee schedule based on the number of people or the acreage involved in a production. While Interior would like the flexibility to address these requests, I think this bill does that.

We think our bill offers the chance for a real win-win situation. The Park Service needs the money and the film industry is willing to pay it within reason. Fees will also help balance the use of our parks for filming with protection of the resource. And the more people see our parks through the movies, the more they'll want to visit them. Everyone can benefit if we do this right.

With that I'll close. I urge your support for the measure.

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this piece of legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 154, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GATEWAY VISITOR CENTER AUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1999

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 449) to authorize the Gateway Visitor Center at Independence National Historical Park, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 449

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 ''Gateway Visitor Center Authorization Act of 1999''.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds the following:

(1) The National Park Service completed and approved in 1997 a general management plan for Independence National Historical Park that establishes goals and priorities for the park's future.

(2) The general management plan for Independence National Historical Park calls for the revitalization of Independence Mall and recommends as a critical component of the Independence Mall's revitalization the development of a new ''Gateway Visitor Center''.

(3) Such a visitor center would replace the existing park visitor center and would serve as an orientation center for visitors to the park and to city and regional attractions.

(4) Subsequent to the completion of the general management plan, the National Park Service undertook and completed a design project and master plan for Independence Mall which includes the Gateway Visitor Center.

(5) Plans for the Gateway Visitor Center call for it to be developed and managed, in cooperation with the Secretary of the Interior, by a nonprofit organization which represents the various public and civic interests of the greater Philadelphia metropolitan area.

(6) The Gateway Visitor Center Corporation, a nonprofit organization, has been established to raise funds for and cooperate in a program to design, develop, construct, and operate the proposed Gateway Visitor Center.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this Act is to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into a cooperative agreement with the Gateway Visitor Center Corporation to construct and operate a regional visitor center on Independence Mall.

SEC. 3. GATEWAY VISITOR CENTER AUTHORIZATION.

(a) AGREEMENT.—The Secretary of the Interior, in administering the Independence National Historical Park, may enter into an agreement under appropriate terms and conditions with the Gateway Visitor Center Corporation (a nonprofit corporation established under the laws of the State of Pennsylvania) to facilitate the construction and operation of a regional Gateway Visitor Center on Independence Mall.

(b) OPERATIONS OF CENTER.—The Agreement shall authorize the Corporation to operate the Center in cooperation with the Secretary and to provide at the Center information, interpretation, facilities, and services to visitors to Independence National Historical Park, its surrounding historic sites, the city of Philadelphia, and the region, in order to assist in their enjoyment of the historic, cultural, educational, and recreational resources of the greater Philadelphia area.

(c) MANAGEMENT-RELATED ACTIVITIES.—The Agreement shall authorize the Secretary to undertake at the Center activities related to the management of Independence National Historical Park, including, but not limited to, provision of appropriate visitor information and interpretive facilities and programs related to Independence National Historical Park.

(d) ACTIVITIES OF CORPORATION.—The Agreement shall authorize the Corporation, acting as a private nonprofit organization, to engage in activities appropriate for operation of a regional visitor center that may include, but are not limited to, charging fees, conducting events, and selling merchandise, tickets, and food to visitors to the Center.

(e) USE OF REVENUES.—Revenues from activities engaged in by the Corporation shall be used for the operation and administration of the Center.

(f) PROTECTION OF PARK.—Nothing in this section authorizes the Secretary or the Corporation to take any actions in derogation of

the preservation and protection of the values and resources of Independence National Historical Park.

(g) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) AGREEMENT.—The term ''Agreement'' means an agreement under this section between the Secretary and the Corporation.

(2) CENTER.—The term ''Center'' means a Gateway Visitor Center constructed and operated in accordance with the Agreement.

(3) CORPORATION.—The term ''Corporation'' means the Gateway Visitor Center Corporation (a nonprofit corporation established under the laws of the State of Pennsylvania).

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS) and the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS).

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

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 449 was introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BORSKI). Mr. BORSKI has worked hard on this bill which will greatly enhance the visitor experience at Independence National Historical Park.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 449 is a noncontroversial and bipartisan bill that would authorize the Gateway Visitor Center at Independence National Historic Park. This bill authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to enter into a cooperative agreement with the Gateway Visitor Center Corporation to construct and operate a regional visitor center on Independence Mall. The center would provide information, interpretation, facilities and services for visitors to Independence National Historical Park, its surrounding historical sites and the City of Philadelphia.

Mr. Speaker, private and public funds will be used to develop the visitor center on National Park property, and it is my understanding that approximately $30 million of private funds have already been raised and this project is ready to move forward.

Mr. Speaker, this is a great example of how we can incorporate private enterprise to improve our parks and the experience for our visitors. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 449.

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

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 449 would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into a cooperative agreement with the nonprofit Gateway Visitor Center Corporation to construct and operate a regional visitor center on National Park Service land within Independence National Historical Park in Philadelphia. Hearings were held on an identical bill, on H.R. 4109, last Congress, and that bill was favorably reported by the Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands. Further action was not taken on the measure prior to adjourning.

Unlike the situation at Gettysburg National Military Park, which is considered controversial by many, this proposal is supported by all involved parties. The proposed visitor center is consistent with the general management plan for the park and has the backing of the NPS, the City of Philadelphia and other interested parties.

As such, we have no objection to the legislation, and we beseech our colleagues to vote for this legislation.

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 449 and ask for all Members to support this legislation. I would like to commend my good friend, Mr. BORSKI, for introducing this bill and would like to thank him for his hard work to bring it to the floor. I would also like to thank Chairman HANSEN, Ranking Member ROMERO-BARCELÓ, Chairman YOUNG and Ranking Member MILLER for all their help in bringing this bill to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, Independence Mall is not only the cornerstone of Philadelphia, it is the cornerstone of democracy. On any day, you can walk down to Independence Mall and find hundreds of tourists and schoolchildren visiting the birthplace of the United States. Each year, more than 3 million people visit the place where we declared our independence and forged a nation based on individual rights.

But the current visitor facilities at Independence Mall are not adequate for this many tourists. Mr. Speaker, it is important that we not only preserve our heritage, but that we keep it accessible to everyone. This bill authorizes the construction of a new Gateway Visitor Center, located at Independence National Historical Park, to provide tourists a convenient, informative and enjoyable visit to the park and the City of Philadelphia. Through exhibits and displays, the Center will not only provide an interpretive presentation on the significance of the Independence National Historical Park, but will also provide information on other historical and cultural attractions throughout Philadelphia.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is not only important to Philadelphia, but to the entire nation as it will keep the site of our independence and the birthplace of democracy easily accessible to everyone. It is a needed addition to the Independence Mall area and will serve our country well in to the next century by preserving and enhancing this national treasure. I urge a unanimous vote on H.R. 449.

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 449, a bill to authorize the Gateway Visitors Center at Independence National Historical Park in Philadelphia.

Every year nearly 5 million visitors come to Philadelphia and Independence National Historical Park to visit and learn about the beginnings of this great country and the founding of democracy. I am proud to represent a portion of the Park which many consider the crown jewel of the National Park Service. We must do all we can to preserve the area which houses the Liberty Bell, Independence Hall and is the birthplace of the Declaration of Independence and Constitution of the United States.

Independence National Historical Park is currently the subject of a major renovation project to preserve the park for future generations. Federal, state, and local leaders are working in unison to address the ongoing needs of the Park, ensuring its greatness as an American institution and historical area. The Park Service's completed General Management Plan documents the vision for the future of the park, and the Gateway Visitors Center is an integral part of this plan.

H.R. 449 is imperative to the renovation of the Park included in the National Park's General Management Plan. It is extremely important to Philadelphia and for those who visit the historical area and experience its significance in the development of this nation. The present location of the visitors center is situated in an area with limited public transit access and on a narrow street. The location for the proposed Gateway Visitors Center will preserve history while at the same time improving access and creating a new entrance to the Park. The Gateway Visitors Center would serve as the region's principal point of orientation by providing a range of exceptional services and programs, attracting visitors to the resources offered in and beyond the park.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join my colleagues from Pennsylvania who have worked so hard to see this legislation come to fruition. Independence National Historical Park houses two of our nations most prized objects, Independence Hall and the Liberty Bell. This bill is vital to the preservation of these treasured artifacts that represent the ideas upon which our nation was founded, and is the key to our nation's history for millions of Americans.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 449.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous materials on H.R. 15, H.R. 154 and H.R. 449, the bills just passed.

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

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING ESTABLISHMENT OF DISASTER MITIGATION PILOT PROGRAM IN THE SMALL BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 388) to authorize the establishment of a disaster mitigation pilot program in the Small Business Administration.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 388

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

SECTION 1. DISASTER MITIGATION PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 7(b)(1) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B), by adding ''and'' at the end; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

''(C) during fiscal years 2000 through 2004, to establish a predisaster mitigation program to make such loans (either directly or in cooperation with banks or other lending institutions through agreements to participate on an immediate or deferred (guaranteed) basis), as the Administrator may determine to be necessary or appropriate, to enable small businesses to use mitigation techniques in support of a formal mitigation program established by the Federal Emergency Management Agency, except that no loan or guarantee may be extended to a small business under this subparagraph unless the Administration finds that the small business is otherwise unable to obtain credit for the purposes described in this subparagraph;''.

(b) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—Section 20 of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 631 note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(f) DISASTER MITIGATION PILOT PROGRAM.—The following program levels are authorized for loans under section 7(b)(1)(C):

''(1) $15,000,000 for fiscal year 2000.

''(2) $15,000,000 for fiscal year 2001.

''(3) $15,000,000 for fiscal year 2002.

''(4) $15,000,000 for fiscal year 2003.

''(5) $15,000,000 for fiscal year 2004.''.

(c) EVALUATION.—On January 31, 2003, the Administrator of the Small Business Administration shall submit to the Committees on Small Business of the House of Representatives and the Senate a report on the effectiveness of the pilot program authorized by section 7(b)(1)(C) of the Small Business Act (15 U.S.C. 636(b)(1)(C)), as added by subsection (a) of this section, which report shall include—

(1) information relating to—

(A) the areas served under the pilot program;

(B) the number and dollar value of loans made under the pilot program; and

(C) the estimated savings to the Federal Government resulting from the pilot program; and

(2) such other information as the Administrator determines to be appropriate for evaluating the pilot program.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE).

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

Mr. Speaker, let me begin by thanking my colleagues on the House Committee on Small Business, particularly the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. TALENT) for his leadership in moving this measure forward, as well as the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), the ranking member on that committee, and my friend from Washington (Mr. BAIRD) who is on the floor this afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, S. 388, a measure drafted and introduced by Senator MAX CLELAND, is a commonsense approach to applying the principle of preventive care when coping with natural disasters. S. 388 is substantially identical to H.R. 818, the Disaster Mitigation Act of 1999, which passed the House on March 2 of this year. It is part of the administration's budget request and has substantial bipartisan and bicameral support.

Since 1953, the Small Business Administration has administered the disaster loan program authorized by Section 7(b) of the Small Business Act. This program provides loans to help small businesses to rebuild after natural disasters.

In past years the loan program has spent billions of dollars helping small businesses and homeowners recover from natural disasters. In fiscal year 1998 the SBA lent $728 million for 30,154 disaster loans. In 1997 it lent $1.1 billion for 49,515 disaster loans. In 1994 the SBA's highest demand came when it loaned over $4.1 billion for damage due to the North Ridge earthquake in California.

Mr. Speaker, the cost of disaster assistance has risen over the past several years due to increases in construction and other costs. It is clear that efforts must be made to hold down these costs. Implementing a program to help small businesses use techniques to lessen damage caused by natural disasters offers the potential to save millions of dollars in the future.

The Federal Emergency Management Agency, FEMA, currently manages Project Impact, which works in conjunction with communities and businesses on such mitigation policies and techniques. Passage of S. 388 will complement and further these efforts of mitigation by offering small businesses low-interest loans for disaster mitigation through the Small Business Administration.

S. 388 authorizes the SBA to establish a pilot program to make loans to small businesses for the purpose of mitigating the effects of natural disasters. These loans will be made in support of the mitigation program established at the Federal Emergency Management Agency. These mitigation techniques are varied and include a wide range of activities including building improvements, relocation and others.

S. 388 will authorize SBA to lend up to $15 million each year through 2004 in support of the Disaster Mitigation Pilot Program. These funds will come from existing section 7(b) disaster loan appropriations and will be subject to appropriations available for that program. This bill will not authorize any new Federal spending.

Finally, S. 388 will require the SBA to report to Congress by January 31, 2003. The report will document the number of loans made, the area served by the pilot, and the estimated savings to the government as a result of the program.

Let me again thank my colleagues the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. TALENT) and the ranking member, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), and the committee staff for their assistance in moving the measure before us, Mr. Speaker, and I want to urge my colleagues to support S. 388.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank my distinguished colleague from South Dakota and also express my gratitude to the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. TALENT) and to the ranking member from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ). Together they have worked to develop this bill which I think has a wonderful potential to help small business owners reduce the cost of disasters before they happen rather than after.

As the gentleman from South Dakota has indicated, the bill before us today is virtually identical to a bill that this House passed on March 2. It establishes a demonstration project at the SBA to make financing available to small businesses so they can make improvements to businesses that just might reduce property loss and could increase worker safety in the event of a natural disaster.

Mr. Speaker, my district in southwest Washington happens to be one of the more disaster-prone in the Nation: We have Mount Saint Helens, we have periodic flooding, and recently in the towns of Kelso and Olympia we have had landslides which have claimed in the case of Kelso more than 140 homes, and in the case of Olympia more than 60 homes have been rendered unstable. I have been working with these good people since before I came to office, and I feel we have to be working more to help people prepare for disasters before they happen as well as cope with disasters after the fact.

That is what this bill does, is helps people prepare for disasters. It authorizes up to $15 million in SBA loans each year for the next 5 years to be used for mitigation efforts so businesses can make structural or interior changes to their businesses that can result in significant savings.

The program runs for five years. It requires a report to Congress on the use and effectiveness of the mitigation loans, so it includes a key and important accountability provision.

This is sensible good government, and it is a costs savings measure. It has been estimated that for every dollar we spend in disaster prevention we could save up to $2 or $3 in disaster recovery.

So I join with my colleague from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE), and I urge all of my colleagues in the House today to support this commonsense legislation and help get this program underway.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ).

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington

(Mr. BAIRD) for yielding this time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of S. 388, the Disaster Mitigation Pilot Program. Traditionally business owners have only been able to get help after a natural disaster has struck and caused damage to their business. For many small businesses this assistance comes too late to save them from economic ruin. The loss of revenue and time needed to recover causes countless businesses to fail. Instead of being able to rebuild, many communities are faced with loss of jobs as many businesses permanently close after a disaster. We have seen this happen again and again over the past few years. Hurricanes, floods and wildfires have threatened the economic stability and future of communities across this Nation.

However, until today businesses have only been able to get help after it is too late. Today's legislation will change this story. Today we are taking an important step in being proactive rather than just reactive to natural disasters.

S. 388 is identical to H.R. 818, which the House passed on March 2 of this year with only a few minor changes in wording. The result is the same. This legislation authorizes $75 million to be used by SBA in cooperation with FEMA over the next 5 years to help businesses in disaster-prone areas take preventive measures to avert or minimize damage should disaster strike.

□ 1445

By enabling businesses to take preventive measures which mitigate the damage caused by floods, hurricanes and other natural disasters, this program will allow them to recover much faster. Therefore, instead of going out of business, they will be able to get back to business much quicker than ever before.

The disaster mitigation program is a common-sense approach to helping businesses cope with disasters. The program also makes fiscal sense. Some estimates show that every dollar spent on mitigation saves $2 in money that would otherwise have to be spent on post-disaster response. Not only will businesses and taxpayers come out ahead, but the American economy will as well.

Finally, I would like to thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD). His constituents face the threat of natural disaster, and his insight and hard work on this legislation have been a great help to all of us. I strongly support S. 388 and I urge my colleagues to vote for this important piece of legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to just offer a couple of closing comments. Let me just briefly reiterate the common sense behind this proposal. It provides low-interest loans up front so small business owners can prepare for disasters before they happen. They can prepare for earthquakes or floods or fires or hurricanes. By spending money up front, through low-interest loans, they will save the taxpayers dollars down the road.

That is why this bill makes so much sense; it will save taxpayers money. It will help small businesses out and it will reduce the overall net cost of disaster response. That is the kind of bill we should be putting forward, and I thank my colleague from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) for doing so.

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

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume for closing.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. BAIRD) and the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) for their work on this and again would just simply say that in Washington we are always looking for win/win solutions. I think this really is a win/win. It is a win not only for disaster victims. It is also a win for the taxpayers.

My State of South Dakota has been no stranger to disasters in the last few years, and consistently we find that FEMA is called on to the spot, SBA and other agencies that deal with disaster assistance, but it is always after the fact.

We have an opportunity here to provide a mechanism whereby businesses and others can prepare in advance for disasters and take those steps that are necessary to try and see that the taxpayers are not called upon after an event to deal with it.

I would again urge my colleagues in the House to support this measure. It is a common-sense approach to legislating solutions on disaster assistance, and hopefully, we will be able to take this and work collectively as partners with FEMA and the SBA and others to see that we do the best job we can on the front end to protect disaster victims, as well as to protect the taxpayers from unnecessary needed expense.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in support of S. 388. This bill will establish a pilot program for the implementation of disaster mitigation measures by small businesses to help them to better prepare for natural disasters.

Small businesses from Texas to New York play a vital role in the health of our economy. They account for 99.7 percent of America's employers. In fact, Small businesses employ 53 percent of the private work force, contribute 47 percent of all sales in the country, and are also responsible for 50 percent of the private gross domestic product. Unfortunately, it is a fact that Small Businesses are ill equipped to deal with natural disasters.

Under this bill, the Small Business Administration, in conjunction with the Federal Emergency Management Agency, would begin a 5-year program to provide loans to small businesses to implement mitigation techniques. These loans would provide funds for proactive measures designed to limit damages from natural disasters. These projects include for example elevating a foundation in case of a flood or strengthening walls in case of an earthquake.

Last year natural disasters cost Americans more than $10 billion. This is the third worst year this decade. I am told that the last three years have been the most active period in history for Atlantic hurricanes. Unfortunately the 1999 hurricane season will be active again this year and other natural disasters are going to occur. Small Businesses will and do suffer economically from these natural disasters.

Under this bill, the loans would be made either directly or in cooperation with banks or other lending institutions through agreements to participate on an immediate or deferred basis. This program is designed to provide these loans to small businesses in disaster-prone areas that would otherwise be unable to obtain credit for such preventative measures.

This bill will help businesses across this country to better prepare for disasters. I support this bill because it aggressively prepares small businesses located in disaster-prone areas to prepare for disasters. I urge my colleagues to support small businesses by supporting this bill.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, for many people nationwide, Guam is synonymous with a number of things. One of them is certainly natural disasters. Guam's location in the Pacific Ocean's typhoon alley makes it regularly susceptible to annual storms that bring destruction to our community. In this decade alone, Guam has been subjected to at least a dozen typhoons. Even though the destruction brought about by a storm is uncommon, it is a common occurrence for the island of Guam. At one time, five typhoons had hit Guam in the span of 3 months.

As many may recall, the most recent storm, Super Typhoon Paka, devastated the island in December of 1997 and caused property damage of over $100 million. On top of these storms, Guam also became a victim of an 8.2 earthquake in 1994, which has been one of the strongest recorded in the Pacific in this century.

S. 388 is good legislation. It is proactive and it will prepare small businesses for recovery. Most often, disaster related programs are targeted to homeowners and gain the bulk of their popularity in the aftermath of destruction. S. 388 and its companion legislation H.R. 818, passed by the House last month, addresses the concerns of small businesses that do not receive the same type of disaster attention given to homeowners. The recovery of a community in the wake of disaster can be bolstered by the level of preparation to mitigate against damage by our business communities. Small businesses help generate economic activity crucial for the recovery of a stricken community.

Reacting to a storm plagues many communities with confusion. This pilot program aims to empower the business community with information and mitigation activities which will prevent serious losses. An appropriation of $15 million is a very small amount compared to potential losses without this sort of program.

I understand that the territories are full partners in this program. I certainly hope that in coming years the amounts will be expanded and we will do everything we can to make sure this pilot program is a success.

I commend the authors of this legislation from both the House and Senate and encourage my colleagues to vote in favor of this measure.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from South Dakota (Mr. THUNE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 388.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. THUNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on S. 388.

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

There was no objection.

MICROLOAN PROGRAM TECHNICAL CORRECTIONS ACT OF 1999

Mr. PEASE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 440) to make technical corrections to the Microloan Program.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate Amendment:

Page 2, strike out all after line 6 down to and including line 20 and insert:

(1) in paragraph (7), by striking subparagraph (B) and inserting the following:

''(B) ALLOCATION.—

''(i) MINIMUM ALLOCATION.—Subject to the availability of appropriations, of the total amount of new loan funds made available for award under this subsection in each fiscal year, the Administration shall make available for award in each State (including the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa) an amount equal to the sum of—

''(I) the lesser of—

''(aa) $800,000; or

''(bb) 1/55 of the total amount of new loan funds made available for award under this subsection for that fiscal year; and

''(II) any additional amount, as determined by the Administration.

''(ii) REDISTRIBUTION.—If, at the beginning of the third quarter of a fiscal year, the Administration determines that any portion of the amount made available to carry out this subsection is unlikely to be made available under clause (i) during that fiscal year, the Administration may make that portion available for award in any 1 or more States (including the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, Guam, and American Samoa) without regard to clause (i).''; and

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PEASE) and the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PEASE).

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

Mr. Speaker, let me begin by thanking my colleagues, the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. TALENT), and the ranking member of the committee, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ). I appreciate their assistance in moving this bill and their help in fashioning it.

Mr. Speaker, this is a technical corrections bill, and though it is important work, it need not occupy a great deal of the House's time. H.R. 440 is the same bill that the House passed on February 9 of this year by an overwhelming margin. H.R. 440 corrects the provisions of the loan loss reserve requirements of the microloan program at the Small Business Administration.

The microloan program was established as a pilot program in 1991 and made permanent in 1997. It provides small loans under $25,000 to the Nation's smallest entrepreneurs. These loans are made through SBA-certified and -approved nonprofit lending and business development intermediaries. These intermediaries borrow funds from the SBA and, in turn, lend those funds to small businesses. In order to protect taxpayer assets, the intermediaries are required to maintain a loss reserve based on the amount of microloans they have outstanding.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate amendment made some clarifications to the House-passed version of the bill. These changes make no substantive changes in the purpose of the bill, but they do tighten the language that provides for some minimum allocation for States with microloan programs. The amendment is necessary to make doubly sure that there is no mistake between congressional intent and agency execution.

The amendment makes clear that subject to appropriations, all State microloan programs shall have access to at least 1/55th of all new funds allocated for the program. This amount will be available until the beginning of the third quarter, at which point all funds will be available to any eligible intermediary.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is not headline material but it is important work nonetheless. It will have a real impact on the very smallest of businesses in this country seeking start-up financing and at the end of the day that is the most important part of our job on the Committee on Small Business.

Let me again thank my colleagues, the gentleman from Missouri (Chairman TALENT) and ranking member, the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ), and the committee staff for their assistance in moving the measure before us.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 440.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by thanking the gentleman from Missouri (Chairman TALENT) for working with me to move quickly to pass the Microloan Program Technical Corrections Act. These changes are important for small entrepreneurs because they would allow lenders to make more loans and increase technical assistance.

Everyone agrees that the challenge facing most entrepreneurs is access to capital. Now, consider the special challenges to microenterprises. It is often more difficult, if not impossible, for many microenterprises to get the financing they need. Microborrowers are either start-up or growth-phase businesses which are unable to meet a lender's collateral or credit requirements. For many private lenders, it is simply not feasible to make the small loans that entrepreneurs need to start or expand their business.

To address this problem, the Small Business Administration launched the microloan pilot project in 1992. This program was designed to help underserved start-up and existing small business owners that do not have access to financing. Since its inception, the microloan program has helped countless businesses start up and grow. Today, with over 100 participating intermediaries, the SBA microloan program is the largest Federal program of its kind. It has a proven record of giving small businesses the support they need to succeed.

One of the most important aspects of the microloan program is its ability to reach women and minorities. Often women and minorities do not have the credit history or necessary capital to get a loan from a bank or other traditional channel. This is where the microloan program steps in and provides the tools to help these business owners achieve the American dream. In fact, the microloan program has become a traditional funding source for women entrepreneurs.

That is why today's legislation is so important. The first thing that the Microloan Program Technical Corrections Act will do is remove the State formula caps. The caps were put in place in order to ensure equitable distribution of funds, but resulted in just the opposite. By removing the cap, we will be ensuring that all States have access to the program.

Additionally, the most recent Senate amendments make sure that every State and territory gets its fair share of microloan funding. Under the latest change, if the program is fully funded, each State will receive an equal part of the full appropriations. In the case that each State receives its $800,000, any extra microloan funding will be distributed by SBA at the administrator's discretion.

I would say to my colleague, by allowing lenders with successful loan portfolios to make more loans and to provide additional technical assistance, today's legislation will only help

more microenterprises grow. Providing additional technical assistance to businesses will enable entrepreneurs who are on the threshold of moving forward the opportunity to do so.

The microloan program has proved invaluable in helping America's small businesses grow. I am glad that we are moving quickly to pass this crucial legislation and that we are looking for ways to improve this important program.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I wish to acknowledge again the work of the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. VELÁZQUEZ) and the work of the chairman of our committee, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. TALENT), on this important piece of legislation. I urge the support of our colleagues for its passage.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PEASE. 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. 440.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. PEASE) that the House suspend the rules and concur in the Senate amendment to the bill, H.R. 440.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONCURRENCE BY HOUSE WITH AMENDMENT TO SENATE AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 98, EXTENSION OF AVIATION WAR RISK INSURANCE PROGRAM

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 135) providing for the concurrence by the House with an amendment in the Senate amendments to H.R. 98.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution the House shall be considered to have taken from the Speaker's table the bill H.R. 98, with the amendments of the Senate thereto, and to have—

(1) concurred in the amendment of the Senate to the title; and

(2) concurred in the amendment of the Senate to the text with the following amendment:

At the end of the Senate amendment, add the following:

Page 2, line 3, strike ''March'' and insert ''May''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) each will control 20 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, last month the war risk insurance program was reauthorized by the House, but only through the end of next month. We need to quickly move to reauthorize the program for a longer period of time and do it in a way that is acceptable to the Senate.

This program has operated successfully for over 47 years.

The bill would reauthorize the war risk insurance program through December 31, 2003. Insurance is an essential feature of any commercial airline operation, but ordinary business insurance operations are normally not willing, and certainly not at normal rates, to insure flights to high-risk areas such as countries at war or on the verge of war.

In many cases, flights into these dangerous situations, however, are required to further our Nation's foreign policy or national security objectives. On many occasions in the past, commercial airlines, rather than military planes, have been used to move materiel and troops into war-type areas including, for example, most recently during Desert Storm-Desert Shield operations and other conflicts.

Without the war risk program, commercial airlines would not have flown these military flights, and therefore the Department of Defense would have had to grant or purchase aircraft at a cost to the taxpayers of millions of dollars, if not billions.

Although the program is not currently being used in Kosovo, it could be needed at any time and, therefore, we cannot afford to allow the program to lapse. The bill before the House now is virtually the same as the bill that we passed last February, but the Senate dropped a provision in the bill involving unrelated technical changes to the centennial of flight commission. Therefore, we need to pass this bill and send it back to the Senate. I would urge support for the resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H. Res. 135, a bill to extend the war risk insurance program through 2003. This program allows the Federal Aviation Administration to issue insurance to airlines flying into war zones when it is in the national interest for the airlines to do so and commercial insurance is not available on reasonable terms.

The war risk insurance program was first authorized in 1951 and it has served the country well. Since 1975, the nonpremium option under the war risk insurance program alone has been activated over 5,000 times. Recently it has been used in support of Operations Desert Shield and Storm in the Middle East, Operation Restore Hope in Somalia, Operation Uphold Democracy in Haiti and Operation Joint Endeavor in Bosnia.

As Members can see from its scope, it has been an active part of our Nation's foreign policy and national security efforts.

In March, we extended this program for only 2 months until May 31, 1999. With the continuing activities in the Persian Gulf and the current situation in Kosovo, it would be unfortunate to allow this program to expire. I would hope that we could quickly pass this legislation to avoid any lapse in this crucial program.

I want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) and the gentleman from California (Mr. DUNCAN), the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) and the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) for their leadership, and I urge my House colleagues to support H. Res. 135.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, House Resolution 135.

The question was taken.

Mr. PETRI. 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.

AUTHORIZING USE OF CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR OPENING CEREMONIES OF SUNRAYCE 99

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 48) authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the opening ceremonies of Sunrayce 99.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 48

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

SECTION 1. USE OF CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR OPENING CEREMONIES OF SUNRAYCE 99.

The organizers of Sunrayce 99 (in this resolution referred to as the ''sponsor'') shall be permitted to sponsor a public event, with solar-powered cars, on the Capitol Grounds on June 20, 1999, or on such other dates as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate may jointly designate, to conduct opening ceremonies for Sunrayce 99.

SEC. 2. TERMS AND CONDITIONS.

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

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

SEC. 3. EVENT PREPARATIONS.

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

(b) ADDITIONAL ARRANGEMENTS.—The Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board are authorized to make any such additional arrangements as may be required to carry out the event, including arrangements to limit access to First Street between Independence Avenue Southwest and Constitution Avenue Northwest.

SEC. 4. ENFORCEMENT OF RESTRICTIONS.

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

SEC. 5. LIMITATION ON REPRESENTATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The event authorized by section 1 may be conducted only after the Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board enter into an agreement with the sponsor that prohibits the sponsor—

(1) from representing, either directly or indirectly, that this resolution or any activity carried out under this resolution in any way constitutes approval or endorsement by the Federal Government of any product or service offered by the sponsor; and

(2) from using any photograph taken at the event for a commercial purpose.

(b) PENALTIES.—The agreement shall provide for financial penalties to be imposed if any photograph is used in violation of this section.

□ 1500

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) each will control 20 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 48 authorizes the use of the Capitol grounds for the Sunrayce '99 solar power car event to be held on June 20th, 1999, or on such date as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration jointly designate.

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

The event is open to the public and free of charge, and the sponsor will assume responsibility for all expenses and liabilities related to the event. In addition, sales, advertisements, and solicitations are explicitly prohibited on the Capitol grounds for this event.

The Capitol grounds will be used for the opening ceremonies for the solar power car event that will begin at the Capitol and after traversing through five States, conclude in Orlando, Florida. Intercollegiate men and women from all over the United States have taken part in the development of the solar power cars. Scholarship achievement awards will be awarded to participants that display exceptional levels of technical innovation, engineering excellence, artistic excellence, teamwork, and good sportsmanship.

This day will highlight the importance of and help us develop a better understanding for the many different uses of solar energy. I support this resolution, and urge my colleagues to join in support.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 48 authorizes the use of the Capitol grounds for the Sunrayce '99 solar powered car event scheduled to be held on the Capitol grounds on June 20, 1999. During this event, college women and men who have designed and developed their own solar power cars will begin a five-State run from the Capitol grounds to Orlando, Florida.

In addition to highlighting the innovation and ingenuity of design and engineering by the college students, the event will emphasize the power and benefits of solar energy.

General Motors, Electronic Data Systems, and the Energy Department are once again cosponsors of the event. The event's sponsors will assume all responsibility for expenses and liabilities related to the event. As with all Capitol event, sales, advertisements, and solicitations are explicitly prohibited on the Capitol grounds for the event.

I support House Concurrent Resolution 48 and urge its passage.

Mr. SALMON. Mr. Speaker, before I begin, I want to thank Congressman BUD SHUSTER, Chairman of the Transportation Committee, for moving H. Con. Res. 48 through the Committee and to the Floor so expeditiously.

The resolution we are considering today will permit the organizers of Sunrayce 99 to sponsor a public event, with solar-powered cars, on the Capitol Grounds on June 20, 1999, or on such other dates as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate may jointly designate, to conduct opening ceremonies for Sunrayce 99.

As the Chairman and co-founder of the House Renewable Energy Caucus I appreciate the innovation necessary to identify and utilize alternative forms of energy. As we move into the 21st Century, one of the critical environmental challenges facing us is the need to discover the possibilities of sustainable energy development, so that our children, and their families will be able to enjoy the clean air and environment that is so important to the health of our nation.

From June 20–29 the world will watch as up to 40 teams participate in Sunrayce 99 and demonstrate good-spirited competition and innovation at its best. The teams will race through five states, from the start in Washington, DC, to the finish at Epcot at Walt Disney World Resort near Orlando, Florida in the nation's premier solar powered vehicle event.

Sunrayce 99 showcases the imagination, ingenuity and teamwork of graduate and undergraduate teams from North America in the development of highly efficient vehicles powered solely by a viable, renewable and sustainable energy source—the sun. I am proud to note that the University of Arizona has registered a team. General Motors, Electronic Data Systems and the U.S. Department of Energy are the sponsors of this biennial intercollegiate competition.

The top three finishing teams will receive trophies and cash awards. Scholarship achievement awards will also be granted for technical innovation, engineering excellence, artistic talents, teamwork and good sportsmanship.

Sunrayce 99 not only demonstrates the possibilities of sustainable energy development, but also the importance of public/private partnerships. This approach will allow companies to work hand in hand with government in successfully tackling the environmental challenges ahead. I applaud the participants of Sunrayce 99—sponsors, applicants, universities, and administrators—for making innovation a reality.

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

Mr. COBLE. 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 North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 48.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING USE OF CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR BIKE RODEO TO BE CONDUCTED BY THE EARTH FORCE YOUTH BIKE SUMMIT

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, (H. Con. Res. 49) authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for a bike rodeo to be conducted by the Earth Force Youth Bike Summit.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. Con. Res. 49

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

SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION OF BIKE RODEO ON CAPITOL GROUNDS.

The Earth Force Youth Bike Summit (in this resolution referred to as the ''sponsor'') shall be permitted to sponsor a bike rodeo (in this resolution referred to as the ''event'') on the Capitol Grounds on May 5, 1999, or on such other date as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate may jointly designate.

SEC. 2. TERMS AND CONDITIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The event authorized by section 1 shall be free of admission charge to the public and arranged not to interfere with

the needs of Congress, under conditions to be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board.

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

SEC. 3. STRUCTURES AND EQUIPMENT.

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

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

SEC. 4. ENFORCEMENT OF RESTRICTIONS.

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

SEC. 5. LIMITATIONS ON REPRESENTATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—No person may represent, either directly or indirectly, that this resolution or any activity carried out under this resolution in any way constitutes approval or endorsement by the Federal Government of any person or any product or service.

(b) ENFORCEMENT.—The Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board shall enter into an agreement with the sponsor, and such other persons participating in the event authorized by section 1 as the Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board considers appropriate, under which such persons shall agree to comply with the requirements of subsection (a). The agreement shall specifically prohibit the use of any photograph taken at the event for a commercial purpose and shall provide for the imposition of financial penalties if any violations of the agreement occur.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) each will control 20 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 49 authorizes the use of the Capitol grounds for the ''Get Out Spoke'n'' to be held on May 5th, 1999, or on such date as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration jointly designate.

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

The event is open to the public and free of charge, and the sponsor will assume responsibility for all expenses and liabilities related to the event.

In addition, sales, advertisements, and solicitations are explicitly prohibited on the Capitol grounds for this event. The Capitol grounds, Mr. Speaker, will be used for the bicycle summit, which will teach children the proper ways to ride their bikes and honor children who have taken an active role in the national campaign to make America more bike-friendly.

This event will help children to develop habits of active citizenship and environmental stewardship. I would also like to note that this resolution has received wide bipartisan support from the Congressional Bike Caucus. I support the resolution, and urge my colleagues to join in support.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 49 authorizes the use of the Capitol grounds on May 5 for a public program to promote bicycle safety. The program is sponsored by Earth Force, a nonprofit organization for children. The goal of this youth program is to teach children the proper ways to ride bicycles and to encourage safe bicycling programs within our communities.

In 1996, over 350,000 children ages 14 and under were treated for bike-related injuries. It is estimated that collisions with motor vehicles account for 90 percent of all bicycle-related injuries.

Event participants will ride their bikes through a mock city set up on a pavement near the Capitol. During this exercise, they will receive safety tips and instructions on how to make bikes safer.

Mr. Speaker, I support House Concurrent Resolution 49. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRANKS) and the committee for supporting the resolution.

I would also like to commend the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), a member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and a founder and active member of the Bike Caucus, for his sponsorship and enthusiastic support for this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), a sponsor of the concurrent resolution.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, we in Congress can do many things to enhance the livability of our communities, giving a wide range of opportunities, whether it is requiring the Post Office to play by the same rules as the rest of America by following local land use laws and zoning codes, and maybe even having meaningful public input, or having more rational water policies to help protect and renew our communities' waterways.

But no matter where we are in America and how we define livability, there are several visual indicators that will tell us right away whether or not we are in a healthy neighborhood.

If we are in a community that is free from vandalism, it is a sign of a healthy neighborhood. If there are areas that provide access to walkways and sidewalks that are away from the rush of traffic, it shows respect for the residents. We are in a healthy neighborhood.

If we have opportunities to move away from the blight that has been a plague for many communities, and there is renewal of deteriorated property and housing well-being, it is a sign of a healthy community.

I would think the most basic indicator, however, is whether or not our children are able to move safely through their neighborhood. One simple thing we can do today to promote that livability is to support this resolution and the event that it will enable. It will be the culmination of a nationwide cycling education project. It allows for a youth bike summit to take place here within the shadow of the Capitol dome. It will be the final event of a campaign that has been sponsored, as we have heard, by Earth Force, involving children from all over America who will be in our Nation's Capitol for this event.

These children were asked to devise safe bicycling routes through their communities and share their proposals with their peers. Earth Force has worked with Safe Moves, another nonprofit agency, to design the mock city for the children to ride through, and it teaches children in the ages from the fifth grade through the ninth grade about safe biking techniques.

As we have heard the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) say, 350,000 children 14 and under were treated in hospital emergency rooms for bicycle-related injuries last year. These collisions with motor vehicles account for 90 percent of all bicycle-related deaths, and 10 percent of all non-fatal related injuries.

The nonpartisan Bicycle Caucus supports educating children early in life in safe biking techniques.

□ 1515

I welcome the support of my colleagues on this resolution and I look forward to working with other Members of Congress on strengthening the Federal partnership in making sure that our communities are made more livable and the promotion of safety for our children should be at the top of our list from every Member of Congress.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 49.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TERRY SANFORD FEDERAL BUILDING

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 911) to designate the Federal building located at 310 New Bern Avenue in Raleigh, North Carolina, as the ''Terry Sanford Federal Building'', as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 911

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

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The Federal building located at 310 New Bern Avenue in Raleigh, North Carolina, shall be known and designated as the ''Terry Sanford Federal Building''.

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the Federal building referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Terry Sanford Federal Building''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) each will control 20 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 911, as amended, designates the Federal building located in Raleigh, North Carolina, as the ''Terry Sanford Federal Building.''

Senator Sanford was successful in many pursuits during his life. He was the founder of three law firms and held positions on the boards of numerous universities and colleges, and several positions on boards of corporations in the technology industry.

Senator Sanford was also President of Duke University from 1969 to 1984, and continued as President Emeritus from 1995 until his passing in 1998. During his tenure, Governor Sanford presided over Duke, which was and continues to be recognized as a world-renowned center of higher learning. Its medical center is a premier health care facility and research center.

In addition to his pursuits in the private sector, Senator Sanford also was a dedicated public servant. From 1950 to 1953, he served on the North Carolina State Ports Authority. In 1953, he was elected to the North Carolina State Senate and served there until 1955.

In 1961, he was elected Governor of North Carolina for a term, returning to private practice in 1965. After several years out of public office, Senator Sanford returned in 1986 with a successful bid to the United States Senate where he served until 1993.

Mr. Speaker, this is a fitting tribute to a dedicated public servant. I know of no other North Carolinian who has dedicated himself any more fully or honorably in so many endeavors, in law, in public service, in education, and in private pursuits. I support the bill, as amended, and urge my colleagues to the support it as well.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 911 is a bill to designate the Federal building in Raleigh, North Carolina, as the ''Terry Sanford Federal Building.''

Senator Sanford served his country and his State for over 6 decades and this designation is a fitting acknowledgment of his devoted service.

FBI agent, World War II paratrooper, college president, governor, and United States Senator are all designations given to Terry Sanford.

As Governor of North Carolina from 1961 to 1965, Sanford advocated and supported a number of nationally recognized innovations in education, including establishing technical and vocational schools. He championed State support for performing arts schools and dedication of revenues for public schools and teachers' pay.

His leadership and diligence led Harvard University to name him as one of the most effective governors of the 20th century. Hard work and loyalty to the interests of his constituents distinguish his service in the United States Senate from 1986 to 1992.

Duke University benefited enormously from his tenure as university president. With wisdom and vision, he guided that educational institution to becoming a leader in the fields of medicine and law.

Mr. Speaker, the bill has bipartisan support. The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) and the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE) have been particularly supportive. It is with great pleasure that I join in broad, bipartisan support for H.R. 911 and urge its passage. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. ETHERIDGE), sponsor of the bill.

Mr. ETHERIDGE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) for yielding me this time, and I also thank my friend, the gentleman from Guilford, North Carolina (Mr. COBLE), for his support in helping get this bill to the floor and for his leadership in this important bipartisan legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I would say that every member of our delegation joins me in support of this important legislation. I would also like to thank the chairman and ranking member of the committee for bringing this bill to the floor in such a timely manner. The number of the bill would indicate that it is receiving expedited treatment to get here, and I thank them for that.

Mr. Speaker, this Sunday, April 18, will mark the 1-year anniversary of the passing of a truly great and courageous North Carolinian and American. Former United States Senator and North Carolina Governor Terry Sanford died last year of complications associated with cancer. Terry Sanford lived a life that has served as a shining example of excellence to an entire generation.

Terry Sanford learned growing up that hard work reaped rewards, that boldness is a requirement of leadership, and that possibilities exist that are only bound by the size of one's imagination.

Throughout his life, he fought to improve education, to promote racial healing, eradicate poverty, promote economic development, promote the opportunity for every person, no matter what their economic background, their creed or color might be, to have economic opportunity.

Known as North Carolina's ''Education Governor,'' Terry Sanford inspired teachers and students to excel with his unrelenting commitment to public education. It was his many contributions to education that led Harvard University to name him as one of the top 10 governors in the 20th century.

As President of Duke University, as we have heard, Terry Sanford challenged a small regional university to dream big and reach for the stars. And reach them it did. When Terry Sanford left Duke University, it became known as the world leader in research and higher education in law, medicine, business, and the arts.

It was his many contributions to create what is generally regarded as the ''Harvard of the South'' that led Duke University to name its Institute for Public Policy after this great American, known as the Terry Sanford Institute for Public Policy.

Called to serve in the public arena once again, Terry Sanford was elected to the United States Senate in 1986. In its years in the Senate, Terry Sanford distinguished himself as a passionate advocate for public education and for the poor and less fortunate.

In addition to his many vital roles as a statesman, politician, and university president, Terry Sanford served the people of North Carolina and this country in many other ways. He served as a paratrooper in World War II, as an agent with the Federal Bureau of Investigation, as a State senator, and in many other capacities.

He also participated in many charities, too many to cover here today. He was one of North Carolina's leading patrons of the arts. His passion for the arts endured until his death, as he spearheaded efforts to bring a world-class performing arts facility to North Carolina.

Terry Sanford was also a committed husband to Margaret Rose, a devoted father to Terry, Jr., and to Betsy.

Mr. Speaker, Terry Sanford inspired me personally as a student and also in

politics. In fact, when I was deciding to run for Congress, I went and sat down and talked with Terry Sanford. His words of encouragement helped me make up my mind, and they continue to inspire me and many others today.

Last year, prior to his passing, I began searching for a way to honor Senator Sanford who has meant so much to me, my family, and so many North Carolinians and Americans. With the help of my colleagues here in Congress, we came up with the idea of naming the Federal building in downtown Raleigh, a stone's throw away from the governor's mansion where Terry Sanford may have made many of his most important contributions to a generation of North Carolinians and a generation of teachers and students who will continue to make a contribution for years and years to come. Naming this building in his honor will allow his influence to be felt by a whole new generation of leaders.

Terry Sanford was more than a great and admired politician. He was one of the most accomplished Americans of our time. His North Carolina values and visionary leadership brought us through some of the most difficult challenges that beset our generation and set us forward in North Carolina on a path of tremendous progress that we enjoy today economically. This gesture is the least we should do for a man who allowed us to view the world from his broad shoulders.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. WISE).

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) for yielding me this time, and I thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Chairman COBLE) for bringing this bill to the floor and making it possible for us to be here.

I want to rise in a little different capacity. Each one of us has one or two people that played major roles in our life that we can point to as a mentor in a formative stage in our life and development. In my life, I was fortunate enough to have Terry Sanford as one of those people.

As a student at Duke University when Mr. Sanford became the President of Duke, and then having had the privilege of working with him not only as a student but then later in various political undertakings, I had the unique experience of getting to know him and to be affected by him. But my experience is no more unique than that of hundreds, perhaps thousands, of young people and that alone is a testament to why this building is aptly named for Terry Sanford.

Terry Sanford was a progressive governor from 1960 to 1964 in a time when integration and the battle for civil rights was sweeping this Nation. And as some southern governors were standing in schoolhouse doors, Terry Sanford was opening schoolhouse doors. While North Carolina was in many ways the birthplace of the civil rights movement with the Greensboro sit-ins, at the same time it was not gripped by many of the same problems that affected others, and that is because of the leadership of Terry Sanford.

As a college president, this was a college president who involved young people at every level, who challenged us by saying, ''You can be involved in whatever level you can rise to.'' During the late 1960s and early 1970s, there could be no more important leadership coming than that.

He one time said, as some of us were sitting around criticizing someone one time, and he looked at us and he said, ''No one is going to be able to say that I did not give everybody a chance.'' That was what Terry Sanford was about: giving an opportunity.

He was a dark horse presidential candidate and in 1972, we did not go on to the White House. But at the same time, he once again gave hundreds of young people, college students and those just out of college, he gave us a chance to express ourselves in times that were very frustrating and to feel that we were making some difference in what was happening on the national scene.

Finally, of course, as a United States Senator, Terry Sanford provided the leadership that he had always provided reaching out to those of all persuasions, bringing them in.

It is interesting today as we wrestle with concerns about education to meet the challenges of education, we are wrestling with many of the same concerns and areas that Terry Sanford worked on as Governor of North Carolina.

□ 1530

He understood well the role of the public university in his love of the University of North Carolina. At the same time, he guided a private university, Duke University, to all new levels of national prominence.

So as a Governor, as a college president, as a presidential candidate, as a United States Senator, as a father, as a war veteran, as an FBI agent, as a citizen, Terry Sanford was an example to us all. The legacy to Terry Sanford is of course that, across this country, indeed I warrant across this world, there are thousands of young people, young then, much older now, there are thousands of people that directly felt his impact and feel it today and carry that on through their lives.

That is why I thank the majority and the minority for bringing this bill to the floor, so that we can properly honor someone who had such an incredible impact on so many people.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the first political figure with whom I seriously identified was Terry Sanford. Indeed, he was a mentor and an inspiration to many of my generation who came of age politically during his governorship in the early 1960s. He taught us what democratic politics at its best could be. He was a model of energetic and innovative leadership, full of ideas, refusing to be bound by the shackles of the past, possessing a vision of future possibility that inspired and empowered others.

This Sunday marks the one-year anniversary of Terry Sanford's death. Looking around the Triangle region that I represent and all of North Carolina, we must remember that our success story was made possible, in large part, by the vision of Terry Sanford. Our quality of life and our economic success is the legacy of his commitment to public education, to the movement for racial justice, to the development of our community college system, and to the growth of Research Triangle Park. Like Terry Sanford, our area is dynamic, vibrant, and full of hope.

When we look back on the broad sweep of Terry Sanford's life—as an FBI agent, a World War II paratrooper, a state legislator, lawyer, author, university president, governor, and senator—we see a life committed to the greatest movements and deeply involved in the greatest accomplishments in this American century.

I am proud to join the entire North Carolina delegation in sponsoring this bill, and I urge all my colleagues to support this legislation to name the federal building in Raleigh for Terry Sanford, an extraordinary citizen, visionary leader, and son of North Carolina.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill H.R. 911, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Con. Res 48, H. Con. Res. 49, and H.R. 911, as amended.

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

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 5:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 32 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 5:30 p.m.

□ 1752

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. UPTON) at 5 o'clock and 52 minutes p.m.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 68. Concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2000 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2001 through 2009.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. Con. Res. 68) ''A concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2000 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2001 through 2009'' and requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 68, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET—FISCAL YEAR 2000

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 68) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2000 and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of the fiscal years 2001 through 2009, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES OFFERED BY MR. SPRATT

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Spratt moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 68 be instructed, within the scope of the conference, to insist that the huge and fiscally irresponsible tax cuts set forth in the reconciliation directives in the concurrent resolution be reported at the latest possible date within the scope of the conference, and to require that the reconciliation legislation implementing those tax cuts not be reported any earlier, to provide the Congress with sufficient time to first enact legislation extending the solvency of the social security and medicare trust funds consistent with the sense of the Congress language in section 315(b)(4) and (5) of the Senate amendment and findings in 322(a)(1)–(3) of the Senate amendment and provisions in sections 5 and 6 of the House concurrent resolution because of the preeminent importance of so enhancing retirement security without reducing benefits and because projected budget surpluses should first be reserved for the use of those trust funds consistent with section 315(a)(4) and (5) of the Senate amendment and sections 5 and 6 of the House concurrent resolution rather than dissipated through the resolution's tax cuts which jeopardize the future of both social security and medicare.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) will be recognized for 30 minutes and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

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

My motion to instruct conferees demands that Congress deal with the solvency of the Social Security and Medicare trust funds before we enact huge tax cuts that could drain the budget of the very funds that are needed to save, protect and make solvent for the long run Social Security and Medicare.

By our calculation, in the first 5 years this proposed tax cut will take $143 billion out of the resources of the Federal Government. The next 5 years it will be $788 billion. And in the third 5-year period of time, occurring around the year 2009, just when Social Security and Medicare need it most, in that 5-year period of time alone by our calculation, this conference report, if enacted and reconciled, would drain the Treasury of $1.066 trillion and leave Social Security and Medicare high and dry.

The motion we make is similar to a motion I made in committee and it is similar to an amendment that we brought to the House floor. It simply says, let us deal first with Social Security, then with Medicare; let us establish them as priorities.

Mr. Speaker, we have come farther than anyone would have expected since 1993 in eradicating the so-called budget deficit, the year-to-year deficit. We now face the next big challenge. If we can step up to it, we can turn the corner into the next century in better fiscal condition than this country has been in in a long, long time. But we cannot lay claim to that until we have dealt with Social Security and Medicare. We cannot deal with Social Security and Medicare and make them solvent for the long run, assuredly solvent, 50 to 75 years, unless we deal with them first.

If we first pass a tax cut of the magnitude proposed by this budget, we will leave Social Security and Medicare unattended, neglected, and we will leave the budget without the resources necessary to do anything about those programs in the future.

In the well of the House just a couple of weeks ago when this budget resolution passed, I pointed out the fact that I am not opposed to tax reduction. We have got it in our own budget resolution. I think in due course it is very much in order, given the surpluses that we see projected. I think they should materialize before we commit ourselves to a big tax reduction, but their budget, the resolution before us, is fixated on tax reduction to the extent that when it comes to dealing with national defense, they flatten the President's budget out in the last 5-year cycle. In dealing with veterans, they actually cut the allocations for veterans' programs at a time when our World War II veterans are swelling to the point that they need it most. They deal with crop insurance for 5 years and then cut the money off in order to provide for more tax cuts. They say that they are for funding more for the NIH, but they take the function for health in the budget and actually give it less, all in the name of maximizing the tax cut.

What we are saying is, as to these other programs, the time and day will come when we can sort through those priorities, but as to Social Security and Medicare, there is no question that they have primacy, they should come first, they should come before tax reduction. That is the gist of this motion to instruct conferees.

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

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

I have just been handed essentially this motion to instruct. In a spirit of just being back from the break that we have been on, I am trying to ignore a lot of the kind of inflammatory language that is contained in this motion to instruct, like the word ''irresponsible'' tax cut. That, to me, is an oxymoron, an irresponsible tax cut. There is no such thing as an irresponsible tax cut. But, I mean, if the gentleman from South Carolina wants to call this fiscally irresponsible, I do not know that I want to get into a big fight with him about that.

Essentially, the way I read this motion to instruct, it is basically saying that we should take the latest possible date within the scope of the conference and require that the reconciliation legislation implementing those tax cuts not to be reported any earlier. It does not seem as though it has got any real force to it.

□ 1800

The gentleman is just saying, ''Can you put off the reconciliation as long as possible?'' That is the way I read this. The gentleman from South Carolina, is there something more than that that he is trying to say?

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

Mr. KASICH. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SPRATT. I am trying to say a lot more than that, Mr. Speaker, but to stay within the scope of what is permissible, I have to say do not do it except as the last act. But I am saying to the gentleman the responsible thing, the responsible thing is not to drain

the budget dry so that the resources there are not there to deal with Social Security and Medicare. The responsible thing is to deal with Social Security, deal with Medicare, and then address tax reduction.

Mr. KASICH. All right. I understand.

There is a reason to be thankful for small things like scope is what I can tell the gentleman because what this means is that basically the gentleman is saying that we have got to make sure that we take care and set aside money for Social Security and Medicare and do tax cuts in a way that it does not impact on that, is essentially what the gentleman is saying, and let me just say to the gentleman from South Carolina that it has been fully our intention, of course, to preserve for the first time in, I think, my lifetime, to be able to preserve all the money that gets collected from the payroll taxes for retirement security, and, as my colleagues know, we are going to save at least $1.8 trillion, which is well over a hundred billion dollars more than the President for purposes of being able to transform Social Security and Medicare and not just so that our seniors will get it, but so that the baby boomers and their children will have a retirement program as well, and at the same time I think we made the argument a couple weeks ago for the other part of the surplus that gets produced by the income taxes and all the other taxes that flow into the Federal Government. We have an overcharge right now, and we believe that overcharge will be to the tune of almost $800 billion.

So we have a twofold program, one to save $1.8 trillion for Social Security and Medicare and an additional $780 billion for tax cuts, and if what the gentleman is arguing for is that we ought to make sure our tax cuts do not impinge on Social Security, the fact is our resolution does that.

So, I will preliminarily say that I do not have any objection to the motion to instruct, and some of my colleagues have come to the floor, and I want them to take a look at it, but my initial reading is that I do not really have any objection outside of the inflammatory language that is contained in the resolution with words such as the fiscally irresponsible tax cuts, and I thought there was at least another one of those inflammatory words somewhere, but that is not such a big deal.

Another thing is the huge and fiscally irresponsible tax cuts. I mean any time we can make the government have a little less in its pockets and people have a little bit more, I think that is very good, and at the same time preserving for the first time since I have been in the Congress all the money we collect from Social Security I think is a huge step forward.

So I will reserve the balance of my time at this point and would preliminarily, unless some of my colleagues here object, would accept the motion to instruct.

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL), the ranking member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I came to the floor really to thank the gentleman from Ohio. The closer we get to the presidential election, the more common sense really reaches this body.

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

Mr. RANGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. KASICH. Be careful, I may have his words taken down.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, there was a time when people used to run around asking for $800 billion tax cuts, and some got closer to a trillion, there was whispering of people meeting in the middle of the night in Michigan asking for 10 percent across the board, and knowing the gentleman from Ohio and his concern about the common folk, and those that drive those milk trucks, and those that are Post Office employees, and just those that make our country so great, I know that when he does come up with a tax cut, and America sure deserves one, that it is going to be equitable, it is going to be fair.

I, of course, have to work more closely with the chairman of my committee, and we may not be able to participate with these formula cuts because we have dedicated ourselves to pull the coat up by the roots, and of course that is a little more complex than just setting aside a trillion dollars. But as we decide how we are going to do it with the gentleman's help, I hope that I heard him say that before we go to the American people to thank them for their productivity, to thank them for the excesses they have had to pay in taxes, especially the payroll tax, that we, as Democrats and Republicans and the House and the Senate, will present to them a secure Social Security system for their children and for their children's children. And even though I know that in the past Medicare has not been a word that the other side likes to talk about much, I am assuming that the same deep-seeded commitment that we have to meet our obligations in the future for Social Security benefits will also repair the Medicare system so that that system will be there too.

So, Mr. Speaker, I do not know what is going to happen in our various conventions, but I know one thing. If I do not hear my side talking as straight talk as the gentleman from Ohio is, if I do not hear that commitment from my side, that we are going to fix the Social Security system for the American people, we are going to fix the Medicare system, and then we are coming back with fair and equitable reduction in people's taxes; that is not a Republican talking, that is a good American.

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

I love when a speaker can drip with irony and cynicism about the intentions of what we are doing with our fiscal program, but I would choose not to think that the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) would be at all cynical about our intentions because I think the gentleman would have to admit, would have to recognize, the fact that for virtually all of the time of my lifetime we have stolen from the Social Security Trust Fund, and we have spent it on other programs, and for the first time we intend to lock up the $1.8 trillion and keep it in reserve, and it will be kept in reserve for purposes of being able to transform the Social Security and the Medicare program, retirement security programs. That is why we have actually saved over a hundred billion dollars in revenues.

I also want to compliment the gentleman for saying that he likes the idea of a tax cut. I wonder if the gentleman may be running for mayor of New York, that he might be giving consideration to that considering the fact that he has made the comment that he likes the idea of tax cuts. I want to compliment the gentleman from New York for coming in our direction.

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

Mr. KASICH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I think there will be more political opportunities for me in the House, but having said that, the gentleman from Ohio did not say that he was just going to reserve the money for Social Security and Medicare. He said that he was going to fix these programs, and then we get on working together for a tax cut. I thought I heard the gentleman correctly when I came over here.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, let me just say to the gentleman that we stand ready, willing and able to be able to move forward on a program that would be able to transform Social Security not just for our parents, but for the baby boomers and their children, and of course we had this opportunity with the Medicare Commission that the President rejected. But I certainly believe that we need to look at creative programs like letting individuals keep 2 percent of the payroll taxes to invest in the American economy, just like Federal employees do, and I think we need to breathe new life into Medicare. I am pleased about the fact that the Republican Congress was able to be significantly involved in terms of extending the life of Medicare.

But let me say to the gentleman what we intend to do is to save all the money that we collect from the payroll taxes and use it at the current time to pay down debt, but we stand willing and able to work with the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL) and the President of the United States to be able to transform those programs and at the same time be able to also give people some of their overcharges back in a tax cut.

So, what the gentleman should anticipate in our budget resolution and what he should anticipate later in the year is saving $1.8 trillion from the payroll taxes to provide the retirement security that our seniors want, and the gentleman should also anticipate a tax cut moving through the United States Congress this year, and that is what I think the game plan is.

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. RANGEL).

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, it is one thing to say they are going to put it in the reserve and reduce the Federal debt, and that is good. But I think what we are trying to do here is to get some type of commitment in saying that if we can delay how we are going to handle taxes until after we come together on Social Security and Medicare, that we will be working more closely together. The gentleman may want 100 percent of it to go in investments, private investments, but at least come up with something that we can say that we tried to do Social Security, we tried to do Medicare, and I think that would be better than just saying that we are putting it in reserve.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT).

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, as I listened to this discussion, I think maybe we should pass a resolution against dumping irony on this floor. When I hear the chairman of the Committee on the Budget say he does not know what an irresponsible tax cut is, that drips, Mr. Speaker, that drips.

There was a time when we had a President named Ronald Reagan who talked about, as my colleagues know, balancing the budget and all that fiscal stuff and then proceeded to drive the deficit higher than it has ever been in the history of this country by giving tax cuts and spending out of the Social Security money. Now it is for that reason we have this motion on the floor. There are some of us who think it is time now to pay down our credit card debt, and the credit card debt is not only in Social Security, but it is in Medicare.

Now I sat on the Medicare Commission for a year and watched people try and push the idea of privatizing Medicare, and that was the only solution they could come up with. Meanwhile, the President had a proposal laying on the table to put 15 percent of the deficit into strengthening Medicare, and it was not even considered by the Commission.

Now I have been waiting. I sit on the Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Ways and Means, and I am waiting for the chairman to call a meeting and make a proposal by which he can make any way in saving Medicare. Nothing has happened in this Congress. We are at the 15th of April almost, and everybody is real pleased this year that we have a budget resolution. But nothing is happening on the two biggest issues, and that is why we are concerned, that is why the motion is here, and I think that the gentleman from Ohio has also been very, very careful about the so-called lockbox that he says that he is putting the money into in the Committee on the Budget. That lockbox has a trap door in it that has a key that is possessed by the majority, and they are going to drop that door, and drop the money out and want to give a tax break, and that is the reason we want to make sure that Medicare and Social Security get dealt with before we go and give another tax break like 1986.

I have been in my district, and I have not had a single soul come up to me and say, ''When are we going to have a tax break? How big is the tax break?'' They all ask about what is happening to Social Security and what is happening to Medicare, and I think this Congress will make a serious error if we do not deal with those things first before we even have a discussion in the Committee on Ways and Means around the discussion of tax breaks.

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

□ 1830

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this motion to instruct, and I would hope that the chairman of the committee would be listening to this discussion because the major point of this resolution is to make sure that we do preserve and protect Social Security before we have a tax cut that literally explodes in the year 2010 to 2015.

The estimates of the budgets that we are now discussing in the conference between the House and the Senate position, if the tax cuts as currently being discussed go into place, it will mean that there will be a drain on the Treasury in 2010 to 2015 of some $1.7 trillion at exactly the same time that Social Security will be running out of money. That is a point that is being overlooked in this exuberance for a tax cut, and I would sincerely ask the majority to take another look.

We all agree with preserving and protecting by taking the Social Security trust funds and applying them to the debt. That is great policy and everyone agrees to that. But when we have a tax cut that starts small and expands to $1.7 trillion by 2015, exactly the same time that the monies paid into Social Security will no longer be adequate to pay out to the beneficiaries at that time, that is the point of this amendment.

I would much rather, as the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) has said, have had a more straightforward motion, but this is an excellent motion to set in the general principle that we will fix Social Security before we do anything else to spend any more of the Social Security trust funds than what we have already done.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) is correct when he says we have been doing this for the last umpteen years. What some of us would like to see now, and I know the Speaker agrees with this point, what some of us would like to do is change that, would change that right now. That is the point of this motion to instruct, and I hope that Members will pay particular attention to it because if we really and truly want to preserve and protect Social Security, this motion must be not only passed but accomplished in the conference and voted through the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. UPTON). Without objection, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) will control the time of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH).

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS).

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

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, it is nice to be back and listening to the political rhetoric.

I came to the floor because the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) indicated that as chairman of the Subcommittee on Health I had not held a single meeting talking about making changes in the Medicare program.

We have been holding hearings taking a look at current Medicare and trying to deal with the current issues. Just as at the end of the last Congress we made adjustments in home health, we are looking at current areas. Although I find it ironic, because I also was for a year on the Medicare Commission, and for want of a single vote, we had a plan which in fact took the government entitlement to standard benefit and blended it with the savings in the marketplace.

It was a plan that was going to save a percent, a percent and a half in the outyears. It was a meaningful change. The President announced that none of his appointees were going to go ahead and support the plan, and he said he was going to offer a proposal.

So it seemed to me, based upon his State of the Union message and based upon his going out the day the Medicare Commission voted on a very responsible plan, saying he was going to come up with his own plan, that I thought I would say, let us see it, Mr. President. Because what we did was guarantee Medicare, guarantee prescription drugs integrated into a program in a responsible way and expanding 100 percent coverage to the low and near low income up to 135 percent of poverty.

The President has not laid a plan in front of us that shows us that. The

President told his appointees not to agree with that bipartisan, broad-based position. Ten of the seventeen members agreed. The gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) did not agree on the changes in 1997. He did not agree on the commission. I actually am looking forward to trying to find something that he agrees on. He does a great job of coming down and giving speeches in which he is able to point and criticize, but I would love to see a solution which captures a majority; not a single vote, as he was on the 1997 changes, 34 to 1, or in the minority on the Medicare commission. I reach out. Let us try to do something in a real bipartisan way.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN).

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

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, let me say first of all that I hope the chairman, the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH), who is not on the floor, does accept this motion to instruct because if one reads the last part of it, it states that we would reserve the surplus rather than have it dissipated throughout the resolution's tax cuts which jeopardize the future of both Social Security and Medicare. That is what this is all about.

We would love to have a bipartisan budget resolution. Having a budget resolution would be a start, compared to last year when we had no budget resolution.

The fact is that the Republican budget really does not do anything for Social Security and Medicare. Sure, it saves the surplus that belongs to Social Security, but it does nothing more, and in fact it does not make up for the incurred liability from the years when the surplus in Social Security was spent. It creates a huge liability of nearly $1.8 trillion over 15 years by locking in tax cuts which are based upon projected surpluses over 15 years, and I think that is a pretty weak basis on which to lock in those tax cuts.

What is going to happen is, when those 15-year projections do not turn out, we will go back to more deficit spending and we will add to the national debt and that will be to the detriment of Social Security, to the detriment of Medicare and to the detriment of the general economy as well.

Finally, this budget uses the old smoke and mirrors. It blows through the pay-go rules, it robs nondefense discretionary spending to pay for defense spending, and it relies on a mythical July CBO update that hopefully will allow us to write the appropriations bills. So it is not a real budget; it is a political document.

Maybe it is better to get one done than getting nothing done like last year, but the fact is, it does nothing for Social Security, and that is what the American people sent us here to do. It does nothing for Medicare. It does not pay down the national debt to the extent that we ought to do. We offered a proposal to do that. It was rejected by the majority. We are eager, when my colleagues want to get serious, to sit down and do that.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CHAMBLISS), the vice chairman of the committee.

Mr. CHAMBLISS. Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat encouraged by what I hear from my friends on the other side because I think we have a real opportunity here to work together in a bipartisan fashion to, in fact, save Social Security.

Our budget does exactly that. We do dedicate $1.8 trillion over the next 10 years to Social Security. That will go to pay down debt. That does not mean the program itself is reformed.

The real way that we have got to work together to save Social Security is to come up with true and meaningful reforms. I think we all agree to that.

I am encouraged by what I hear over here. My good friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) who works with me on so many other issues of mutual interest made some good points. My friend, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), that I work with on the Committee on the Budget made some excellent points, and I think it is time that we came together on this issue of the budget, came together on the issue of Social Security, came together on the issue of Medicare, and let us work for meaningful reform. Let us take the numbers that both of us know we are dealing with.

Irrespective of what the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) just said, we know what we are dealing with in the short term, and we have some idea of what we are dealing with in the long term. We can take those numbers and we can make it work, if we will work together. I look forward to working in a bipartisan fashion to truly save Social Security and truly save Medicare, and we thank the Members for wishing to join our team on that.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I stand in favor of this motion to instruct conferees to address the solvency of the Social Security and Medicare trust funds before enacting huge and fiscally irresponsible tax cuts that would drain the budget surplus. Virtually all economists, including the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, Alan Greenspan, have argued that addressing the fiscal challenges posed by the impending retirement of the baby boom generation should take precedence over tax cuts.

Of course, the challenge is not just one facing Social Security but most especially Medicare as well. The Medicare hospital insurance trust fund in fact is projected to become insolvent long before the Social Security trust fund. So a broad consensus has developed that we should address the long-term future of both of these programs, that that really is of the utmost priority on our national agenda.

Nonetheless, here we are about a fourth of the way through this first session of the 106th Congress and we have made no discernible progress on these two issues, which arguably are the most important domestic issues that face us.

Both the Senate and the House versions of the budget resolution would take us down a road that provides no help on extending the solvency of Medicare and Social Security. They do contain across the board as opposed to targeted tax cuts that would certainly grow in the future, in a way that jeopardizes the progress we have made in eliminating the budget deficit.

We did offer an alternative in committee and on the floor, we on the Democratic side of the aisle, an alternative that would buy down more debt and would transfer assets into these trust funds to extend their life. Unfortunately, that alternative was rejected.

At the very least, we should instruct our conferees now to include in the budget resolution provisions to put on hold attempts to enact a large tax cut that will consume the budget surpluses and more into the future.

We should at least put tax cuts off limits until the end of the fiscal year to give us time to seriously address the Social Security and Medicare challenges that face us. So I welcome the prospect of bipartisan cooperation on this and urge passage of the motion to instruct.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds just to respond to the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution basically is asking us to do what we intend to do and that is save Social Security first and then deal with tax cuts.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARY MILLER).

Mr. GARY MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting listening to the debate on this side of the aisle. Some have said we need to continue our course and others say we need to have a bipartisan agreement on the budget resolution, and I wish that were possible.

However, this side of the aisle balanced the budget. The President wants to increase taxes, wants to spend more money. We fought in the past to continue the concept of welfare reform. The President vetoed welfare reform twice before finally deciding to follow our lead.

We are keeping the budget caps. The President wants to break the budget caps. For the last year, all I have heard from this side of the aisle is, we need to save Social Security.

Where is all the rhetoric now? Obviously one of the Members from the other side got his wish and some of my colleagues were beamed up.

All we have talked about is talk. This side of the aisle wants to set 100 percent aside for Social Security this year alone, $137 billion, and over 10 years $1.8 trillion.

The President wants to save 62 percent and spend this year alone $58 billion on his programs, and over 10 years wants to set only $1.3 trillion aside, compared to our $1.8 trillion.

We provide for Medicare in our budget. The President cuts $11.9 billion over 5 years out of Medicare. This side of the aisle believes working men and women should have a tax cut. The President proposed raising taxes $172 billion over 10 years.

We provided $22 billion for elementary, secondary and vocational education. That is $1.2 billion more than the President proposes.

I wish we could come to a bipartisan agreement.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. POMEROY).

□ 1830

Mr. POMEROY. Mr. Speaker, I just came back from conducting town meetings all across the State of North Dakota.

When the people I represent consider the priority in which this body and this Congress ought to move forward in response to the budget surplus, they uniformly come down, in town meeting after town meeting, with a strong consensus to do something about preserving and extending the solvency of the social security trust fund, to do something about extending the solvency of the Medicare trust fund.

The preceding speaker gave an awful lot of statistics, but the bottom line reality is this: The Republican budget resolution passed before the Easter recess by this House does not extend by one day the solvency of the Medicare trust fund, the solvency of the social security trust fund. That is what has led us to this motion to instruct we are offering this afternoon.

Just like the folks I represent think, I bet the folks throughout the country think that we need to take care of the existing responsibilities before we fritter away this surplus. That means doing something to extend trust fund solvency. That means that before tax cuts, we commit the resources to make sure that social security is prolonged and strengthened, that Medicare is prolonged and strengthened.

That is what is before us, Mr. Speaker, two alternatives: the budget resolution, which does not extend by a day the solvency targets for the trust funds, and would instead move the tax cuts forward; or the motion to instruct, which would make it very clear that this Congress, in a bipartisan way, hopefully, believes first things first: First we address the solvencies, then we look at what we can do with tax cuts.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds.

I think my colleague on the other side of the aisle voted against the President's proposal. I know few people on the other side of the aisle who voted for it.

We in our budget resolution save social security, and with the surplus that goes above and beyond that, we are able to provide a tax cut instead of spending more, which my colleagues on the other side of the aisle seem to want to do, is to spend more. We do not.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. MARK GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, like so many others here today, I am fresh off a two-week district work period. During that two-week time, I had about a half-a-dozen town hall meetings, all of them on the budget. I had town hall meetings in Green Bay, Sturgeon Bay, Marinette, Appleton.

During that time I outlined what is in the budget resolution that we passed in this body last week. The reaction that I got was universal. The reaction was simply, well, it is about time. It is about time that we set aside the social security surplus for social security.

I have to pause here for a moment. My friend, my colleague, the gentleman from Texas, said, well, this does not do much for social security. It simply sets aside the surplus belonging to social security. I would agree with him philosophically, but it is something that this institution has failed to do for 30 years, so it is something important. It is something historic.

My constituents believe that these principles are long overdue. They believe in setting aside the social security surplus. They believe in paying down the debt. They believe in putting dollars into the programs that this president promised but failed to fund, like valuable money for crop insurance; like important, long overdue money for veterans' health programs. My constituents throughout northeastern Wisconsin want to see these principles implemented as soon as possible.

Today we are establishing a conference committee, and there are good arguments we have heard on both sides, arguments presumably we will hear within the conference committee, but today is not the day to let this deteriorate into partisan bickering. Today is not the day to try to snatch defeat from the jaws of victory.

Today is the day for us to move forward so these principles will be implemented as soon as possible, and on a bipartisan basis, because this is what we have been telling the American people we will do and this is clearly what they want.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, boy, this discussion has been heartening, because what I hear on the other side of the aisle is that they agree with the thrust of the Democratic budget resolution, which is that no net tax cuts or additional spending should be passed until we extend the solvency of social security and Medicare. That is really the only major issue on which we have disagreed.

Now I hear from the other side of the aisle that we really do not disagree on that. That is what this resolution said, and simply, no tax cuts until we extend the solvency.

Now, we are told by independent, objective actuaries, ones that the other side uses as well as we do, that the Republican budget resolution does not extend the solvency of social security or Medicare for even one day. That means that we will go back to the drawing board together and come up with a proposal that we both agree on that will extend the solvency.

This is an intergenerational responsibility. Our parents met that responsibility. Not only did they win a war and ensure freedom for us, but they gave us the foundation of prosperity, which was fiscal responsibility. That is all we are suggesting we should do for the next generation.

Let us not use up all the trust funds for our own purposes. Let us not give ourselves tax cuts that we do not necessarily need, as much as we would like them, until we make sure that the next generation is going to experience as high a standard of living as we are experiencing. That is the least we owe them.

That is all our resolution does is to say, let us do our homework first before we give ourselves a big additional allowance. It is an intergenerational responsibility. It is what America ought to be all about. I am glad that the Republicans agree, no additional tax cuts until we extend the solvency of Medicare and social security. Now we can agree, we can move forward and do the people's business.

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

Mr. Speaker, we are going to save social security, not spend it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PAUL RYAN).

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I think it is very important to go back to the basics and point out what we are actually accomplishing in this budget. For the first time in over 30 years, for the first time in my lifetime, we are proposing to stop the raid on social security. We are proposing to stop taking our FICA taxes, our social security payroll taxes, and spending it on other government programs.

We are saying that for every dollar in social security taxes we pay, that will go to social security. For every dollar of Medicare taxes we pay, that will go to those programs. No longer will this become a slush fund for politicians. This money that we pay in our payroll taxes will go to those programs. That is a sea change.

On the contrary, the President has proposed to raid social security by the

tune of $341 billion over the next 10 years. We hear this talk about social security surpluses, non-social security surpluses. What our budget plan is doing is doing this: One hundred percent of social security revenues go to social security.

If we do begin to overpay our income taxes, off of our income taxes, non-social security surpluses, rather than spending that money in Washington, we should get that money back. That is the difference we are talking about here.

The President, in his State of the Union address, did say he was going to extend the life of social security, but what he actually achieved was putting more IOUs in the social security trust fund. We need real reform of social security, not more IOUs. We have to start reforming social security by putting real money in the trust fund, by making sure that our payroll taxes do in fact go to social security, not to fund other government programs.

That is what this is about, honesty in accounting, honesty to the American people, and making sure that our payroll taxes go to the very programs they were designed to go to.

If we begin overpaying our taxes after we have set social security aside, after we have got our debt going down on a downward glide path, we ought to get our money back. Rather than sending more of our income tax dollars here to Washington and letting people sit around and finding different ways to spend it for us, we ought to get our money back.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me, and I thank him for bringing this resolution out onto the floor, because it makes quite clear in its language, and I read, that huge and fiscally irresponsible tax cuts set forth in the reconciliation directives in the concurrent resolution are in fact jeopardizing our ability to be able to deal with the social security and Medicare crisis in our country.

Now, if the majority, if the Republicans, want to vote for our resolution, then they are essentially now taking that oxymoronic position of being carnivorous vegetarians. They are trying to be both at the same time, which is fine, I guess, for this evening and trying to have it both ways, but the reality is that the Republican budget does not extend the solvency of the Medicare trust fund by one day. Instead, the Republican resolution ignores the dark clouds on the health care horizon and offers an $800 billion tax cut proposal.

This hurricane that will hit the health care system is something that we all know to be real. We have the baby boom generation that is about to hit the retirement system, to start to have all of the health care problems that come with aging.

The Republicans insist on attacking the President's budget. We are not, on the Democratic side, defending the President's budget. We have a different budget on our side, one that does ensure that Medicare and social security is made solvent, that these programs are not cut in any way, and that we ensure that the tax cut of the Republicans does not dip their straws into this revenue and make it impossible for us to take care of ordinary families.

I hope that everyone in the House sincerely supports this Democratic motion. I am afraid that too many are going to pay tribute to it only by the hypocrisy which will be evident by, I am afraid, supporting something that at the end of the day they will never in fact support when the real votes come on the House floor.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to respond to my colleague from Massachusetts.

I would just point out that we set aside more money to save social security than the President does. We do it because we have set aside all the surplus of social security for the next 10 years. We box it in and do not spend it and do not use it as tax cuts.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, it is easy to hoodwink people who might be listening when we are sort of listening superficially, but I think it should be very clear that the Democrat proposal does not do anything more to save social security than the Republican proposal.

Members can say, well, here is scoring, and here is that. The fact is that we are going to have to come up with the same money to save social security with the Democrat proposal by saying, look, we are either going to cut other spending or we are going to increase taxes someplace. In fact, the Democrats' proposal implies that we are going to have to increase more taxes to save social security.

Look, this is historic. Both sides of the aisle should be supporting this budget, because for the first time in history, for the first time in at least recent history, in the last 40 years, we do not spend any of the social security trust fund money for other government programs.

Let me say it again, none of the social security surplus money is being spent for any other government spending. That is what this Chamber has been doing for the last 40 years. That is what has added to the predicament of social security and Medicare. No tax cuts from social security surpluses next year. That is historic, also.

We have problems, where we go in military spending. Maybe that military spending and supporting what is happening in Kosovo is going to reach into the social security surplus funds before we finish out the end of this year. This is a good start on a budget. Our next step to save social security and Medicare has to be to step up to the plate, for people like the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CHARLIE STENHOLM), people like the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. JIM KOLBE).

Like I and so many others have said, let us face up to what really needs to be done to save social security by making some of those changes, by getting a better return on investment.

I would suggest that the Democrats and Republicans have come a long way in the last several years doing what needs to be done, and that means stop spending the social security surplus money.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1½ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, we have come a long way, but we are still a long way apart. Number one, there is a major difference between our position and theirs in the two opposing budget resolutions brought to the Floor of the House 2 weeks ago.

First of all, we have a lockbox that works. Theirs has a loose lid and a trap door. We have one that works. It sees that the social security surpluses are used solely for social security.

Secondly, over 15 years, we pay down debt by $474 billion. That in itself reinforces the solvency of social security.

Thirdly, we came to the Floor with a letter from the chief actuary of the Social Security Administration and made it part of the record of that debate, certifying that our proposal would extend the life, the solvency, of social security until 2052. They have no such plan. They have not added one day to the solvency of social security.

□ 1845

And, finally, this is our concern in this resolution. This is our concern that in acting, locking in these huge tax cuts that get bigger and bigger such that in the 5-year period from 2009 until 2014, we will have $1.66 trillion in tax reduction at a time when Social Security will be in duress. What happens if these surpluses do not materialize? What happens to Social Security under the Republican budget? What happens if the surpluses do not materialize and the tax cuts do?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPRATT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the problem, as the honorable gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), ranking member of the Committee on the Budget, knows, is where do we come up with the money when there is not enough money coming in from Social Security to pay those benefits required? And the gentleman is just saying, let us add another giant IOU.

But still the problem comes down to coming up with that money to pay those benefits. That is what needs to be dealt with.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, do not take it from me;

take it from the chief actuary. Our plan extends the life of Social Security to 2052; the Republican plan does not extend it 1 day.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

(Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, listening to the debate that my colleagues just had brings me to where we are today and why we need to move on this motion to instruct conferees. It is a simple request that will have an enormous impact.

Interesting, my good friend on the other side of the aisle never really answered the question, where will those monies come from? That is why Democrats are simply asking that we put on hold, put on hold the large tax cut that is being proposed by Republicans so that it will not consume the surplus that we are trying to focus on, a very crucial issue—saving Social Security and Medicare.

In fact, if we would listen to people like Federal Reserve Chairman Greenspan, who has no ax to grind, he has argued that addressing the fiscal challenges posed by the impending retirement of those in the baby boomer generation should take priority over any tax cut. So in actuality, any suggestion of a tax cut without reasonably responding to how we best support and save Social Security does not make any sense.

Social Security and Medicare are too important to neglect. And without Social Security we will find that the elderly poverty rate would be 48 percent instead of the 11 percent that it is now. Without action to address Social Security, the trust fund will exhaust itself by 2034 and Medicare will exhaust itself by 2015.

The real key to what baby boomers understand and what working Americans understand is that if we do the Democratic plan, we will be able to reduce the debt and thereby interest rates because we will have the monies focused on the trust fund. And at the same time our budget resolution reduces the debt. We understand in black and white what it means to pay this higher interest rate without the reduction of the debt, which results in a lower interest rate on the mortgage payments so many working families have to pay if we do reduce the debt.

This is what Americans clearly understand efforts that will save them from high interest mortgage rates. It simply does not make sense that Republicans will not put a hold on their urgent desire for tax cuts which, in actuality, the 10 percent the preferred tax cut supported by the gentleman from Ohio (Chairman KASICH) of the Committee on the Budget goes mostly to those making over $200,000 a year. Forty-eight million households in the United States will not even see the tax cuts.

So why are the Republicans trying to represent that now we are coming with a bundle of goodies—tax cuts. It is not a bundle of goodies, but a bundle of misconceptions. I urge the House to support this motion to instruct and let us make sure that we deal with the question of saving Social Security, saving Medicare. And further when Americans get the real results in their monthly mortgage payment because the debt is reduced they will see the real difference when they pay less interest on their mortgage payment. That will be the policy upon which we can stand and be united on—saving Social Security and Medicare while reducing the nation's debt.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of the motion offered by Ranking Member SPRATT, which instructs the conferees to hold off on filing a report until this body passes legislation that will extend the life of Social Security and Medicare.

When the House version of the Republican Budget was passed just a few short weeks ago, it was heralded by the Majority as the move which saved Social Security. However, that assessment is incomplete, just as was the budget resolution. This is because, unlike the Democratic substitute that was offered at the time, it failed to place our surplus back into the Social Security Trust Fund. While Republicans continued to champion their budget, because it purportedly offered to take 100% of the surplus and put it aside for Social Security, they failed to advise the taxpayers that those funds, while set aside, could still be used for other purposes—like tax cuts for the wealthy.

Furthermore, the Republican Budget fails to do anything to extend the life of Medicare, which is just as important a program for our seniors. The Democratic resolution, on the other hand, would have extended the life of this poverty and life-saving program for another eighteen years. By failing to instruct the conferees to handle this pressing issue today, you are postponing for another year our opportunity to address this issue. By voting for this motion offered by Ranking Member SPRATT, we can send a signal to the American people that we are ready and willing to renew Medicare, and to provide a ready safety net should they suffer catastrophic illness.

We Democrats are not foreign to tax cuts. In fact, we have supported them in our budget resolutions. The difference is that our cuts are focused and disciplined. They benefit families by making childcare more affordable. They do not jeopardize our future for short-term gains, and they preserve our economy, which is enjoying its longest period of sustained growth since World War II.

I urge my colleagues to support the Spratt motion, and to support our efforts to preserve both Social Security and Medicare for our future generations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. UPTON). The gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) has 9¾ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) has 4¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU).

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, the budget resolution that is debated on the floor of the House and in the other body, as well, represents a blueprint, a broad outline of our vision and priorities for the future. And as this is the first budget resolution of the 21st century, it ought to reflect our economic priorities as we move into the next century as well.

Putting together that blueprint at the Committee on the Budget level, we asked some basic questions. First, what do we do about Social Security, one of the most important issues we will face this year? And as the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) has clearly described, we said, let us end the raid on the trust fund; let us set aside the entire Social Security surplus, 100 percent, exclusively to strengthen Social Security and Medicare. In contrast to the President's budget that only set aside 62 percent of that surplus, and he spent the other 38 percent.

Then we asked the question: What do we do about spending and the growth of the Federal Government? And the answer to that question was: Let us respect the 1997 budget agreement, a bipartisan agreement that controls the rate of growth of government spending. It was put together through lengthy negotiations in 1997 and sets a limit on how large and broad the scope of the Federal Government should be.

Third, we said: Well, what about taxes? And this is an important question, because today taxes are at an all-time high; 20.5 percent of our Nation's economy is being consumed by taxes at the Federal level. And we said once we have set aside every penny of the Social Security surplus, if we have revenues higher than that we ought to give those back to the American people, because there are more of them working today than ever before. They are more productive, they are earning more, and they are paying more in taxes than they ever have before.

Mr. Speaker, we set aside every penny of the Social Security surplus, not 62 percent, as the President suggested. We adhere to the 1997 budget agreement instead of breaking it, as the President's budget does; and we provide for tax relief once we set aside the Social Security surplus, instead of raising taxes by $100 billion.

It has been stated very clearly from the other side of the aisle when we make these comparisons between our budget resolution and the President's budget resolution: But we are not defending the President's budget. Do not force us to defend the President's budget.

Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States is the leader of his party, the leader of the strongest Nation on Earth, and we cannot find a single Member from the other side to defend his budget blueprint, the blueprint that should set the economic priorities for the future of this country, that should set the economic priorities for the first year of the next century, and we cannot find anyone that is willing to defend that budget.

We should support the principles that gave us the first balanced budget in 30 years, that strengthened Medicare, extended its solvency for another 10 years, and that gave the first tax relief in 16 years. Support the Republican principles that are embodied in this budget. Support this rule and let us move forward to economic prosperity.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I was interested to hear the Members on the other side talk about how they are planning to save Medicare. Never has salvation looked so unattractive.

Medicare is today hurting. The people in the State I represent, Massachusetts, used to have prescription drugs through their HMOs. Then the Republicans passed the Medicare bill in 1997 and they lost it. There was a reasonable home health care program in Massachusetts and elsewhere, and then the Republicans ''saved Medicare'' in 1997 and wrecked home health care along the way.

Hospitals are hurting, hospitals that are teaching hospitals and hospitals that deal with poor people. In 1997, the Republicans gave a capital gains tax cut and paid for it by cutting Medicare. So their notion of saving Medicare comes after they already, in 1997, made serious restrictions.

People listening ought to understand, if they think Medicare is perfect now they can thank Republicans for saving it in that fashion. I find it to be a serious problem.

And then the gentleman from California said, ''We are going to fix it.'' How are they going to fix it in their plan which, fortunately, did not get enough votes? Well, for one thing they were going to raise the age from 65 to 67, so that people who are now working and do not have medical care could wait another 2 years. Some fix. They fix the system by breaking the people.

Then we said, well, prescription drugs. We will provide prescription drugs for people up to 135 percent of poverty, because if they are in poverty they probably can be on Medicaid. Well, what is 135 percent of poverty? For an elderly couple whose income is about $20,000 a year, they get no help with prescription drugs.

So what we have here is a Republican plan to continue the damage with Medicare. And that is one of the most central differences now between the parties. The Republican plan of 1997 already weakened Medicare's ability to provide adequate service. I know very few people in my part of the country who are in the business of either providing or consuming health services who think Medicare is tenable the way it now is. And what they will do is, of course, leave all that damage that they did undone.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes just to point out to my colleague that the President came in with an $11 billion cut in Medicare. And when he did, my colleagues on other side of the aisle said the President had a great budget. They liked his new tax increases. They liked his new spending. They did not seem to complain then about the $11 billion worth of cuts that the President had in his budget.

Now they do not like the President's budget. But what I know is that in 1994 when Republicans got elected, we set out to get our country's financial house in order and balance this financial budget and save Medicare and Social Security, and that is what we are doing. And to move from this welfare state into a society of opportunity. That is what we are doing.

Mr. Speaker, the bottom line is we have set aside $1.8 trillion for Social Security and Medicare. It is $1 billion more than the President set aside. We do not spend it and we do not provide tax cuts. We reserve it, and in our budget resolution we do not allow the national debt to go up; and the President said he would veto it because he wanted to raise the debt ceiling. We are not going to raise the debt ceiling. It is the best way to make sure that we do keep our country's financial house in order and do not make this government larger.

When this President got elected, 17.5 percent of all revenues funded the Federal Government. Now it is 20.5. It has gone up and we are not looking to have it go up any higher.

Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH), chairman of the Committee on the Budget.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, let me, in summation, say that the language in this resolution, while at times bordering, well, not bordering but frankly inflammatory, the orders directed therein are not anything different than what we were planning to do. Boy, that sure sounds like Washington doubletalk. We do not think this resolution is a big deal, so I am urging my Members to go ahead and accept it.

Let me just for a second talk about the budget so that Members of this body will clearly understand what we are doing. And it should give us cause for celebration, because at one point we were struggling to try to figure out how to balance the budget. Now we are to the point where we are actually able to go beyond balancing the budget to the point where we are running huge surpluses. And we think the surpluses are a great opportunity to leverage good news into even better news.

The good news on the side of Social Security, and I want to compliment the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), my friend. He has joined with the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) in what I think is a creative opportunity to try to preserve Social Security, not just for the seniors. We know the seniors are going to get their Social Security. But the challenge is what do we do for the baby boomers and their kids? So if mom and dad are listening, mom and dad are going to get their money because there are so many baby boomers. But the arithmetic runs us into trouble because when the baby boomers retire, there are not a lot of workers.

Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the bipartisan team here in the House for their efforts to try to work together, have some guts. I am very interested in what they are doing. They ultimately get to where they are. I believe that we ought to put 2 percent aside into a private account for people to be able to participate in the economy like Federal workers. But the point is that we are not going to spend that money coming in from Social Security now on other government programs; we are going to lock it up. And we are either going to use it in the transition program to transform Social Security and Medicare or we are going to use it to pay down some debt.

The time will come when we are going to have some people with some guts in all branches of the government who are going to be willing to fix these retirement programs. So, I do want to compliment my friend and colleague from the State of Texas for his efforts.

□ 1900

At the same time, there is going to be somewhere around a $780 billion overcharge in the rest of the taxes we levy on the American people. My fear is that we take that money and we use it to expand the size of government, just the opposite of why we balanced the budget. We balanced the budget to make government less important and people more important, and we ought to proceed on that path.

So what we are going to do is take some of those overcharges we have put on the American people, overtaxes, and we are going to give them a refund. We are going to let them have more money in their pockets. With more money comes more power.

That is why I say, when I hear people say irresponsible tax cuts, I cannot think of a situation where my colleagues want to give people more power and government less where that can be argued in a negative way. I mean, the reverse of that argument is that people ought to be less important and government ought to be more important. I respect my colleagues if they think that way, but I do not agree with them.

I have got to tell my colleagues, when the people understand it that way, they want their money back. They do not want the government to be more important. They want to be more important. Do my colleagues know why? Because when they are more important, they can control their own future, their own destiny. They can go out and do more to support their family and their community. The Speaker here today can go out and buy those

Michigan tickets to go to the ball game a little easier.

The fact is that when people have more in their pocket, it is the nature of power; and power is a zero-sum game. When government has more, people have less. When people have more, government has less. That is where I think we ought to be. That is why we are going to have a tax cut. At the same time, we are going to preserve the spending discipline that we put in when we passed the 1997 budget deal.

I have just got to suggest to everybody in this Chamber, this is a budget that everybody ought to be voting for, because we have been able to accomplish things that have not been accomplished before. We do not want to blow the opportunity to return power to people and fundamentally reform our retirement programs for the baby boomers and reform it in such a way that, again, people are handed some more power to be able to do better planning themselves for their future, particularly when they get to be seniors and it becomes some of the most important time in their life.

So I would like to say to my colleagues, they can vote for this, and I would anticipate before the 15th of this month, we will have a budget resolution conference agreement on this floor that will accomplish what I have outlined. I will look forward to broad bipartisan support.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2¼ minutes, the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, the resolution we are about to send to conference does not protect Social Security, and it does not protect Medicare. It does not extend the life of either program or assure the solvency of either by 1 day. It does not rise to the challenge.

Worse still, the enormous tax cuts that it calls for could undercut Social Security and Medicare, especially, Mr. Speaker, if the surpluses projected do not materialize. The tax cuts are locked in: $143 billion the first 5 years, $788 billion the second 5 years, $1.66 trillion the third 5 years. They are a certainty. They are locked in.

The surpluses are economists' constructs. They may happen. I hope they do, but they may not. If they do not, what happens? What happens? How do we run the government when we do not have enough income tax and other tax revenues? We spend the payroll tax revenues.

The problem with that is that the demand upon the Treasury that this bill will make are greatest at the time when Social Security is in greatest need, between 2009 and 2014 when the war babies begin to retire and baby boomers begin to retire.

So this resolution says fix this budget resolution in conference. Save Social Security first, save Medicare as well, and then do tax cuts.

Mr. Speaker, given what the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) has said, I would say that everyone who votes with this motion to instruct conferees is making a pledge to follow these priorities, making a pledge to follow these procedures, and specifically making a pledge not to bring a tax bill to the floor of the House for consideration until Social Security is assuredly solvent, until Medicare is assuredly solvent, until both of those things are accomplished and enacted.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. UPTON). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SPRATT. 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, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed until after the votes on the two suspension motions postponed earlier today.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will now put the question on each motion to suspend the rules and then on the motion to instruct the conferees on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today in the order in which that motion was entertained.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H. Res. 135, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 911, by the yeas and nays; and

H. Con. Res. 68, the motion to instruct conferees, by the yeas and nays.

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

PROVIDING FOR CONCURRENCE BY HOUSE WITH AMENDMENT TO SENATE AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 98, EXTENSION OF AVIATION WAR RISK INSURANCE PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, House Resolution 135.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, House Resolution 135, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 392, nays 1, not voting 40, as follows:

[Roll No. 78]

YEAS—392

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (CA)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Davis (FL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Napolitano
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel

Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walden
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—1

Paul

NOT VOTING—40

Baker
Barr
Barton
Berman
Bishop
Borski
Brown (FL)
Carson
Coburn
Cooksey
Cox
Crane
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (IL)
DeMint
Dingell
Doolittle
Engel
Gordon
Hall (OH)
Hastings (FL)
Hoekstra
Kilpatrick
Lantos
Largent
Lee
McCollum
Mink
Nadler
Neal
Pryce (OH)
Radanovich
Roukema
Taylor (NC)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Walsh
Weygand
Woolsey

□ 1925

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 78, I was unavoidably delayed in the district and was absent from the vote on House Resolution 135. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

TERRY SANFORD FEDERAL BUILDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. UPTON). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 911, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 911, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 394, nays 0, not voting 39, as follows:

[Roll No. 79]

YEAS—394

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (CA)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Davis (FL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Napolitano
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walden
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—39

Baker
Barr
Barton
Berman
Bishop
Borski
Brown (FL)
Carson
Coburn
Cooksey
Crane
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (IL)
DeMint
Dingell
Engel
Gordon
Hall (OH)
Hastings (FL)
Hoekstra
Jefferson
Kilpatrick
Lantos
Largent
Lee
McCollum
Mink
Nadler
Neal
Pryce (OH)
Radanovich
Roukema
Taylor (NC)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Walsh
Weygand
Woolsey

□ 1941

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 79, I was unavoidably delayed in the district and was absent from the vote on H.R. 911. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 68, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET—FISCAL YEAR 2000

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. SPRATT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. UPTON). The pending business is the question on the motion to instruct on House Concurrent Resolution 68 offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 349, nays 44, not voting 40, as follows:

[Roll No. 80]

YEAS—349

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Bachus
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (CA)
Brown (OH)
Burr
Callahan
Calvert
Campbell
Canady
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Castle
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (FL)
Davis (VA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Emerson
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Moakley
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Napolitano
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Quinn
Rahall
Ramstad
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sweeney
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thune
Thurman
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walden
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—44

Archer
Armey
Bryant
Burton
Buyer
Camp
Cannon
Chabot
Coble
Cubin
Deal
DeLay
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
English
Goodling
Hansen
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hostettler
Hulshof
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kingston
Linder
McCrery
McIntosh
Packard
Paul
Salmon
Schaffer
Sessions
Shadegg
Smith (MI)
Souder
Stearns
Sununu
Tancredo
Thomas
Thornberry
Tiahrt

NOT VOTING—40

Baker
Barr
Barton
Berman
Bishop
Borski
Brown (FL)
Carson
Coburn
Cooksey
Crane
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (IL)
DeMint
Dingell
Engel
Gordon
Hall (OH)
Hastings (FL)
Hoekstra
Kilpatrick
Lantos
Largent
Lee
McCollum
Mink
Nadler
Neal
Peterson (MN)
Pryce (OH)
Radanovich
Rangel
Roukema
Taylor (NC)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Walsh
Weygand
Woolsey

□ 1949

Mr. HEFLEY and Mr. JONES of North Carolina changed their vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the motion to instruct was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 80, I was unavoidably delayed in the district and was absent from the vote on H. Con. Res. 68. Had I been present, I would have voted "Yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, due to business in the 15th Congressional District of Michigan, I regret that I was unable to vote on April 12, 1999. If I had been present, I would have voted ''aye'' on H. Res. 135, ''aye'' on H.R. 98, ''aye'' on H.R. 911, and ''aye'' on the Democratic motion to instruct conferees on H. Con. Res. 68.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. UPTON). Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees:

For consideration of the House concurrent resolution and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

Messrs. KASICH, CHAMBLISS, SHAYS, SPRATT, and MCDERMOTT.

There was no objecton.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 111

Mr. WAMP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as cosponsor of H.R. 111.

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

There was no objection.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1143, MICROENTERPRISE FOR SELF-RELIANCE ACT OF 1999

Mr. DIAZ-BALART, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106–85) on the resolution (H. Res. 136) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1143) to establish a program to provide assistance for programs of credit and other financial services for microenterprises in developing countries, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

IN PRAISE OF OUR TROOPS INVOLVED IN THE YUGOSLAV CONFLICT

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

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity several days ago to accompany with several other Members of this House and some Members from the other body with Secretary Bill Cohen, the Secretary of Defense, to Brussels and Mons and Aviano and Ramstein, involving the Yugoslav conflict. What I want to say this evening is that I have the highest regard and great praise for the young men and young women in uniform that we saw, in particular at Aviano Air Base, with the pilots, the ground troops, with the personnel, and again at Ramstein where we saw those pilots, and the ground crews and the loaders who are putting the cargo for the refugees onto those airplanes. They are professional, they are working hard, they are dedicated, and every man and woman in this country should be very proud of those in uniform who are doing their duty as they have been given their duty by their superior officers.

Mr. Speaker, I have high praise for them, and I congratulate them on the wonderful job that they are doing for America.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

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

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.)

GODSPEED TO OUR TROOPS IN THE BALKANS

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

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with my colleague the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON). Both of us had the privilege of accompanying Secretary of Defense Cohen into the theater. All of us walked away, one, awestruck by the commitment and spirit of the young men and women who represent us there. Their technical ability, their proficiency is something that is awe-inspiring, as well as their commitment.

Additionally, I think for me and others on the trip the commitment of the other NATO parties was something that struck us, and as we all pray and hope for a quick end to this conflict and the safety and security of our men and women that are in the field, I join with my colleague from Missouri and many others wishing them Godspeed.

CONGRATULATING THE UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT MEN'S BASKETBALL TEAM

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, I do want to take this first opportunity back from the NCAA for a little bit of bragging rights, and when I was there in Europe I met some other folks from Connecticut, some from my own district, and one of the great things about our State is that our UCONN basketball teams, men and women but this year it is the men's turn, are really the center of attention from an athletic perspective. Our team beat the Duke Blue Devils 77 to 74 for that championship, and with this win UCONN became the first school in New England to win this NCAA since 1947.

It was a great team. They made an incredible effort on that day and through the whole season. What is clear to all of us is that each and every one of the players put their heart and soul and every bit of effort in it, and I congratulate each one of them.

But I want to take a moment in particular for Jim Calhoun and his entire coaching staff. Coach Calhoun, who is a great coach and a great human being, someone that is involved in the community to help good causes, has been at UCONN since 1986 and has built an incredibly impressive record. In 13 seasons his record is 304 wins, 120 losses. Coach Calhoun has taken UCONN basketball from the backwaters to the front edge of competition, and he has succeeded time and time again in the Big East, in the championships, and finally this year in the NCAA.

For all my constituents, those like myself who are graduates of the University of Connecticut and every citizen in our State, this was a truly exciting moment and one that we will revel in for some time.

Congratulations, UCONN, the team, the president and all the folks back at Storrs.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the University of Connecticut men's basketball team for winning the 1999 NCAA Division I National Championship over Duke University. UCONN's 77–74 victory over the Blue Devils culminated years of hard work, dedication and perseverance on the part of the players, coaches and the entire University community. The residents of my state also deserve some of the credit for being among the most loyal, supportive fans in the nation.

The Huskies' ''road to the Final Four'' has been long, but illustrious. UCONN has been in the NCAA tournament twenty times in school history. Its teams have played in seven ''Sweet Sixteen'' and four ''Elite Eight'' games in the 1990s alone. The path to this year's Final Four appearance—the first in school history—included victories over Texas-San Antonio, New Mexico, Iowa and Gonzaga. UCONN bested Ohio State to advance to the championship game. UCONN's win over Duke produced the school's first NCAA Division I men's basketball National Championship and marked the first time since 1947 that a school from New England has won the title.

It goes without saying that basketball is a team sport. This UCONN team is the embodiment of that statement. Game in and game out, this group of extraordinary young men worked together as a unit to achieve their common goal. Every player made a contribution which helped the team win the Big East regular season and tournament championships, advance through the tournament to the Final Four and, ultimately, win the 1999 National Championship.

During the tournament every player made contributions that helped the team to move ever closer to its ultimate goal. Kevin Freeman provided offensive spark throughout the tournament especially in the game against Ohio State and helped to contain national player of the year Elton Brand in the championship game. Ricky Moore, who many people, including this member, believe is the best defensive player in college basketball, demonstrated over and over again why he has earned this title. He played opposite star guards throughout the tournament and made crucial plays against Duke's Trajan Langdon in the final seconds of the championship game which sealed the victory for UCONN. Jake Voskuhl filled the lane throughout the tournament and in the final game played a crucial role in containing Elton Brand. And what more can be said about the contributions of Richard Hamilton and Khalid El-Amin? Hamilton, who was named tournament MVP, scored an average of 24 points in six tournament games capping off the season with a 27 point performance in the final game. El-Amin, the team's floor leader, directed the offense, motivated his teammates and made crucial shots down the stretch in the victories against Ohio State and Duke. Others, including Edmund Saunders, Rashamel Jones and Souleymane Wane, played critical minutes in each game contributing to the team's success.

Coach Jim Calhoun and his assistants—Dave Leitao, Karl Hobbs and Tom Moore—have done a masterful job. Over the past thirteen seasons, Coach Calhoun has built a program that has dominated the Big East, one of the most competitive conferences in NCAA basketball, winning the regular season championship six times and the tournament championship four times. After only two seasons at UCONN, Coach Calhoun led the Huskies to the 1988 National Invitation Tournament championship. His teams have advanced to at least the round of sixteen in the NCAA tournament seven times this decade. Coach Calhoun can be very intense, but he is committed to his players more than anything else.

In Connecticut, UCONN basektball is the state past-time. Every game is sold out and families across the state gather to watch every game on TV or listen on the radio. The Huskies have such phenomenal support because the team has a special relationship, a dedication to one another which is infectious. This commitment produced an extraordinary season.

Mr. Speaker, as a UCONN graduate and the representative of Storrs, I am especially proud of the team's accomplishment. The team achieved its objective due to the extraordinary chemistry between its members, skilled coaching and incredible support from its fans. Once again, congratulations on a great season and enjoy the title—1999 National Champion.

□ 2000

U.S. INVOLVEMENT IN KOSOVO: WHY THIS HUMANITARIAN CRISIS?

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

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I am taking this opportunity to discuss one of the primary reasons I introduced legislation that will prohibit the use of appropriated funds to the Department of Defense from being used for the deployment of U.S. ground troops in Kosovo unless deployment is specifically approved by Congress and authorized by law.

There are many reasons why Members of Congress should support the bill. Issues that need to be discussed include the authority of Congress to declare war, why this region is or is not vital to our national security interests, and whether the human and monetary cost of American involvement in this fight is worth risking American lives.

The President has argued that for humanitarian reasons American intervention is necessary. Why is it more important for us to be involved militarily in Yugoslavia, a country certainly of no real national security threat to the United States, when there are human rights violations occurring in China, a nation that is perhaps our biggest security threat in the new world order?

While we rightly condemn Yugoslav President Milosevic for driving ethnic Albanians from Kosovo, we continue to maintain a strategic partnership, sell highly sensitive satellite information, provide normal trade relationship status to China, a nation that has suppressed and displaced over 128,000 Tibetans and commits some of the most horrific human rights abuses in the

world, including forced abortion, sterilization, execution, rape against its own people.

Who is our biggest national threat? A nation the size of the Commonwealth of Kentucky, with a population of 11 million and an active military of 114,000 and 400,000 reserves or a country the size of the United States, with a population of 1.2 billion and an active military of 2.8 million with 1.2 million in reserve under communist control with a nuclear and chemical arsenal that sells weapons technology to rogue nations at odds with the United States?

Civil wars and human rights atrocities are occurring all over the world. According to the 1998 world refugee survey, there are over 3.5 million refugees and asylum seekers worldwide, including 2.9 million in Africa, 5.7 million in the Middle East, 2.2 million in South Central and East Asia and the Pacific.

Let us get back to the question of why Kosovo and not elsewhere is important. In Sudan alone there are 4 million internally displaced persons and over 350,000 refugees. In just the last decade over 1.9 million people in Sudan have died due to war-related causes and famine. In 1998, 2.6 million Sudanese were at risk of starvation due to civil war, drought and government restrictions on relief flights. Why are not we bombing the Sudanese Government and sending in ground troops?

Afghanistan has over 2.6 million refugees and between 1 million and 1.5 million internally displaced persons. Today the extremist Afghan Taliban government discriminates and completely controls the life of half its population. Women are forbidden to work outside the home and from attending school, may not ride in vehicles unless accompanied by a male relative and are denied health care in many parts of the country. They have left over 2 million dead and 700,000 widows and orphans. Why are not we bombing Afghanistan and sending in ground troops?

What about Angola, Colombia and Sierra Leone? And the list goes on and on and on.

Clearly, we must have a better foreign policy strategy than this. It is quite obvious that the administration does not have a well-thought-out policy regarding Kosovo. Through NATO, the administration seems to be running this war day to day without any master plan or exit strategy.

Despite efforts to keep our troops away from the Kosovo border, we now have three American POWs. To make matters worse, we are now hearing that the administration went against the advice of top Pentagon officials who determined early that we should not even be engaged in a bombing campaign in Yugoslavia.

It is unrealistic to believe that we can intervene for a few months, a year or 3 years and settle this conflict that has raged for centuries.

Four years ago, or 5, when the Secretary of State, Secretary of Defense and the Joint Chiefs came before the Foreign Affairs Committee on which I served, I asked the question, you say you are going into Bosnia for a year? I know that you know the history and know that it all began in the 4th century with the fall of the Roman Empire and was exacerbated in the 10th century with the rise of the Ottoman Empire. What are you going to do in 1 year's time that they could not do in all of these centuries?

Of course, the answer is nothing. Four years, $7 billion, 19,000 troops later, we are still there with the current ground force of 6,200.

I asked the same question when they went into Haiti, asking what is it you are going to do in a year that we did not do the ten times we went in before the last time, staying for 15 years? Of course, the answer is, we did not do anything, other than to spend a billion dollars and send 20,000 troops. We are still there.

There are those who would like to say that this is some comparison with Hitler. That is mixing oranges and apples.

Madam Speaker, I will continue this tomorrow evening.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. NORTHUP). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

IF NATO HAS ITS WAY, ALBANIAN KOSOVARS WILL NOT REMAIN PART OF SERBIA

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

Mr. PAUL. Madam Speaker, the U.S.-NATO war against Serbia is illegal by all standards. Congress has not declared war. Therefore, the President has no authority to wage war. Attacking a sovereign nation violates longstanding international law as well as the NATO and U.N. charters.

NATO's aggression is immoral as well. It forces U.S. citizens and others in Europe opposed to the war to pay for it, and some are even forced to fight in it against their will. If the war expands, we can expect the return of the draft to make sure there are enough soldiers to participate.

As ugly as the Yugoslavian civil war may be in Kosovo, and as heart wrenching as the pictures of mass refugees fleeing their homeland is, one evil can never justify another. If one is disinclined to be persuaded by law and morality and responds only to emotions, propaganda and half-truths, then one must consider the practical failure of compulsive intervention in the affairs of other nations.

Prior to NATO's expanding the war in Yugoslavia, approximately 2,000 deaths in the past year were recorded in Kosovo. As a consequence of NATO's actions, the killing has now escalated and no one can hardly be pleased just because now Serbs, our once-valiant allies against the Nazis, are dying. Those who are motivated by good intentions while ignoring facts cannot be excused for the escalating and dangerous crisis in Yugoslavia.

The humanitarian concerns for Albanian refugees is justified, but going to war because of emotional concerns while ignoring other millions of refugees around the world only stirs the passions of the oppressed, whether they are Kurds, Palestinians, Tibetans, East Timorans or Rwandans.

When NATO talks of returning Albanians to their homes in Kosovo, I wonder why there is no reference or concern for the more than 50,000 Serbs thrown out of their homes in Bosnia, Slovenia and Croatia. Current NATO policy in Yugoslavia will surely encourage more ethnic minorities around the world to revolt and demand independence.

Some in Congress are now saying that although they were strongly opposed to the administration's policy of bombing in Yugoslavia prior to its onset, conditions are now different and an all-out effort to win with ground troops, if necessary, must be undertaken. This, it is said, is required to preserve NATO's credibility.

Who cares about NATO's credibility? Are American lives to be lost and a greater war precipitated to preserve NATO's credibility? Should the rule of law and morality be thrown out in an effort to preserve NATO's credibility? Can something be wrong and misguided before it is started and all of a sudden deserve to be blindly supported?

This reasoning makes no sense.

No one has quite figured out the secret motivation of why this war must be fought, but I found it interesting that evidence of our weapons shortage is broadcast to the world and to the Serbs. Surely one result of the war will be a rapid rush by Congress this year to massively increase the military budget. But a serious discussion of our flawed foreign policy of intervention that has served us so poorly unfortunately will not occur.

Political leaders and pundits are struggling to define an exit strategy for the war. In the old days when wars were properly declared for national security reasons, no one needed to ask such a question. A moral war fought against an aggressor for national security reasons was over when it was won. It has only been since Congress has reneged on its responsibility with regards to war power that it has become necessary to discuss how we exit a war not legitimately entered into and without victory as a goal.

The political wars, fought without declaration, starting with the Korean War to the present, have not enhanced the long-term security and liberty of the American people. Institutionalizing a collective approach to war

seems a result of the obsession to save face for NATO. Never before in our history have we Americans accepted so casually the turning over of a military operation to foreign control with non-American spokesmen briefing us each day.

This is a major step in further solidifying the world government approach to all political problems. There is, however, one major contradiction to the internationalist desire to assimilate all countries and ethnic groups and have them governed by a single world government.

Quite ironically, ethnic diversity will surely be the casualty of all of this mischief. NATO and the U.S. are co-conspirators and military allies of a Serbian province that is seeking to become a separate ethnic country. Let there be no doubt, if NATO has its way, Albanian Kosovars will not remain part of Serbia.

The US-NATO War against Serbia is illegal by all standards. Congress has not declared war; therefore the President has no authority to wage war. Attacking a sovereign nation violates longstanding international law, as well as the NATO and UN Charters.

NATO's aggression is immoral as well. It forces US citizens and others in Europe, opposed to the war, to pay for it and some are even forced to fight in it against their will. If the war expands we can expect the return of the draft to make sure there are enough soldiers to participate.

As ugly as the Yugoslavian civil war may be in Kosovo and as heart wrenching as the pictures of mass refugees fleeing their homeland is, one evil can never justify another.

If one is disinclined to be persuaded by law and morality and responds only to emotions, propaganda, and half-truths, then one must consider the practical failure of compulsive intervention in the affairs of other nations.

Prior to NATO's expanding the war in Yugoslavia approximately 2,000 deaths in the past year were recorded in Kosovo. As a consequence of NATO's actions the killing has now escalated and no one can hardly be pleased just because now Serbs, our once valiant allies against the Nazi's, are dying. Those who are motivated by good intentions while ignoring facts cannot be excused for the escalating and dangerous crisis in Yugoslavia.

The humanitarian concerns for Albanian refugees is justified, but going to war because of emotional concerns, while ignoring other millions of refugees around the world, only stirs the passions of the oppressed, whether they are Kurds, Palestinians, Tibetans, East Timorans, or Rwandans. When NATO talks of returning Albanians to their homes in Kosovo, I wonder why there's no reference or concern for the more than 500,000 Serbs thrown out of their homes in Bosnia, Slovenia, and Croatia. Current NATO policy in Yugoslavia will surely encourage more ethnic minorities around the world to revolt and demand independence.

Some in Congress are now saying that although they were strongly opposed to the administration's policy of bombing in Yugoslavia prior to its onset, conditions are now different and an all-out effort to win with ground troops if necessary, must be undertaken. This, it is said, is required to preserve NATO's credibility. Who cares about NATO's credibility? Are American lives to be lost and a greater war precipitated to preserve NATO's credibility? Should the rule of law and morality be thrown out in an effort to preserve NATO's credibility? Can something be wrong and misguided before it's started and all of a sudden deserve to be blindly supported? This reasoning makes no sense.

No one has quite figured out the secret motivation of why this war must be fought. But I found it interesting that evidence of our weapons shortage is broadcast to the world and to the Serbs. Surely, one result of the war will be a rapid rush by Congress this year to massively increase the military budget. But, a serious discussion of our flawed foreign policy of intervention that has served us so poorly, unfortunately, will not occur.

Political leaders and pundits are struggling to define an ''exit strategy'' for the war. In the old days when wars were properly declared for national security reasons, no one needed to ask such a question. A moral war, fought against an aggressor, for national security reasons, was over when it was won. It's only been since Congress has reneged on its responsibility with regards to war power, has it become necessary to discuss how we ''exit'' a war not legitimately entered into, and without victory as the goal. The political wars fought without declaration, starting with the Korean War to the present, have not enhanced the long-term security and liberty of the American people.

Institutionalizing a collective approach to war seems to be a result of the obsession to ''save face'' for NATO. Never before in our history have we Americans accepted so casually the turning over a military operation to foreign control with non-American spokesmen briefing us each day. This is a major step in further solidifying the world-government approach to all political problems.

There is, however, one major contradiction to the internationalist's desire to assimilate all countries and ethnic groups and have them governed by a single world government. Quite ironically, ethnic diversity will surely be the casualty of all this mischief.

NATO and the US are co-conspirators and military allies of a Serbian Province that is seeking to become a separate ethnic country. The full force of our efforts, no matter what humanitarian picture is painted to justify our actions, is to make Kosovo an Albanian Muslim state separate from Serbia.

Current NATO and US policy completely contradict the professed goal of multi-ethnicity and assimilation of all people. NATO's operation, by its very nature, is bureaucratically burdened by the effort to appease the political concerns of 19 different countries. This inefficiency and the contradiction of supporting the establishment of an ethnic state will guarantee NATO's deserved demise. The sooner we get out of Yugoslavia the better off everyone will be.

LET US MEASURE UP JUST AT LEAST THIS ONE TIME TO THE GREATNESS OF THE PEOPLE WE REPRESENT

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

Mr. POMEROY. Madam Speaker, today in Kosovo, a baby will die. Three weeks ago, this same little one was healthy and happy. She will not, however, be strong enough to cope with the cold, the hunger, the exposure and the inevitable disease, and today she will die in the arms of a desperate mother who is powerless to keep her daughter safe and well.

Madam Speaker, today in Kosovo, a young woman will be raped. Three weeks ago she was thinking of her studies and her friends, reveling in the beauty and innocence of one who has only celebrated her 16th birthday.

Madam Speaker, today in Kosovo, a loving husband, an adoring father, an affectionate son and a beloved brother will be shot to death as he stands unarmed and unable to comprehend why he is about to die.

Three weeks ago he provided for his family, puttered about his house, attended to those he loved and participated in his community. He lived the life and held the dreams of ordinary folks the world over.

These unspeakable tragedies, Madam Speaker, will repeat themselves hundreds, thousands or very possibly tens of thousands of times as the ethnic cleansing of Kosovo continues to unfold.

As we wrestle with the complexities of the United States's response to this horror, I hope this great House, the people's house, will rise above the partisanship that has all too often characterized debate in this Chamber. For the sake of those whose lives have been abruptly ended, for the sake of those whose families have been destroyed, for the sake of those who have endured life-scarring assaults, let us measure up just at least this one time to the greatness of the people we represent.

□ 2015

Let us, Madam Speaker, deliberate with wisdom and seriousness of purpose the grave question of how our country should respond to the horrific situation in Kosovo.

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET FOR THE 106TH CONGRESS

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

Mr. KASICH. Madam Speaker, in accordance with clause 2(a) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, I submit for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the Rules of the Committee on the Budget for the 106th Congress.

These rules were adopted by the Committee on the Budget by voice vote at an organizational meeting held by the committee on January 20, 1999.

If there are any questions on the Committee Rules, please contact Jim Bates, Chief Counsel of the Budget Committee.

GENERAL APPLICABILITY

Rule 1—Applicability of House Rules

Except as otherwise specified herein, the Rules of the House are the rules of the committee so far as applicable, except that a motion to recess from day to day is a motion of high privilege.

MEETINGS

Rule 2—Regular Meetings

(a) The regular meeting day of the committee shall be the second Wednesday of each month at 11 a.m., while the House is in session.

(b) The chairman is authorized to dispense with a regular meeting when the chairman determines there is no business to be considered by the committee. The chairman shall give notice in writing or by facsimile to that effect to each member of the committee as far in advance of the regular meeting day as the circumstances permit.

(c) Regular meetings shall be canceled when they conflict with meetings of either party's caucus or conference.

Rule 3—Additional and Special Meetings

(a) The chairman may call and convene additional meetings of the committee as the chairman considers necessary, or special meetings at the request of a majority of the members of the committee in accordance with House Rule XI, clause 2(c).

(b) In the absence of exceptional circumstances, the chairman shall provide notice in writing or by facsimile of additional meetings to the office of each member at least 24 hours in advance while congress is in session, and at least 3 days in advance when Congress is not in session.

Rule 4—Open Business Meetings

(a) Each meeting for the transaction of committee business, including the markup of measures, shall be open to the public except when the committee in open session and with a quorum present, determines by rollcall vote that all or part of the remainder of the meeting on that day shall be closed to the public in accordance with house Rule XI, clause 2(g)(1).

(b) No person other that members of the committee and such congressional staff and departmental representatives as the committee may authorize shall be present at any business or markup session which has been closed to the public.

Rule 5—Quorums

A majority of the committee shall constitute a quorum. No business shall be transacted and no measure or recommendation shall be reported unless a quorum is actually present.

Rule 6—Recognition

Any member, when recognized by the chairman, may address the committee on any bill, motion, or other matter under consideration before the committee. The time of such member shall be limited to 5 minutes until all members present have been afforded an opportunity to comment.

Rule 7—Consideration of Business

Measures or matters may be placed before the committee, for its consideration, by the chairman or by a majority vote of the members of the committee, a quorum being present.

Rule 8—Availability of Legislation

No bill or joint or concurrent resolution shall be considered by the committee unless copies of the measure have been made available to all committee members at least 4 hours prior to the time at which such measure is to be considered. For concurrent resolutions on the budget, this requirement shall be satisfied by making available copies of the complete chairman's mark (or such material as will provide the basis for committee consideration). The provisions of this rule may be suspended by the concurrence of the chairman and ranking minority member.

Rule 9—Procedure for Consideration of Budget Resolution

(a) It shall be the policy of the committee that the starting point for any deliberations on a concurrent resolution on the budget should be the estimated or actual levels for the fiscal year preceding the budget year.

(b) In developing a concurrent resolution on the budget, the committee shall first proceed, unless otherwise determined by the committee, to consider budget aggregates, functional categories, and other appropriate matters on a tentative basis, with the document before the committee open to amendment; subsequent amendments may be offered to aggregates, functional categories, or other appropriate matters which have already been amended in their entirety.

(c) Following adoption of the aggregates, functional categories, and other matters, the text of a concurrent resolution on the budget incorporating such aggregates, functional categories, and other appropriate matters shall be considered for amendment and a final vote.

Rule 10—Rollcall Votes

A rollcall of the members may be had upon the request of at least one-fifth of those present. In the apparent absence of a quorum, a rollcall may be had on the request of any member.

HEARINGS

Rule 11—Announcement of Hearings

The chairman shall make public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of any committee hearing at least 1 week before the hearing, beginning with the day in which the announcement is made and ending the day preceding the scheduled hearing unless the chairman, with the concurrence of the ranking minority member, or the committee by majority vote with a quorum present for the transaction of business, determines there is good cause to begin the hearing sooner, in which case the chairman shall make the announcement at the earliest possible date.

Rule 12—Open Hearings

(a) Each hearing conducted by the committee or any of its task forces shall be open to the public except when the committee or task force, in open session and with a quorum present, determines by rollcall vote that all or part of the remainder of that hearing on that day shall be closed to the public because disclosure of testimony, evidence, or other matters to be considered would endanger the national security, or would compromise sensitive law enforcement information, or would tend to defame, degrade, or incriminate any person, or would violate any law or rule of the House of Representatives. The committee or task forces may by the same procedure vote to close one subsequent day of hearing.

(b) For the purposes of House Rule XI, clause 2(g)(2), the task forces of the committee are considered to be subcommittees.

Rule 13—Quorums

For the purpose of hearing testimony, not less than two members of the committee shall constitute a quorum.

Rule 14—Time for Questioning Witnesses

(a) Committee members shall have an amount of time not to exceed 5 minutes to interrogate each witness until such time as each member who so desires has had an opportunity to interrogate such witness.

(b) After all members have had an opportunity to ask questions, the round shall begin again under the 5-minute rule.

(c) In questioning witnesses under the 5-minute rule, the chairman and the ranking minority member may be recognized first, after which members may be recognized in the order of their arrival at the hearing. Among the members present at the time the hearing is called to order, seniority shall be recognized. In recognizing members to question witnesses, the chairman may take into consideration the ratio of majority members to minority members and the number of majority and minority members present and shall apportion the recognition for questioning in such a manner as not to disadvantage the members of the majority.

Rule 15—Subpoenas and Oaths

(a) In accordance with House Rule XI, clause 2(m) subpoenas authorized by a majority of the committee may be issued over the signature of the chairman or of any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by the chairman or such member.

(b) The chairman, or any member of the committee designated by the chairman, may administer oaths to witnesses.

Rule 16—Witnesses' Statements

(a) So far as practicable, any prepared statement to be presented by a witness shall be submitted to the committee at least 24 hours in advance of presentation, and shall be distributed to all members of the committee in advance of presentation.

(b) To the greatest extent possible, each witness appearing in a nongovernmental capacity shall include with the written statement of proposed testimony a curriculum vitae and a disclosure of the amount and source (by agency and program) of any Federal grant (or subgrant thereof) or contract (or subcontract thereof) received during the current fiscal year or either of the 2 preceding fiscal years.

PRINTS AND PUBLICATIONS

Rule 17—Committee Prints

All committee prints and other materials prepared for public distribution shall be approved by the committee prior to any distribution, unless such print or other material shows clearly on its face that it has not been approved by the committee.

Rule 18—Committee Publications on the Internet

To the maximum extent feasible, the committee shall make its publications available in electronic form.

STAFF

Rule 19—Committee Staff

(a)(1) Subject to approval by the committee, and to the provisions of the following paragraphs, the professional and clerical staff of the committee shall be appointed, and may be removed, by the chairman.

(2) Committee staff shall not be assigned any duties other than those pertaining to committee business, and shall be selected without regard to race, creed, sex, or age, and solely on the basis of fitness to perform the duties of their respective positions.

(3) All committee staff shall be entitled to equitable treatment, including comparable salaries, facilities, access to official committee records, leave, and hours of work.

(4) Notwithstanding paragraphs 1, 2, and 3, staff shall be employed in compliance with House rules, the Employment and Accountability Act, the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, and any other applicable Federal statutes.

(b) Associate staff for members of the committee may be appointed only at the discretion of the chairman (in consultation with the ranking minority member regarding any minority party associate staff), after taking into consideration any staff ceilings and

budgetary constraints in effect at the time, and any terms, limits, or conditions established by the Committee on House Administration under clause 9 of House Rule X. Such staff members shall be compensated at a rate, determined by the member, not to exceed $60,000 per year from the committee's budget. Members shall not appoint more than one person pursuant to these provisions. Members designating a staff member under this subsection must certify by letter to the chairman that the employee is needed and will be utilized for committee work and, to the extent space is available, will spend no less than 10 hours per week in committee offices performing committee work.

Rule 20—Staff Supervision

(a) Staff shall be under the general supervision and direction of the chairman, who shall establish and assign their duties and responsibilities, delegate such authority as he deems appropriate, fix and adjust staff salaries (in accordance with House Rule X, clause 9(c)) and job titles, and, in his discretion, arrange for their specialized training.

(b) Staff assigned to the minority shall be under the general supervision and direction of the minority members of the committee, who may delegate such authority as they deem appropriate.

RECORDS

Rule 21—Preparation and Maintenance of Committee Records

(a) An accurate stenographic record shall be made of all hearings and business meetings.

(b) The proceedings of the committee shall be recorded in a journal which shall, among other things, include a record of the votes on any question on which a record vote is demanded.

(c) Members of the committee shall correct and return transcripts of hearings as soon as practicable after receipt thereof, except that any changes shall be limited to technical, grammatical, and typographical corrections.

(d) Any witness may examine the transcript of his own testimony and make grammatical, technical, and typographical corrections.

(e) The chairman may order the printing of a hearing record without the corrections of any member or witness if he determines that such a member or witness has been afforded a reasonable time for correction, and that further delay would seriously impede the committee's responsibility for meeting its deadlines under the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(f) Transcripts of hearings and meeting may be printed if the chairman decides it is appropriate, or if a majority of the members so request.

Rule 22—Access to Committee Records

(a)(1) The chairman shall promulgate regulations to provide for public inspection of rollcall votes and to provide access by members to committee records (in accordance with House Rule XI, clause 2(e)).

(2) Access to classified testimony and information shall be limited to Members of Congress and to House Budget Committee staff and stenographic reporters who have appropriate security clearance.

(3) Notice of the receipt of such information shall be sent to the committee members. Such information shall be kept in the committee safe, and shall be available to members in the committee office.

(b) The records of the committee at the National Archives and Records Administration shall be made available for public use in accordance with Rule VII of the Rules of the House of Representatives. The chairman shall notify the ranking minority member of any decision, pursuant to clause 3(b)(3) or clause 4(b) of the rule, to withhold a record otherwise available, and the matter shall be presented to the committee for a determination on the written request of any member of the committee.

OVERSIGHT

Rule 23—General Oversight

(a) The committee shall review and study, on a continuing basis, the application, administration, execution, and effectiveness of those laws, or parts of laws, the subject of which is within its jurisdiction.

(b) The committee is authorized at any time to conduct such investigations and studies as it may consider necessary or appropriate in the exercise of its responsibilities under clause (1)(e) of rule X of the Rules of the House, and, subject to the adoption of expense resolutions as required by clause 6 of rule X, to incur expenses (including travel expenses) in connection therewith.

(c) Not later than February 15 of the first session of a Congress, the committee shall meet in open session, with a quorum present, to adopt its oversight plans for that Congress for submission to the Committee on House Administration and the Committee on Government Reform in accordance with the provisions of clause (2)(d) of House Rule X.

REPORTS

Rule 24—Availability Before Filing

(a) Any report accompanying any bill or resolution ordered reported to the House by the committee shall be available to all committee members at least 36 hours prior to filing with the House.

(b) No material change shall be made in any report made available to members pursuant to section (a) without the concurrence of the ranking minority member or by a majority vote of the committee.

(c) Notwithstanding any other rule of the committee, either or both subsections (a) and (b) may be waived by the chairman or with a majority vote by the committee.

Rule 25—Report on the Budget Resolution

The report of the committee to accompany a concurrent resolution on the budget shall include a comparison of the estimated or actual levels for the year preceding the budget year with the proposed spending and revenue levels for the budget year and each out year along with the appropriate percentage increase or decrease for each budget function and aggregate. The report shall include any rollcall vote on any motion to amend or report any measure.

Rule 26—Parliamentarian's Status Report and Section 302 Status Report

(a)(1) In order to carry out its duty under section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act to advise the House of Representatives as to the current level of spending and revenues as compared to the levels set forth in the latest agreed-upon concurrent resolution on the budget, the committee shall advise the Speaker on at least a monthly basis when the House is in session as to its estimate of the current level of spending and revenue. Such estimates shall be prepared by the staff of the committee, transmitted to the Speaker in the form of a Parliamentarian's Status Report, and printed in the Congressional Record.

(2) The committee authorizes the chairman, in consultation with the ranking minority member, to transmit to the Speaker the Parliamentarian's Status Report described above.

(b)(1) In order to carry out its duty under section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act to advise the House of Representatives as to the current level of spending within the jurisdiction of committees as compared to the appropriate allocations made pursuant to the Budget Act in conformity with the latest agreed-upon concurrent resolution on the budget, the committee shall, as necessary, advise the Speaker as to its estimate of the current level of spending within the jurisdiction of appropriate committees. Such estimates shall be prepared by the staff of the committee and transmitted to the Speaker in the form of a Section 302 Status Report.

(2) The committee authorizes the chairman, in consultation with the ranking minority member, to transmit to the Speaker the Section 302 Status Report described above.

Rule 27—Activity Report

After an adjournment of the last regular session of a Congress sine die, the chair of the committee may file any time with the Clerk the committee's activity report for that Congress pursuant to clause (1)(d)(1) of rule XI of the Rules of the House without the approval of the committee, if a copy of the report has been available to each member of the committee for at least 7 calendar days and the report includes any supplemental, minority, or additional views submitted by a member of the committee.

MISCELLANEOUS

Rule 28—Broadcasting of Meetings and Hearings

(a) It shall be the policy of the committee to give all news media access to open hearings of the committee, subject to the requirements and limitations set forth in House Rule XI, clause 4.

(b) Whenever any committee business meeting is open to the public, that meeting may be covered, in whole or in part, by television broadcast, radio broadcast, and still photography, or by any of such methods of coverage, in accordance with House Rule XI, clause 4.

Rule 29—Appointment of Conferees

(a) Majority party members recommended to the Speaker as conferees shall be recommended by the chairman subject to the approval of the majority party members of the committee.

(b) The chairman shall recommend such minority party members as conferees as shall be determined by the minority party; the recommended party representation shall be in approximately the same proportion as that in the committee.

Rule 30—Waivers

When a reported bill or joint resolution, conference report, or anticipated floor amendment violates any provision of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the chairman may, if practical, consult with the committee members on whether the chairman should recommend, in writing, that the Committee on Rules report a special rule that enforces the act by not waiving the applicable points of order during the consideration of such measure.

OPERATIONS IN KOSOVO

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Madam Speaker, the American people understand separation. They understand the tragedy, the human tragedy, of moving families, women and children, and the elderly away from their homes.

One of the things that American people are good at is coming to the aid of those who cannot help themselves. The tragedy in Kosovo over the last weeks and months has developed into an enormous tragedy, like the 13-year-old girl

who was moved from her home, started out with her family, came to a fork in the road, and her father and brother went in one direction and she and her mother went another. They came to an encampment or a camp area and she was separated from her mother.

The American people understand that a sustained air strike is imperative if we are to relieve the pain of separation and the crisis that is going on in the former Yugoslavia. This weekend I spent time with my constituents, many of whom expressed extreme concern about this crisis, questioning, of course, what we should do, but being supportive of the idea that Americans had to do something, as we failed to do in Rwanda and Burundi. I think now we are aware that ethnic cleansing, the murder of innocent civilians, has to stop and cannot be tolerated by the world family.

This weekend I joined the clerical community of my city and and prayed for peace. In fact, we have made this week in Houston a week of prayer, and we have asked for the respective institutions of religious concerns to offer up prayers or callings for peace. We did that this weekend, and I enjoyed and welcomed the opportunity to worship at the Wheeler Avenue Baptist Church this past Sunday, along with members of the Muslim community and other faiths, in calling upon and praying for peace.

I believe that as we sustain these air strikes, we should still be calling for return to the peace table. Although we must stand firm in what we require of Mr. Milosevic, and that is, of course, to allow the refugees to return to their homes, to remove the Serbian troops from that area, and to allow for peacekeeping troops to go into that area, we, part of the NATO allies, must not silence our voices from asking for return to the peace tables.

Seven hundred thousand have been removed from Kosovo. We now hear tell of the possibility of enormous atrocities, the killing of very many. But I believe that it is extremely important that we do not give up on the sustained air strikes, that we stay focused and unified; that the American people must be educated and informed about how we need to proceed.

Nothing should be excluded or precluded, but we certainly should not move precipitously into the use of ground troops. We have to recognize the importance of bringing along a unified position against Mr. Milosevic. And certainly we must continue to press for the release of the POWs, three young men who should not have been taken in the first place, who were part of a U.N. peacekeeping operation, who have been taken inappropriately and wrongly by the Serbians.

I would simply say that the American people can rise to the occasion. They have always come to the aid of those in need. This conflict is a serious conflict, and any determination on using ground troops should be one that is done with the support and cooperation of the American people. NATO must remain unified.

I would ask that our NATO allies would engage all of us in the ultimate decisions that are made, and that we, as part of the NATO ally operations, be unified in our discussions so that there is not division, but there is unification and unity.

Most of all, I say, we must protect the children and families. We cannot afford to have the elderly march miles and miles and miles, tormented by being removed from their homes and getting finally to the border and dropping dead, which has happened to many of those refugees who have been sent from their homes. We cannot have the fathers and husbands and brothers being killed randomly, such that they are not even having a decent burial.

America is doing the right thing in joining with its allies in this sustained air strike, and we must stand united together as we move to make determinations, Madam Speaker, that will help bring peace to that region.

But I do say and call upon the national organizations of religion to call for a week of prayer, and also to call for a return to the peace talks so we can have peace in the Balkans.

Madam Speaker, I rise to address the ongoing situation in Kosovo. After 20 days of an intensive air war on Yugoslavia, I am pleased that the campaign is beginning to see results.

In its 20th day, the air war has produced results. Serb troops are beginning to feel the weight of the NATO air strikes. The air war has been successful in hitting both command and control structures and inflicting damage on Serb troops in the field. I feel that this body must stay the course and make Milosevic capitulate the NATO's terms. We must ensure that Milosevic pays a heavy price for his present policy of repression against the Kosovar Albanians, to alter his calculation about continuing on this course; and seriously, diminish his military capacity to exert his will over Kosovo.

This House has sent an invaluable message to Milosevic that aggression does not pay. In using air power we signal our willingness to establish a lasting peace in the region.

Many in this House were critical of the President when he sent our troops to Bosnia for peacekeeping operations. But today I feel that this was one of the best votes I ever made. Bosnia today is a nation on the way to recovery. Its people both Muslim and Christian live in peace and security and this is in tshanks in no small part to the men and women of our armed forces. It takes courage to make tough decisions and stand by one's convictions. We as a nation must be willing to stand against oppression and horrible atrocities being committed in the Balkans.

If this House fails to stay the course it would be interpreted as a vote of no confidence for our foreign policy in the Balkans. It would send confusing signals about our national resolve to persevere to friend and foe alike.

The conflict in Kosovo has caused great human suffering and if left unchecked this conflict threatens the peace and stability of Europe. Already there is evidence of massive graves in Kosovo and I fear that they contain many of the missing ethnic Albanian men.

Tension in this ethnic Albanian region has been increasing since the government of Yugoslavia removed Kosovo's autonomous status. Belgrade's decision came without the approval of the people of Kosovo, which has a population consisting of 90% ethnic Albanians. Several human rights groups report of Serbian forces conducting abductions and summary executions. These reprisal killings and the continued human rights violations confirm many of our fears.

The United States and its allies have taken concrete steps to ensure that this continued violence in the Kosovo region does not spread to Albania, Macedonia, Greece, and Turkey. We must continue the sustained airstrikes to protect the people of Kosovo from this siege of terror by Milosevic.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to stay the course in our effort to provide a peaceful multi-ethnic democratic Kosovo in which all its people live in security.

THE ADMINISTRATION'S PROPOSAL TO SELL IMF GOLD RESERVES

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Madam Speaker, today I rise to speak against the Clinton administration's recent proposal to dump a large portion of the International Monetary Fund's gold reserve on the open market, just to wipe off the books some of the debt of nations under the Heavily-Indebted Poor Countries initiative, or HIPC.

Since Congress must initially approve such a transaction, I rise to state my clear opposition to such a sale. This proposal is wrong and misguided for at least the following reasons.

First, the IMF gold sales could harm, yes, harm, the very nations it is intended to help. Gold mining is a viable and productive part of the economies of well over half of the 41 countries included in the HIPC initiative. In 10 of those countries, gold mining accounts for between 5 and 40 percent of the exports, and in most of the other identified and indebted countries that currently do not mine gold, there are advanced plans for significant gold development.

It would be unfortunate and, yes, ironic if potential investment in gold mining were deterred by the adverse impact of IMF gold sales on the gold price and the economies of this industry.

Secondly, the sale of IMF gold reserves would further depress the gold price in America. The gold price is at its lowest place in 20 years. Mere discussion of a possible IMF gold sale has already depressed the price of gold by more than 3½ percent in the last 2 weeks, and outright sale would have a devastating impact on gold prices.

Finally, such goal sales would substantially harm the U.S. gold mining industry. Gold is a viable U.S. export commodity that substantially benefits our balance of trade. The gold industry

provides thousands of high-paying jobs in this country. In Nevada alone more than a thousand miners have been laid off due to the already depressed gold prices. A further decline would be a serious blow to rural communities in many States, including Nevada, and across this country, since many of them heavily rely on the stable price and production of this commodity.

While I understand the motives of those who support the HIPC initiative, I do not believe that the sale of IMF gold reserves is the best way to be helpful. Gold plays a special and significant role in the economies of this country and those around the globe as well, and this Congress should not take affirmative actions to adversely impact its value.

Accordingly, I oppose any initiative to sell the IMF gold reserve, and strongly urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

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

SAVE THE TIDAL BASIN BEAVERS

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

Mrs. CHENOWETH. Madam Speaker, I would like to identify with the remarks of my colleagues tonight on the very heavy issue of Kosovo. However, Madam Speaker, I am going to turn our attention back clear across to this side of the globe and to Washington, D.C. because, Madam Speaker, it is with great alarm that I ask my colleagues to join me in asking the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to provide immediate and emergency protection for the Tidal Basin beaver.

Over 200 years ago General George Washington chopped down a cherry tree. Now, had General Washington had this happen at this time in his life, and a little later on, and if he lived today, he would have been disgraced in the nightly news, his wife trapped and hauled off, with his child being pursued by trappers.

I do not think this is the way to go, Mr. Speaker. It is time that we stand up and stop this pitiful removal of Bucky, the beaver. When you remove an indigenous species the effects are longstanding, and these beaver have made their pilgrimage back to their homeland where their ancestors once frolicked. They built dams and raised their families.

The cherry trees surrounding the Tidal Basin are not even native to the District of Columbia, they were imported from Japan. These beaver are indigenous to this area. This is their natural habitat. These beaver are also an important part of the ecology in the District of Columbia and its unique environment.

Out West it is the policy of the Federal agencies to remove the people, rather than the animals, when there is a conflict between people and wildlife. Now, beaver are members of the Rodentia species, which include rabbits, squirrels, chipmunks, and rats.

Out West, in California, when a farmer accidentally ran over a rat, a kangaroo rat, with his tractor, the farmer was arrested and charged with a criminal taking of an endangered species, and his tractor was impounded so he could not use it anymore.

I just think that we need to bring equality in the way that we handle threatened and endangered species.

Out in Idaho, the Federal Government is reintroducing gray wolves and grizzly bears into and near populated areas. The Fish and Wildlife Service claim this reintroduction will restore the Canadian gray wolf, which never did live in Idaho, and the grizzly to its natural habitat.

Although I think this is debatable, I strongly suggest equal treatment for Bucky the beaver, the Tidal Basin beaver. These little beaver deserve equal rights and protection under the law, if not for the sake of the animal kingdom, Madam Speaker, for the sake of humanity.

If these rugged, pioneering beaver can make it in the polluted and murky conditions of the Potomac and the Tidal Basin, then by goodness, they deserve to be free. This is nature's way of reintroducing the native beaver. It is a natural occurrence, and who are we to fool with Mother Nature?

As the future of the captive victim, Bucky the beaver, lies at the hands of the Fish and Wildlife Service, her mate and offspring are in danger of further separation from each other, their way of life, and the homestead that they were so diligently trying to create.

Gene pool testing will undoubtedly determine that Bucky the beaver is an evolutionarily significant unit. This distinct population segment of the Rodentia family must be saved. If the Canadian gray wolf and the grizzly bear are good for reintroduction in Idaho, then we ought to leave the poor little beaver alone in their native habitat in Washington, D.C.

Madam Speaker, I would like to say that this issue has spread all across the Nation, and even up into Alaska, where today a resolution was introduced in the Alaskan legislature by the majority leader of the Senate, Robin Taylor. I will enter that into the record, as well as a poem about Bucky the beaver, whose lyrics were written by Senator Robin Taylor, and they are very, very good.

I would like to make one last plea that we do all we can to save Bucky the beaver.

The poem and resolution referred to are as follows:

BUCKY BEAVER

[Lyrics By Senator Robin Taylor, Alaska State Senate, To be sung to the tune of Davy Crockett]

Bucky Bucky Beaver
Lets fight to keep him free.
A Potomac flood left him a facin'
Life alone in the Tidal Basin,
He survived right well with the squirrels and the bees
And chewed up a couple of Cherry Trees.
Bucky Bucky Beaver
Let's fight to keep him free.
The Park police now steal his food
Try to trap him and treat him rude,
He's a unique species and proud of that
A livin' on some critical habitat.
Bucky Bucky Beaver
Let's fight to keep him free.
Critters like Bucky sometimes don't fit
The parky plans of the hypocrits.
But he needs our help so one and all
Give Al Gore a personal call . . . tell him
Bucky Bucky Beaver . . . let's fight to keep him free.

CS FOR SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 20(RES), IN THE LEGISLATURE OF THE STATE OF ALASKA, TWENTY-FIRST LEGISLATURE—FIRST SESSION

(By the Senate Resources Committee)

Sponsor(s): Senator Taylor

A RESOLUTION

Relating to the removal of beaver from Washington, D.C.

Be it Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Alaska:

Wheras the National Park Service is attempting to trap and remove at least two beavers from the vicinity of the Potomac Tidal Basin near the national Mall in Washington, D.C., because the beavers have downed four cherry trees and five white cedar trees; and

Wheras the natural wild and free roaming beaver were trapped to extinction in Washington, D.C., and the Potomac Tidal Basin beaver are only retaking habitat that the species has occupied forever and in which man is the trespasser; and

Wheras the return of beaver to Washington, D.C., will enhance the biological diversity of the nation's capital and the integrity of its residents, as cherry tree eating beavers cannot tell a lie; and

Wheras the unrestrained development of government buildings, highways, and urban sprawl in Washington, D.C. has destroyed beaver habitat, and immediate steps should be taken to halt all major construction projects; and

Wheras human activity in or around the Potomac Tidal Basin will undoubtedly have adverse effects on the new beaver colony; and

Wheras Washington, D.C., and the nation as a whole would benefit from greater efforts on the part of the National Park Service to assist and protect wildlife by excluding people from areas where wildlife is attempting to reestablish a foothold on its natural range in the nation's capital; and

Whereas federal law requires that the Potomac Tidal Basin is now, because of the beavers' pioneering effort, a critical habitat area; and

Whereas critical habitat areas are uniquely rare, and, without immediate enforcement of federal laws, this unique subspecies of Potomac Tidal Basin beaver will again become extinct; and

Whereas we have no information or good science about the habitat of the ''Potomac Tidal Basin beaver,'' and a task force of scientists should immediately be impaneled and all human activity in the tidal basin area halted until a thorough and complete analysis has been completed; and

Whereas the National Academy of Sciences has been studying predator control in Alaska for five years, and the National Park Service has labeled these beavers as very evasive and wily ''tree predators''; and

Whereas the federal government is, over objections, reintroducing gray wolves, grizzly bear, and lynx into several western states in order to enhance the biological diversity in those states; and

Whereas the National Park Service is closing Glacier Bay National Park and Preserve to fishing for crabs because the crabs are an essential element of the ecosystem of the park and the long established and sustainable crab fishery is inconsistent with the preservation of natural crab populations; and

Whereas the policy of the National Park Service in Alaska and several other states is to remove the people rather than the animals when there is a conflict between people and wildlife; and

Whereas federal law provides for extensive penalties for harassment of endangered species;

Be it Resolved That the Alaska State Legislature respectfully requests that the National Park Service cease its efforts to remove the beaver from the Potomac Tidal Basin in Washington, D.C., and assist the reestablishment of a healthy beaver population in the nation's capital; and be it

Further Resolved That the Alaska State Legislature respectfully requests the Fish and Wildlife Services to exercise its federal authority and cite, with criminal violations, members and contractors of the National Park Service who harass the Potomac Tidal Basin beavers; and be it

Further Resolved That the Alaska State Legislature respectfully requests the National Park Service to investigate the habitat requirements for beaver in Washington, D.C., and the adaptations that beaver have made to cope with the unique urban environment of Washington, D.C., establish protected beaver habitat areas in Washington, D.C., and use good science in its actions regarding beaver in Washington, D.C.

Copies of this resolution shall be sent to the Honorable Al Gore, Jr., Vice-President of the United States and President of the U.S. Senate; to the Honorable Bruce Babbitt, Secretary, U.S. Department of the Interior, to Robert G. Stanton, Director, National Park Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, to Jamie Rappaport Clark, Director, Fish and Wildlife Service, U.S. Department of the Interior; to all members of the U.S. Congress; to the Honorable John Kitzhaber, Governor, State of Oregon; to Paul G. Risser, Ph.D., President, Oregon State University; and to the Honorable Ted Stevens and the Honorable Frank Murkowski, U.S. Senators, and the Honorable Don Young, U.S. Representative, members of the Alaska delegation in Congress.

SENDING GROUND TROOPS TO KOSOVO WOULD COMPOUND A HUGE FOREIGN POLICY ERROR

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

Mr. DUNCAN. Madam Speaker, several times over the last few days I have heard reports on national networks saying that Members of Congress were getting ''antsy'' about not committing ground troops to Kosovo. The implication is that all of the Members of Congress want ground troops in there immediately.

I believe it was a terrible mistake to start bombing in the first place, and it certainly would be compounding a huge error to place many thousands of ground troops in there now.

As many columnists have pointed out, the NATO bombings have made this situation much worse than it ever would have been if we had simply stayed out. The very liberal Washington Post columnist, Richard Cohen, wrote, ''I believe, though, that the NATO bombings have escalated and accelerated the process. For some Kosovars, NATO has made things worse.''

Pat M. Holt, a foreign affairs expert writing in the Christian Science Monitor, wrote, ''The first few days of bombing have led to more atrocities and to more refugees. It will be increasing the instability which the bombing was supposed to prevent.''

□ 2030

Philip Gourevitch, writing in the April 12 New Yorker Magazine, said: ''Yet so far the air war against Yugoslavia has accomplished exactly what the American-led alliance flew into combat to prevent: Our bombs unified the Serbs in Yugoslavia, as never before, behind the defiance of Milosevic; they spurred to a frenzy the 'cleansing' of Kosovo's ethnic Albanians by Milosevic's forces; they increased the likelihood of the conflict's spilling over into Yugoslavia's south-Balkan neighbors; and they hardened the hearts of much of the non-Western world against us—not least in Russia, where passionate anti-Americanism is increasing the prospects for the right-wing nationalists or the Communist Party to win control of the Kremlin and its nuclear arsenal in coming elections.''

Many conservative analysts have been very critical. Thomas Sowell wrote: ''Already our military actions are being justified by the argument that we are in there now and cannot pull out without a devastating loss of credibility and influence in NATO and around the world. In other words, we cannot get out because we have gotten in. That kind of argument will be heard more and more if we get in deeper.

''Is the Vietnam War so long ago that no one remembers? We eventually pulled out of Vietnam,'' Mr. Sowell wrote, ''under humiliating conditions with a tarnished reputation around the world and with internal divisiveness and bitterness that took years to heal. Bad as this was, we could have pulled out earlier with no worse consequences and with thousands more Americans coming back alive.''

Mr. Sowell asks, ''Why are we in the Balkans in the first place? There seems to be no clear-cut answer.''

William Hyland, a former editor of Foreign Affairs Magazine, writing in the Washington Post said, ''The President has put the country in a virtually impossible position. We cannot escalate without grave risks. If the President and NATO truly want to halt ethnic cleansing, then the alliance will have to put in a large ground force or, at a minimum, mount a credible threat to do so. A conventional war in the mountains of Albania and Kosovo will quickly degenerate into a quagmire. On the other hand, the United States and NATO cannot retreat without suffering a national and international humiliation. * * * The only alternative is to revive international diplomacy.''

Mr. Hyland is correct, but unfortunately I am afraid that ground troops in Kosovo would be much worse than a quagmire. Former Secretary of State Lawrence Eagleberger was quoted on a national network last week as saying that the Bush administration had closely analyzed the situation in the Balkans in the early 1990s and had decided it was a ''swamp'' into which we should not go.

NATO was established as a purely defensive organization, not an aggressor force. With the decreased threat from the former Soviet Union, was NATO simply searching for a mission? Were some national officials simply trying to prove that they are world statesmen or trying to leave a legacy?

The U.S. has done 68 percent of the bombing thus far. This whole episode, counting reconstruction and resettlement costs after we bring Milosevic down, will cost us many billions.

If there have to be ground troops, let the Europeans take the lead. Do not commit U.S. ground troops. Let the Europeans do something. The U.S. has done too much already. Humanitarian aid, yes; bombs and ground troops, no.

MEMBERS OF CONGRESS PARTICIPATE IN REENACTMENT OF SELMA-TO-MONTGOMERY CIVIL RIGHTS MARCH

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

Mr. UPTON. Madam Speaker, with me on the House floor I have a number of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, Republican and Democrat, who experienced a marvelous journey to Selma, Alabama, a few weeks ago to commemorate the 34th anniversary of the great march led by Dr. King and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) to end racism and bigotry across this country.

We had nearly 20 Members of Congress from both sides of the aisle that traveled to Selma and Birmingham and Montgomery. What I would like to do is ask all of my colleagues who are here to take various stations and we could have a conversation on the floor without the formal proceeding of yielding to other Members.

Madam Speaker, I guess I should first recognize my good friend and brother, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS), elected the same year as I, who helped lead us on that march, as we did

last year as well, giving so many of us the experience of walking in the shoes of those that had gone before. It was an experience that I have to say I will never forget.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Madam Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) my friend, my brother, and my colleague, for being the co-leader of this delegation traveling from Washington to Birmingham where we had an opportunity to visit the Civil Rights Museum, the Sixteenth Street Church that was bombed on September 15th, 1963, where the four little girls were killed, and to visit the park where they used the dogs and the fire hoses against little children.

We then traveled, as the gentleman suggested, on to Montgomery and then to Selma. During that entire trip in the State of Alabama, we were in the district of the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. HILLIARD) and we should take the moment to thank him for his hospitality and thank all of our colleagues.

This trip was sponsored by Faith and Politics, a group that comes together here in Washington where we have been meeting for some time discussing the whole question of race, having a dialogue on race. We have been doing it here, in our districts, in our offices, in our homes. We did it on this trip and we are going to continue to do it.

So I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) for bringing us together tonight. Maybe the gentleman from Alabama would have something to say, since we were in his district in Alabama.

Mr. HILLIARD. Madam Speaker, let me first of all thank all of my colleagues for coming to Alabama. I am very happy that we got a chance to participate in the reenactment of the Selma-to-Montgomery march. I hope, and I am certain that it did bring feelings different from what they would have felt elsewhere unless they had been with JOHN LEWIS and others on the actual march.

We still march for equality in this country, and the participation of my colleagues in that march brought forth the idea that there are still things that are imperfect about this country. But the fact that all of my colleagues came and all participated let me know, and hopefully let America know, that all of my colleagues are on the job, that they are trying to make this country a better place, and realize that we still have got a distance to go.

So we were very happy to have our fellow Members of Congress in the State of Alabama, have them participate in the reenactment of something that meant so much to this country and something that had our colleagues of 3 decades ago to look at themselves and reexamine the state of discrimination in this country and make changes. Because we were there, I hope we will reexamine how things are, and any changes that are necessary, we will make them.

Mr. LAHOOD. Madam Speaker, it was obviously a real treat for me to participate. I think of all of the activities, actually being in Selma and being with JOHN LEWIS and the reenactment of the crossing of the Edmund Pettis Bridge is something that I will never forget. I think that was for me the highlight of the trip.

Then also I think recognizing that we serve in the House with so many different personalities and different people. And even though I have known JOHN LEWIS for a period of time, I guess I did not really recognize the kind of hero that he is to so many people in the movement in really striving for better race relations and improving civil rights. To have the opportunity to be with him that weekend and to have him really walk us through what happened during that period I think sensitizes all of us to the importance of those events in terms of really standing on the shoulders of people who were there and sensitizing us to the importance of better race relations and what happened there in terms of the movement.

Then having the opportunity to hear from Mrs. Martin Luther King, who joined us on that Sunday morning, and hearing from her was just an extraordinary experience.

Madam Speaker, I have taken the occasion to actually go back to my own district earlier this week. As a matter of fact, a few days ago I met with the African-American leaders in my own community, the head of the NAACP, the head of a couple of other African-American organizations. I talked to them about our experience and talked to them about what we can do as leaders in our community in Peoria to improve race relations.

So I am really trying to build on the experience that we had, that the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) provided to us, and that all of the folks at Faith and Politics provided.

I think I want to conclude by saying a special thanks to Doug Tanner for really helping to organize these activities. Doug is here in the Chamber with us tonight and has done just an extraordinary job of helping to organize all of us around people like the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) and others to make this happen.

Madam Speaker, it is something I will never forget. I hope to build on it in my own community, and I hope we can build it as Members here in the House. I thank the gentleman from Georgia for his leadership and for the ability of all of us to join him and share the experience that he shared with us. And a special thanks to Doug Tanner for all that he does to sort of enlighten all of us and give us an experience that I know many of us will never forget.

Mr. UPTON. Madam Speaker, this was a great trip in that all of us here, 20 or so that went down on both sides of the aisle, I thought became much stronger friends as we renewed our commitment to end racism and bigotry and discrimination. And as much as we thought we knew each other on the trip, we always learn something new.

I have been in a little prayer group with the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER), and it was only until we got on the bus and my wife and I were sitting in front of BOB and his wife and we sort of talked about our experiences that I thought when I was in the mid-'60s when this event really happened, I did not know about it. I was in fourth grade. I did not see that on the news. I did not watch the news when I was in the fourth grade.

It came out in the description, as I was listening to the gentleman from California, and he was talking about a variety of different events and seeing different things unfold, that I learned that he had been a student in college and had seen some of the events and actually took it upon himself to come down and become, in essence, one of the Freedom Riders on one of those buses.

I know that it was a marvelous experience for him. He actually spent some time in prison because of it. And this was his first trip back to Alabama since then. I would love to hear a little bit of the gentleman's thoughts firsthand tonight.

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan, and I thank all of us for being able to put this together. I wish those who were viewing this from their offices and from around the country could see that we are a bipartisan group standing on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. UPTON. We like having the gentleman from California on this side of the aisle. We will keep working on it.

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, seeing the world from the right is a very different perspective. But it is clear that we all see this as not only a bonding experience for all of us, but to come together around the issues of fighting discrimination and ending racism is something that bonds us all together. There is no aisle when it comes to these issues.

And like all of the other Members who were on this incredible weekend pilgrimage, we thank especially JOHN LEWIS for leading us in a religious experience. We were with, I think we all know, an authentic American hero, someone who really changed American history, changed the course of history through his own personal witness, his willingness to stand up for righteousness and for the truth and against racism; who was beaten down, was imprisoned, and yet got up and is here in Congress to lead us into a new understanding.

Madam Speaker, we thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS), all of us, for reliving those experiences.

The changes that I saw, and I had not been in Alabama for 30 years, were incredible political changes, social

changes. It reminded us of the progress that we made, but it also reminded us I think of the ways we have got to go.

We were in Selma, and a small town takes a long time to change. We saw how changes had to be made there. But what struck me as someone who had been there 30 years ago was the incredible courage that was evidenced, the tremendous courage evidenced by the young people and the older people at that time. I got to go back to college after a summer in jail. People had to stay there and take the hardship and the challenge and the threats of death.

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FILNER. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Speaker, I did not interrupt the gentleman except for the single purpose of pointing out what he was about to point out himself. The gentleman very correctly recognized JOHN LEWIS as a great American hero. However, the gentleman from California was humble in not pointing out the fact, explicitly I think, that he himself was pretty heroic, a Freedom Rider, 3 months, 6 months in prison in Mississippi. For those of us who grew up in the South, that is a stirring testimonial.

We are proud and I could see when we were down there that he was, I hope, pleased to see that some of the things that he fought for have come to fruition. A long way to go still, but the world is a much greater place because of the sacrifices that he and JOHN LEWIS made.

Mr. FILNER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for his remarks.

□ 2045

Mr. UPTON. Madam Speaker, one of the individuals that we had wished had been with us for the full time but was with us for certainly a good part of it was the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. DICKEY). All of us here participated in many discussions and conferences, not only with the White House but with other folks, not only in this town but across the country. The gentleman from Arkansas has been a special help on this, and his heart is big, and we appreciate that.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. DICKEY).

Mr. DICKEY. Madam Speaker, the thing that I wanted to point out has a lot to do with the age of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) at the time and my age at the time. He was in the fourth grade. I was 17 years of age when in Arkansas we had the tragedy of Little Rock Central, or the Little Rock High School crisis.

I know that I was going to college during that time and had to pass back and forward through Little Rock exactly during that time. I had a profound lesson that I learned on this trip because of my insensitivity back then. I just started playing it through. I watched as everything happened there and how many brave and heroic young people were leading the attack against bigotry and against hatred, and I thought about my own self.

I was not but about three, two years younger than the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS), and there he was. He cared enough to sacrifice. I thought about this as we were going from church to church and where they had their meetings in preparation for the walks, how they never did know, they did not know enough about the society or about the opposition to know whether they were going to survive or not.

They were not interested whether or not they would be successful. They were only interested in proposing and pushing the issue of fairness and civil rights. I thought that was a significant, a significant message that I learned.

I also sat across the street on the bus and looked at the spot that Rosa Parks got on the bus, the very point. We were told that she was not a part of any organized effort. She had just reached the point where she had said enough is enough; I am not going to put up with it anymore. Look what happened. She was not a young person at the time, but she was brave. She was brave because she did not count what the consequences might be.

I mean death was at near hand for all of these people, and that is just hard to understand. I mean here in the United States, it was like battle lines were drawn, and people stepped out and they were beaten like the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) was beaten as he finished crossing the bridge.

I think what it all amounts to and what I learned from it is that these people sacrificed so much so that a person like myself, who was possibly calloused by being from a privileged family, could feel better about ourselves.

I want to thank you for what you did, all of you who sacrificed then, and particularly I want to thank my colleagues for including me in this trip because it did me a lot more good than I ever imagined.

Mr. UPTON. Madam Speaker, one of our great Members that accompanied us was the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON). I would be happy to hear some of her comments.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Madam Speaker, for me it was an opportunity to reconnect and to be revived. I think sometimes we live through an experience and do not know all the details, but we think we know them.

For me to go back and actually see the places for the first time, as a person who was active in civil rights, not in Alabama but my own little local area, to understand how profound those individuals had to be, how courageous they had to be, and how significant their involvement meant in terms of progress, and how the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. DICKEY) said that Rosa Parks was an average person who did an extraordinary thing, and how that extraordinary thing on the part of ordinary people meant just a difference in the Americans' response.

I think the other thing that was good for me, and I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) as well, is bringing those of us who are more experienced in the civil rights group together and those who never have been involved.

Those of us who think of ourselves as experienced sometimes get a little calloused. We kind of forget the significance of the battles that the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) did or others did or Rosa Parks did. We kind of need to be revived. So for me it was a revival and a motivation.

The thought I had going back home at the 'hood was not so much I need to do it with my white citizens as well, but I needed to do it for my children who are now adults. I needed to do it with my friends, in fact for them to really have an appreciation of what a profound history there is.

My colleagues are right. It was indeed a spiritual awakening. It is a sense that all those kids who were attacked, you know, there is a prophetic history of the divine intervention. There is a whole theory called God of history; and that there is intervention of how the divine uses ordinary people to move people in authority in such a way that could not be moved by people in authority. So in some ways, we need to understand what that means, that ordinary people can make a difference.

I thank my colleagues for including me, and I hope that, if I do not go back the next time, that many of our colleagues will have the experience. But we ought to just share with people the opportunity of having this kind of revival and motivation and appreciation for a sense of history.

Mr. UPTON. Madam Speaker, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY) was an active member with our group going down, and again, for me, was one of the first times I actually had a chance to have lengthy and decent conversations with a naval representative from Arkansas. It was terrific to have him on board, too.

Mr. BERRY. Madam Speaker, all of us that participated in the trip came away with a new appreciation for what happened in Selma, Montgomery, and Birmingham. We are very appreciative of the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) and certainly the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) for making it possible for us to experience that.

When I first came to the House, one of the first people that extended the hand of friendship to me was the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS). He shook my hand and he said, ''Welcome, my friend and my brother.'' I knew just from the way he shook your hand and the way he said it that he meant it.

Until I went to Selma and walked across the Edmund Pettus Bridge arm-in-arm with the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS), I did not really appreciate what he meant or how important it was that he did that.

I suspect, had I been through some of the things that the gentleman Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) and some of the others that were in the nonviolent civil rights movement at that time, I would not even want to be in the same room with a guy like me. I can understand that.

But I think it says so much that we can come together, that we did make this pilgrimage, and it meant an awful lot to all of us. It shows us, not only how far we have come, but how far we have yet to go, and that we must never, ever forget that we cannot go back to what that was.

I just once again want to thank all of my colleagues for their leadership: Doug Tanner, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS).

What a great privilege it was to be with the other leaders of the movement, Bernard Lafayette, many, many others that were there. To hear their experiences firsthand, it gave it all just so much more meaning. I think the term ''keep your eye on the prize'' certainly will always be much more meaningful to me now, and it points out to us how petty and unimportant some of these things we argue about on this floor are, and that there are things that are more important and that that is what we should be about.

But it was a tremendous experience for me. I think that anyone that has not done it has really missed something.

Mr. UPTON. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) who joined us and helped us in every way.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Madam Speaker, I want to add my voice to thank Doug Tanner and the Faith and Politics Institute for putting this trip together.

I have been, since I have been here, a strong believer in the importance of Members on both sides of the aisle, I would say to the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER), it is strange over here on the left side of the aisle too for me, as it is for him on the right, but I think when Members of both parties go out and see each other out of this room, good things happen.

So I found it to be an enriching weekend from many standpoints. But just to have the opportunity to talk to Members who are not of my party and to get to know them as people, I think helps us do our work here. I think that is important.

What actually piqued my interest on this trip, I heard the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) at the Hershey retreat a couple years ago during the nondenominational church services describe his experience. It is his story, and I am not going to take it from him. But basically there are three Members of his party that were all involved in this movement at the same time in the 1960s, and they had some differences in points of view.

The fact that they not only came together years later to serve in the United States Congress but in the same political party, I think to me that story, I have carried that story with me since he told it, for 3 years, to show that there are no differences that cannot be bridged when one begins to work towards it.

Like the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), I knew the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS). I would sit as the Speaker pro tempore, and would I see the gentleman from Georgia come to the well and talk every once in a while. A lot of times he was talking about things that I did not agree with, but I did not know his rich history.

To have the chance to walk in the footsteps with a true American hero like JOHN LEWIS was an amazing experience for me, just a kid growing up in Ohio. I will not forget that.

We have all been gone over our Easter break in our districts. I took what I learned that weekend, and I visited a lot of schools because I like to spend time with my young people in my district.

I was able to tell them the story about what some people had to go through to get the right to vote and the fact that JOHN LEWIS and people like JOHN LEWIS were willing to risk their lives, were willing to risk police dogs and fire hoses and everything else that could be thrown at them in the 1960s just to get the right that we all take for granted to go in and cast a ballot in a Presidential race or a congressional race or a city council race.

So I was talking with some high school seniors, and I asked them, because we can register to vote at 18, how many are registered that are 18; and only half of them were. It has given me a powerful incentive and a powerful message to go back and talk to them now about what people before them had to go through to get the right to vote and that they should not squander that opportunity.

I was reminded of how far we have to go, but I was mostly reminded of the fact that we need to do it all together, Republicans and Democrats, black and white, men and women, rich and poor. A lot of times discussion in this Chamber is about dividing rather than bringing together. We need to concentrate more on finding the things that unite us. When we do that, I think that we can move forward.

If the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) will permit me, I have one quick story that I was reminded of when we were in Alabama, about one of our Presidents, Harry Truman. We all go door-to-door in our campaigns. As the story goes, he ran into a nasty homeowner one day and stuck out his hand and said, ''I am Harry Truman, and I would like your vote.'' The woman would not come from behind the door. She said, ''Mr. Truman, I know exactly who you are, and I would not vote for you if you were Saint Peter himself.'' Mr. Truman, for a Democrat, he had pretty quick wit. He said, ''Madam, with all due respect, if I were Saint Peter, I do not think you would be in my district.''

It occurred to me when we were down in Alabama that this is one district, the United States is one district, and we need to figure out what it is that is going to pull us together more than anything else.

So I was very thankful to spend those three days with all of my colleagues, and I was most appreciative to have the chance to spend that time with the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. UPTON. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT) who was a great fellow to join us with his wife as well on the trip as we crossed the State.

□ 2100

Mr. WATT of North Carolina. Madam Speaker, I was seated here listening to the stories and thinking about what this trip meant to me. Let me start by just thanking the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS), our leader, our primary leader, and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), our co-leader on this trip. It was a wonderful, wonderful experience.

My colleagues will probably recall that at the end of the trip when we were at the airport about to board the plane from Alabama, we had a little debriefing, a discussion, and everybody was going around talking about what this trip had meant. And I sat quietly and never said anything because I was still sorting through the emotions I was feeling and the significance of this trip.

And it took me several weeks really to kind of put in perspective some feelings. And this is kind of where I got to at the end of that vexing period.

I was reminded that in 1963, I got a scholarship offer to Talladega University in Alabama. And I came to that fork in the road. I had never been to Alabama. And when I looked at the scholarship offer that I had gotten, I decided that probably the last place in the world I wanted to go was Alabama in 1963.

And I have been true to that up to this trip. I never set foot in Alabama. It was not a place that I ever aspired to go to to visit. I had these images of people being beaten and fire-hosed and dogs sicced on folks. All these years since 1963, those images have lingered in my mind, and I never have wanted to go to Alabama. And I finally got talked into it by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) and the wonderful people from Faith and Politics, my good friend over here.

Now, another part of me kept saying, well, why did I not want to go to Alabama? I mean, North Carolina, which is where I am from, is in the south also. And I think I came to grips with some fears that I had about going to Mississippi and Alabama and Arkansas, the far southern States, where this movement was taking place. I think I decided that part of the reason that I never wanted to go there was that I was afraid to go there.

I knew that there were battles to be fought in North Carolina, but I felt like

the people in North Carolina were more progressive than the people in Alabama and Mississippi. And so I came away from this trip really with an increased amount of admiration for the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS).

I wrote him a letter. It took me 3 or 4 weeks to write the letter to him because I wanted to say exactly what I wanted that note to him to say. And what I wanted to say to him was that there were those of us in all areas of the south who were kind of around the margins of the civil rights movement, doing little bits and pieces of things here and there, and then there were those like the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) and Fred Shuttlesworth who were right in the middle of this heated battle and making what very easily could have been the ultimate sacrifice, and was in fact for the young girls in Alabama and for other people who participated in those movements.

I already loved and respected the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS). I had read his book. I had heard about him. I had seen him on television. But to be there in Alabama and to walk and ride through that State where I now believe I was fearful of going allowed me to come away with an even greater appreciation for those who are on the firing line and making that ultimate sacrifice.

And so, I want to say publicly and with all sincerity that I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS). And I thank all of those thousands of people, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) and all of those people who were not fearful, or even if they were, they overcame those fears and they went and they made that sacrifice, because it has made America what it is today and it has certainly made it possible for us all to stand here and share these experiences, black and white, Republican and Democrat, and to say to America that when it comes to a unity of purpose and all of us being Americans, there is no argument about that anymore. And in those days, there was an argument about it.

We put that argument to rest, and we owe a great debt to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) for doing that.

Mr. UPTON. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

Mr. SPRATT. Madam Speaker, I shudder to follow that eloquence.

The gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT) and I grew up 30 miles apart. He is from Charlotte, North Carolina. I am from York, South Carolina. Not Alabama, not Mississippi, but still the segregated south.

I was 12 years old in 1954, about 18, 19, 20 years old when the civil rights movement started. And while York County was not the same as Neshoba, Mississippi, when the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) made his first stop in Rock Hill, South Carolina, 13 miles from where I live on the Freedom Rider bus, he was met by thugs in the bus station who took him on, took him down, and he received the first of I guess many batterings on the head, bloodied up badly.

But here is the profound point about it and the reason this pilgrimage we made is so important to understanding ourselves as a people and understanding what this movement is about. A police officer, as I recall the story, had been standing on the sidelines watching the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) take the beating, and at some point he sort of interceded and asked him, do you want to prefer charges, which he could have done. And he said, no, I do not have anything against him individually. I am against the system, the oppression, the way it affects white people and black people, causes them to do things like this. I did not come down here to get this man in trouble. I came to lift us all out of this oppression.

In that same city of Rock Hill, about the third or fourth series of sit-in strikes developed at the local McCrory's from a small, black Baptist college called Friendship College. It started more or less spontaneously, but they were following what was happening at North Carolina A&T and what was happening at Nashville. And they did the same thing in Rock Hill except they did something different.

When they were taken to the county prison, which, believe me, the prison campus is not a place where anybody of any color would want to be, when they were taken there, they did not post bond; they took their toothbrushes with them and they stayed for the duration, 30 days.

The significance of what they did was not appreciated by those of us who were outside onlookers. It was not appreciated by me until I read Taylor Branch's book. Because SNCC at that point was just about broke, they did not have money to send bail money up to get these young college students out of jail, and they developed a motto that would exonerate SNCC from having to come up with that money: ''Jail. No bail.''

Now, my colleagues would think that that was just a bunch of hard-headed college kids out to make a point. But the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS), when I asked him about the significance of it, told me, no, that helped us show the world that we were not just a bunch of college kids out fighting for our rights, but it was something more profound here.

There is a profoundness of doctrine about civil disobedience, a profoundness of doctrine about nonviolence that we all need to learn in this country today. And that is why this pilgrimage was more than just some symbolic journey. We all need to learn this.

Every school child in America grows up and knows what Lexington Green is. He or she should also know what Kelly Ingram Park in Birmingham is. Every school child in this country grows up and knows what Concord Bridge is in Massachusetts and what happened there. He or she should know what happened at the Edmund Pettis Bridge, too. It is a part of our history.

And the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WATT) put it far better than I. For 200 years just about, this country professed to be the greatest constitutional democracy in the world. We lived under a Declaration of Independence which guaranteed all men the pursuit of happiness, equality. But it was not true. The Supreme Court of this country said black people were not even people. The Constitution did not even count them.

That was the kind of lie that this country lived. And these people, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) and so many others in these places, made America rise up and live out the true meaning of her creed. It was an enormous accomplishment. It was a second American Revolution. No question about it.

Back when the Friendship Nine went to the county prison and stayed there, told SNCC they did not want bail, one of the early organizers of the movement in Nashville, Diane Nash, was in Atlanta; and she was so moved by what they did that she drove her car to Rock Hill and got picked up at McCrory's and taken to the county jail, and she stayed there with them just to give them the spirit to persevere.

She said something about the movement once when someone had made a paean to Dr. King, who was truly an American hero, no doubt about it. She said, do not make him superhuman. Do not enlarge him beyond the point that he is bigger than life itself. Because if you do, she said, you will misunderstand the meaning of the movement.

There were all kinds of people involved in the movement. Rosa Parks stands for the kind of participation that made the movement work, young members like the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS), coming out of a small rural community in Alabama and just following their gut instincts. We made the movement. These people made the movement.

And if we understand that, and that is part of what we understand when we go to Selma and Birmingham and Montgomery, if we understand that, we realize that we do not need some big Messianic figure to come lead us down the path to the future; it is our responsibility, all of our responsibilities.

And the abiding message in this experience is, we can change this country for the better and it is a responsibility of each of us to do it.

Mr. UPTON. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. FORBES), a very special member of the delegation who has always spoken against discrimination and bigotry.

Mr. FORBES. Madam Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding. And I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) particularly for leading this delegation. It is an important time for all of us, I think, in this country.

An old adage says that ''if you do not remember history, you are bound to repeat it.'' This is a little bit more than just remembering history, though. This is really asking us to dig deep within our soul, as so many who led the civil rights movement, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) and some of the others that have been mentioned, Bernard Lafayette, Fred Shuttlesworth, Dr. King, literally hundreds of people who broke with conventional wisdom and said that we should reach deeper into America's soul and make this a better Nation.

□ 2115

For me it was really, going into my fifth year in the Congress, one of the most profound and emotional and important undertakings that I have done since I have been privileged to represent the First District of New York.

During the 1960s, during the height of the civil rights endeavors, I was in my early teens, 11, 12, 13 years of age, and like my friend from North Carolina, I saw what was going on in Alabama and as a youngster I thought, ''That's not a place that I would ever want to be.'' But still it was very remote to me, not unlike unfortunately the images we were seeing in Vietnam. It was horrible. We were outraged. Our hearts were broken. But it was happening somewhere far, far away, and particularly for young people at that time, many who were challenged to move into leadership roles as they grew older themselves. There was a remoteness to that endeavor that I am embarrassed to admit. But I was privileged to be part of this delegation on the 34th anniversary of what happened at the Edmund Pettis Bridge that really was almost the apex of the civil rights struggle. It allowed me as just one Member of Congress to dig deep within my own being and to ask, ''Are we doing enough today to continue to correct the wrongs?'' We are in this wonderful body and we are all sent here ostensibly to meet the challenges, to make America a better place, to correct the wrongs that we see around us.

I am moved tonight by the bipartisan spirit that engulfed us when we went to Selma, Alabama and Birmingham, Alabama just a couple of weeks ago. It reminds me that as a Member of Congress, I take those lessons and those reminders back with me in a very real way. I am hopeful that as we move forward, that this one Member of Congress, being further sensitized to the need to understand that yes, we have come a long way since even the 1960s but we have not come far enough.

As my friend from Ohio reminded me and all of us, that the key here is that we do it all together, that we figure out a way to meet the remaining challenges in this most wonderful Nation on the face of the earth, where people like JOHN LEWIS and other leaders could challenge the conventional wisdom and say, we can be a better place. And it is not about condemning what we are, it is challenging us to be better as we move forward as a Nation. And so I first of all again want to thank the Faith and Politics Institute, Reverend Tanner, FRED UPTON, my good friend JOHN LEWIS and all of the Members who were part of that delegation, because you really made it a very real and moving experience for me and allowed me to take some valuable lessons from that experience. I will not only return for the 35th anniversary but also hopefully in my daily work as long as I have this privilege to try to be a better Member of Congress and work to meet the other challenges that we face.

In closing, I would like to also thank the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. HILLIARD) for his hospitality, the great way in which he received us and opened up his heart so that we could learn a little bit more about the wonderful Alabama that has come. I thank him for his leadership on this as well.

Mr. HILLIARD. One of the things that I think I learned from this experience was the lessons that we get from being with one another, not in this Chamber but away. I got to know some of you who I had barely spoken to in the four terms that I have been in this body. That gave me an opportunity to learn and to know of you as individuals. That was so gratifying to me, because I know you as persons. I do not see you as just another Congressperson or just as a number, not as a Republican or as a Democrat but as a friend. I really appreciate having that long weekend, spending that long weekend with you and getting to know you as individuals.

I would like to take the opportunity to invite you back for another long weekend for the millennium march. It will be bigger, it will be better, we will have more participants, and hopefully we will have many people who, like you, will see life as it is unfolding in the United States, a better place for all of us because of what JOHN LEWIS and so many others like him did in the past. Thank you for coming and you are welcome back to come in March of the year 2000.

Mr. UPTON. Just prior to the gentleman from Alabama giving his statement there just now, a number of us asked our friend Doug Tanner and some others, I know that based on our pilgrimage, there will be a lot of us that would like to cosponsor legislation to make that little park just across the river by the real start of the Edmund Pettis Bridge a national park, a national shrine.

We are looking for you to lead that effort as it is in your district, congressional courtesy. But if you wait too much longer, you are going to have some other people. We are offering that up, but I know a lot of us here, Republicans and Democrats, would like to cosponsor that effort and help you see that become a reality. As people gave their remarkable tales here on the floor tonight and what it meant to them, for some reason, about a little more than a year ago, JOHN LEWIS and maybe AMO HOUGHTON and a few others, JAY DICKEY, Doug Tanner, sort of had me on a list, and we got together down in a little room in the Capitol, EF–100, and we talked about racism and what we could do. We can always pass the laws, but until something really happens at the grassroots, nothing is really going to happen. We talked about a number of different resolutions that we were offering up. I think the gentleman from Georgia then was in the middle of writing his book and how we could come together. A couple of weeks later, he asked me on the House floor if I might make the pilgrimage to Selma in 1998. When he gave me the weekend, March 6, the first weekend, I knew that I had major commitments back home in Michigan, that I could not do it, but somehow we juggled some things around and I flew down just for the day. I had never been to Alabama, ever. I flew down that Sunday morning, caught the first flight out at National Airport at 6 a.m. or whatever, terrible storm, got down just in time to hear JOHN's sermon in the church. His sermon reflected a little bit on who would have guessed, me, JOHN LEWIS, 33 years later, coming here to preach in the same church where Dr. King had preached and seeing some of the changes but knowing we had so far to go.

We walked across the bridge, we took a bus ride, we had a long discussion about racism and bigotry and what it meant in our own lives. We came back. The gentleman then came back to my district. We had a tough scene this last summer. We had the Klan come to my district for the first time that I can ever remember. They were not welcome. Yet they had the right to come. As you and I both met with a number of leaders in my hometown, we discussed how we ought to deal with it. You went back to really sort of the roots of what you wrote about in your book and your life, about nonviolence, how we ought to make it a nonevent, and we did. And in the end, they canceled their visit the day that they were supposed to come, though they came a few months later, and they found out that there was no welcome wagon out and people for the most part ignored them. The reaction was perfect.

As we thought about this trip this year, and AMO HOUGHTON was the cochair last year, the Republican cochair along with Jim Nicholson, our Republican national chairman and the former governor of Colorado last year as well, I was privileged to be asked to cochair this group and really spend a night or two in Alabama, to have listened to the stories of so many Members last year when they talked about their meeting with Governor Wallace. I can remember SHERROD BROWN and you going to visit him literally in, I do not know if it was a hospital or his room, but he was not doing so well. Of course he has passed away today. And the white Members were not anxious to have their picture taken with him, thinking about all of the efforts that Governor

Wallace had done at the schoolhouse door and everyplace else. Yet you had forgiven him, peace in your heart. He knew that he had erred, he had asked for forgiveness and in fact he came around.

As we read your book, JOHN, and listen to your words, your wonderful words about leading the nonviolent effort, to see the courageous struggle that you went through and to visit the sites, whether they be in Montgomery or Birmingham, to see where Rosa Parks was taken off that bus, to look in the church where Dr. King first spoke or first became a minister, to see the shrine in the basement of the four wonderful, beautiful little girls who were killed with a bomb on a Sunday, to go through that wonderful museum in Birmingham, to see really, to touch the jail cell, to see the bombed-out bus that you and others had ridden at some point, to walk through that park, to see the dogs with their fangs out and to learn from Bernard Lafayette that in fact one of the German shepherds had a gold-plated tooth that the police riled up when he charged those kids.

We are so thankful for the work that you did to really help change America for the better. The reason that this pilgrimage was so important was for us to know where we are going, we have got to know where we have been. We know where we have been now, those of us that were not from there, and we know that we never ever want to go back. Yet there is work that we have to do. As Republicans and Democrats, as Members in this Chamber and the other and across the country, we have to make sure that there is no room in our hearts for hatred, for bigotry or racism. It is your footsteps and it is your leadership and it is your grace that allowed us to see the path that you took that helps give us the conviction and the courage and the perseverance to continue that path.

We are so appreciative of that love and of that work, JOHN.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Let me thank my friend and colleague and each of you for all of the kind words and everything that you have said tonight. But you must keep in mind, I was only one participant in a struggle. It was a community of participants, not a leader but just one individual in a community of individuals participating in a movement. I think our trip has brought us closer together.

I ran into Mrs. Martin Luther King, Jr. last Sunday at church. She said to me, ''JOHN, I was so moved, I was deeply moved, I can never tell you how moved, to see all those Members of Congress in Selma, Alabama during the first weekend in March.''

I think that is why we have to go back. I am glad our colleague, Congressman EARL HILLIARD from Alabama, has extended an invitation for us to come back for the 35th anniversary of the march from Selma to Montgomery. We must go back. Because I think in this process, we help America to become a circle of brothers and sisters, what I like to call, really in the movement what we call a band of brothers and sisters, a circle of trust. We build a sense of community. We move toward that period and that place of laying down the burden of race. I think as we move into the next century, we have to be the leaders, saying that as a Nation and as a people, we must lay down the burden of race. It is too heavy a burden for us to bear. I think what we have displayed tonight with the help of our good friend Doug Tanner and Faith and Politics, that it is something that we can share, not just with each other but back in our districts, in our States and for the whole Nation. If we can build just pockets of the beloved community, here on Capitol Hill, here in Washington, maybe we can build it around America, and maybe we can bring peace to the world community.

□ 2130

Madam Speaker, I think we got to keep it going, and this should not be the end, it should be just the beginning.

Mr. LAHOOD. Madam Speaker, I just want to say I know there are a lot of Members who are sitting in their offices reading mail and probably signing mail and doing all kinds of work, and what I would say:

The invitation has been extended to Members for next year to go to Selma to celebrate the 35th anniversary, and if there are Members who care about race relations in America, and if there are Members who care about improving race relations in America, and if there are Members who care about really improving race relations in their own State, in their own district, I hope they will talk to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) or any of the rest of us about the opportunity to go to Selma next year and celebrate, commemorate, the 35th anniversary. It is a great opportunity, and it is a great learning experience.

Mr. UPTON. Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. DICKEY).

Mr. DICKEY. I do not want my colleagues to leave yet. But I want to say something. All this talk about the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS), it has got some down sides to it, and let me just tell my colleagues what they are.

If we build him up so much, he might choose to come into my district again and campaign against me. So what I want to say, JOHN, is you are invited to come into Pine Bluff, Arkansas, on all of the even-numbered years, but I do not want you coming back again.

And another point: The gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY), which makes two Arkansans that went on this trip; there was not any other State, is not another State that had two people. Or North Carolina it is? Excuse me. I will have to say that we matched North Carolina. But Marion also campaigned against me in the last election. I do not know what it is that is about me, but I want to be serious about it in this sense: that what we do politically does not matter; what we do with the heart does. And the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) and I are connected in the heart, and I want to thank him for that.

And I wanted to talk to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD).

Mr. LAHOOD. There are actually two Members from Ohio, too, just to make sure.

Mr. DICKEY. Is that right?

Mr. LATOURETTE. Actually there were three Members from Ohio. Sherrod Brown, Tom Sawyer and I can tell you what it is about you that gets these guys in your district.

Mr. DICKEY. Just because the gentleman is on that side of the aisle does not allow him to do that.

Mr. LAHOOD. It has something to do with being from Arkansas. I think that is what he was getting at.

Mr. UPTON. We had two Members from the great State of Michigan.

Mr. DICKEY. I just wanted you all to chime in. That is the only reason I brought it up.

I want to get into an exchange with the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) about how, what he thought of Southerners during this time, and I will chime in as well.

Mr. LAHOOD. We only have 1 minute left, and I am afraid that it would not be enough time for me to explain what I think about Southerners.

Mr. DICKEY. I am talking about at that time. I think we got another hour.

Mr. UPTON. Does the gentleman from Georgia have the next hour? Is that right? I think we do, so we can go a few minutes, could we not?

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. UPTON. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members, and we had many Members on the trip that were not here tonight, may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. NORTHUP). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I am by profession an educator and a historian, and from March 5th to March 7th, not only did I become a student of our nation's civil rights history, I saw history come alive during the pilgrimage to Birmingham, Montgomery and Selma. To be led by civil rights leader and my distinguished colleague, Representative JOHN LEWIS, was an honor in itself.

The events which took place in Alabama were pivotal in our nation's civil rights movement. ''Letter from a Birmingham Jail,'' the 16th Street Baptist Church bombing and the Bloody Sunday march were crucial experiences to America's collective psyche. It was Martin Luther King, Jr., and his devoted supporters who forced Americans to acknowledge the injustices committed against our fellow American citizens.

Race relations is extremely, if not more, relevant today. The painful lessons learned in

Montgomery, Birmingham and Selma continue to be experienced by minority populations all over the United States. The struggle for political recognition and participation continues not only in the African-American populations, but now in the fast-growing Hispanic American and Asian Pacific Islander American groups. It is only in the past few decades that we have seen the mobilization of Hispanic and Asian Pacific Islander communities, and who knows what racial-oriented movements will awaken at the dawn of the next millennium. My point is that these movements are crucial to our nation's maturity and diversity, they are integral to our constant drive to faithfully implement the democratic principles on which our Constitution is based.

I took my youngest son, Raphael, to Alabama, because I felt that it was crucial for young generations to learn the history of the civil rights struggle. The American people did not achieve the Voting Rights Act or establish the Civil Rights Division in the Department of Justice because these were the ''right'' things to do to help achieve equality in the United States. Our young adults must understand that it was through the toil, and sometimes blood, of courageous brothers, sisters, mothers, fathers, students and teachers who accomplished these feats.

The people of Guam are going through our own civil rights struggle. We are American citizens, yet we are unable to vote for President. The opportunity to determine vote for our island's future political status has been stymied by numerous political and administrative obstacles.

The Pilgrimage to Alabama would not have been made possible without the leadership of Congressman JOHN LEWIS and Congressman FRED UPTON, without the efforts of Congressman EARL HILLIARD, and without the sponsorship of the Faith and Politics Institute. I take this opportunity to thank them for their diligent efforts in ''keeping hope alive.''

I encourage my colleagues to continue to learn from the lessons taught in Alabama.

Mr. UPTON. I just want to again thank the Faith in Politics Institute and the wonderful leadership of Doug Tanner and a terrific staff who really planned hours and many weeks to get this thing done the right way, and it was done the right way, and I know that Members will be anxious to go next year and to expand our circles and to do whatever we can to help end the scourge of racism and bigotry across this land.

SUPPORT THE PATIENTS' BILL OF RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, last Friday House Democrats across the country called on the Republican leadership to bring the Patients' Bill of Rights to the floor for a vote. Over a hundred Democrats nationwide held events in their districts to encourage their constituents to sign on to an electronic petition urging the Speaker of the House, DENNIS HASTERT, and Senate Majority Leader TRENT LOTT to take immediate action on the Patients' Bill of Rights. In Washington I joined with a number of my Democratic colleagues from the House in a similar event before boarding a bus to Philadelphia, where we joined President Clinton at a rally in support of the Patients' Bill of Rights. In echoing the call of the House and Senate Democrats, President Clinton encouraged all Americans to log on to the Internet and sign the electronic petition to the Speaker and Senate majority leader. So far 13,600 people have signed this petition.

The reason, Madam Speaker, so many people have already signed the petition I think is clear. The managed care issue was left unfinished in the 105th Congress. On the House side the Patients' Bill of Rights was defeated by just five votes when it came to the floor, and it was considered on the floor as a substitute to the Republican leadership's managed care bill, which did pass and which in my opinion was a very bad piece of legislation. This Republican managed care reform or so-called managed care reform was a thinly-veiled attempt to protect the insurance industry from managed care reform, and not a single Democrat voted for it, and I think it was a show of solidarity on the Democrats' part that none of us voted for that what I consider very unfair bill which would not have done anything to reform managed care.

Last Friday's event illustrates that support amongst Democrats for passing the Patients' Bill of Rights is as strong as ever, and let me assure my colleagues that it needs to be. The Republican leadership in the House has reintroduced a bill that is virtually identical to what it moved last year, and on the Senate side the so-called HELP committee recently approved a sham managed care bill that does not allow patients to sue insurance companies, but does allow insurance companies, not doctors and patients, to define medical necessity.

Attempts to improve this bill were rebuffed by Republicans, who rejected 20 to 22 amendments offered by Democrats. Amendments rejected by Republicans included proposals to expand the access to emergency room care, expand access to specialists, establish minimum hospital stays for women undergoing mastectomies for breast cancer, and to provide access to clinical trials where appropriate for patients with life-threatening conditions.

I wanted to talk a little bit tonight about an editorial that followed up on the Democrats and what the Democrats and the President were emphasizing last Friday. The New York Times made observations in an editorial on Saturday that were very similar to what I said tonight and basically noted just how hollow the Republican approach to managed care reform is, and I would quote from the New York Times editorial on Saturday:

''Just about everyone on Capitol Hill professes interest in producing legislation that protects patients from unfair health practices, reads the editorial,'' and it goes on, ''yet it is the Democratic proposal that more fully reflects the recommendations of a presidential advisory commission to improve health plan quality. The Senate Republican bill is too limited to accomplish this purpose.''

Listing the myriad of problems with the Senate Republican bill, the New York Times editorial goes on to note, and I quote, that most of its provisions would apply only to 48 million individuals covered by plans in which large employers act as their insurers, leaving 110 million people in other plans unprotected. And the New York Times notes that the Republicans in the Senate have drawn a completely arbitrary line between people who get their insurance from their employer and people who do not, and for reasons that I cannot explain, Republicans think only people who get their insurance from their employer should be entitled to patient protections.

The protections that are afforded to individuals who qualify, moreover, under the Senate Republican bill constitute no protection at all, and again I refer to the New York Times editorial on Saturday which notes that, quote, ''Appeals to an external reviewer will be allowed only when an insurer refused to pay for a procedure on the grounds that it was not medically necessary or is experimental. Because the Republican bill would allow insurance plans to define what treatment is medically necessary, this provision is absolutely meaningless for patients. In fact, it is worse than the current law, because if you set up an external appeals process that uses the plan's definition of medical necessity, that would even make it more difficult to hold health plans accountable for their actions. It basically adds another layer of bureaucracy that patients have to confront before they go to court.''

Other shortcomings, and I am not going to go through all them, Madam Speaker, but other shortcomings noted by the New York Times editorial include the Republicans' failure to guarantee access to specialists and the failure to allow patients to sue health plans.

For all of these reasons, this New York Times editorial concludes that the Democrats' Patients' Bill of Rights, quote, ''would be substantially stronger in allowing external review of coverage of disputes, in defining medical necessity, and in giving enrollees greater rights to take health plans to court.'' And the fact of the matter is, Madam Speaker, the Patients' Bill of Rights would be substantially stronger in every other aspect of managed care reform as well.

The point I am trying to make, and I think the point that we, as Democrats, were trying to make on Friday with our press conference and our rally with

the President and our petition on the Internet is that there is a pronounced difference between what the Democrats are proposing with the Patients' Bill of Rights and the sham managed care reform that has been brought up by the Republican leadership.

Now given all that, I want to say that the biggest problem we have is of course getting the Patients' Bill of Rights passed, and the obstacles are substantial. The insurance industry is working hand-in-hand with the Republican leadership to duplicate last year's successful effort to kill managed care reform. Industry opponents of the Patients' Bill of Rights recently launched two separate million-dollar advertising campaigns to undercut support for managed care reform, and the House Republican leadership looks like they are just attempting another dog and pony show to somehow indicate that they care about this issue.

The latest information, and this is the thing that most upsets me, the rumors flying around Capitol Hill, are that instead of a comprehensive managed care reform, the Republicans may bring up different patient protections in pieces, bits and pieces over the next 2 years. In other words, instead of bringing the Patients' Bill of Rights to the floor, they would bring a bill that would only deal with emergency room care or external appeals or whatever.

This approach really should concern everyone that supports managed care reform because it is a means by which the Republicans hope to avoid a debate on the significant aspects of managed care reform, like the right to sue, like medical necessity. In other words, they are trying to claim that they are doing something about managed care reform, and they are really not. If this piecemeal approach is adopted, we should be very concerned because I think that the issue of managed care reform is going to be ignored. The issues that the public really cares about will be left off the table essentially.

Madam Speaker, I think it is important that we keep raising this issue, that we cannot deal with managed care reform in a piecemeal way. We have to deal with it in a comprehensive way. That is what the Democrats are doing, that is what we will continue to do as we move forward over the next few weeks and keep pushing to have this bill be brought to the floor.

And I have some of my colleagues that are here joining with me tonight. Some of them were at the rally that we had in Washington and came on the bus. Others had events in their districts on Friday to indicate support and to get people to sign on to the Internet and on to the petition that we have.

I first would yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina, who has been very active as a cochair of our Democratic Health Care Task Force on this issue.

Mrs. CLAYTON. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for having this special session where we can discuss and share with the Nation, but also share with our colleagues the significance of our bill.

I just wanted to share with you and those who are listening that I have heard from many of my constituents who have expressed their support for the Patients' Bill of Rights legislation. One told me of a disturbing story. My constituent was suffering with chest pain and needed to go to an emergency room immediately. By having done so without prior approval from his insurance provider, he was forced to pay his bill himself.

Another constituent shared a story about a child who was born with an otherwise preventable disease. The HMO doctor received financial incentive to delay the treatment, resulting in serious repercussion to the infant and his family. Still another told a story of his wife who had mastectomy and then was told she had to leave the hospital the very day, even though the anesthesia had not worn off.

These are really not made-up stories, they are stories that happen over and over again. They are real-life experiences happening to the least among us, happen to ordinary people, the people you would not think of.

We need management care reform now. We need a Patients' Bill of Rights now. Currently managed care is eroding the protection that we are supposed to be guaranteed. What can we in Congress do to restore what we set out to do in the first place? Well, our goal should be to provide health care for all people across this country.

Make no mistake about what we talk about here is not really health care reform, but it is significant, it is significant. This is a national challenge that will grow out of control if we do not begin to at least do what we can do by having managed care.

We need managed care because to make it more accountable and affordable and accessible for all people. We also need health care for those people uninsured, and I want to make sure as we talk about the Patients' Bill of Rights, we should not misunderstand that the number of people who are uninsured has grown since 1994, not less. So the Patients' Bill of Rights is really trying to make sure those of us who are fortunate enough to have insurance, to hold accountable the insurance company.

So, the first step towards this goal must be, indeed the first step at least, the first step should be to pass the Patients' Bill of Rights. That is a congressional challenge. We have an opportunity here.

So H.R. 350 ensures that treatment decisions are made by a patient's doctor, not an insurance company. The insurance company should not tell you that you are able to leave the hospital after an operation. Your doctor should tell you that. With this Patients' Bill of Rights, the insurance company will no longer be able to control the length of stay in the hospital. This bill holds managed care plans accountable when their decision to withhold or limit care injures patients.

□ 2145

This bill allows patients to seek an outside specialist at no additional cost, whenever the specialists, in their plan, cannot meet their medical needs. This bill extends important protection for women in managed care.

Women will be able to stay in the hospital for more than one day when they have a mastectomy or need to have other procedures that require that. This bill gives women direct access to OB/GYN services without limitation.

Furthermore, patients have the right under this bill to appeal denials on limitations of care to an external independent entity whenever their life or health is jeopardized.

To achieve the type of health care that is suitable to all, we must provide health care efficiently and effectively while continuously minimizing costs.

The Patients' Bill of Rights is a very reasonable proposal for managed care reform. This bill ensures that patients have rights. Patients deserve to have rights.

Other bills being pushed do not address most of the issues contained in H.R. 358, especially not the Patient's Protection Act which was passed in the 105th Congress.

If we are going to support a managed care reform, it should really, truly be reform and we should do it right. Let us not repeat what happened last Congress.

Think about the people, all the people, not just a few.

Health care professionals support the Patients' Bill of Rights. Many consumers and individual groups support the Patients' Bill of Rights. I support the Patients' Bill of Rights and I urge all of my colleagues on both sides to join me in ensuring that patients receive what they deserve. Their constituents throughout America certainly are telling them that.

Let us meet the national challenge. Our challenge is indeed to provide health care for all of our citizens across the country, for those who have insurance coverage, although inadequate and unaffordable and especially those who have no insurance at all. We must give people the rights they deserve. We must give people the rights they deserve and should have. Let us meet our congressional challenge by taking the first step, by passing the Patients' Bill of Rights.

On February 9, when those who were in Washington going to Philadelphia, we began our crusade across the Nation but we began it in North Carolina.

In the First Congressional District, we used a four county telecommunication. I communicated with four people on the Internet. Not the Internet, but information highway, to tell them about the Internet.

I had doctors there, nurses there. I had patients there. On one site I had 45 people. On the other site I had 32 people. On another site, I had 19 people and another site I had only seven people. Not only that, we also talked to doctors' offices at the same time.

We had doctors' offices signing their patients up. We had hospitals signing their patients up. We went to the police department and talked to the chief of police. He had his 78 people sign up. We went to the social services department and asked, are you insured? Do you have health insurance? Do you care about this? Of course they cared about it.

Teachers cared about that. We went to our churches the day following that and said if they did not have a computer there is a computer in the church. Tell your people to sign up. We told them use this technology. Go to your libraries.

It was a tremendous success. My understanding, to date there are more than 13,000, but I want to say I know that in North Carolina we knew at the end of Friday we had over 750 people, so now we ought to have over 1,000.

North Carolina is not the only one in it. It is an easy process. When people understand this, indeed they want to sign on, but we need to do more.

See, this bill represents managed care reform, but we also need health care reform. At least we ought to do this and do it right.

Madam Speaker, I encourage all my colleagues to join me in supporting and ensuring that patients, patients, have a real bill of rights. Apparently that is what the people want and indeed that is what the people deserve.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Speaker, I wanted to thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) for her comments.

Let me say, the gentlewoman has said it so well that this is really a common-sense approach. There is nothing miraculous here. If people understand what we are talking about with these patient protections, they want to sign the petition, they agree with us. I think that is what the gentlewoman and so many of our colleagues saw last week when they participated in this petition drive.

The gentlewoman said it so well. There are actually HMOs, good HMOs I should say, who actually support these patient protections. Some of them implemented some of the patient protections. Then there are other bad ones that have not. So we do not want to assume that this is not something that even some of the HMOs support, to be honest. Physicians support it.

One of the interesting things, because I know that the gentlewoman has been involved with the Indian Physicians Association, IPA; they were here a couple of weeks ago, just before our holiday break, and spoke to a lot of us, and it was interesting because some of the physicians and some of the people that were at that Indian physicians day also owned HMOs and they were very supportive of the Patients' Bill of Rights.

So I think, as the gentlewoman points out, if we get the word out, people understand it and they want to support this bill. They want to sign the petition. They want Republicans to bring this bill to the floor.

The other thing I wanted to mention, and I think the gentlewoman is so right when she talks about, we are dealing here with managed care reform, but there is the larger issue of the uninsured and so many people that no longer are insured that even were insured a few years ago. Again, I kind of feel like I am preaching to the choir because the gentlewoman has been involved with our health care task force for a long time now, and we tried to address the problem of the uninsured unfortunately in a piecemeal way.

I do not like piecemeal approaches for managed care reform any more than I do for trying to cover everybody. I would rather have universal health care coverage, but ever since the President brought forth a proposal and the insurance companies fought that so hard and killed it 4 or 5 years ago, we have had to try to deal with coverage in a piecemeal way.

We did the Kennedy–Kassebaum bill. We did the Kids Health Care Initiative. We had the Near Elderly Initiative. I know that the gentlewoman has been involved with all of these things as part of our task force. Those things have had some success, but again they show that a piecemeal approach is not adequate. There really cannot be a piecemeal approach to managed care reform or to health insurance coverage.

But again the political realities set in, so we do the best we can.

So I am glad the gentlewoman mentioned it because it is obviously true. There are more people uninsured today than there were 5 years ago.

Madam Speaker, let me point out that it is the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) who started this whole petition drive that was so successful last Friday. She came up with the idea of having the bus trip to Philadelphia with the President's rally and having our Members around the country deal with this on the Internet so effectively. It was a tremendous success, and I want to congratulate her for doing it.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALLONE. I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) for yielding. I am proud to join with the gentleman.

Before my colleague, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) leaves the floor, it was really very exciting. We had Members everywhere doing things, and the use of the technology not only to be on the Internet superhighway, but to use telecommunication or teleconferencing to gather in people just speaks volumes about what it is that we can do to reach out to people in this country.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Madam Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PALLONE. I yield to the gentlewoman from North Carolina.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Madam Speaker, I just want to say how the interaction works. My colleague, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) is on our health task force and she brought up the idea of using the nurses. Well, I want to say in our conference I happened to have one conference on the university campus, so I extended it out to the school of nursing. The dean came over and brought others, and the American Cancer Association. So we were able to use it.

One place we had at a community college where the university people came over. Another place, we had another community college we had relatively very few, about nine people, but they had gone out and gotten 60 names of people who wanted to participate. So those seven people multiplied almost five times.

So I want to thank the gentlewoman for thinking of this idea. I would not have thought of using the nurses if she hadn't mentioned it.

I want to thank the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) for being creative and forcing me to use the technology we have. This is a unique way of getting the grass-roots participation, using technology, democracy at its best, I think, for whatever cause. This certainly is a worthy cause so I thank the gentlewoman for that.

Ms. DELAURO. There were kind of two bites at the apple. One was the old fashioned highway where we get on the bus, which was great. It was a really terrific experience. The press conference here was great. Then using the Internet, and the extent to which our colleagues all over the country participated, it was just the beginning, which is really what is very exciting about it because I think that people understand that they can engage, that they really can be a part of what is happening and their voices can be heard in this body.

I think that that is one way of providing the best of the opportunities for the public to participate in the process of formulating good public policy, which is what essentially we are trying to do here.

I just would make one more point because the other thing, and both of my colleagues, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) mentioned this, when one thinks about it, just only a few years ago we were really consumed with the notion of how we were going to insure at that time the 38 million or 39 million people in this country who were uninsured, and today, quite frankly, we are just trying to deal with a holding action for people who do have insurance and making sure that they have

the access that they need and are provided with the health care that they are paying for.

We have kind of been sidetracked from looking at folks who do not have any insurance yet, and what we need to be doing is to try to deal with both parts of this equation, because it is so serious.

The whole point of all of this is just to say to patients and to people who have health insurance today that the decisions that are going to be made regarding your health care are decisions that are going to be made by physicians, by doctors, by health providers, in conjunction with you, the patient, and you are going to have a voice in this effort as well. It is not going to be an area in which the bureaucrats are going to have the final say.

My colleagues have gone through all of the parts of this effort and what is involved. This is very simple. It is very basic. It is a common-sense approach to health care, and that is if one needs emergency room care, they can get emergency room care. If one happens to have a specialist and is being treated for an illness and it happens that their employer changes the insurance coverage, that in fact they are guaranteed a continuity of the care that they have received and they can continue to see the physicians that were taking care of them under one particular plan and they can continue that under another plan.

We have all been the recipient of countless numbers of people who have told us the horror stories that they are going through, which is why this piece of legislation enjoys such a breadth of support.

□ 2200

It enjoys a breadth of support on both sides of the aisle, except that we have found that this body, for some strange reason, and I do not fathom it, and the President commented on it on Friday in Philadelphia, which is the fact that we have to resort to going the route of a petition nationally to get people to make their voices heard, to bring to life that which they believe out there on both sides of the aisle, because illness and health care is not a partisan issue, it affects everyone.

In fact, we have not had the opportunity in this body to be able to debate, to talk about, to in fact have the kind of attention brought to this issue that needs to be brought to it because in some way the leadership of this House has been blocking the passage of the Patients' Bill of Rights, when in fact there is tremendous and strong support for this effort nationwide.

So what we have done is that we kicked off this nationwide online petition drive, and I would just say that now, with the click of a mouse, and in the article that came out about my participation in this effort, the report is wonderful in a sense of the kind of, I should be more technologically competent, but this is a way to get engaged in it. I was fumbling around with the mouse to get it right. My kids, our kids, all of our kids and young people can do this in a heartbeat, but that is what we have to do. We have to take advantage of the opportunities to be able to use this.

We also had people that joined with us on Friday and over the weekend, health care providers. More than 40 medical and patient advocacy organizations took up the call for strong HMO reform, but they put the petition drive on their websites.

I want to urge my colleagues here tonight, those of us who engaged in these efforts, and there were about 80 or more Members who engaged in this effort, that individually we need to sign up and to make our voices heard. We can do that in a very, very easy way. We are thankful to Families USA for allowing us to engage in the website. That is, House Members need to just do www.FamiliesUSA.org, so that we individually can make our voices heard on this issue and sign up.

I want to mention the reason we went to Philadelphia, because I think it is important. There was real symbolism in going to Philadelphia. It is basically where our Bill of Rights was founded, our Declaration of Independence, our Constitution. This is where our Founding Fathers had a vision for this Nation and the laws that this Nation would rest on.

It is unfortunate that our health care system comes up short when it is measured against the standards that were established at the birth of this great Nation. The Republican leadership in this House want to have a Declaration of Independence, but they do not want to have the Constitution as part of it.

The Constitution, we can declare our support for a Patients' Bill of Rights, but we have to establish the laws to make it a reality. That is what our job is here today. That is what we are about, is to try to establish the laws that make this a reality. Without that, we are not going to be successful. Without those laws, that is not what our Founding Fathers wanted, and it is not good enough for our families today.

What we have to do is to take into consideration the health and well-being of the people we represent. That is what this effort is all about. We are going to continue to make the case. We will continue to have our colleagues and their own communities try to use whatever outreach mechanisms they can to engage the people in this country; to say to the people, and as the President said to the folks in Philadelphia, but more to the country, we need to have your voices in this process. That is the way in which our government works. That is what our democracy is about. That is why we have tried to engage in this effort.

I think it was a good effort. We had a lot of fun doing it on Friday, but it was only the beginning and the outset of the process.

I want to thank my colleagues for joining in tonight, and my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) for holding this special order so we could carry on the debate and the discussion. I thank him very much.

Mr. PALLONE. I want to thank the gentlewoman. Let me just say that she made a good point. She talked about the bus and the grass roots effort and the Internet, but she also made the point that it is kind of too bad that we have to do all of this.

The reason, and I am going to be very partisan about it, the reason is because the Republican leadership refuses to bring this bill up. We all remember very well that in the last session of Congress the only way we were able to get a vote on the issue at all was because of a discharge petition. We actually had to get the majority of Members of the House, or close to it, on a discharge petition, because they would not consider the bill in committee. They would not have any discussion or hearings on it. Only through the forced mechanism, if you will, of the discharge petition were we able to bring it up. It is true that there are some Republicans on the other side that support us, but their leadership will not bring it up.

I go back to what we discussed earlier, which is that the reason for that I am convinced is because of the insurance industry. It is the money and the power and the influence of the insurance industry on the Republican leadership that makes it impossible for this to come up, or that is the reason it is not coming up.

I resent the fact that over the last few weeks the industry has doubled its efforts now, with the ads on TV, with the ads in the print media, and basically we are seeing the same thing we saw last year to try to kill this bill.

The thing that is incredible about it, one of the things they were alleging in some of the ads I saw was about the cost. They keep saying that if we have these patient protections, it is going to cost too much.

One of the things that I did not mention about the New York Times editorial, which was right on point, I thought, it was in the next day after our rally, was that they say at the very end, it says, ''The insurance lobby is already embarked on a media blitz to defeat any new regulations as too costly. But consumer protections under the Democratic plan would increase the health plan costs by only a tolerable 2.8 percent, according to Congressional Budget Office estimates made last year, or slightly more if lawsuits against ERISA plans are permitted in state court. Health plans should be made to deliver what they promised, their enrollees, and held accountable when they fail.''

The bottom line is that every indication we have seen in every State that has passed some of these protections on a State level is that it has either no increased costs, or so minimal that it makes it not even relevant. I just resent the fact that this insurance industry advertising campaign and blitz is

trying to basically throw out falsehoods about what we are doing here today.

Ms. DELAURO. Just a final comment, because we have so many folks on the floor to speak tonight.

The fact is that with accountability, it is, again, common sense. If there is a particular entity that is going to engage in a medical decision and participate in that decision, and by some manner, by something it goes wrong, where there is an error, and to be a participant in that decision and then to say that you have no responsibility just does not make any sense.

You cannot have it both ways. You cannot be initiating medical decisions, making them on procedures, on prescription drugs, on the whole variety of areas, and then, if something goes wrong, then, my gosh, you can walk away and say, I have no culpability at all, no responsibility. That is not right, and that is, I think, one of the prime reasons why there is so much of a resistance to bringing this effort up.

But people who in good faith are the recipients of those medical decisions, by whomever they are made, need to have an opportunity to redress anything that may go wrong with those decisions.

Mr. PALLONE. I agree.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS), who again is a member of our task force, and has heightened this issue so many times for us, for her colleagues in the House.

Mrs. CAPPS. I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRANK PALLONE), and to say what a pleasure it is to be here with fellow colleagues from around the country, really; North Carolina we have heard from, and Connecticut, and we will be hearing from Texas and other places.

Mr. Speaker, last Friday I joined a nationwide effort to build support for the Patients' Bill of Rights. It was a privilege to do this, and to know that I was in concert with our efforts in my district out in the Central Coast of California, where I was in line with and online with those around the country in what we might call an old-fashioned petition drive, democracy in action.

I was at one of the excellent institutions of higher learning in my district, and took advantage of state-of-the-art computer facilities and was able to lead an online grass roots petition drive to encourage students to speak out on the importance of managed care reform.

We went to Santa Barbara City College, and the school of nursing was our host there, and invited other students to join us. We had quite a lively discussion as we logged on, because we began to talk about the fact that this is democracy in action, and this is the way that citizens of all ages, young students as well as middle-aged students and older people, could hear and discuss together the issues, but also make their wishes known to their representatives, not just their individual one, but to the leadership of this House, and to those of us in Congress who are in a position to take action on behalf of these, our constituents.

The computer lab stayed open, as it is available for all students. After our discussion was concluded and we had finished, it only takes a minute to do this, then people could go on their way and spread the word, and others could come in during the day. They talked about going home and telling their families about this opportunity that they would have as well.

So my hat is off to nursing students and my nurse friends there at City College and the other institutions that have allowed this to happen, the Learning Resource Center there.

As we were talking about the need to do this action in Congress, it came up, why? What has happened? How come it is out of whack and out of control the way it is?

In California, managed care has been a way of life for a great number of years. We began to think back, and it came into being, the HMO, as a way to counteract, and I was a nurse there for a long time in the schools, and I recall that all of us as patients, nurses, whatever our role, we are familiar with the high cost of health care, and that it began to rise so exponentially in the seventies and eighties, and there really was a need to curb it. It looked like a good thing was happening.

So as I have tried to get a handle on it and explain it to my student friends the other day, I describe it as a pendulum swung out of control to too high cost, at one point, and then swinging too far the other way as the excesses, really, of managed care have now come home to hit us, and to hit so many people really personally and tragically, or in serious ways.

Our job is to bring the pendulum back to the center again. Of course, the center is patient care; the need for the consumer, the patient, and that relationship with the doctor or other health care provider that is the heart of what health care is all about. It is a picture, too.

Some of the students said, well, they wanted to institute prevention and have opportunities for learning about taking care of our bodies, and learning about how to really be effective and responsible health care consumers.

Yes, in the beginning we had a lot of this impetus, but again, as the cost-cutting has come into play so strongly it has seemed that many of these good ideas that we saw, and perhaps still do, have fallen by the wayside. Now we hear about only so many visits for physical therapy, or so many opportunities. It is not with the patient's need or well-being in mind, even within the setting of managed costs, but this is really too far into that corner.

I have been hearing from constituents as long as I have been in office, and before that as a nurse in the school district I heard from families, about their real issues and about where these decisions need to be made. These voices of my constituents and others here need to be heard in Congress. We need to take action on behalf of patients and the recipients of health care.

I heard stories on Friday at Santa Barbara City College of even young people already having medical necessity determined by the insurance provider, and seeking redress and not being able to find it. They are frustrated. They want to express their concerns.

Medical decisions need to be made by patients and their doctors. Patients need to have all the information they need to make these critical decisions. There are some plain truths in health care.

Mr. Speaker, this historic measure will guarantee patients basic rights by allowing people to choose their doctor, to end oppressive gag rules so patients have access to all critical treatment options, and to establish medical necessity, to have medical standards for quality of care.

Most importantly, this bill will hold HMOs accountable by giving patients critical legal recourse when insurance companies deny necessary medical coverage. If patients can sue their doctors for poor care, they should be able to sue insurance bureaucrats who determine medical decisions.

Mr. Speaker, last week we saw people all across the country and in my district take part in a movement to restore common sense to health care. These people have often felt isolated from the political process. They could log onto the Internet as a means of raising their voices. So far, thousands of people across the country have logged onto the Families USA website, and this will continue as citizens across the country want to lend their support to the Patients' Bill of Rights.

□ 2215

The American people have spoken and they are speaking, and now Congress needs to listen to them. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) for giving me the opportunity to share my experience.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman and she talked about the preventive nature of these patient protections, and I think that is so true. And I think also one of reasons why we find that they do not increase costs is because they are prevention and ultimately they reduce costs. In fact, even the right to sue, which was mentioned, every time we have looked at this in the States that have implemented these kinds of patient protections and allowed the ability to sue, it even serves as a preventive measure because the HMOs take precautions because they do not want to be sued and they do not want to have huge damages recovered against them.

It is very important for us to keep that in mind, that all of this is preventive and ultimately that is why it does

not cost additional money and I think in the long run saves money.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) who has been involved in the Kids Health Care Initiative and Kennedy–Kassebaum and now the Patients' Bill of Rights.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his leadership and the wiseness of this special order and I enjoyed hearing my colleague from North Carolina, my colleague from Connecticut, and now California; and I will soon be hearing from my colleague from Texas. We all must have had some sort of signal on this issue.

I know of the great leadership of the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) and her long years of service as a nurse. In fact, we were so happy to have her involvement and instruction to us on this very important issue even as a newer Member of Congress, and we appreciate it.

The reason why I think we have ESP is that I went to a school of nursing in my district, having been raised by a nurse. My mother was involved in hospital work for many, many years, and I knew that her prime concern was the care of the patient.

This is one of the most commonsense bills I have ever read. And I want all who are listening to know that we who are speaking have read it and believe that it is only fair to put ''patient'' back in health care and medical care. And that is what the Patients' Bill of Rights does.

It was so refreshing to be at the Prairie View A&M College of Nursing with Dean Brathwaite and Professor Bernard and others and to see 60 or so nursing students, including, I am told, one of the largest classes of male nursing students, talk about their concern about patient care.

So we began the process by educating and discussing these elements, how important it is for these young nurses to have the ability to be part of the decision-making process, to listen to the patient, to share the patient's information with the physician and let that be the prime decider of how their health care should be determined, rather than a bureaucrat sitting behind a desk and, I hate to say it, maybe using the Internet or the computer to say no because we are trying to use the Internet for a good reason. But I have heard from so many of my constituents to say that they just got a cold call saying they cannot have this service, they cannot have this specialty service.

One of the issues that I think is so very important in the Patients' Bill of Rights for women is the direct access to obstetricians and gynecologists. Heretofore, we have had to spend a long time arguing about the importance of the OB/GYN relationship between patient and physician. Unfortunately, this is only made clearer in the Patients' Bill of Rights by way of giving the woman an option of seeing a family physician for general health concern and access to an OB/GYN for routine annual examinations.

One of the most devastating cancers is ovarian cancer, and in a recent article it was determined that there is a new test that could be utilized on a yearly basis for women to catch ovarian cancer early. In the present health structure that would be a distant opportunity or possibility for women now who may not have direct access to their OB/GYN.

This fits very well, this Patients' Bill of Rights, with this new medical find, this new technology, to provide an early detection of ovarian cancer. This works out perfectly because it gives women the access to their OB/GYN.

This idea of not being able to have an immediate review when it has been denied does not make sense. Patients are fishing for someone who they can ask. Their child needs this service, they need a specialist. I think the Patients' Bill of Rights is common sense. It is common sense not to discriminate against someone because of race, color, ethnicity, religion, age, mental or physical disability, sexual orientation, genetic orientation, or source of payment.

The Patients' Bill of Rights answers the concerns of so many Americans who have said they have been denied because they have a prior or previous existing disability; they have been denied because of age, and no one tells them that it is age, but they have a guess that that is the reason why they have been denied; because they live in a certain community, which may be urban or rural; they may come from a certain racial background.

We know in certain racial populations there are histories of high blood pressure. In the African-American community, histories of stroke. And, therefore, these individuals have found themselves being subject to denials for coverage because of certain traits that are obviously not within their power sometimes to change.

So I was very pleased to be able to join with the student nurses at the Prairie View A&M University College of Nursing to join on April 9, Friday, as many were in Philadelphia and Washington. I hope that the gentleman from New Jersey got the word that we were signing on on the Internet. The nursing students could not wait.

We also announced that the Texas Association of Nurses added their name to the list of supporters of the Patients' Bill of Rights along, of course, with the American Medical Association and the National Nursing Association as well. We were so enthusiastic that if the gentleman would beg our pardon, we were going to combine new technology with old fashioned ways.

Friday, this coming week, we are going to announce an effort in our churches so that churches on Sundays will be able to have handwritten petitions. They may not be able to sign up on the computers on Sundays when the members come to church, but we will have handwritten petitions that we will be adding to the superhighway and they are looking forward to doing that in my district. So I welcome that. I do not want to deny anyone the opportunity to sign up and we are going to have that effort.

I thank the gentleman from New Jersey very much for holding this special order. Let me encourage my colleagues in a bipartisan way, in the spirit of Hershey which I participated in, let us ensure that the 61 percent of patients who complained about the decreased amount of time they spend with their doctors get relief. Let us ensure that the 59 percent who complained about the difficulty in seeing medical specialists get relief. And let us ensure that the 51 percent who complained about the decreased quality of health care for the sick get relief.

Mr. Speaker, the way to get relief is if we pass this Patients' Bill of Rights in a nonpartisan or bipartisan manner and respond to the health crisis that is going on in America.

With that, I thank the gentleman again for giving me this opportunity. Certainly, I want to join in acknowledging and thanking the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) for this idea, and hoping that we will see the fruits of our labor very, very soon.

I rise today to add my voice in support of the Patients' Bill of Rights. The Patients' Bill of Rights sets a Federal standard to ensure that Americans will have basic consumer protection in their health care plans.

Last Friday, like many of my Colleagues, I met with the nursing students of the Prairie View A&M University College of Nursing where we discussed the negative imput of the present HMO structure on their ability to give patient care. We must reform managed care so the patients' needs are first priority and not the whines on of an HMO adminsitrator.

Those students and staff along with myself enthusiastically signed onto the Internet to push for their bill to come to the floor. We must pass a Patients' Bill of Rights this session.

I support the Patients' Bill of Rights because I believe Americans deserve quality health care from their managed care plans. I have received many letters from constituents that express their dissatisfaction with the care that they received from HMOs.

Texans and all Americans want a Patients' Bill of Rights because we want quality care from HMOs. A Kaiser Family Foundation study found that 73 percent of voters believe that patients should be able to hold managed care plans accountable for wrongful delays or denials.

The same study also found that 61 percent of patients complained about the decreased amount of time doctors spend with patients; 59 percent complained about the difficulty in seeing medical specialists; and 51 percent decreased the quality of health care for the sick.

There are 13 essential consumer protections contained in the Patients' Bill of Rights. Some of the basic tenets include:

Oversight through Federal and State governments and other entities to monitor the quality of care given to patients. Patients -

should know that there is active oversight, and not rubber-stamping of the care they receive.

Direct access to Obstetricians and Gynecologists for women. The unique health needs of women should be addressed in any health care plan. Women should have the option to see a family physician for general health concerns and access to an OB/Gyn for routine annual examinations.

Uniform licensing standards for all health plans. All plans should meet national standards of care and should be licensed to operate in the states where they do business.

Nondiscrimination in the delivery of services on the basis of race, color, gender, ethnicity, national origin, religion, age, mental or physical disability, sexual orientation, genetic information, or source of payment. No one should receive substandard care on the basis of these factors.

Ability to make informed choices about the various options and the level of care. Patients should have all of the information necessary to make decisions about their care including alternative treatments.

Unlimited access to emergency care and to specialists when necessary. Emergency care should be available at any time without prior authorization for treatment. If a specialist is needed, patients should be able to receive his/her services.

Additionally, as chair of the Congressional Children's Caucus the HMO system today sometimes hurts health care for children by denying these young patients the specialists care they need. Mental health services are also vital to children and more attention needs to be given to providing such services to children since now ⅔'s of American children do not have access to mental health services or pediatric specialists.

Simply stated, the Patients' Bill of Rights provides consumers with the basic protections that are necessary to ensure that they receive quality care.

The Patients' Bill of Rights should not be controversial for any Member of Congress who is serious about protecting patients from insurance company abuses. The choice is clear. We should stand with patients, families, and doctors, not with the well-heeled special interests that put profits ahead of patients.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Texas and assure her that we heard these voices loud and clear on April 9 when so many people signed on to the Internet. As so many of our colleagues said, we are going to keep going and with her help we will keep going.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN) my colleague on the Committee on Commerce who has been so much involved with the health care initiatives that we have made over the last few years, Kids Health Care, Kennedy–Kassebaum and the others.

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank my New Jersey colleague for being chair of our Health Care Task Force of the Democratic Caucus, and I think after what happened this last week and the American people have made very clear about what issues they want this Congress to work on. At the top of that list is managed care reform.

Of course, I think we have heard not only that voice but that echo now for a number of years. And last year the Republican leadership failed to make the good-faith effort to pass meaningful HMO reform. In fact, the bill that we passed is what I called a sham bill that did nothing to protect patients.

While it had a good name, the Patient Protection Act really did more to protect the insurance companies than anyone else. And I say that because actually it rolled back the State law in the State of Texas that the State of Texas had passed in 1997. And almost every one of the so-called patient protections had loopholes big enough to drive a car through.

Fortunately, the Senate had enough sense not to force through that partisan bill that did not adequately protect patients, and this year it seems the roles are reversed. This year the Senate ''HELP'' Committee passed a managed care bill along party lines and rejected 20 out of 22 Democratic amendments. The only amendments they accepted were technical in nature. The 20 amendments designed to protect patients in managed care were voted down one by one.

Now, they did not all deal with allowing patients to sue their health care provider. So 20 of those amendments, Mr. Speaker, were rejected. Republicans rejected amendments that would have protected women who undergo mastectomy for breast cancer and rejected expanding access to emergency room care and access to clinical trials so that patients in the managed care system can have the cutting-edge health care available.

Hopefully, the House will act more responsibly this year and reject the Senate proposal. Our House Committee on Commerce began hearings already, we had one hearing on a promised bipartisan hearing schedule for managed care reform. Certainly, the press releases and the public statements by the House and committee leadership has been encouraging. Let us just hope that they follow through with their commitment to bipartisanship and agree to support real managed care reform like the Patients' Bill of Rights.

That means not just a flashy title or a few catch phrases, but elimination of gag clauses for all physicians and providers and patients; provide timely and binding external appeals; guarantee access to specialists and emergency room care and, again, access to clinical trials so patients can have cutting-edge technology, allow doctors to determine what is medically necessary, and also protect the privacy of medical records.

Most importantly, managed care reform holds the medical decision-maker accountable. Now, the medical decision-maker sometimes may not be that provider. What some people either do not understand or care about is that there is no accountability without liability. There is no accountability without liability. We can pass all the patient protections we want with the best appeals and full access to specialists, but if a health plan cannot be punished for ignoring these medical decisions, they will continue to ignore doctors' treatment decisions and patients will continue to suffer.

Managed care was begun in our country and I understand. Before I was elected to Congress, my job at my company was dealing with insurance companies and negotiating for health care for our employees. And having dealt with them, I know the cost that individual businesses were seeing, and so managed care was created to control those costs.

Again, they have done that. But let us bring that pendulum back and say, we want to control those costs, but we do not want to see the loss of quality for those employees that I used to have to find their insurance for or the people out there who today are trying to find that insurance.

Mr. Speaker, I again thank my colleague from New Jersey for his leadership and also this special order this evening allowing those of us, who all have different ways we talk, to talk about from all across this country how important real managed care reform is for this session of Congress.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I thank both my colleagues from Texas. As they say, Texas is one of the first States to actually implement these patient protections that we are talking about. But we still need the Federal legislation, because so many people are not covered by State legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE. Mr. Speaker, I agree with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN), and there was one point that I wanted to add, because I know that he has worked very hard on this issue of children's health.

I think we should really make very plain and clear that the Patients' Bill of Rights is going to enhance the care of children. One of the things negatively that comes out of being denied is the denial of a specialist for a child. Many parents have made mention of the fact that this insurance covers them, it is managed care insurance, their child needs this kind of procedure and this kind of specialist. Yet, when the parent goes to their insurance company to seek it, they are denied.

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing more hurting than a parent who cannot help to provide good health care for their children. So I think that we should not leave tonight without noting how important this is to the children of America, and particularly those children needing mental health services who for so long have been denied access.

Two-thirds of America's children do not have access to mental health services. So I would simply say that we are talking of adults, adults probably signed on the Internet. But this has an enormous reach to the children of America to make sure that they have good health care.

I just wanted to add to the gentleman's comments as well to make sure

we did not forget the children in all of this.

Mr. PALLONE. The gentlewoman is absolutely correct. One of the criticisms that we have had of the Republican bill, the leadership bill, is that although sometimes it provides for pediatric care or a pediatric specialist, it does not in any way provide for the subgroups. As we know, today oftentimes children need to go to a specialist other than just the pediatrician, who has almost become a general practitioner. That kind of specialty care is not provided for in the Republican bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GREEN).

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in the closing minutes of the special order, I would like to mention what the gentleman from New Jersey said about changing Federal law, because again the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) and I are both from Texas, and Texas changed the law in 1997 for those insurance policies that are licensed under State law. I know it is being considered by dozens and dozens of States.

But in Texas I have seen the percentage, that over 60 percent of the health insurance policies in our State are issued under ERISA, under Federal law. So we can have the best laws we want to coming out of our State capitols all across the country, and I think the one in Texas is really revolutionary, so to speak, and I hope other States will follow this on those policies that are licensed by State law; but we have to pass something in Congress to affect Federal law, to affect those multi-State companies that have plans in the gentleman's district, in my district, and yet they come under Federal law.

So we need to deal with the majority of the people. That is why Congress has to take up this standard and follow the lead of States like Texas. I know New Jersey is considering it also. I would hope that we would have that.

That point needs to be made. It is not Congress meddling in States' rights, it is Congress learning from the success that we have had, at least in the State of Texas, and following through. Okay, it has worked in Texas. We have not seen breaking down the courthouse doors with all these lawsuits that have been threatened or at least threatened by the insurance companies.

All it is is trying to manage the field, to make that pendulum come back a little bit so we talk about quality. We have to pass a Federal law to give our constituents, no matter who they work for, whether it is an in-State insurance policy or a multi-State, that same protection. Again, I thank the gentleman for bringing that up.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, Labor Secretary Alexis Herman and my colleague XAVIER BECERRA joined me for a rally and press conference at Los Angeles County+USC Medical Center to unveil the nationwide internet petition calling for a Patients' Bill of Rights.

Based on the enthusiasm of the large crowd that morning, my guess is that this is going to be a popular petition across my State and our Nation.

And there is good reason for it to be popular. The petition, at www.familiesusa.org calls for a meaningful Patients' Bill of Rights—A Patients' Bill of Rights that guarantees:

access to specialists,

choice of health coverage, by offering an alternative to HMO's of that is all an employer can provide.

access to emergency care whenever and wherever it is needed,

the right of patients to hold their HMO accountable,

protection for providers who advocate for patients,

and, access to approved clinical trials when no other treatment is available.

The importance of guaranteeing these rights cannot be overstated. Passage of a meaningful Patients' Bill of Rights will save lives.

Last Friday we heard the stories of two victims of HMO practices, Nick Enriquez and Serenity Silen. Both were children who deserved much better care than they received.

The story of Serenity's father's battle with his HMO to save his daughter's life epitomizes why we need a meaningful Patients' Bill of Rights.

Serenity was diagnosed with leukemia, but only after having been misdiagnosed four times because HMO's were not willing to pay for the cost of full medical diagnostic tests, such as a complete blood count.

After about 2 months, Serenity's father had to take her out of his HMO's network to finally get a proper diagnosis.

But it did not end there, when Serenity returned to the HMO for treatment, she received substandard care. At one point, when Serenity went into remission, she could have been given a bone-marrow transplant that would have increased her chances of survival. Instead, the HMO said a transplant procedure was ''expensive'' and only reserved as a last-ditch effort. But this delay jeopardized any future transplant, and fatally endangered Serenity's life.

After an exhausting struggle with the HMO, Serenity's father found a hospital outside of the HMO network that could provide proper care for her. But it was too late. Because of their focus on cost instead of care, the HMO created a time delay that resulted in irreversible damage to Serenity's health and caused her premature death.

We cannot let this type of practice continue. Health care decisions belong back in the hands of patients and doctors, not insurance company administrators who are only watching the bottom line.

Serenity's father said it best. ''Children deserve to live.'' No child should ever have to go through what Serenity experienced.

Let us, together, do something about this.

Let us bring compassion back to health care.

Let us put patients first.

Let us pass a meaningful Patients' Bill of Rights.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is absolutely right. What we need is comprehensive Federal reform, and the Patients' Bill of Rights is the best and the most comprehensive managed care bill before the Congress.

I am just hopeful that with this electronic petition drive, that we will convince the Republican leadership and make them understand that they should not waste time, and they have to bring the Patients' Bill of Rights to the floor so we can pass it here, pass it in the Senate, and then send it on to the President, who indicated very strongly on Friday at our rally that he would sign this bill when it gets to his desk.

ONGOING KOSOVO CRISIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON) is recognized for half of the time remaining before midnight.

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight in what I hope will be a nightly discussion in this body on what I think is one of the most dangerous involvements of our military in recent time; that is the ongoing situation in Kosovo.

It is my hope that Members on both sides of the aisle will rise on the House floor at the end of each day's session, as we saw to some extent in the 5-minute special orders today, to discuss the current situation, what our plans are, to interact and engage with the administration, not necessarily in a partisan way, but in a way to look for solutions that bring dignity to the people of Kosovo, that bring stability and sense back to the Balkans, and that provide the best possible course of action for the safety of American soldiers and those who are currently involved and those who might be involved in the Balkan Theater.

Let me first of all say that this should be constructive discussion, again, and should not be based on partisan rhetoric or name calling. Now, with our troops deployed in the air assault, should not be the time for us to tear down past actions even though we may disagree with them. But I think two things are certainly clear that we should make at the beginning of each of our discussions, so that no one can misinterpret the debate or the discussion in this country about America's position in Kosovo.

The first is that no one, including Milosevic, should underestimate America's resolve to stop the torture, the ethnic cleansing and the bloodshed that he has perpetrated on the people of his nation and especially the people of Kosovo. He should understand that Republicans and Democrats are united in their resolve to make sure that he is held accountable for the atrocities that he has perpetrated on innocent people. No one should underestimate our resolve in that area.

The second point that we should make clear at the outset is a simple one and one that we all agree on, and that is that we unequivocally support our troops. They are in harm's way right now. They have our full prayers

and blessings. Each and every one of our colleagues in this body and the other body are doing everything possible to give our men and women serving on behalf of this Nation all the support, the resources, the tools, and the equipment and protection they need to carry out their mission.

Those two things are unmistakable. Those two things are not in the debate. We are committed to deal with Milosevic as a Congress and as a country, and we are behind the President in that. We are committed to support our troops in their deployment that they are currently pursuing.

But, Mr. Speaker, I am concerned with some of the rhetoric that I am hearing on the talk shows. I have done appearances on the networks and today with CNN. I am listening to some of my colleagues and some of the discussion from the think tank experts inside the beltway here who are moving very rapidly toward the notion that we should prepare or, if not prepare, that we should actually deploy American troops on the ground.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very dangerous decision that we must consider carefully, completely, and thoroughly. Even though I did not agree with the President's initial position to get us involved in a NATO-sponsored air campaign, I do think that we need to have a discussion about where we go from here.

I think all of us listened to the White House tell us that perhaps a short period of time would transpire, when we started the aerial assault, and then Milosevic would in fact give in. Unfortunately, we are now into weeks instead of days, and there does not seem to appear to be a lessening of Milosevic's resolve.

But before we move into the next phase and prepare or actually send in American ground troops, we in this body had better have some very serious discussion and debate about what our policy is and what it should be, because committing ground troops carries heavy burdens.

I think we still have some other options. The ground troops from America should only be committed as a final resort, as a last resort when we have depleted and used up all other options that are available to us. I am convinced that we have not yet reached that point. In fact, I think we have some very serious things that we could be doing, which I will outline in a few moments.

I also want to make the point very clearly, Mr. Speaker, that when our colleagues and when the pundits inside the beltway talk about deploying our troops, they need to understand what that means. It is too easy for Members of Congress to say ''send in the troops.'' These are not robots we are talking about. These are human beings. They are the sons and the daughters and the moms and dads of the American people.

When we commit our young people and our military personnel to go into harm's way, we had better have thought through the actual activity for which they are going to be involved. We better think about the objectives. We better think about the danger to their lives.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, my concern is that some of the people inside of this beltway want to commit our troops too quickly, and that has resulted in a terrible problem that we are not now trying to deal with within the military.

In fact, let me show a chart here, Mr. Speaker, which I think sums up the situation very well. In the years from World War II until 1990 and 1991, all of the commanders in chief during that time period that started with Dwight D. Eisenhower and Harry Truman and then went on to John Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson, Jimmy Carter and Ronald Reagan and George Bush, in all of those years, under all of those Presidents, Republicans and Democrats alike, they committed our troops just 10 times, 10 deployments in 40 years, only where it was absolutely essential to put our troops in harm's way.

From 1991 until today with the Kosovo deployment, we have seen our troops deployed 33 times. Ten times in 40 years, 33 times in the last 8 years.

Mr. Speaker, none of these 33 deployments were budgeted for or paid for in advance. The cost for all of these deployments came out of an already decreasing defense budget. Bosnia up until now has cost the American taxpayers $10 billion. All of that had to be eaten out of other defense requirements and priorities or had to be funded through special supplemental appropriations.

Kosovo, in the short period of time we have been deployed there, has cost the American taxpayer $2 billion, and the daily price tag for Kosovo is increasing exponentially.

Members of Congress and pundits in Washington who are quick to want to commit our troops to this 33rd ground deployment need to understand that we have not identified, first of all, a way to pay for this operation.

But that is not the largest issue involved here, Mr. Speaker. Because we have deployed our troops 33 times in 8 years, because we have sent our troops from Macedonia, to Bosnia, to Somalia, to Haiti, to domestic situations, from Kuwait to now the deployment in Kosovo, the morale among our young people in the military is starting to suffer.

Today, Mr. Speaker, the retention rate for pilots in the Navy and the Air Force is the lowest it has been since World War II. The Army is having such a difficult time recruiting young people to go into the Army that they are now resorting to lowering the threshold. Secretary Caldera has suggested that we should now allow non-high school graduates to sign up for Army service. In fact, we have Navy ships at sea today who are 600 and 700 sailors short from the required optimum strength that they should be carrying in the deployments that they are completing.

These situations are not happening in a vacuum, Mr. Speaker. They are happening because of this deployment rate of committing our troops month after month around the world in a number of situations which requires these young people to be away from their families and children for much longer periods of time.

In addition to morale problems, the cutbacks in our funding necessary to pay for these deployments are causing us to stretch out programs so that we are not modernizing our military the way we should.

I understand that President Clinton will be, or maybe he did today deliver a speech to our B–52 pilots. I am glad he did that. It is important to let them know that we are behind them. But I wish the President would address to them the fact that those B–52s are going to be flying when they are 75 years old because we have not provided the funding to replace those aircraft in a more timely manner.

That is the real tragedy of what we are doing with our rapid deployment, with our increased OPTEMPO rate, and yet not providing the support to maintain the readiness of our troops that they so desperately need.

All of those factors must be considered in the equation of whether or not America should put ground troops into Kosovo. I think it is a very serious challenge that we have ahead of us, Mr. Speaker, in considering whether or not we should support the administration's efforts to move forward with a multinational ground force, especially one that involves U.S. troops.

We need to understand that unless this Congress is prepared to address the issues that are causing morale problems in the services today, that are causing retention rates to be at the lowest point ever, to cause young military personnel to want to leave the service instead of reenlisting, then we have got a major problem.

□ 2245

I would challenge our colleagues, Mr. Speaker, that are so adamant today about committing ground troops. Are they prepared to support the reinstatement of the draft if we continue to have problems with young people not signing up for the military? Are they willing to vote to reinstate the draft, as we did during the Vietnam War, to suck young people in, to force them to go into combat?

That could be the need if we continue to have the problems that we are having because of the deployment of troops today around the world, troops that continue to provide cover in Haiti, continue to be in Bosnia, continue to be in Somalia, continue to be in Kuwait, continue to be in Macedonia, and now may be expected to go into Kosovo perhaps even in large numbers.

Mr. Speaker, I think the Kosovo deployment that is being talked about

now by the U.N., whether it is under the title of peacekeeping or a military force, is going to involve conflict, it is going to involve hostile actions, it is going to involve casualties, and it is going to involve loss of life. Before we make that commitment, this Congress needs to make sure that we have explored every other option.

Mr. Speaker, I come to the House floor tonight because I do not think we have explored every other option. I want to present one and I want to challenge the administration tonight to follow through on my suggestion.

Mr. Speaker, as many of our colleagues know, I focus a lot of my time on dealing with Russia. I formed and I chair the congressional initiative between our Congress and the Russian parliament, the State Duma. I have been to Russia a number of times. I host members of the Duma when they come to Washington, and I interact with Duma leaders on a regular basis. In fact, of the 450 members of the State Duma, I know over 150 members personally, including the leaders of all the seven main factions that lead the State Duma in their deliberations.

In fact, I was supposed to speak at Harvard University before the end of April to the visiting class of Duma deputies that Harvard runs a training program for each year to give them the orientation of the way our Congress works in America so that the Russian Duma can learn from our experiences.

Last week, the Russian Duma canceled the next visit that they were planning to make to Harvard. They canceled that visit because of the Kosovo situation. Last week, Mr. Speaker, I talked to my friend in the Duma on the phone, after having met with a couple of Russian leaders in person at a conference last week in Philadelphia.

One of my friends who is a senior leader of the support of the Russian Duma told me that in the 7 years since the reforms in Russia he had never seen the hostile feelings toward America as he is seeing right now because of Kosovo. In fact, he told me that almost every Duma deputy from the radical fringe of the communist and the LDPR's Zhirinovsky faction to the moderate members of the Duma and Yabloko faction, every member of the Duma is expressing outrage, outrage not only at the continual bombing in Kosovo, the bombing of Serbia, but outrage that Russia was not brought into a fuller dialogue in trying to find a way to end this crisis.

In fact, one of my friends told me that it is a dangerous situation in Russia right now. With President Yeltsin having illness problems and, I think, widely acknowledged as not being in total control of what is happening in Russia, there is more and more feeling that Russia may do things that create serious instability between the U.S. and Russia. That would be an international tragedy.

If Russia were to start supplying military equipment to the Serbians or if Russia were to even think about providing support in terms of forces to the Serbs, we would have a very, very dangerous and volatile situation.

We need to understand, Mr. Speaker, that there are some alternatives, and at least one that should be pursued. I understand that the President's initial action through NATO was to have the NATO countries, through a massive air campaign, bomb Milosevic into submission. Up until now, that has not worked. It may work in the future. And according to our President, we are in there for the long haul. That is going to be a terrible price we are going to pay both in terms of destruction to innocent people and buildings, also in terms of dollar investments on the part of the U.S.

My concern is that if we do not think through this process, we could see a situation where Russia could enter this conflict on the other side. I have no doubt that we would be victorious and that we would win any such battle. But, Mr. Speaker, we do not want Kosovo to be the start of a world war or a major conflict involving two nations with very capable nuclear weapons.

On Friday evening, Mr. Speaker, I received a telephone call from two of my friends in Russia who are involved in the State Duma. They had faxed to me earlier that day a memo asking if I would review a preliminary plan that they had put together that would perhaps provide a solution to end the hostilities in Kosovo. I read the document. I talked to the individuals on the telephone. I assessed their feelings about the Duma rallying behind this initiative. And then I called senior leaders in the administration to let them know that this had occurred and that I thought it was worthy of consideration.

Over the weekend, I had additional discussions. Today I talked to Members on both sides of the aisle, senior leaders of both parties, about their thoughts on the ideas presented by the members of the Russian Duma for our consideration. The individuals who called me, Mr. Speaker, asked me to give them my response about whether or not their ideas are realistic to begin a discussion.

Mr. Speaker, I think their ideas are worthy of consideration, and I encourage the administration to move in beginning negotiations which we could assist with in the Congress in terms of supporting, finding a new solution to the hostilities in Kosovo.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, the Russian side proposed to me that Russia would guarantee to the international community that no more ethnic homicide or ethnic cleansing would be carried on in Kosovo. The Russian side would guarantee that to the international community.

The second initiative that was proposed by the Russian side was that Russia would see that Milosevic agreed to the agreements reached at the contact working group of the NATO coalition in Rambouillet. So the Russians were proposing as their second condition that Milosevic come to the table agreeing to the Rambouillet accords, which the President has said are critical.

The one caveat that they mentioned was that they thought that the international peacekeeping force that would be put into Kosovo to guarantee the security and the stability for the Kosovars to make sure that conflict ended and to guarantee the rights of those citizens would not involve the militaries of any of those nations that are today bombing Serbia, that those nations that would make up the ground forces to implement the agreement and the Rambouillet accord would come from nations that are not today involved in direct hostilities against the Serbs.

In fact, the Russians even proposed some example countries. They suggested perhaps that these troops could come from Poland, the Netherlands, Greece, Albania, even Russia itself, and other European nations who have not been involved in the bombing campaign against the Serbs.

Mr. Speaker, I think that makes absolute sense to have a multinational force to enforce the accords that were reached in Kosovo to protect the Kosovars, overseen by troops from countries that are not involved in the hostilities today, who would then report to NATO as to the progress of enforcing the agreed-upon arrangements that were negotiated under NATO's leadership.

The third recommendation that the Russians proposed to me, Mr. Speaker, was that we establish a bilateral commission, a bilateral commission that in fact would be assembled in an informal way to monitor the Albanian Government's compliance, the Serbian Government's compliance with the agreed-upon framework established by NATO so that the parliamentarians of both nations would be involved. Not to set foreign policy, not to overrule or supersede the authority of the one leader we have in America, and that is our President, but to make sure from a parliamentary standpoint that all aspects of both governments, both parties in this country and all seven factions in Russia were, on a daily basis, monitoring the compliance to the peace accords that had been reached, which Milosevic would have agreed to.

Mr. Speaker, I think these initiatives are worthy of discussion. I think these initiatives are the direction that we should be going in terms of dialoguing with Russia about the situation in Kosovo and our relationship with Serbia. I am not saying it is the end-all or the cure-all or a perfect solution. But this is far better to talk about than to talk about preparing Americans to go into a ground war campaign and to look at killing more lives.

Someone at some point in time is going to have to pay to rebuild Serbia

and Kosovo. We need to understand that it should be our top priority today to find a peaceful way out of this conflict that allows dignity and respect for NATO, that allows dignity and respect for the process that we use, that allows Russia to regain the dignity in their relationship in the past with Serbia, and that shows Milosevic that neither Russia nor the U.S. nor the allied nations will tolerate the kind of actions that he has perpetrated on the people of Kosovo.

That is the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, that we have right now.

I have offered to my Russian friends to engage them wherever that might take place. They have talked about coming here. If need be, we could go there. But we need to find a way to proactively engage Russia in this solution.

I also think there is one other point that we should make, Mr. Speaker. The American taxpayers each year put approximately $600 million to $1 billion of U.S. tax money into the Russian economy. We do it through the cooperative threat reduction. We do it through economic development assistance through the Department of Commerce. We do it through the Defense Department with joint military programs and exchanges. We do it through the Environmental Protection Agency through environmental initiatives. We do it through a multitude of agencies and operations of the Federal Government.

Not only do I think it is in our interest to have Russia be more involved, I think Russia has a responsibility. America has been very helpful in securing additional funding for the replenishment of the IMF so that Russia can continue to work economically. America has been very aggressive in helping Russia deal with environmental problems, nuclear stabilization. In fact, the President just proposed this year an increase of $1.4 billion over 5 years to further help Russia stabilize its nuclear arsenal.

It is time that we called Russia in, not just through a long distance phone call, but in a real and substantive way, with all factions involved, from the radical left to the radical right, in helping us solve the problem of Kosovo in a way that reduces the risk of losing more lives, of damaging more property, and in a way that could lead to a further escalation of conflict.

□ 2300

So, Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight and I challenge the administration to take up the challenge that was given to me by my Russian friends who want to see us find a peaceful way, a peaceful way out of what is becoming a terrible tragedy and yet a peaceful way that recognizes that Milosevic is dead wrong and must be dealt with in an aggressive, firm way. There is still that possibility. We must take up that effort. And we must stop the talking about a ground war operation, a ground campaign and subjecting young Americans in a way that is going to cost lives and cause serious hardship for American families.

REGARDING THE CRISIS IN KOSOVO

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Without objection, the previous order for 5 minutes is vacated and the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) is recognized for not beyond midnight.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, like the gentleman before me who stood before this House, the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, I rise to address this House regarding the crisis in Kosovo, and my speech will echo some of the themes that he addressed, particularly at the end of his presentation.

Mr. Speaker, our actions in Kosovo are motivated by the highest level of idealism. We are willing to spend our treasure and, much more importantly, risk the lives of our men and women, to prevent atrocities and to assure that the Albanian Kosovars will be able to live in peace and with autonomy.

In some foreign capitals, they simply cannot believe this level of idealism. They are scurrying to find some ulterior motive. But those who understand America know that we are in Kosovo motivated by that idealism and certainly not motivated out of a desire to have some interest in some mineral resources less valuable than a single B–2 bomber. We who understand America and understand American idealism, know that that idealism will be expressed through our government.

Yet even in such a great idealistic undertaking, we must establish a realistic strategy. We must make sure that our idealistic motivations do not cloud our judgment. And here, Mr. Speaker, I would like to contrast realism with blinding idealism.

In a more ideal world, Kosovo would be the only place of tragedy and atrocity. But realistically we should note that the government of Sudan has killed 2 million of its African citizens, and that killing continues tonight; that 800,000 Tutsis were killed in Rwanda; and there are continuing mass murders on an enormous scale in the Congo, Myanmar and elsewhere.

In an ideal world, we could hope to easily restore Kosovo as a multiethnic, semiautonomous region. Realistically it is unlikely that Albanians and Serbs will live in harmony in the absence of an outside force. And it is just as unlikely that the Kosovars will renounce their goal of independence.

A blind idealist might see the world as pure good versus pure evil. Yet the Serbs, who we vilify today, were just a few years ago themselves victims of ethnic cleansing. Some 180,000 Serbs who had lived for centuries in Croatia were expelled from that country—while America said nothing, and did nothing. And the Kosovar Albanians, who are pictured today as the embodiment of all ideal virtue—we must remember that they are tragic victims of present circumstance—but they are represented in large part by the KLA, the Kosovo Liberation Army, an organization that the United States Government has described as terrorist, an organization that may have alliances with Iran, with Osama Bin Laden, and even with drug dealers.

Blind idealism would cause us to demand the maximum possible objective and believe that we could achieve that objective with the minimum force. Yet realism requires us to adopt perhaps more limited objectives consistent with the future safety of the Albanian Kosovars. And realism demands that we marshal the substantial force which may be necessary to achieve any realistic objective.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that we should take three steps.

The first echoes the comments of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I believe that we should involve Russia in the diplomatic efforts to the maximum possible degree. Russia may be able to pull the Serbs to a negotiating position that is more realistic, and more just, than the position that Milosevic insists upon taking at the present time.

Russian involvement in both diplomacy and in peacekeeping offers a face-saving method for Milosevic to make major concessions.

Now, I know that there are those who will stand before this House and who will say we should not be negotiating with Milosevic, we should be seeking to dispose of him. But I would point out that we are still waiting for someone to dispose of Saddam Hussein. And in a realistic world, we must try to bring an end to the mass murder as quickly as possible.

Involving Russia is important beyond the events at hand. Ten years from now, Kosovo may be nearly forgotten if we are successful in bringing peace today, but Russia will continue to be a critical nuclear-armed state, and treating Russia with respect now will be important in our relationship with Russia in the future. And we should remember that 85 years ago, Russia mobilized its army in support of Serbia in events that led immediately to World War I.

Tomorrow, Secretary Albright will meet with Igor Ivanov, the Foreign Minister of Russia. That meeting will take place in Oslo. Hopefully this is the first step toward the maximum possible involvement of Russia in bringing peace to Kosovo.

Second, we should signal now that we are willing to reach peace on the basis that the Rambouillet agreement would apply to roughly 80 percent of Kosovo territory rather than all of Kosovo.

No one denies that the Serbs have rights in Kosovo. They represented over 10 percent of the Kosovo population even today. When I say ''today,'' I mean before the tragic recent events. Kosovo has been part of Serbia for centuries, and Kosovo is the religious and

cultural birthplace of the Serbian nation. In fact, the Rambouillet agreement itself seeks to recognize Serb rights by stating that Kosovo would remain part of Serbia.

By leaving Serbs in control of the historically and religiously significant sites, including the original seat of the Serbian Orthodox Church, the most important of the monastery lands, and the battlefield of Kosovo Polje, on which the Serbs fought the Turks in the 14th century, we can make an offer that the Serbs can accept. Or, rather, Russia can make an offer that both sides can accept. In contrast, no Serb government, even one without Milosevic, even after 20 days of bombing, could accept the current Rambouillet agreement which the Serbs, and many other observers, believe would end all Serbian rights in all of Kosovo.

Certainly the Kosovar Albanians who represent roughly 85 percent of the population before the recent tragedy could live far better in roughly 80 percent of Kosovo's territory, protected by NATO troops as compared to asking those same people to live in refugee camps.

Third, we should begin training an army of Kosovar Albanians. This army should be independent of the KLA, and for now U.S. troops should control custody of the weapons while the training proceeds.

Milosevic may not believe that bombing will compel his departure from Kosovo, and he may not believe that NATO troops are willing to risk casualties in ground combat. But if there is an Albanian army being trained, then even Milosevic will know that there will be a ground force willing to absorb combat casualties which could be deployed in a matter of months.

□ 2310

This will hopefully impel him to negotiate now.

The administration asserts that bombing alone will bring Milosevic to his knees. If this is true, then we can cease the training operation and retain custody of the weapons without affecting the long term future of the Balkans.

There are those who insist that we try to achieve the maximum objective, Rambouillet applied to all of Kosovo with the minimum involvement of the Kosovars themselves. They advise deploying NATO troops while not even training the Kosovars. This approach is not only dangerous for our service men and women, it is also dangerous for our foreign policy. If we deploy NATO troops into hostilities, and if casualties rise to the point where the American public, or the German public, or the French public, or the British public demand the withdrawal of their Nation's soldiers, then the NATO alliance will be broken and Milosevic may prevail. If that occurs, then every tyrant and mass murderer in the world will feel that he can act with impunity. The Vietnam syndrome and the Somalia syndrome will return.

Mr. Speaker, we need the option, sometime in the near future, of being able to deploy a well-trained, well-armed force of Albanians—a force willing to take casualties because they are fighting for their own homes. Hopefully, by negotiating from strength we can achieve an agreement that will eliminate the need to deploy any combatant ground troops, NATO or Kosovar.

In conclusion, the American people have shown a willingness to commit their treasure, and more importantly the lives of their sons and daughters, to preventing atrocities and ameliorating tragedies. If we realistically define our objectives and if we prepare to use all of the tools at our disposal, we will secure a reasonable life for the Kosovars, and we will inspire the American people to support limited, realistic efforts to stopping atrocities in Sudan, Myanmar, the Congo and elsewhere. If instead we devote inadequate resources to an effort to achieve an absolute idealistic objective, we may fail, and that would be a tragedy for those service men and women who die in such an effort. It will be a tragedy for the Kosovars, and it would be a tragedy for the victims of atrocities around the world.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MCNULTY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GEJDENSON, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. POMEROY, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SHERMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. DUNCAN) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. DEAL of Georgia, for 5 minutes, on April 13.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana, for 5 minutes each day, today and on April 13, 14, 15 and 16.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, on April 13.

Mr. GOODLING, for 5 minutes each day, today and on April 13.

Mr. WICKER, for 5 minutes, on April 13.

Mr. PAUL, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KASICH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GIBBONS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART, for 5 minutes, on April 13.

Mrs. CHENOWETH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DUNCAN, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 243. An act to authorized the construction of the Perkins Country Rural Water System and authorized financial assistance to the Perkins County Rural Water System, Inc., a nonprofit corporation, in the planning and construction of the water supply system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

S. 278. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain lands to the country of Rio Arriba, New Mexico; to the Committee on Resources.

S. 292. An act to preserve the cultural resources of the Route 66 corridor and to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to provide assistance; to the Committee on Resources.

S. 293. An act to direct the Secretaries of Agriculture and Interior to convey certain lands in San Juan County, New Mexico, to San Juan College; to the Committee on Resources.

S. 334. An act to amend the Federal Power Act to remove the jurisdiction of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to license projects on fresh waters in the State of Hawaii; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 382. An act to establish the Minuteman Missile National Historic Site in the State of South Dakota, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

S. 422. An act to provide for Alaska state jurisdiction over small hydroelectric projects; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 756. An act to provide adversely affected crop producers with additional time to make fully informed risk management decisions for the 1999 crop year; to the Committee on Agriculture.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles;

On March 26, 1999:

H.R. 774. To amend the Small Business Act to change the conditions of participation and provide an authorization of appropriations for the women's business center program.

H.R. 808. To extend for 6 additional months the period for which chapter 12 of title 11, United States Code, is reenacted.

H.J. Res. 26. Providing for the reappointment of Barber B. Conable, Jr. as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

H.J. Res. 27. Providing for the reappointment of Dr. Hanna H. Gray as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

H.J. Res. 28. Providing for the reappointment of Wesley S. Williams, Jr. as a citizen regent of the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

On March 31, 1999:

H.R. 171. To authorize appropriations for the Coastal Heritage Trail Route in New Jersey, and for other purposes.

H.R. 193. To designate a portion of the Sudbury, Assabet, and Concord Rivers as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

H.R. 705. to make technical corrections with respect to the monthly reports submitted by the Postmaster General on official mail of the House of Representatives.

H.R. 1212. To protect producers of agricultural commodities who applied for a Crop Revenue Coverage PLUS supplemental endorsement for the 1999 crop year.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 14 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 13, 1999, at 9:30 a.m., for morning hour debates.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1302. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Table Grapes (European or Vinifera Type); Grade Standards [Docket Number FV–98–302] received March 30, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1303. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Cinnamaldehyde; Exemption from the requirement of a Tolerance; Correction [OPP–300769A; FRL–6069–2] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received March 17, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1304. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Clopyralid; Extension of Tolerance for Emergency Exemptions [OPP–300802; FRL–6066–2] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received March 17, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1305. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Imidacloprid; Extension of Tolerance for Emergency Exemptions [OPP–300808; FRL 6066–9] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received March 17, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1306. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Norflurazon; Extension of Tolerance for Emergency Exemptions [OPP–300803; FRL–6063–2] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received March 17, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

1307. A letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting notification of the 1999 compensation program adjustments, including the Agency's current salary range structure and the performance-based merit pay matrix; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1308. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report requesting transfers from the Information Technology Systems and Related Expenses account, pursuant to Public Law 105–277 (H. Doc. No. 106—49); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1309. A letter from the Director, Administration and Management, Department of Defense, transmitting the calendar year 1998 report on ''Extraordinary Contractual Actions to Facilitate the National Defense,'' pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1434; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1310. A letter from the Principal Deputy, Under Secretary of Defense, transmitting the Selected Acquisition Reports (SARS) for the quarter ending December 31, 1998, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2432; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1311. A letter from the Director, Congressional Budget Office and Director, Office of Management and Budget, Congressional Budget Office and Office of Management and transmitting a joint report on the technical assumptions to be used in preparing estimates of National Defense Function (050) fiscal year 2000 outlay rates and prior year outlays, pursuant to Public Law 101–189, section 5(a) (103 Stat. 1364); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1312. A letter from the Under Secretary for Acquisition and Technology, Department of Defense, transmitting a report on the estimated amount of savings, supporting rationale for allowing restructuring costs, and other information associated with restructurings; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1313. A letter from the Under Secretary for Acquisition and Technology, Department of Defense, transmitting a report entitled ''Current DOD Demonstration Program to Improve the Quality of Personal Property Shipments of the Armed Forces, Interim Progress Report''; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1314. A letter from the Alternate OSD Federal Register, Liaison Officer, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Civilian Health and Medical Program of the Uniformed Services (CHAMPUS); TRICARE Prime Enrollment Procedures (RIN: 0720–AA48) received March 22, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1315. A letter from the Under Secretary for Acquisition and Technology, Department of Defense, transmitting the authorization for the procurement by the Department of Defense of articles containing para-aramid fibers and yarns manufactured in the Netherlands; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1316. A letter from the Under Secretary of Defense, Comptroller, Department of Defense, transmitting notification that the Department of the Army is pursuing a multiyear procurement for the Longbow Hellfire missile for FY 1999 through FY 2003, pursuant to Public Law 105–261; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1317. A letter from the Director, Defense Procurement, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule—Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement; Employment Prohibition on Persons Convicted of Fraud or Other Defense-Contract-Related Felonies [DFARS Case 97–D020] received March 13, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1318. A letter from the Comptroller, Department of Defense, transmitting notification that the Department of the Navy is pursuing a multiyear procurement for the E–2C ''Hawkeye'' aircraft for FY 1999 through FY 2003; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1319. A letter from the Senior Civilian Official, Office of the Assistant Secretary Of Defense, Department of Defense, transmitting an interim report describing the plans for evaluating Year 2000 capabilities of DoD systems within operational environments; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1320. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Health Affairs, Department of Labor, transmitting a report on the establishment of an appeals process for TRICARE Claimcheck denials, pursuant to Public Law 105–261; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1321. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a report on government-wide spending to combat terrorism, pursuant to Public Law 105–85; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1322. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, transmitting an assessment of the technical and operational aspects of the Airborne Laser Program to the Congress, pursuant to Public Law 105–736; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1323. A letter from the Under Secretary of Defense, transmitting a report regarding the designation of ten ''Pilot Programs for Testing Program Manager Performance of Product Support Oversight Responsibilities for Life Cycle of Acquisition Programs.''; to the Committee on Armed Services.

1324. A letter from the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting notification that it is estimated that the limitation on the Government National Mortgage Association's (''Ginnie Mae's'') authority to make commitments for a fiscal year will be reached before the end of that fiscal year, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 1721 nt.; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1325. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule—Section 8 Certificate and Voucher Programs Conforming Rule; Technical Amendment [Docket No. FR–4054–C–04] (RIN: 2577–AB63) received March 18, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1326. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule—Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act (RESPA) Statement of Policy 1999–1 Regarding Lender Payments to Mortgage Brokers [Docket No. FR–4450–N–01] (RIN: 2502–AH33) received March 18, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1327. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule—Public Housing Agency Plans [Docket No. FR–4420–I–01] (RIN: 2577–AB89) received March 18, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1328. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Final Flodd Elevation Determinations—received March 22, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1329. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket No. FEMA–7281] received March 22, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1330. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Final Flood Elevation Determinations—received March 22, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1331. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations [Docket No. FEMA–7276] received March 22, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1332. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency,

transmitting the Department's final rule—Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations—received March 22, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1333. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Changes in Flood Elevation Determinations—Recieved March 22, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1334. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP); Insurance Coverage and Rates (RIN: 3067–AC96) received March 23, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

1335. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Postsecondary Education, Department of Education, transmitting final priorities and invitation for applications for new awards for fiscal year (FY) 1999, pursuant to 20 U.S.C. 1232(f); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1336. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Labor, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule—Dipping and Coating Operations (RIN: 1218–AB55) [Docket No. S–022] received March 22, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1337. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of the Acquisition Advocate, Department of Labor, transmitting the Department's final rule—Audit Requirements: Grants, Contracts, and Other Agreements and States, Local Governments, and Non-Profit Organizations (RIN: 1291–AA26 and 1291–AA27) received March 30, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1338. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Labor, transmitting copies of the 1998 reports of the Department's Advisory Council for Employee Welfare and Pension Benefit Plans; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1339. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the annual report to Congress on the implementation of the authority and use of fees collected under the Prescription Drug User Fee Act of 1992, pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 379g nt.; to the Committee on Commerce.

1340. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Office of Telecommunication and Information Applications, NTIA, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule—Public Telecommunications Facilities Program: Closing Date [Docket No. 990302059–9059–01] (RIN: 0660–ZA07) received March 17, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1341. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's ''Major'' final rule—Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Child Restraint Systems; Child Restraint Anchorage Systems [Docket No. 98–3390, Notice 2] (RIN: 2127–AG50) received March 18, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1342. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Control of Air Pollution From New Motor Vehicles; Compliance Programs for New Light-duty Vehicles and Light-duty Trucks [FRL–6312–9] (RIN: 2060–AH05) received March 17, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1343. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; California State Implementation Plan Revision, Yolo-Solano Air Quality Management District, Monterey Bay Unified Air Pollution Control District, South Coast Air Quality Management District, Santa Barbara County Air Pollution Control District, Sacramento Metropolitan Air Quality Management District, and Kern County Air Pollution Control District [CA 195–0101a; FRL–6235–8] received March 30, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1344. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations. (Dayton, Washington and Weston, Oregon) [MM Docket No. 98–90, RM–9270] received February 26, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1345. A letter from the AMD—Performance Evaluation and Records Management, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—1998 Biennial Regulatory Review—Review of International Common Carrier Regulations [IB Docket No. 98–118] received March 30, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1346. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Food Labeling; Serving Sizes; Reference Amount for Baking Powder, Baking Soda, and Pectin [Docket No. 94P–0240] received March 22, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1347. A letter from the Deputy Executive Secretary, Food and Drug Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Over-The-Counter Human Drugs; Labeling Requirements [Docket Nos. 98N–0337, 96N–0420, 95N–0259, and 90P–0201] (RIN: 0910–AA79) received March 22, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1348. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Food and Drug Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Food Labeling; Nutrient Content Claims, Definition of Term: Healthy; Extension of Partial Stay [Docket Nos. 96P–0500 and 91N–384H] (RIN: 0910–AA19) received March 22, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1349. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Policy and Procedure for NRC Enforcement Actions; Interim Enforcement Policy for Generally Licensed Devices Containing Byproduct Material [NUREG–1600, REV.1] received March 16, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1350. A letter from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Transition Rule for Ohio Investment Advisers [Release No. IA–1794; File No. S7–2–99] (RIN: 3235–AH60) received March 29, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

1351. A letter from the Acting Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, transmitting notification concerning the Department of the Air Force's proposed Letter(s) of Offer and Acceptance (LOA) to Korea for defense articles and services (Transmittal No. 99–11), pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(b); to the Committee on International Relations.

1352. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles or defense services sold commercially under a contract to Russia [Transmittal No. DTC 39–98], pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c); to the Committee on International Relations.

1353. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report on chemical and biological weapons proliferation control efforts for the period of February 1, 1998 to January 31, 1999, pursuant to Public Law 102–182, section 308(a) (105 Stat. 1257); to the Committee on International Relations.

1354. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Accountability Review Board report and recommendations concerning serious injury, loss of life or significant destruction of property at a U.S. mission abroad, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 4834(d)(1); to the Committee on International Relations.

1355. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting his notification directing U.S. Armed Forces to commence a series of air strikes in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (FRY) in response to the FRY government's continued campaign of violence and repression against the ethnic Albanian population in Kosovo; (H. Doc. No. 106–42); to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed.

1356. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an update on the report submitted on March 26, 1999 with regards to the participation of U.S. military forces in a series of air strikes conducted by NATO in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia; (H. Doc. No. 106–45); to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed.

1357. A letter from the Chief Counsel (Foreign Assets Control), Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Weapons of Mass Destruction Trade Control Regulations: Implementation of Executive Order 13094—received March 22, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

1358. A letter from the Director, Bureau of Economic Analysis, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule—Direct Investment Surveys: Raising Exemption Level for Annual Survey of Foreign Direct Investment in the United States (RIN: 0691–AA32) received March 23, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

1359. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendments to the International Traffic in Arms Regulations (ITAR): Control of Commercial Communications Satellites on the United States Munitions List—received March 15, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on International Relations.

1360. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 13–23, ''Apostolic Church of Washington, D.C. Equitable Real Property Tax Relief Temporary Act of 1999'' received March 19, 1999, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1–233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1361. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 13–22 ''Real Property Tax Reassessment and Cold Weather Eviction Temporary Amendment Act of 1999'' received March 19, 1999, pursuant to D.C. Code section 1–233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1362. A letter from the Chairman of the Board, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting a copy of the annual report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act during the calendar year 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1363. A letter from the Executive Director, Committee For Purchase From People Who Are Blind Or Severely Disabled, transmitting the Committee's final rule—Procurement List, Additions, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1364. A letter from the Director, Division of Commissioned Personnel, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting transmitting the annual report disclosing the financial condition of the Retirement Plan and Annual Report as required by Public Law 95–595, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9503(a)(1)(B); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1365. A letter from the Deputy Associate Administrator for Acquisition Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—General Service Administration Acquisition Regulation; Small Business Subcontracting Program [APD 2800.12A, CHGE 82] (RIN: 3090–AG96) received March 29, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1366. A letter from the Chairman and General Counsel, National Labor Relations Board, transmitting the National Labor Relations Board's (NLRB's) 2000 Performance Plan, pursuant to Public Law 103–62; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1367. A letter from the Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting a copy the report of the Consumer Product Safety Commission in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act during the calendar year 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1368. A letter from the Administrator, Small Business Administration, transmitting the semiannual report on activities of the Inspector General for the period April 1, 1997, through September 30, 1997, and the semiannual report of Management's Final Actions, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. app. (Insp. Gen. Act) section 5(b); to the Committee on Government Reform.

1369. A letter from the Chief, Customer Liaison Branch, U.S. General Services Administration, transmitting the annual Federal Procurement Report for fiscal year 1997; to the Committee on Government Reform.

1370. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Election Commission, transmitting 3 recommendations for legislative action, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 437d(d)(2); to the Committee on House Administration.

1371. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—North Dakota Regulatory Program [ND–035–FOR, Amendment No. XXV] received March 18, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1372. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Pennsylvania Abandoned Mine Land Reclamation Program; Pennsylvania Regulatory Program [PA–121–FOR] received March 17, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1373. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Department of the Interior, transmitting the 1997 Section 8 Report on National Natural Landmarks that have been damaged or are likely to be damaged; to the Committee on Resources.

1374. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in the Eastern Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 981222314–8321–02; I.D. 030599C] received March 16, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1375. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Fish and Wildlife Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Seasonal Closure of the Moose Range Meadows Public Access Easements in the Kenai National Wildlife Refuge (RIN: 1018–AE58) received March 17, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1376. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Fish and Wildlife Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Regulations for Administrative and Visitor Facility Sites on National Wildlife Refuges in Alaska (RIN: 1018–AE21) received March 17, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

1377. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule—Documentation of Nonimmigrants Under the Immigration and Nationality, as Amended; Photograph Requirement—received March 22, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1378. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, Office of Diversion Control, Drug Enforcement Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Schedules of Controlled Substances: Placement of Modafinil Into Schedule IV [DEA–17F] received March 22, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1379. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting the National Plan of Integrated Airport Systems (NPIAS), pursuant to 49 U.S.C. app. 2203(b)(1); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1380. A letter from the Vice President, Government Affairs, Amtrak, transmitting the 1998 Annual Report, and Amtrak's FY 2000 Legislative Report and Grant Request, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 1701y(f)(2); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1381. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification of Class E Airspace; Defiance, OH [Airspace Docket No. 98–AGL–67) received March 29, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1382. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification of Class E Airspace; Lima, OH [Airspace Docket No. 98–AGL–69] received March 29, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1383. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification of Class E Airspace; Tiffin, OH [Airspace Docket No. 98–AGL–70] received March 29, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1384. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification of Class E Airspace; Napoleon, OH [Airspace Docket No. 98–AGL–72] received March 29, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1385. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class E Airspace; Belle Plaine, IA [Airspace Docket No. 98–ACE–51] received March 29, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1386. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class E Airspace; Maquoketa, IA [Airspace Docket No. 98–ACE–50] received March 29, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1387. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class E Airspace; Burlington, IA [Airspace Docket No. 98–ACE–56] received March 29, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1388. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Pilot Responsibility for Compliance With Air Traffic Control Clearances and Instructions—received March 29, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1389. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification of Class E Airspace; BRYAN, OH [Airspace Docket No. 98–AGL–68] received March 29, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1390. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification of Jet Route J–42 [Airspace Docket No. 97–AEA–29] (RIN: 2120–AA66) received March 29, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1391. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revocation of Restricted Area R–5704 Hermiston, OR [Airspace Docket No. 98–ANM–23] (RIN: 2120–AA66) received March 29, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1392. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 29501; Amdt. No. 1921] received March 29, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1393. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model SA 330J Helicopters [Docket No. 97–SW–42–AD; Amendment 39–11092; AD 99–07–07] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received March 29, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1394. A letter from the Attorney, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Harmonization with the United Nations Recommendations, International Maritime Dangerous Goods Code, and Internatinal Civil Aviation Organization's Technical Instructions [Docket No. RSPA–98–4185 (HM–215C)] (RIN: 2137–AD15) received March 4, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1395. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification of Class E

Airspace; Port Clinton, OH [Airspace Docket No. 98–AGL–73] received March 29, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1396. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification of Class E Airspace; Grand Rapids, MI [Airspace Docket No. 98–AGL–77] received March 29, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1397. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Establishment of Class E Airspace; Kelleys Island, OH [Airspace Docket No. 98–AGL–74] received March 29, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1398. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification of Class E airspace; Shelbyville, IN [Airspace Docket No. 98–AGL–80] received March 29, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1399. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Establishment of Class E Airspace; Steubenville, OH [Airspace Docket No. 98–AGL–65] received March 29, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1400. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification of Class E Airspace; Toledo, OH [Airspace Docket No. 98–AGL–71] received March 29, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1401. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification of Class E Airspace; Adrian, MI [Airspace Docket No. 98–AGL–66] received March 29, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1402. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class E Airspace; Washington, IA [Airspace Docket No. 99–ACE–18] received March 29, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1403. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Establishment of Class E Airspace; Glencoe, MN [Airspace Docket No. 98–AGL–76] received March 29, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1404. A letter from the Attorney, Office of the Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Prohibition Against Certain Flights Within the Territory and Airspace of Serbia-Montenegro [Docket No. 29508; Special Federal Aviation Regulation (SFAR) No. 84] (RIN: 2120–AG78) received March 29, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1405. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; SOCATA—Groupe Aerospatiale Model TBM 700 Airplanes [Docket No. 99–CE–08–AD; Amendment 39–11096; AD 99–07–11] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received March 29, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1406. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Change Using Agency for Restricted Areas; FL [Airspace Docket No. 98–ASO–21] (RIN: 2120–AA66) received March 29, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1407. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Industrie Aeronautiche e Meccaniche Model Piaggio P–180 Airplanes [Docket No. 98–CE–97–AD; Amendment 39–11095; AD 99–07–10] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received March 29, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1408. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; British Aerospace Jetstream Model 3201 Airplanes [Docket No. 98–CE–91–AD; Amendment 39–11094; AD 99–07–09] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received March 29, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1409. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model SA. 315B Helicopters [Docket No. 98–SW–57–AD; Amendment 39–11093; AD 99–07–08] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received March 29, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1410. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Lockheed Model L–1011–385 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 96–NM–256–AD; Amendment 39–11090; AD 99–07–05] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received March 29, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1411. A letter from the Chief, Regs and Admin Law, USCG, DOT, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone: Chesapeake Bay, Patapsco River, Inner Harbor, Baltimore, Maryland [CGD05–99–009] (RIN: 2115–AA97) received March 18, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1412. A letter from the Chief, Regs and Admin Law, USCG, DOT, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Special Local Regulations for Marine Events; 1D48 Chesapeake Grand Prix Round-the-Buoys Races [CGD 05–99–012] (RIN: 2115–AE46) received March 18, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1413. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class E Airspace; Perryville, MO [Airspace Docket No. 99–ACE–1] received April 6, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1414. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class E Airspace; Palmyra, NY [Airspace Docket No. 99–AEA–03] received April 6, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1415. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class E Airspace; Mexico, MO [Airspace Docket No. 99–ACE–4] received April 6, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1416. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class E Airspace; Grand Island, NE [Airspace Docket No. 99–ACE–2] received April 6, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1417. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; McDonnell Douglas Model DC–9–80 Series Airplanes, and Model MD–88 Airplanes [Docket No. 98–NM–166–AD; Amendment 39–11099; AD 99–07–14] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received April 6, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1418. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Sikorsky Aircraft-manufactured Model CH–54A Helicopters [Docket No. 97–SW–60–AD; Amendment 39–11102; AD 99–07–16] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received April 6, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1419. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Construcciones Aeronauticas, S.A. (CASA) Model CN–235 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98–NM–219–AD; Amendment 39–11098; AD 99–07–13] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received April 6, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1420. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 747–100, –200, and –300 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 97–NM–87–AD; Amendment 39–11097; AD 99–07–12] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received April 6, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1421. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron, Inc.-manufactured Model HH–1K, SW204, SW204HP, SW205, SW205A–1, TH–1F, TH–1L, UH–1A, UH–1B, UH–1E, UH–1F, UH–1H, UH–1L, and UH–1P Helicopters [Docket No. 98–SW–31–AD; Amendment 39–11101; AD 99–07–15] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received April 6, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1422. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica S.A. (EMBRAER) Model EMB–120 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98–NM–265–AD; Amendment 39–11100; AD 99–02–18 R1] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received April 6, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1423. A letter from the Acting Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Transportation, transmitting

the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operation Regulations; Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Florida [CGD07–98–083] (RIN: 2115–AE47) received April 6, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1424. A letter from the Acting Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone: Bergen County United Way Fireworks, Hudson River, Manhattan, New York [CGD01–99–018] (RIN: 2115–AA97) received April 6, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1425. A letter from the Acting Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone; Ward Cove, Tongass Narrows, Ketchikan, AK [COTP Southeast Alaska 99–001] (RIN: 2115–AA97) received April 6, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1426. A letter from the Attorney, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Second Extension of Computer Reservations Systems Regulations [Docket No. OST–99–5132] (RIN: 2105–AC75) received April 6, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1427. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model AS 332C, L, L1, and L2 Helicopters and Model SA 330F, G, and J Helicopters [Docket No. 98–SW–46–AD; Amendment 39–11084; AD 99–07–02] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received March 25, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1428. A letter from the Senior Attorney, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Disclosure of Change-of-Gauge Services [Docket Nos. OST–1995–177, 47546, 45911, 45912, and 45913] (RIN: 2105–AC17) received March 18, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1429. A letter from the Attorney-advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision to Reporting Requirements for Motor Carriers of Property and Household Goods [Docket No. BTS–98–4659] (RIN: 2139–AA05) received March 18, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1430. A letter from the Chief, Regs and Admin Law, USCG, DOT, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Special Local Regulations for Marine Events; Western Branch, Elizabeth River, Portsmouth, Virginia [CGD 05–99–010] (RIN: 2115–AE46) received March 18, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1431. A letter from the Chief, Regs and Admin Law, USCG, DOT, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Special Local Regulations for Marine Events; 1D48 Chesapeake Grand Prix Distance Race [CGD 05–99–013] (RIN: 2115–AE46) received March 18, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1432. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the 1999 Aviation System Capital Investment Plan (CIP), pursuant to 49 U.S.C. 44501(b); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1433. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 29502; Amdt. No. 1922] received March 29, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1434. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 767 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99–NM–39–AD; Amendment 39–11091; AD 99–07–06] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received March 29, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1435. A letter from the Attorney, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Anchorage, Alaska, Terminal Area [Docket No. 29029; Amendment 93–77] (RIN: 2120–AG45) received March 25, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1436. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Federal Aviation Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Dr.Ing.h.c.F.Porsche Aktiengesellschaft (Porsche) 3200N01, N02, and N03 Reciprocating Engines [Docket No. 99–ANE–09–AD; Amendment 39–11089; AD 99–04–15] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received March 29, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1437. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Federal Aviation Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Williams International, L.L.C. FJ44–1A Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 98–ANE–36–AD; Amendment 39–11088; AD 99–07–04] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received March 25, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1438. A letter from the Secretary of Transportation, transmitting a report containing safety considerations for transporting hazardous materials via motor carriers in close proximity to Federal prisons; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

1439. A letter from the Acting Associate Administrator for Procurement, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—NASA Internal Programmatic Approval Documentation—received March 25, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science.

1440. A letter from the Acting Associate Administrator for Procurement, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—NASA Mentor-Protege Program, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science.

1441. A letter from the The Board of Trustees, the Federal Old-Age And Survivors Insurance And Disability Insurance Trust Funds, transmitting the 1999 Annual Report of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Funds, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 401(c)(2), 1395i(b)(2), and 1395t(b)(2); (H. Doc. No. 106–48); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

1442. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Branch, Customs Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Addition of Brazil to the List of Nations Entitled to Reciprocal Exemption From the Payment of Special Tonnage Taxes (T.D. 99–32) received March 29, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1443. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Branch, Customs Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Technical Amendment to the Customs Regulations (T.D. 99–24) received March 5, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1444. A letter from the Assistant Commissioner, Examination, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Mining Industry Coordinated Issue: Excess Moisture—received March 29, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1445. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Administrative, Procedural, and Miscellaneous (Notice 99–18) received March 29, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1446. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Department's final rule—Ruling and determination letters (Revenue Procedure 99–23) received March 29, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1447. A letter from the Assistant Commissioner (Examination), Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—All Industries Coordinated Issue: Health Insurance Deductibility for Self-Employed Individuals—received March 30, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1448. A letter from the Assistant Commissioner (Examination), Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—All Industries Coordinated Issue: Retroactive Adoption of an Accident and Health Plan—received March 30, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1449. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Examination of returns and claims for refund, credit, or abatement; determination of correct tax liability [Rev. Proc. 99–20] received March 19, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1450. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Last-In, First-out Inventories [Revenue Ruling 99–19] received March 25, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1451. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Examination of returns and claims for refund, credit, or abatement; determination of correct tax liability [Revenue Procedure 99–19] received March 16, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1452. A letter from the Commissioner, Social Security, transmitting the 1998 Annual Report of the Supplemental Security Income Program; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1453. A letter from the Acting Regulations Officer, Social Security Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Benefits for Spouses, Mothers, Fathers, and Children (RIN: 0960–AD83) received March 25, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1454. A letter from the The Board of Trustees, The Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund, transmitting the 1999 Annual Report of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 401(c)(2), 1395i(b)(2), and 1395t(b)(2); (H.

Doc. No. 106–47); to the Committee on Ways and Means and ordered to be printed.

1455. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's Monetary Policy Report to the Congress pursuant to the Full Employment and Balanced Growth Act of 1978, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 225a; jointly to the Committees on Banking and Financial Services and Education and the Workforce.

1456. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting a recommendation as to whether coverage of portable electrocardiogram transportation should be provided under Part B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act; jointly to the Committees on Commerce and Ways and Means.

1457. A letter from the Administrator, Agency for International Development, transmitting a report on Development Assistance Program Allocations for FY 1999, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2413(a); jointly to the Committees on International Relations and Appropriations.

1458. A letter from the Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Farm Credit Administration, transmitting the proposed fiscal year 2000 budget; jointly to the Committees on Government Reform and Agriculture.

1459. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, transmitting a report which provides information about the effects of regulation on the economy; jointly to the Committees on Government Reform and Appropriations.

1460. A letter from the Acting Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting a report entitled ''Attacking Financial Institution Fraud: Fiscal Year 1996 (Second Quarterly Report).,'' pursuant to Public Law 101–647; jointly to the Committees on the Judiciary and Banking and Financial Services.

1461. A letter from the Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting the 1998 Report of Activities required by the Architectural Barriers Act, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 4151; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Education and the Workforce.

1462. A letter from the Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting a copy of the National Transportation Safety Board's appeal letter to OMB regarding the initial determination of the Board's fiscal year 2000 budget request; jointly to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure and Appropriations.

1463. A letter from the The Board of Trustees, the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund, transmitting the 1999 Annual Report of the Board of Trustees of the Federal Supplementary Medical Insurance Trust Fund, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 401(c)(2), 1395i(b)(2), and 1395t(b)(2); (H. Doc. No. 106–46); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

1464. A letter from the Fiscal Assistant Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Highway Trust Fund quarterly report that appears in the December 1998 issue, pursuant to 26 U.S.C. 9602(a); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Transportation and Infrastructure.

1465. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification of the President's decision to send cetain U.S. forces to Macedonia to enhance force protection for U.S. and other NATO forces in that nation, to support U.S. and NATO military activities in the region, to deter attacks on U.S. and NATO forces already in Macedonia, and to assist in preparing for a possible NATO peace implementation force in Kosovo, pursuant to Public Law 105–262; (H. Doc. No. 106–41); jointly to the Committees on International Relations, Appropriations, and Armed Services and ordered to be printed.

1466. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification that there have been dramatic and very serious developments in Kosovo and the region, particularly Macedonia and Albania. In the light of these disturbing events, I have directed that additional U.S. forces be deployed to Albania and Macedonia in order to support disaster relief by, among other actiities, delivering food and essentials, constructing shelter, providing coordination and assisting in onward movement, and when necessary, providing protection for relief supplies and refugees, pursuant to Public Law 105–262; (H. Doc. No. 106–43); jointly to the Committees on International Relations, Appropriations, and Armed Services and ordered to be printed.

1467. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report to inform you of my decision to deploy additional U.S. forces to Albania in support of ongoing NATO air operations to reduce the capacity of the Serbian military and security forces to conduct offensive operations, pursuant to Public Law 105–262; (H. Doc. No. 106–44); jointly to the Committees on International Relations, Appropriations, and Armed Services and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

[Filed on March 31, 1999]

Mr. BURTON: Committee on Government Reform. Report on Oversight Plans for All House Committees (Rept. 106–78). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Pursuant to the order of the House on March 25, 1999 the following report was filed on April 7, 1999]

Mr. BLILEY: Committee on Commerce. H.R. 851. A bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to establish improved predictive models for determining the availability of television broadcast signals; with an amendment (Rept. 106–79 Pt. 1).

[Filed on April 12, 1999]

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska: Committee on Resources. H.R. 39. A bill to require the Secretary of the Interior to establish a program to provide assistance in the conservation of neotropical migratory birds; with an amendment (Rept. 106–80). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COBLE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 769. A bill to amend the Trademark Act of 1946 to provide for the registration and protection of trademarks used in commerce, in order to carry out provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes (Rept. 106–81). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GILMAN: Committee on International Relations. H.R. 1143. A bill to establish a program to provide assistance for programs of credit and other financial services for microenterprises in developing countries, and for other purposes (Rept. 106–82). Referred to the Committee on the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. McCOLLUM: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 46. A bill to provide for a national medal for public safety officers who act with extraordinary valor above and beyond the call of duty (Rept. 106–83). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. COBLE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1189. A bill to make technical corrections in title 17, United States Code, and other laws (Rept. 106–84). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 136. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1143) to establish a program to provide assistance for programs of credit and other financial services for microenterprises in developing countries, and for other purposes (Rept. 106–85). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COBLE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 1027. A bill to provide for the carriage by satellite carriers of local broadcast station signals, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 106–86 Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker:

[The following action occurred on April 7, 1999]

H.R. 851. Referral to the Committee on the Judiciary extended for a period ending not later than April 16, 1999.

[Submitted April 12, 1999]

H.R. 1027. Referral to the Committee on Commerce extended for a period ending not later than April 16, 1999.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

[Omitted from the Record of March 25, 1999]

By Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland (for himself, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. SAXTON, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. LINDER, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. BASS, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. GOODE, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. COBLE, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, and Mr. MARTINEZ):

H.R. 1363. A bill to specify that the legal public holiday known as Washington's Birthday be called by that name; to the Committee on Government Reform.

[Submitted April 12, 1999]

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 1364. A bill to exclude certain veterans' compensation and pension amounts from consideration as adjusted income for purposes of determining the amount of rent paid by a family for a dwelling unit assisted under the United States Housing Act of 1937; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. ANDREWS (for himself and Mr. PAYNE):

H.R. 1365. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to recognize the time required to save funds for the college education of adopted children; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ENGLISH (for himself, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. MCINNIS, Mrs. EMERSON, Mr. TALENT, Mr. NETHERCUTT, and Mr. SESSIONS):

H.R. 1366. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce the tax on beer to its pre-1991 level; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey:

H.R. 1367. A bill to amend section 211 of the Clean Air Act to prohibit the use of the fuel additive MTBE in gasoline; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. GOODLING (for himself, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. PETRI, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. GEKAS, Mr. PITTS, Mr. GANSKE, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BARR of Georgia, and Mr. WAMP):

H.R. 1368. A bill to prohibit the use of funds appropriated to the Department of Defense from being used for the deployment of ground elements of the United States Armed Forces in Kosovo unless that deployment is specifically authorized by law; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. KILPATRICK (for herself, Mr. FROST, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. SHOWS, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. CAPUANO):

H.R. 1369. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense to make military helicopters and other equipment available to State and local governments to assist in emergency law enforcement and rescue operations; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. WAXMAN:

H.R. 1370. A bill to amend the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act of 1977 to prevent persons doing business in interstate commerce from providing financial support to the International Olympic Committee until the International Olympic Committee adopts institutional reforms; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Ms. NORTON (for herself, Ms. CARSON, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. FORBES, Mr. FROST, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. GEKAS, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. KING, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mrs. LOWEY, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. STARK, and Mr. WYNN):

H.R. 1371. A bill to amend the Federal tort claims provisions of title 28, United States Code, to repeal the exception for claims arising outside the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PALLONE (for himself, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. NADLER, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. PAYNE, and Mr. GEJDENSON):

H.R. 1372. A bill to prohibit the Department of the Interior from expending any funds for a mid-Atlantic coast offshore oil and gas lease sale; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. SANFORD (for himself and Mr. GOODLING):

H.R. 1373. A bill to promote the development of a government in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) based on democratic principles and the rule of law, and that respects internationally recognized human rights, to assist the victims of Serbian oppression, to apply measures against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committees on Banking and Financial Services, Ways and Means, the Judiciary, and Transportation and Infrastructure, 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. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 1374. A bill to designate the United States Post Office building located at 680 State Highway 130 in Hamilton, New Jersey, as the ''John K. Rafferty Hamilton Post Office Building''; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. STARK:

H.R. 1375. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to reduce the maximum financial risk permitted for physicians participating in Medicare+Choice plans and encourage payment for quality; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CAMPBELL:

H.J. Res. 44. A joint resolution declaring a state of war between the United States and the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. GILMAN (for himself and Mr. GEJDENSON):

H. Con. Res. 81. A Concurrent resolution permitting the use of the rotunda of the Capitol for a ceremony in honor of the Fiftieth Anniversary of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and welcoming the three newest members of NATO, the Republic of Poland, the Republic of Hungary, and the Czech Republic, into NATO; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. CAMPBELL:

H. Con. Res. 82. A Concurrent resolution directing the President, pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution, to remove United States Armed Forces from their positions in connection with the present operations against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mrs. NAPOLITANO (for herself, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. TURNER, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. HOYER, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. FILNER, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. WEINER, Mr. FROST, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. HAYES, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, and Ms. WATERS):

H. Con. Res. 83. A Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and its President Slobodan Milosevic release the three illegally detained United States servicemen and abide by the Geneva Convention protocols regarding the treatment of both prisoners of war and innocent civilians; to the Committee on International Relations, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SHUSTER:

H. Res. 135. A resolution providing for the concurrence by the House with an amendment in the Senate amendments to H.R. 98; considered and agreed to.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

7. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Michigan, relative to Senate Resolution No. 21 memorializing the President and Congress to increase funding for full-time National Guard personnel; to the Committee on Armed Services.

8. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey, relative to Assembly resolution 112, memorializing the United States Congress to increase funding for research by the National Institutes of Health for the treatment and cure of Duchenne and Becker muscular dystrophy; to the Committee on Commerce.

9. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, relative to Senate Joint Resolution 5, urging the President of the United States not to attempt to use federal agencies to initiate strategies to mitigate greenhouse gases until and unless the Kyoto Protocol is amended or otherwise revised so that it is consistent with United States Senate Resolution No. 98 to include specific scheduled commitments for developing countries to mitigate greenhouse gas emissions within the same compliance period required for industrial nations; to the Committee on Commerce.

10. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, relative to a resolution urging the Bureau of the Census to conduct the 2000 decennial census consistent with the aforementioned United States Supreme Court ruling and constitutional mandate, which require a physical headcount of the population and bars the use of statistical sampling to create, or in any way adjust the count; to the Committee on Government Reform.

11. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of The Mariana Islands, relative to House Resolution No. 11–26, urging the Office of Insular Affairs to be honest and sincere in its presentation of the facts about the Commonwealth to Congress and the news media; to the Committee on Resources.

12. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, relative to Legislative Resolution No. 10, petitioning Congress of the United States to propose to the states an amendment to Article I, section 2 of the United States Constitution that would increase the length of the terms of office for members of the House of Representatives from two years to four years with one-half of the members' terms expiring every two years; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

13. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey, relative to Assembly Resolution No. 19, memorializing Congress to provide $5 million in federal funds for the next stage of project development, as noted hereinabove, for the Trans-Hudson/Midtown Corridor Management/Project Development Initiative; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

14. Also, a memorial of the House of Representatives of the State of West Virginia, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 14 memorializing the Congress of the United States to make all possible efforts to support and assist the incorporation of the Coalfields Expressway into the Appalachian Development Highway System; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

15. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of New Jersey, relative to Assembly Resolution No. 109 memorializing the Congress of the United States to encact H.R. 1126 of 1997, the ''Merchant Mariners Fairness Act of 1997''; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

16. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming, relative to Joint Resolution No. 1, memorializing that the Wyoming State Legislature fully supports the antidumping and the countervailing duty petitions against Canada as filed by the Ranchers-Cattlemen Action Legal Foundation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 5: Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. GORDON, Mr. BAKER, and Mr. HANSEN.

H.R. 6: Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 8: Mr. EVERETT, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. STUMP, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. HUNTER, and Mr. LATHAM.

H.R. 14: Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. KUYKENDALL, Mr. GORDON, and Mr. GARY MILLER of California.

H.R. 17: Mr. TERRY.

H.R. 19: Mr. BLILEY, Mr. GILCHREST, and Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 27: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 39: Mrs. KELLY.

H.R. 40: Mr. WYNN, Ms. LEE, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 44: Mr. PALLONE and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 46: Mr. NETHERCUTT.

H.R. 65: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, and Mr. PHELPS.

H.R. 72: Mr. BATEMAN, Mrs. WILSON, Mr. DUNCAN, and Mr. POMBO.

H.R. 82: Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. GORDON, and Mr. SAWYER.

H.R. 114: Mr. GEJDENSON.

H.R. 116: Mr. LARSON, Mr. WEINER, Mr. DICKS, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, and Ms. RIVERS.

H.R. 157: Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, and Mrs. EMERSON.

H.R. 163: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Mr. TALENT, and Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 175: Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. GORDON, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. SCHAFFER, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. CONYERS, and Ms. PELOSI.

H.R. 179: Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut.

H.R. 192: Mr. FOLEY.

H.R. 206: Ms. BALDWIN.

H.R. 208: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 219: Mr. GARY MILLER of California.

H.R. 220: Mr. GARY MILLER of California and Mr. MORAN of Kansas.

H.R. 274: Mr. HINCHEY, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. PASCRELL, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. GILMAN, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. WEINER, and Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 275: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.

H.R. 282: Mr. HOLDEN.

H.R. 303: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. YOUNG of Florida, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. HORN, Mr. DELAHUNT, and Mr. OBERSTAR.

H.R. 315: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 323: Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. PHELPS, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. SAWYER, Mrs. EMERSON, and Mr. GORDON.

H.R. 329: Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. LAMPSON.

H.R. 351: Mr. MCHUGH, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. MOORE, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. CRAMER, and Mr. CRANE.

H.R. 357: Mrs. TAUSCHER, Ms. MCKINNEY, and Mr. BECERRA.

H.R. 383: Mr. NEY, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. BILBRAY, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. GANSKE, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. HORN, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mrs. WILSON, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. QUINN, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GORDON, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. GRAHAM, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. FOLEY, and Mr. BURTON of Indiana.

H.R. 384: Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin and Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 390: Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. MCCOLLUM, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Mr. LAZIO, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. BERMAN.

H.R. 394: Mr. LUTHER, Mr. INSLEE, and Mr. OLVER.

H.R. 395: Mr. LUTHER, Mr. INSLEE, and Mr. OLVER.

H.R. 397: Mr. LUTHER, Mr. INSLEE, and Mr. OLVER.

H.R. 405: Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. RILEY, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. SWEENEY, and Mr. LAZIO.

H.R. 406: Mrs. EMERSON.

H.R. 407: Mr. HILL of Montana, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, and Mr. HALL of Texas.

H.R. 415: Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 417: Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. WISE.

H.R. 423: Mr. NEY, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. LARGENT, and Mr. COX.

H.R. 430: Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. TERRY, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 443: Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. GALLEGLY, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H.R. 461: Mr. OXLEY.

H.R. 488: Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey.

H.R. 492: Mr. TANCREDO and Mr. GIBBONS.

H.R. 517: Mr. HYDE.

H.R. 531: Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. SKELTON, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. WEYGAND, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. TALENT, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. WEINER, Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, and Mr. PAYNE.

H.R. 537: Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 541: Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. LARSON, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, and Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 548: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 555: Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 576: Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. FOLEY, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. WEXLER, Mr. WEYGAND, Ms. DANNER, Mrs. KELLY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. HOLDEN, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H.R. 607: Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 637: Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mrs. THURMAN.

H.R. 657: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 664: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. UDALL of Colorado.

H.R. 670: Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. RILEY, Mr. DICKS, and Mr. BROWN of California.

H.R. 682: Mr. GARY MILLER of California.

H.R. 684: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. VENTO, and Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.

H.R. 688: Mr. DICKEY, Mr. COX, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. CANADY of Florida, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, and Mr. HUTCHINSON.

H.R. 701: Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. BARR of Georgia, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H.R. 716: Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. BURTON of Indiana, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. TIAHRT, Mr. ISAKSON, and Mr. GARY MILLER of California.

H.R. 730: Ms. NORTON, Mr. BROWN of California, and Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 750: Mr. LAZIO, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. STENHOLM, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 756: Mr. DIAZ-BALART and Mrs. CLAYTON.

H.R. 771: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. BARR of Georgia.

H.R. 777: Mr. BONIOR.

H.R. 783: Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina, Mr. BISHOP, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. BENTSEN.

H.R. 784: Mr. DINGELL, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. DUNCAN, Ms. DANNER, and Mr. EVERETT.

H.R. 785: Mrs. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 786: Mr. HUNTER and Mr. BROWN of California.

H.R. 793: Mr. BARR of Georgia.

H.R. 796: Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. BECERRA, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mrs. CHRISTENSEN.

H.R. 797: Mr. SHOWS, Mr. STARK, Ms. KILPATRICK, and Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 798: Mr. WEINER, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. REYES, and Mr. MCNULTY.

H.R. 804: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. DICKEY, and Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 827: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BENTSEN, and Mr. BLAGOJEVICH.

H.R. 832: Mr. WISE and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 834: Mr. RUSH and Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina.

H.R. 835: Mr. WAMP, Mr. GORDON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. HANSEN, and Mrs. BONO.

H.R. 837: Ms. BROWN of Florida and Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 845: Mr. PHELPS.

H.R. 850: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin and Mr. ETHERIDGE.

H.R. 855: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. SAXTON.

H.R. 860: Mr. ANDREWS, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. SANDLIN, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. GORDON, Mr. BROWN of California, and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H.R. 878: Mr. TANCREDO.

H.R. 894: Mr. BARCIA, Mr. GOSS, and Mr. OXLEY.

H.R. 902: Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. ROTHMAN, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 903: Mr. PAUL, Mr. ROGAN, Mr. SWEENEY, and Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 904: Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. CAPUANO, and Mr. GORDON.

H.R. 912: Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 927: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 933: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 935: Mr. GRAHAM.

H.R. 937: Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 959: Mr. WEYGAND, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. HILLIARD, Ms. WATERS, and Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 960: Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. WEINER, and Mr. INSLEE.

H.R. 969: Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. WAMP, and Mr. GARY MILLER of California.

H.R. 979: Mr. FORBES, Mr. WEINER, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. ANDREWS, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. VENTO, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. STARK, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. KIND, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.

H.R. 984: Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. RUSH, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. MCDERMOTT.

H.R. 985: Mr ALLEN.

H.R. 1003: Mr FROST, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mrs. MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 1008: Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, and Mr. POMBO.

H.R. 1022: Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. GONZALEZ and Ms. BERKLEY.

H.R. 10 36: Mr BROWN of California.

H.R. 1041: Mr GREEN of Wisconsin and Mr. COBURN.

H.R. 1063: Mr WEINER.

H.R. 1080: Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 1082: Mr HILLIARD, Mr. DICKS, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. HOLT, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. KLINK, Mr. KIND, Mr. LAFALCE, Ms. SANCHEZ, and Mr. PASCRELL.

H.R. 1083: Mr. WU, Mr. DICKEY, and Mr. METCALF.

H.R. 1084: Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. NETHERCUTT, and Mr. WALDEN of Oregon.

H.R. 1090: Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. FORBES, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, and Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 1092: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. WU, Mr. HOUGHTON, and Mr. ROYCE.

H.R. 1095: Mr. CLAY, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. BAIRD, and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 1106: Mr. BERRY, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. WEINER, and Mr. SCARBOROUGH.

H.R. 1108: Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. BECERRA, and Mr. BISHOP.

H.R. 1109: Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 1111: Mr. BRYANT, Mr. INSLEE, Mr. FROST, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. OLVER.

H.R. 1116: Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma.

H.R. 1138: Mrs. ROUKEMA and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

H.R. 1144: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi and Mr. BLUNT.

H.R. 1146: Mr. BARR of Georgia, and Mr. WAMP.

H.R. 1159: Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. GORDON, and Mr. OXLEY.

H.R. 1167: Mr. WAXMAN and Mrs. CAPPS.

H.R. 1168: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CAMP, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. KING, Mr. PHELPS, and Mr. CLYBURN.

H.R. 1202: Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. CAPUANO, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, and Mr. HINCHEY.

H.R. 1213: Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 1218: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. HAYES, and Mr. WAMP.

H.R. 1233: Mr. PORTER, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. WEINER, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 1248: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. SPRATT, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. FROST, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. BORSKI, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. KIND, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. CAPPS, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. WEINER, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 1250: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. QUINN, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, and Mr. MATSUI.

H.R. 1266: Mr. HOUGHTON.

H.R. 1269: Mr. VENTO, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. STARK, and Mr. WEINER.

H.R. 1287: Mr. KING.

H.R. 1317: Mr. SESSIONS and Mrs. THURMAN.

H.R. 1335: Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 1344: Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. CONDIT, and Mr. CAMP.

H.R. 1349: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 1355: Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. PORTER, Ms. RIVERS, Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. SERRANO, and Mr. UDALL of Colorado.

H.R. 1358: Mr. CARDIN.

H.J. Res. 21: Mr. FOLEY.

H.J. Res. 25: Mr. LEWIS of California, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mrs. THURMAN.

H.J. Res. 34: Mr. ADERHOLT.

H. Con. Res. 8: Mr. BLAGOJEVICH.

H. Con. Res. 10: Mr. NEY, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Mr. STUMP, and Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.

H. Con. Res. 21: Mrs. KELLY, Mr. CROWLEY, and Mr. KING.

H. Con. Res. 30: Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. STEARNS, Mr. WAMP, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. DICKEY, and Mr. BATEMAN.

H. Con. Res. 74: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. STARK, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Ms. RIVERS, and Mr. UDALL of Colorado.

H. Con. Res. 76: Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. FOSSELLA, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. SHOWS, Mrs. MYRICK, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, and Mr. POMEROY.

H. Con. Res. 77: Mr. BISHOP, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. GONZALEZ.

H. Res. 15: Mr. CAPUANO.

H. Res. 16: Mr. CANADY of Florida.

H. Res. 34: Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. SANCHEZ, and Mr. CAPUANO.

H. Res. 35: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H. Res. 41: Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Ms. BERKLEY, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mrs. CUBIN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. DUNN, Mr. EVANS, Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. GOSS, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. LINDER, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. MASCARA, Mr. METCALF, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. SOUDER, and Mr. SPRATT.

H. Res. 59: Mr. EHLERS.

H. Res. 95: Mr. TANCREDO and Mr. GARY MILLER of California.

H. Res. 97: Mr. HASTINGS of Florida and Mr. MEEKS of New York.

H. Res. 106: Mr. METCALF, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. ETHERIDGE, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. BONIOR, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. MCCRERY, Ms. DELAURO, Mrs. CLAYTON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. WEINER.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 111: Mr. WAMP.