EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

OVERSIGHT: A KEY CONGRESSIONAL FUNCTION

HON. DAVID DREIER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1999

Mr. DREIER. Mr. Speaker, many of us are committed to improving and emphasizing programmatic oversight, we jointly asked the Congressional Research Service to conduct bipartisan oversight training for Members and congressional staff. Two sessions have already been held and the third will be held on July 26. So far they have been a great success, and I would like to express my appreciation to the Congressional Research Service, particularly Mort Rosenberg and Walter Oleszek, for their extraordinary efforts to make this such a great success.

At our first oversight workshop, Lee Hamilton, former Democratic Chairman of the International Relations Committee and the Iran-Contra Committee, shared his thoughts and insights with the attendees. He stated in part:

Oversight is designed to throw light on the activities of government. It can protect the country from the imperial presidency and from bureaucratic arrogance. It can expose and prevent misconduct, and maintain a degree of constituency influence in an administration. The responsibility of oversight is to look into every nook and cranny of government affairs. Overlook is designed to look at everything the government does, expose it, and put the light of publicity to it. It reviews, monitors, and supervises the execution and implementation of public policy, to assure that ''the laws are faithfully executed.''

I wholeheartedly agree with our distinguished former colleague. As chairman of the Committee that is charged with the responsibility of safeguarding the privileges and prerogatives of this esteemed institution, I believe Congress should vigorously conduct oversight in order to fulfill the legacy of our Founding Fathers—which is ultimately to preserve and protect our fragile democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I believe all members can benefit from the thoughtful comments of Lee Hamilton, which are included as follows:

OVERSIGHT: A KEY CONGRESSIONAL FUNCTION

INTRODUCTION

I very much appreciate the kind remarks by my friend and former colleague David Dreier. As David mentioned, we devoted considerable attention to ways of improving congressional oversight during our work on the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress in 1993–94. We held a number of hearings and made several recommendations for structural reforms, some of which have since been implemented.

Oversight of how effectively the Executive Branch is carrying out congressional mandates is an enormously important function of Congress. It is at the very core of good government. Congress must do more than write the laws; it must make sure that the administration is carrying out those laws the way Congress intended. The purpose of oversight is to determine what happens after a law is passed. As Woodrow Wilson put it (and I find myself quoting Woodrow Wilson more and more these days): ''Quite as important as lawmaking is vigilant oversight of administration.'' As more power is delegated to the executive and as more laws are passed, the need for oversight grows.

That is why I have been particularly concerned about the weakening of congressional oversight in recent years. Congress has given too much focus to personal investigations and possible scandals that will interest the media, rather than programmatic review and a comprehensive assessment of which federal programs work and which don't. For those of us who care deeply about the institution of Congress, this has been a disturbing trend. Thus I strongly support the efforts of Speaker Hastert to have the House return to its more traditional oversight functions. Congress needs to get back to the basics on oversight. The Speaker's recent comments on that have been right on the mark.

Under Dan Mulhollan's direction, Walter Oleszek and Mort Rosenberg of CRS have assembled several excellent panels for this series of oversight workshops. You will be hearing from some people with real expertise in this area. In the few minutes I have with you today I want to discuss briefly the importance of good oversight and some of the lessons I learned from my time in Congress about what makes oversight successful.

I. IMPORTANCE OF GOOD OVERSIGHT

A. Nature of Congressional Oversight

I believe in tough, continuing oversight. Oversight has many purposes: to evaluate program administration and performance; to make sure programs conform to congressional intent; to ferret out (in the oft-heard phrase) ''waste, fraud, and abuse''; to see whether programs may have outlived their usefulness; to compel an explanation or justification of policy; and to ensure that programs and agencies are administered in a cost-effective, efficient manner.

Oversight is designed to throw light on the activities of government. It can protect the country from the imperial presidency and from bureaucratic arrogance. It can expose and prevent misconduct, and maintain a degree of constituency in an administration. The responsibility of oversight is to look into every nook and cranny of governmental affairs. Oversight is designed to look at everything the government does, expose it, and put the light of publicity to it. It reviews, monitors, and supervises the execution and implementation of public policy, to assure that ''the laws are faithfully executed''.

Congress can use several tools to make federal agencies accountable, including periodic reauthorization, personal visits by members of staff, review by the General Accounting Office or inspectors general, subpoenas, and reports from the Executive Branch to Congress. Several types of committees—authorization, appropriations, governmental affairs, and special ad hoc committees—can all play important roles in oversight.

Congress needs a large number of oversight methods to hold agencies accountable because the various methods have their own strengths and weaknesses. Oversight hearings, for example, cannot be called every day, so committees may turn to reports or on-site visits to agencies.

In many ways Congress underestimates and undervalues its power in oversight. Agencies start to get a little nervous whenever someone from Congress starts poking around, and that is probably to the good overall. Federal bureaucracies do not stay on their toes unless they expect review and oversight from Congress.

B. History of Oversight

Oversight has been a key function of Congress since its very beginning. It is an implied power, not an enumerated power in the Constitution. It is based on the constitutional powers given to Congress to pass laws that create agencies and programs, to provide funding for these agencies and programs, and to investigate the Executive Branch. The first congressional oversight investigation took place in 1792, an inquiry into the conduct of the government in the wars against the Indians, and they have been taking place ever since.

Congress overhauled its oversight responsibilities in 1946 with the passage of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946. It reinforced the need for ''continuous watchfulness'' by Congress of the Executive Branch, and placed most of that responsibility in the standing committees rather than in specially created investigatory committees. The extent of congressional oversight has fluctuated in recent decades, with some Congresses taking it much more seriously than others. In the 96th Congress, for example, Speaker Tip O'Neill gave it very high priority and called the 96th the ''oversight Congress''. More recently, Speaker Gingrich shifted the emphasis of oversight, seeing it not just as a way to oversee but to shrink the size and reach of the federal government. He also used it to aggressively investigate the White House. Speaker Hastert, as I noted earlier, is encouraging the committees to move away from oversight as political micro management to oversight as congressional review of agency performance and effectiveness.

C. Importance of Policy Oversight

The oversight responsibilities of Congress are critical to good policy. Most important policy issues are complex, and Congress is seldom able to specify fully all the details of a governmental program in the original legislation. The Clean Water Act, for instance, sets the goals and general procedures for improving the quality of the nation's water resources, but the specific rules and regulations for achieving these aims are left to Executive Branch officials. For several reasons, Congress needs to carefully monitor how its broad intentions are translated into actual programs:

First, tough monitoring by Congress can encourage cost-effective implementation of a legislative program. Every year the President sends Congress specific funding requests for thousands of federal programs. These requests can often be cut back, as Members seek to identify the minimum funding levels needs for a program to be effectively implemented. Such oversight efforts are an important means for reducing governmental waste and making government work better.

Second, Congress must assure that the program, as implemented, reflects the intent of Congress. In complex issue areas such as environmental policy or health care, agency officials may simply misinterpret a piece of

legislation or they may use the discretion they have been given in the law to shift policy toward their views, the President's views, or the views of special interest groups.

Third, Congress must continue to monitor programs to determine whether unintended consequences or changing circumstances have altered the need for the program. Programs need consistent and regular review and assessment over time. Members of Congress are helped in that task by their close connection to their constituents, which gives them special opportunities to observe on a day-by-day basis the strengths and weaknesses of federal programs as they are being carried out.

D. Decline in Oversight

In recent years, the traditional oversight activities of Congress have generally declined, for a variety of reasons:

The shorter congressional workweek means that committees do not meet as often as they used to, reducing time for oversight.

The power of the authorizing committees—which is where most of the oversight was done—has declined over the years.

Monitoring the myriad of federal programs is tedious, takes time and preparation, and is often quite technical. It is typically unglamorous work, and most Members see little political benefit from engaging in it. Members do not rank oversight at the top of their responsibilities. For most Members, constituent service is number one, legislation is number two, and oversight is number three.

The media do not pay much attention to traditional oversight work. They usually like to focus on scandals. Congress has permitted the desire for media coverage to drive the hearing and oversight process.

There is simply less interest in government reform.

And constituents rarely contact their Members asking them to engage in systematic program review.

But another factor has been that the oversight priorities of Congress have shifted away from the careful review of programs to highly adversarial attempts at discrediting individual public officials—looking at great length at, for example, Hillary Clinton's commodity transactions or charges of money-laundering and drug trafficking at an Arkansas airport when Bill Clinton was Governor. Congress has certainly investigated federal officials throughout congressional history—from its earliest investigation of the Indian wars to the Teapot Dome scandal of 1923 to Watergate and the Iran-contra hearings (which I co-chaired). The authority of Congress to conduct investigations can be a crucial check on executive powers.

But recently there has been too much personalization and not enough policy in congressional oversight. Certainly for many years a lot of congressional oversight has been done for partisan purposes, and that doesn't necessarily make it bad. But spending too much time on personal investigations weakens the oversight function of Congress. It consumes Executive Branch time and resources and, more importantly, diverts congressional time and resources from the more constructive work of policy oversight. That's why Speaker Hastert 's attempt to redirect congressional oversight is a good sign, and I am hopeful that it will be successful.

II. NATURE OF GOOD OVERSIGHT

You will hear from a host of experts during these oversight workshops explaining in considerable detail the role and nature of congressional oversight. So let me briefly give you a few observations to help set the stage for your discussions—some specific examples of what I thought worked well when I was in Congress plus a few general lessons I learned about how oversight should be handled.

A. Specific Examples from Committee Work

Much of my oversight work in Congress was done on the Foreign Affairs/International Relations Committee. We had the responsibility of overseeing all foreign policy activities and agencies. Let me give you a sense of some of the main methods I used that I found particularly helpful.

Regular hearings: Congressional hearings are one of the most important methods of oversight. Yet, hearings can be unproductive when Members simply read prepared questions and aren't ready to ask the tough follow-up questions. So I gave particular attention to regular hearings on United States policy. I found them particularly helpful in forcing Executive Branch officials to articulate policy and explain the rationale behind it—something they do not like to do. One good example would be the extensive oversight I had relating to U.S. programs of assistance to the former Soviet States—the Freedom Support Act—as well as Eastern Europe—the SEED Act.

Closed briefings: Regular, indeed weekly closed briefings were essential to educating ourselves on complex issues. I instituted a monthly series of ''hot-spot'' classified briefings for Members done by the CIA on particularly volatile areas including Bosnia, the situation in Rusia, North Korea, and other issues that most Members do not routinely pay attention to.

Letters for the Record: One technique I developed, which I found to be a good way to exercise oversight, was to press the Administration for written explanations and clarifications of various aspects of U.S. foreign policy, which I would then insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I did this, for example, to help pin the administration down on its position on arms sales to Taiwan, on the Nuclear Agreed Framework with North Korea, on the train-and-equip program for Bosnia, and on U.S. policy vis-a-vis Turkey. Sometimes I had to go back to them several times to get a meaningful response. Since educating and informing the public is at the heart of oversight, I found the publication of letters to be very important. I was impressed by the interest these letters generated.

Staff travel: I required staff to make a periodic trips with focused objectives to the areas of the world they covered. For example, Committee staff made repeated trips over a several year period to Bosnia, to look into specific aspects of the Dayton peace process including how U.S. assistance was being spent, and the role of U.S. peacekeeping troops in the region. This travel, in combination with the travel of staff from other committees, served to demonstrate to the Administration and local officials in Bosnia that Congress was paying close attention to how resources were being spent. I also required staff to write extensive reports on the main findings and accomplishments of their travel.

Informal contacts: I made sure staff had informal and frequent contacts with Executive Branch officials. If you get to know people before a problem on crisis, you are in much better shape when there is one. Staff has close contact with officials at the State Department, DOD, and the NSC on all aspects on the Middle East crisis, in Bosnia, as well as U.S. relations with Russia and the NIS. My staff and I were able to work closely with U.S. officials on such issues as the Middle East, Russia, Yugoslavia, China, and North Korea in part because of longstanding personal contacts with lay people.

Reports to Congress: Although Congress has in many ways gone overboard in the reports that it requires of the Administration, sometimes this is a very useful tool. For example, I had the State Department make reports on the economies of major recipients of foreign aid. We need to know what effect our assistance is having in key countries.

GAO investigations: GAO has enormous resources, and probably does more detailed oversight work than congressional committees can. I found GAO particularly helpful on foreign assistance programs, the Lavi fighter the Israelis wanted to build with U.S. help but which did not make sense, and on specific overseas projects which ran into trouble.

B. GENERAL OBSERVATIONS ON SUCCESSFUL OVERSIGHT

Let me now turn to a few general thoughts and observations about what makes oversight successful:

First, oversight works best when it is done in as bipartisan a way as possible. Certainly there will be times when the committee chairman and the ranking minority member will disagree, but they should be able to sit down at the beginning of a new Congress and agree on the bulk of the Committee's oversight agenda.

Second, policy oversight is aided when there is a constructive relationship between Congress and the implementing agency. Much oversight by its very nature is adversarial, and that is particularly appropriate when an agency has engaged in egregious behavior. But excessive antagonism between the branches can be counterproductive and do little to improve program performance. Oversight should put aside petty political motives, and it should act constructively not destructively. Oversight should be conducted seeking good ideas.

Third, oversight should be done in a regular, systematic way. Congress lacks a continuous, systematic oversight process, at it oversees in an episodic, erratic manner. On the Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress we recommended, for example, that each committee do a systematic review of all of the significant laws, agencies, and programs under its jurisdiction at least every 10 years. My sense is that there are activities of government that have gone on for a long time without full-scale review.

Fourth, oversight must be comprehensive. There are vast number of activities of the federal government that never get into the newspaper headlines, yet it is still the task of Congress to look into them. When I was on the Foreign Affairs Committee, for example, we even held oversight hearings on everything from Yemen and to the future of NATO. Oversight that is driven by whether we can get cameras into the hearing room is not enough to get the job done. I am impressed by how decisions about oversight are made on the basis on how much media attention can be attracted. The relationship between the decline of oversight by Congress and the decline of investigative journalism bears further examination. Being comprehensive in oversight also means casting the net widely to look at the variety of federal agencies involved in a particular area, not just the main one (for example, not just looking at foreign policy actions of the State Department, but also of Commerce, Defense, Agriculture, CIA, etc). As I said earlier, it is the responsibility of oversight to look into every nook and cranny of government.

Fifth, the oversight agenda of Congress should be coordinate to eliminate duplication. The administration often complains, with some justification, about the burden of redundant oversight and duplicative testimony. Different committees shouldn't cover the same ground over and over, while other important areas and programs fall through the cracks. Committees currently do prepare their oversight plans, but I sense no one is in charge of coordination.

Sixth, continuity and expertise are critical to successful oversight. Excessive staff turnover and turnover of chairmen harm the institutional continuity and expertise so essential to the job of oversight. This is also why I generally favor having standing committees do oversight rather than special, ad hoc communities. Also, oversight should not be used or directed by interest groups.

Seventh, there is such a thing as too much oversight. Good oversight draws the line between careful scrutiny and intervention or micro-management. Congress should examine broad public policies, but it should not mettle and it should avoid a media show. It should certainly expose corrupt and incompetent officials, but it should avoid attacking competent, dedicated officials. Oversight requires reports to be informed, but the reporting requirements should not be excessive. In general, the quality of oversight is much more important than the quantity.

Eighth, good oversight involves documentation. The more you can get things in writing, the better off you are.

Ninth, follow-through is also important. It is one thing to ask agencies to improve their performance, but it requires the work of Members, committees, and staff aides to make sure that the changes have taken place.

Tenth, Member involvement in oversight is important. Certainly much of the work needs to be done by staff. Yet I found that Members often left too much of the responsibility with staff. Having Members involved brings additional leverage to any oversight inquiry.

Eleventh, good oversight takes clear signals from the leadership. Structural reforms and individual efforts by Members can be helpful, but for oversight to really work it takes a clear message from the congressional leadership that oversight is a priority and that it will be done in a bipartisan, systematic, coordinated way. The key role of the House Speaker and the Senate Majority Leader in successful oversight cannot be overstated.

And finally, there needs to be greater public accountability to congressional oversight. The general public can be a very important driving force behind good oversight. Congress needs to provide clear reports from each committee outlining the main programs under its jurisdiction and explaining how the committee reviewed them. As citizens understand how important congressional oversight is to achieving the kind of government they want—government that works better and costs less—they will demand more emphasis on the quality of oversight by Congress, and they will be less tolerant of highly personalized investigations that primarily serve to divert Members' attention from this critical congressional function.

CONCLUSION

My personal belief is that conducting oversight is every bit as important as passing legislation. President Wilson thought that ''the informing function of Congress should be preferred even to its legislating function.'' Our founding fathers very clearly recognized that ''eternal vigilance is the price of liberty''.

A strong record of congressional oversight of—''continuous watchfulness''—will do a lot to restore public confidence in the institution. It will show that Congress is taking its responsibilities seriously and is able to work together.

I'm not Pollyannaish about all of this. Certainly there will be roadblocks and obstacles in the effort to strengthen and improve oversight. The work is not particularly easy under the best of circumstances, and we can't expect all of the hard feelings and distrust about the direction of oversight in recent years to dissipate overnight. But it is my firm belief that this is an area in which Congress simply must do better. And your willingness to participate in these workshops gives me good reason to think that this is an area in which Congress will do better.

AFRICAN GROWTH AND OPPORTUNITY ACT

SPEECH OF

HON. RON KLINK

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, July 16, 1999

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 434) to authorize a new trade and investment policy for sub-Sahara Africa:

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Chairman, I oppose H.R. 434, and I am proud to say I was an original co-sponsor of a much better trade bill, H.R. 772, the ''HOPE for Africa Act'' introduced by my colleague JESSE JACKSON of Illinois.

I supported H.R. 772, and opposed H.R. 434, for reasons centering on concerns for labor, the environment, womens' rights, and the HIV/AIDS problem faced worldwide.

First, in labor terms, I opposed H.R. 434 because it is bad for both American and African workers. Over the past twelve months, 118,000 jobs in the textile and apparel industry have been lost in the United States—more jobs than in any other industry. The reason is competition with low-wage imports, manufactured in nations where worker compensation and working conditions are deplorable. As a result, U.S. textile workers are losing their jobs, and African workers work in sweat-shop style conditions.

On the other hand, H.R. 772, the Jackson bill, would have required that labor rights be adhered to in the workplace, while the H.R. 434 has no binding language to protect worker rights. The Teamsters, International Longshoremen and Warehousemen, AFSCME, Paper Allied-Industrial Chemical and Energy Workers (PACE), Transport Workers of America, Union of Needletrades, Industrial and Textile Employees (UNITE) and the United Auto Workers all opposed H.R. 434.

Second, in environmental terms, I opposed H.R. 434 because the bill text does not even mention the environment. The bill contains no environmental safeguards in its core text—which is a startling oversight. This encourages U.S. firms to move to sub-Saharan Africa in order to evade the standards they must meet here at home.

On the other hand, H.R. 772, the Jackson bill, provided a new model for trade by combining expanded trade, open to all sub-Saharan countries, with the requirement that multinational corporations operating in these countries comply to the same environmental standards that apply here in the United States.

For these reasons, H.R. 434 was opposed by—and H.R. 772 was supported by—the Sierra Club, Defenders of Wildlife, Friends of the Earth, American Lands Alliance, Earth Island Action, International Rivers Network, Native Forest Council, International Law Center for Human, Economic and Environmental Defense, and the International Primate Protection League.

Third, in women's rights terms, I opposed H.R. 434 because it simply called on the Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC) to give special consideration to women entrepreneurs and to investments that help women and the poor.

On the other hand, H.R. 772, the Jackson bill, targeted investment financing for small businesses and women-owned and minority-owned businesses, including provisions for human rights, labor rights and environmental protections.

Fourth, in HIV/AIDS terms, I opposed H.R. 434 because it completely ignored the AIDS crisis. The bill failed to mention the word ''AIDS'' nor did it specify any funding to combat the AIDS epidemic in Africa. However, since the beginning of the AIDS crisis, 83% of AIDS deaths have occurred in sub-Saharan Africa.

On the other hand, H.R. 772, the Jackson bill, targeted direct assistance from the Development Fund for Africa for AIDS education and treatment programs. For these reasons, many HIV/AIDS community groups opposed H.R. but supported H.R. 772—ranging from the Human Rights Campaign Fund to Project Planet Africa.

In closing, I want to turn for a moment to general trade policy. I read a disturbing quote from the Chinese Ministry of Foreign Trade and Economic Cooperation (MOFTEC) given on March 3, 1999: ''Setting up assembly plants with Chinese equipment, technology and personnel could not only greatly increase sales in African countries but also circumvent the quotas imposed on commodities of Chinese origin imposed by European and American countries.''

H.R. 434, had very weak transshipment provisions, with no safeguard against China using sub-Saharan Africa as a transshipment point for Asian manufacturers of textile and apparel products. On the other hand, H.R. 772, the Jackson bill, contained strict, enforceable rules guarding against transshipment from China and other locales. For these reasons, the National Cotton Council and the American Textile Manufacturers Institute opposed H.R. 434.

By passing H.R. 434, which I voted against, nothing was accomplished to give relief, and to save the jobs of, American and African textile workers; to protect the environment; to help African women; to give aid to victims of HIV/AIDS; nor to deny China the right to circumvent the trade laws which impose quotas on Chinese goods.

This is a sad day for American trade relations with sub-Saharan Africa.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CHARLES W. "CHIP" PICKERING

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1999

Mr. PICKERING. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained and missed the following rollcall vote: Rollcall vote No. 295, H.R. 2466. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye.''

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. DAN BURTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1999

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, due to a prior commitment, I was unavoidably detained during the following rollcall votes. Had I been there. I would have voted ''no'' on rollcall No. 302; ''no'' on rollcall vote No. 303; ''yes'' on rollcall vote No. 304; ''yes'' on rollcall vote No. 305; ''yes'' on rollcall vote No. 306; and ''no'' on rollcall vote No. 307.

HECTOR G. GODINEZ POST OFFICE BILL

HON. LORETTA SANCHEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1999

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, today I come to the House of Representatives to introduce a bill to rename the Santa Ana U.S. Postal Processing Center after a true American, Hector G. Godinez. Mr. Godinez gave so much to his country and community, and this bill will recognize his life long efforts.

Santa Ana has been Mr. Godinez' home since 1925. After graduating from high school he joined the military, beginning his service to our country. He served during World War II and in recognition of his strength and bravery in General Patton's tank unit, was awarded a Bronze Star and the Purple Heart.

When Mr. Godinez returned home from the war, he decided to continue his record of public service as a letter carrier. During his 48 years in the U.S. Postal Service he rose from letter carrier to Southern California District Manager.

Mr. Godinez' belief that individual action can help build a better community is clearly illustrated by his active involvement in Santa Ana. Mr. Godinez was deeply committed to the Orange County District Boy Scouts of America and was their chairman in 1985. He served as president of the Santa Ana Chamber of Commerce and was a board member of the California Regional Center Program for Handicapped and Special Needs Children in Orange County.

Mr. Godinez was a founding member of the Santa Ana League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC) Council and served on the Board of Directors LULAC Foundation. He and the other Santa Ana LULAC members were participants and supporters in the 1948 case of *Mendez* v. *The Board of Education,* a monumental civil rights case ending discriminatory practices against Mexican American children in Orange County schools.

He guided our citizens through decades of change in California, both as a public servant and an activist. Our lives as Orange County residents are better for his life's work, and as his Congressional representative, I feel obligated to seek this honor on his family and community's behalf.

I believe it is only fitting to honor this man who gave so much to his community and country. I hope my colleagues will support this bill to name the Santa Ana U.S. Postal Processing Center after Hector Godinez.

TRIBUTE TO GEORGE E. ''SHORTY'' MCGRAW

HON. MARION BERRY

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1999

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a great Arkansan. This man served his country with intelligence, courage, and dedication, Mr. George E. ''Shorty'' McGraw.

Mr. McGraw was born in 1918 in Gillett, Arkansas. He worked as an auto mechanic until 1941, when he enlisted into the military. Mr. McGraw went on to graduate from Air Mechanic School and Flight Engineer School. He later served overseas with the Twentieth Air Force, 6th Bomb Group. On July 20, 1945, while flying his 33rd mission, Mr. McGraw was shot down and wounded. He was captured, beaten, and taken as a prisoner of war until his release on his 27th birthday. Mr. McGraw later attended Navigator Training School. He eventually retired as a Captain in 1961 with a total of 10,000 flying hours over his twenty years of service.

George E. ''Shorty'' McGraw is not only a wonderful citizen, neighbor and friend, he is a brother, husband, father, grandfather and great-grandfather. He is the heart and soul of his community. Captain McGraw was recently bestowed with a Purple Heart for his selfless service of his country. His devotion and love for his country never diminished. Captain McGraw serves as an inspiration to all.

A DIPLOMAT'S DIPLOMAT RETURNS HOME

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1999

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, in a few days, Mr. Pat Hennessy, the Political Counselor at the Irish Embassy here in Washington, returns home for service in his government's Department of Foreign Affairs (DFA). The DFA's gain will be our loss here in America at a critical point in Irish history.

Pat is known to many of us in the Congress, on both sides of the isle, as a diplomat's diplomat. He previously served with distinction in the Irish Consulate in New York City before his tenure at the Irish Embassy here in Washington. In New York, he got to know and worked closely with the large Irish American community and the many friends of Ireland in America's largest and greatest city. He understands our nation and people well.

Pat has worked tirelessly for lasting peace and justice in the north of Ireland during his service in the U.S. He has also helped to advance greater U.S.-Irish relations in many areas, whether cultural, economic or otherwise.

During an important transition to Republican control of the House and new congressional leadership in the cause of lasting peace and justice in Ireland and improved U.S.-Irish relations, Pat did not miss a beat. He treated all of those many friends of Ireland equally and fairly.

In 1997, then-Speaker Newt Gingrich reinvigorated the long dormant Irish American interparliamentary exchange. Pat has played a vital role in fostering and improving these parliamentary exchanges since then.

Our sessions on both sides of the Atlantic since 1997 have served to further the bonds of friendship and understanding between the Congress and the Dail, the Irish Parliament, in Dublin. They increased interest in the Congress on events in Ireland, whether in the north, or the Republic in the south with its booming economy and many American firms' vast investment in the ''Celtic Tiger.''

The success of these legislative exchange programs is in no small part due to Pat's efforts and the growing and expanding U.S.-Ireland links in so many areas of common interest and support. We wish Pat and his wife Pauline and their family much happiness and success as he returns to Ireland.

Our door will always be open when Pat decides to return to America, whenever or in whatever capacity.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. EDWARD R. ROYCE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1999

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday July 15, I was unavoidably detained for rollcall No. 302. If I had been present, I would have voted ''nay'' on this amendment.

THEATER HIGH ALTITUDE AREA DEFENSE

HON. DOUG BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1999

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, this Member commends this editorial from the July 15, 1999, Norfolk Daily News to his colleagues regarding the need for development of the Theater High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) in light of recent successful tests and North Korea's intention to launch a long range missile capable of reaching Alaska or Hawaii.

IT CAN BE DONE—FIRST ''HIT'' OF MISSILE INTERCEPT SYSTEM AN INDICATION THE TECHNOLOGY DOES WORK

In hindsight, it would appear that the media gave too little coverage to a report several weeks ago that had U.S. intelligence sources confirming that North Korea is preparing a late-summer launch of its Taepo Dong 2 missile, an ICBM capable of reaching Alaska or Hawaii. This will make North Korea one of only a few countries above to strike U.S. soil with long-range missiles.

But what should be given even bigger coverage is the news that the U.S. Army's new anti-missile system successfully intercepted a target ballistic missile launched 120 miles away in a test that was conducted last month.

Without using an explosive warhead, the interceptor destroyed the incoming missile by crashing into it at an altitude of almost 60 miles. What's called the Theater High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) is designed, however, to defeat intermediate-range missiles. That means it will not be able to stop North Korea's Taepo Dong 2. But it proves that ''hit-to-kill'' technology can work,

which is something critics of missile defense have long denied.

The challenge now is to build an effective defense against long-range missiles that builds on THAAD's success. This will require much more development and testing, and much more support from Congress and the Clinton administration.

The fact that it took the Army seven tests to score the first THAAD ''hit'' is not an argument against missile defense but an argument for investing more in anti-missile technologies. It can be done, but it's a difficult proposition.

Unfortunately, the United States cannot make progress as long as the Clinton administration observes the restrictions of the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty. As a matter of international law the treaty is defunct since the United States' signing partner, the Soviet Union, ceased to exist in 1991. Misplaced devotion for the ABM Treaty hampers the development, testing and deployment of certain kinds of missile defense, ensuring that any system will be less capable than it otherwise could be.

IN MEMORY OF VICTORIA ''VIKKI'' BUCKLEY (1947–1999)

HON. THOMAS G. TANCREDO

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1999

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the memory of Colorado State Secretary, Victoria ''Vikki'' Buckley: a wife and mother of three, a public servant, a self made individual, and a leading citizen of the Denver Metro Area, in Colorado, who passed away last week.

Vikky Buckley was a courageous political leader who worked in the Secretary of State office for the citizens of Colorado for more than a quarter century. Few realize that Vikki, a Denver Native, began working in the secretary of state office 28 years earlier. She had been a welfare mom and actively removed herself from a system that she believed fosters dependency.

Many people have read about individuals who lift themselves through their own dedication and efforts, but it is seldom that they rise so quickly to an elected office. Vikki was educated in the Denver Public Schools attending East High School. She continued her education at Metro State College and then the Seible School of Engineering in Englewood where she received an Associates Degree in drafting. She was an active participant at Heritage Christian Center and in various political organizations including the Aurora Republican Forum and the Araphahoe County Republican Men's Club. She spoke frequently on issues of community and inclusion from the perspective of an American woman who happened to be black and Republican.

Elected Secretary of State in 1994, Vikki was the first American of African descent elected to a statewide constitutional office in Colorado. As a Republican, she was noted as the highest ranking African American female holding statewide office in America. She has been featured in publications from the controversial Limbaugh Letter (June 1999) to the Ladies Home Journal (''Against All Odds'').

She was a rising star that believed in making government work for people. She was loved by friends and admired for her courage of conviction. My heart goes out to her entire family upon their loss. I am honored to have known Vikki.

Governor Bill Owens released the following statement, ''I join all Coloradans in being deeply saddened by the untimely passing of Colorado Secretary of State Vikki Buckley. She overcame many challenges in life and achieved high office in our state through determination and hard work. Vikki's competitive spirit paved the way for her election as Colorado's first African-American Secretary of State. Frances and I and our three three children express our profound sympathy to Vikki's family on behalf of all Coloradans and our appreciation for her many years of service to our state.''

Let the permanent RECORD of the Congress of the United States show that Vikki Buckley was a tireless advocate for the people of Colorado, and a friend of America.

THE MEAL TAX REDUCTION ACT

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1999

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, today I am reintroducing the Meal Tax Reduction Act. This legislation, which I also introduced in the last session of Congress, is designed to alleviate some of the tax code inequities that hurt the food service industry. As many of my colleagues know, the food service industry is the only business specifically excluded from normal business expense deduction rules. My legislation is aimed at restoring fairness to current law.

The Meal Tax Reduction Act would partially restore the deduction permitted for meals and entertainment expenses to 80 percent. While I believe we should eventually reinstate the meal tax to 100 percent, this legislation takes the first steps to gradually restore the tax to at least the pre-1993 level of 80 percent.

Under the Balanced Budget Act, transportation workers can already deduct a higher percentage of their meal expenses than other workers, and transport workers will eventually be able to deduct 80 percent of their food expenses. My legislation would simply extend the deductions already put in place for the transportation industry, so that fairness is ensured for everyone.

This important legislation would eventually allow someone starting a small business, working away from home on a construction job, or traveling away on business to take a reasonable tax deduction for food expenses.

Since the law was changed in 1993 to a 50 percent meal tax deduction there has been a notable has had a negative effect on the restaurant sector of our economy. And the restaurant industry employs millions of people. Restoring the meal tax deduction would help create new jobs in our economy, often for people who are trying to enter the workforce for the first time. If welfare to work is to be fully implemented, we need to create the kind of entry level positions and entrepreneurial opportunities that are often the first steps up the ladder to the American Dream.

In addition, law penalizes and de-legitimizes the food service. The Meal Tax Reduction Act would begin moving the restaurant industry toward parity with other businesses. The act immediately increases the meal tax deduction to 60 percent next year, and eventually to 80 percent by the year 2008. My legislation gradually fixes the meal tax inequity.

Lastly, I want to note that since the introduction of my legislation last year, that support for meal tax equity has been steadily increasing. In fact, Chairman Bill Archer of the Ways and Means Committee has included meal tax reductions in his comprehensive tax plan tat are very similar to legislation for which I have been advocating. There is nothing like an idea whose time has come.

INTRODUCTION OF THE NATIONAL TELECOMMUTING AND AIR QUALITY ACT

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1999

Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, traffic congestion and lack of mobility threatens not only our nation's prosperity, but quality of life and the family unit. That is why today, I am introducing the ''National Telecommuting and Air Quality Act,'' a bill designed to reduce both air pollution and traffic congestion.

Efforts around the country to widen existing facilities and construct new bridges and highways and improve mass transit are essential. However, improved and expanded use of new technologies is also essential to meeting transportation needs.

Telecommuting is also part of the answer to reducing traffic congestion and air pollution and easing the strain on families trying to find time to raise children and make ends meet from one payday to the next. It's also part of good environmental stewardship and energy conservation. Many jobs can be performed as well or better at home through the use of computers, faxes, email, and telephones than at an office or in other work centers.

Mr. Speaker, telecommuting, by large numbers of employees, has many positive bi-products to which I would like to draw my colleagues' attention.

Traffic congestion: In cities such as Los Angeles and Washington, D.C. (Numbers 1 and 2 on the gridlock list), telecommuting could reduce peak commuter traffic. According to research, 40 percent of the nation's workforce have jobs which are compatible with telecommuting. This reduction would come without paving one more lane of highway or adding one more bus or subway car. That saves money and makes everyone's life better.

Air pollution: Automobiles produce about 30 percent of urban smog. Telecommuting could take a large bite out of air pollution (including nitrogen oxide, carbon monoxide, lead, particulate matter, volatile organic compounds and carbon dioxide). The result helps now and leaves a better world for our kids.

Family wellness: Telecommuting gives workers more time to spend at home. Parents could care for infants or small children while they work. The stress of what to do with an ill relative—an older parent afflicted with Alzheimer's disease, for example—can be lessened. Working moms and dads could be better and more nurturing parents without having to leave the workforce. Instead of choices, there are good choices.

Benefits to the handicapped: People with handicaps who lead productive and useful lives, but decide that the hassle of getting to and from work just isn't worth it, could be in the mainstream of the workforce through telecommuting.

Energy conservation: Our nation remains heavily dependent on foreign oil, which is directly related to our culture of two- or more-car families and daily driving habits. Replacing the daily commute with telecommuting would reduce national oil consumption and help reduce dependency on foreign oil.

Telecommuting is the information age's answer to traffic congestion, environmental stewardship and strengthening the family. Studies have shown that telecommuting works to increase both employee productivity and morale, which in turn helps the business bottom line. The concept is a win-win proposal for reducing traffic congestion and improving air quality—at virtually no cost to the federal government. Problems of employees shortfalls are also eased—people leaving the workforce for personal reasons would be less inclined to do so. But outside of the communications industry and some participation in the high-tech community, American businesses have not yet caught the vision-and the benefits of telecommuting.

I believe the ''National Telecommuting and Air Quality Act'' can help.

The idea is to develop pilot programs to urge employers to encourage and allow their employees to telecommute. That, in turn, helps reduce regional traffic congestion and air pollution, and also enables the region to build new bridges and parkways within clean air regulations. The goal is to provide an incentive for the public and private sectors to use telecommuting.

The centerpiece of the telecommuting pilot project is a voluntary pollution credits trading program to explore the feasibility of using ''profit incentives'' to reduce traffic congestion and air pollution.

The idea works like this: millions of people nationwide get in their cars each morning and drive to work. This causes air pollution, and urban smog (nitrogen oxide, carbon monoxides, etc.) often referred to as ozone precursors. Yet there is little incentive for the private sector to become involved to reduce air pollution causing traffic. There is no monetary value placed on reducing this source of air pollution from a private sector business standpoint.

The pilot program would establish an air pollution credits trading program in which small and large businesses, non-profit organizations, federal and state governments, schools and universities, or any other employer, can acquire credits by voluntarily participating in an employee telecommuting program. Participating employers receive pollution credits for a portion of the reduced pollutants which they can then sell on an exchange similar to a commodities exchange.

Manufacturers and utility companies are currently regulated under the Clean Air Act and under increased pressure to reduce air pollutants from both the federal government and states which are struggling to develop implementation plans that improve air quality while allowing economic growth. Pollution credits trading is in practice today with sulfur dioxides (SOXs), which were mandated to be reduced under the Clean Air Act. Trading occurs between utility companies and manufacturing operations.

If the air pollution credit trading program were in place, a participating employer which allowed its employees to telecommute on a regular basis would receive a pollution reduction credit for keeping those cars off the road and would be able to sell a portion of those credits for cash on a trading exchange. The size or value of the credit would be determined by the estimated pollution reduction.

Any number of groups could buy the credits including utilities or other regulated entities under the Clean Air Act. Even environmental groups might want to buy pollution credits and hold on to them. The net result is reduced air pollution and traffic congestion, and most importantly an improvement in quality of life—more time with the family and less time on the road in traffic. And if all the studies are correct, these gains will be made with no loss of worker productivity. In fact, studies indicate telecommuting increases productivity.

The bill provides a grant to the National Environmental Policy Institute to work with the Department of Transportation, the Environmental Protection Agency and Department of Energy to develop, in conjunction with regional businesses and local governments, a telecommuting clean air credits trading program in major metropolitan regions in the country confronted with significant traffic congestion. Included in the pilot will be the Washington, D.C., and Los Angeles, California, metropolitan regions, the top two most congested regions in the nation, and several other heavily congested areas.

Mr. Speaker, the reason for the pilot program is two-fold. First, as chairman of the House Appropriations Transportation Subcommittee and as a representative of one of the fastest growing regions in the country, I understand today's serious transportation needs. Loudoun County, Virginia, in my district, is the third fastest growing county in the nation. Between 1976 and 1997 Loudoun County's population has shot up 175 percent. Those of you familiar with Tysons Corner may be interested that in 1976 it had 3.5 million square feet of office space. Today there is more than 21 million square feet of office space, a 500 percent increase.

With this rapid and sustained growth, it should be no surprise that Washington is the second most traffic congested region in the country. Spending an hour and a half commuting each way to work is typical for many area residents.

Also, I have long been an advocate of ''family-friendly'' workplace policies, particularly with the federal government. Families today are under so much daily stress and are faced with too many difficult challenges. Perhaps the most frustrating part of an hour and a half commute is that in many cases it could have been avoided. I think it is even more frustrating when both parents are working. Today's moms and dads are challenged to race home and get a hot meal on the table so they can sit, eat and talk together as a family.

In the 101st Congress, I was a part of a successful effort to authorize and fund a metro-wide federal telecenter program which now boasts a total of 17 regional federal telecenters. There are seven telecenters in Northern Virginia, including one of the first telecenters to open in the Shenandoah Valley Tele-Business Center in Winchester, Virginia. The centers are up and running with the latest technologies and technical support staff on hand. The next logical step is to get the public and private sectors involved in a wider telecommuting effort for their employees who can take advantage of cutting-edge technology to work from home.

I have talked with leaders in the high-technology community about this telecommuting and air quality project. I have urged participation of industry leaders such as ATT, Litton Corporation, AOL, Orbital, and Science Application International Corporation and would encourage them to join in a symposium this fall on telecommuting initiatives for the Washington metropolitan region. The symposium would be part of the TeleWork America initiative spearheaded by the International Telework Association and Council.

Any weekday morning, you can see the traffic back up along the Dulles Toll Road with high-tech buildings dotting the landscape along the corridor. If anyone can show how successful telecommuting can be, these are the businesses to lead the way.

Clearly, as we are poised to enter the 21st Century—the ''Information Age''—telecommuting has a place. I have heard it said that work is something you do, not someplace you go. A pollution reduction credit trading program will provide the incentive for the private sector to lead the way in the telecommuting effort.

Mr. Speaker, I hope our colleagues will look at this bill and consider signing on as a cosponsor of this proposal to promote cleaner air and less traffic congestion.

H.R. —

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 ''National Telecommuting and Air Quality Act''.

SEC. 2. GRANT PROGRAM FOR DESIGN OF PILOT PROGRAM REGARDING TELECOMMUTING AS MEANS OF IMPROVING AIR QUALITY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) GRANT FOR DESIGN OF PILOT PROGRAM.—The Secretary of Transportation (in this section referred to as the ''Secretary'') shall make a grant to a nonprofit private entity that is knowledgeable on matters relating to air quality for the purpose of developing a design for the proposed pilot program described in subsection (b). The grant shall be made to the National Environmental Policy Institute (a nonprofit private entity incorporated under the laws of and located in the District of Columbia), if such Institute submits an application for the grant.

(2) ADMINISTRATION OF PROGRAM.—The Secretary shall carry out this section (including subsection (c)(1)(C)) in collaboration with the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency and the Secretary of Energy.

(b) PROPOSED OZONE PRECURSOR CREDIT-TRADING PILOT PROGRAM.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section:

(A) The term ''participating employers'' means employers that voluntarily authorize and engage in telecommuting.

(b) The term ''telecommuting'' means the use of telecommunications to perform work functions under circumstances in which the use of telecommunications reduces or eliminates the need to commute.

(C) The term ''regulated entities'' means entities that are regulated under the Clean

Air Act with respect to emissions of one or more ozone precursors.

(D) The term ''ozone precursors'' means air pollutants that are precursors of (ground level) ozone.

(E) The term ''VMTs'' means vehicle-miles-traveled.

(2) DESCRIPTION OF PROGRAM.—For purposes of subsection (a)(1) and other provisions of this section, the proposed pilot program described in this subsection is a pilot program under which the following would occur:

(A) Methods would be evaluated and developed for calculating reductions in emissions of ozone precursors that can be achieved as a result of reduced VMTs by telecommuting employees of participating employers.

(B) the estimated reductions in such emissions for the periods of time involved would be deemed to be items that may be transferred by such employers to other persons, and for such purpose the employers would be issued certificates indicating the amount of the reductions achieved for the periods (referred to in this section as ''emission credits'').

(C) A commercial trading and exchange forum would be made available to the public for trading and exchanging emission credits.

(D) Through the commercial trading and exchange forum, or through direct trades and exchanges with persons who hold the credits, regulated entities would obtain emission credits.

(E) Regulated entities would present emission credits to the Federal Government or to the State involved (as applicable under the Clean Air Act) and the amounts of reductions in emissions of ozone precursors represented by the credits would for purposes of the Clean Air Act be deemed to assist in achieving compliance.

(F) The Federal Government would (explore means) to facilitate the transfer of emission credits between participating employers and regulated and other entities.

(c) SITES FOR OPERATION OF PILOT PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall ensure that the design developed under subsection (a) includes (recommendations for) carrying out the proposed pilot program described in subsection (b) in each of the following geographic areas:

(A) The greater metropolitan region of the District of Columbia (including areas in the States of Maryland and Virginia).

(B) The greater metropolitan region of Los Angeles, in the State of California.

(C) Three additional areas to be selected by the Secretary, after consultation with the grantee under subsection (a).

(2) CONSULTATION.—The Secretary shall require that, in carrying out paragraph (1) with respect to a geographic area, the grantee under subsection (a) consult with local governments and business organizations in the geographic area.

(d) STUDY AND REPORT.—The Secretary shall require that, in developing the design under subsection (a), the grantee under such subsection study and report to the Congress and to the Secretary the potential significance of the proposed pilot program described in subsection (b) as an incentive for expanding telecommuting and reducing VMTs in the geographic areas for which the design is developed, and the extent to which the program would have positive effects on—

(1) national, State, and local transportation and infrastructure policies;

(2) energy conservation and consumption;

(3) national, State, and local air quality; and

(4) individual, family, and community quality of life.

(e) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—For the purpose of making the grant under subsection (a), there is authorized to be appropriated $250,000 for fiscal year 2000. Amounts appropriated under the preceding sentence are available until expended.

STATEMENT ON THE 5TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE AMIA BOMBING

HON. NITA M. LOWEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1999

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, over the past decade, we have seen a horrifying increase in terrorist attacks around the world. Extremists in every corner of the globe have carried out violent, deadly attacks on innocent civilians in the Middle East, Latin America, the United States, and elsewhere.

One of the worst terrorist attacks in the 1990s was the bombing of the AMIA Jewish Community Center in Buenos Aires, Argentina. July 18, 1999 marks the fifth anniversary of this cowardly attack on the Jewish community of Argentina, which tragically took the lives of 86 people, and injured over 200 more.

I rise today to honor the memory of the victims of the AMIA bombing; to pay tribute to the families of those victims, who have carried on with tremendous strength and courage; and to join them in their call for justice.

Mr. Speaker, although it has been five years since the AMIA bombing—and seven years since the bombing of the Israel Embassy in Buenos Aires, which killed 29 people—the perpetrators of these terrorist attacks have not yet been brought to justice.

Last year, I had the privilege of visiting Buenos Aires and meeting with representatives of the Jewish community there. I stood with members of Memoria Activa, AMIA, DAIA, and others affected by these bombings, and I joined them in their demand that the Argentine government do more to arrest and prosecute those responsible for these terrible attacks. But our calls have gone unanswered.

The absence of swift and sure justice for the terrorists who carried out these attacks is a tragic mockery of the memory of those who lost their lives. A terrorist attack anywhere in the world is a threat to all of us. And a terrorist attack that goes unpunished, is an invitation for these cowards to strike again.

Mr. Speaker, today we honor the memory of the victims of the AMIA bombing. The greatest gift we can give to their friends and family is to bring their killers to justice. I can upon our own government and the Argentine government to do everyting in their power to close this horrible chapter in our fight against terror.

HALTING THE ANTHRAX VACCINATION PROGRAM, H.R. 2548

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1999

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce H.R. 2548, a bill to halt the implementation of the Department of Defenses' Anthrax Vaccination Program. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this worthy legislation.

This legislation would halt the continued implementation of the force-wide Anthrax Vaccination Program within the Department of Defense. As my colleagues may know, this program was the result of a decision reached by the Secretary of Defense early last year that mandatory vaccination of all personnel in the U.S. Armed Forces was necessary.

Concerns about the program began shortly after its implementation earlier this year and have increased as the number of troops receiving the vaccine has increased. These problems attracted the attention of the Government Reform Subcommittee on National Security, which initiated a series of hearings in March. To date, the subcommittee has had three hearings, with a fourth scheduled for this week.

The congressional hearings held in March, April, and June have raised a number of concerns about the vaccination program including its purpose, its value, the manner in which it is being carried out, and its effects on those who serve in uniform. These concerns have been heightened by recent media reports and information circulating among those affected by the vaccine. Subsequently, my office, and those of many of my colleagues, has received an increasing number of contacts from concerned constituents, both members of the Armed Forces, as well as their distraught parents or relatives.

The Secretary of Defense set out four specific conditions that had to be met before the vaccination program could start: First, supplemental testing to assure sterility, safety, potency, and purity of the vaccine stockpile; second, implementation of a system for fully tracking anthrax immunizations; third, approval of operational plans to administer the vaccine and communications plans to inform military personnel; and fourth, review of medical aspects of the program by an independent expert.

According to the hearing testimony before the subcommittee, none of these conditions was satisfactorily addressed before the vaccine program was implemented.

The most prominent concern raised relates to the overall effectiveness of the vaccine. The FDA approval cited by the Defense Department was for a vaccine that was designed to protect workers in the woolen industry from cutaneous contact with anthrax spores. Conversely, the primary anthrax threat facing military personnel is not from cutaneous, but weaponized versions of the bacteria, which are inhaled by their victims. There has been little or no testing of the vaccine's effectiveness in humans against this form of anthrax. Some testing has been done on animals with mixed results, the most promising returns coming from laboratory monkeys. However, to assume a drug that has achieved moderately successful results in primates will have a similar response with humans is only the start of basic research, not a definitive conclusion based on solid scientific evidence.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, there is no evidence from the Defense Department that this vaccine would be effective against altered or multiple anthrax strains. Given that the Soviet Union placed a high priority on the development of the deliverable multiple anthrax strains, this is a legitimate concern. Analysis of tissue samples from Russians killed in an accidental anthrax release from a production facility in the 1970's have indicated infection from a combination of individual strains.

A second major concern relates to the overall safety of the vaccine. As with any drug, there are concerns about harmful side effects. Since 1970, the primary recipients of the vaccine have been several thousand mill workers and mostly DOD researchers. This limited civilian usage of the drug has resulted in limited evidence of adverse reactions. The one exception to this was the inoculation of approximately 150,000 gulf war troops. However, the Defense Department's poor recordkeeping after the gulf war has made gleaning any useful information about the vaccine's effectiveness or harmful side effects impossible. In fact, a Senate committee studying gulf war illness in the 103rd Congress did not rule out the use of the vaccine as a cause of gulf war syndrome.

Thus, it is premature to conclude that a drug used on several thousand individuals with a small incidence of adverse effects is safe to administer to 2.5 million military personnel. A simple overall 2 percent rate would yield 50,000 adverse reactions each and every year. This is an unacceptably high rate (more on the DOD reported reaction rate later). It is also completely unknown what will be the effect of cumulative annual boosters, let alone the combined effects from 15 or so other biological warfare vaccines under development. I ask, Mr. Speaker, what other force protection program has, as a built-in component, such a high casualty rate and unknown level of future risk?

Questions regarding the safety of the vaccine are appropriate given the history of the production of the vaccine. The original manufacturer of the vaccine, Michigan Biologics Products Institute (MBPI), ''voluntarily'' closed down in March 1998, in order to make $1.8 million renovations. Prior to this, MBPI had been cited repeatedly by the FDA for quality control problems and manufacturing violations dating back to 1990.

The subcommittee briefing from the April 29 hearing, stated that the vaccine ''is dangerous enough that the manufacturer demanded, and received, indemnification from the Army against the possibility that persons vaccinated may develop anaphylaxis or some unforseen reaction of serious consequences, including death. Private indemnity insurance was considered too costly.'' If the manufacturer was highly concerned about potential civil litigation, why was the Defense Department so quick to convey the message that the vaccine was safe for general use? This is a question that needs to be addressed.

There are additional concerns related to the tracking system being implemented with this vaccine. The gulf war experience illustrated the need for a comprehensive tracing system to measure the potential side effects of the multiple vaccinations often administered to soldiers being deployed overseas. While I understand that such a tracking system has been developed for this program, there have been several reports of individuals being inoculated with expired lots of the vaccine, to the significant detriment of their health as recorded in testimony and the media.

Moreover, it appears that adverse exclusionary categories, such as respiratory conditions, previous reactions, chills and fever, and pregnancy are not being adequately reviewed by the personnel in charge of administering the shots. Rather, the subcommittee has received reports that many of those administering the vaccine are simply glossing over communicating the exclusionary requirements in an effort to inoculate as many individuals as rapidly as possible. Likewise, there is evidence suggesting that the reporting of adverse reactions among troops who have received the vaccine, is being discouraged, so as not to cause undue alarm in those units which have not received their first round of shots.

In that same regard, the official Defense Department's reported reaction rates of between .0002 percent and .007 percent this year is not reassuring. The subcommittee has received reports that vaers forms are not available to service members, not filled out, or not forwarded. FDA and JAMA sources indicate extremely low percentages of reactions are ever reported anyway, and the military's record of reaction reports with the 1970's swine flu vaccine is far below that of civilian rates. Given these qualifiers, it seems the DOD-reported reactions rates should, at least, be accompanied by reasonable disclaimers.

There is also some uncertainty with the operational plans to administer the vaccine. There appears to be some confusion with deadlines as some units begin their shots and frequent deadline adjustments for unit personnel to receive their shots. Some of those deadline adjustments appear due to commander fear of excessive personnel losses because of the vaccine. Additionally, as Reserve Component personnel express an interest in transferring or terminating their participation because of the vaccine, the subcommittee has heard that they are met with delays, instructions to not list the vaccine as a reason, and even threats of poor evaluation reports. If members are convinced after careful research that a policy truly threatens their civilian livelihood, they should be allowed to communicate the truth about their perspective.

Moreover, the Reserve Officers Association has recommended that all National Guard and Reserve units should receive shots from lots of newly made vaccine. The ROA is chartered by Congress to review Defense policies to ensure their adequacy. Since they represent 80,000 current, experienced, and retired Reservists, their opinion should be considered carefully. Given that Bioport Corp. is not due to begin distribution of new vaccine until next year, and Guard and Reserve units are currently being vaccinated, it appears that DOD has rejected this recommendation.

Lastly, there are serious reservations about the independent review of the medical aspects of the vaccination program. The reviewer in question, Dr. Gerald N. Burrow, has been cited by the Defense Department as approving of the safety and effectiveness of the vaccine. Yet in a letter to the subcommittee dated April 26, 1999, Dr. Burrow stated:

> The Defense Department was looking for someone to review the program in general and make suggestions, and I accepted out of patriotism. I was very clear that I had no expertise in anthrax and they were very clear they were looking for a general oversight of the vaccination program . . . I had no access to classified information. The suggestions I made were to utilize focus groups to be sure the message they wanted to send to force personnel was being heard, and to use the vaccination tracking system as a reminder for subsequent vaccinations. I had no further contact after delivering my report and do not know whether my suggestions were implemented.

Given that the independent reviewer was admittedly not an expert in the field of anthrax, how can the Defense Department stand by his earlier claims that the vaccine was safe for distribution and the ''best protection against wild-type anthrax?'' Given past poor credibility in these issues, the history with gulf war illnesses, and the enormous potential risk to our entire population of uniformed defenders, why was this individual, and not someone with a background in large vaccination programs or biological agents like anthrax, selected for the independent review? These are questions that the Secretary of Defense needs to answer.

Mr. Speaker, it bears mentioning that several of our allies have taken a different approach to this issue. The United Kingdom has a voluntary vaccine policy for anthrax, which yields only an estimated 30 percent cooperation. The Canadians have faced the similar controversies to our program, and even more severe logistics problems with their vaccine, and are not currently administering it to their troops. Furthermore, it should be noted that Israel, which is conceivably at the greatest risk in the middle east and has received Scud attacks, does not rely on vaccines, but antibiotics.

Moreover, our own State Department, which arguably has more personnel risk because embassies are less well protected than military units, has only a voluntary policy. It is almost inescapable that this policy appears as a captive research market. Why in light of everyone else's lack of forced inoculations is it necessary to put U.S. service member trust on the line when two surveys have indicated that 80 percent of the civilian and military respondents oppose the program?

Above and beyond the specific concerns mentioned here, we are concerned about the public perception of the anthrax vaccination program and its impacts on service member morale. We must ensure that this single force protection measure which addresses only one of myraid of biological threats is not itself a more real threat to our citizens in uniform.

This legislation would accomplish this goal by requiring a suspension of the anthrax vaccine program until an independent study by the National Institutes of Health is conducted on both the safety and effectiveness of the vaccine. This study would review the claim being made by the Defense Department concerning both the effectiveness of the vaccine against airborne anthrax as well as on the low incidence of harmful side effects.

In addition, the legislation would require a second study by the General Accounting Office, on the effect of the vaccination program on service morale, focusing specifically on recruiting and retention issues in National Guard units.

Should these studies show that the vaccine is indeed effective against weaponized anthrax, is produced in a safe, controlled manner acceptable to the FDA, and does not have an unacceptably high systemic reaction rate, Congress may authorize the resumption of the program. Until these questions are answered however, our service men and women should not be subjected to a mandatory vaccination program with so many unknowns.

To allow the program to continue without these concerns being addressed, would not only be irresponsible, it would be, for those of us in Congress, an abdication of our oversight authority. As it currently stands, the anthrax vaccination program simply has too many unknowns. It may or may not work as advertised,

and in doing so, may fulfill the old cliche of the cure being worse than the illness.

Given that our allies have seen fit to either make their programs voluntary, or eliminate them altogether, we owe our men and women in uniform a closer look at the effects of our program.

Accordingly I urge my colleagues to join in support of this measure, H.R. 2548.

H.R. 2548

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 ''Department of Defense Anthrax Vaccination Moratorium Act''.

SEC. 2. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) a single force protection measure such as the mandatory anthrax vaccine immunization program should not be implemented by the Department of Defense without regard for that measure's own effects on morale, retention, recruiting, and budget; and

(2) an insufficiently proven vaccine should not be advocated as a substitute for research, development, and production of truly effective vaccines and essential antibiotics, adequate personal protective equipment, detection devices, and nonproliferation measures.

SEC. 3. MORATORIUM OF VACCINATION PROGRAM.

The Secretary of Defense shall suspend implementation of the anthrax vaccination program of the Department of Defense. After the date of the enactment of this Act, no further vaccination may be administered under the program to any member of the Armed Forces except in accordance with this Act.

SEC. 4. STUDY BY NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH.

(a) STUDY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director of the National Institutes of Health shall require the appropriate national research institute to conduct or oversee an independent study of the effectiveness and safety of the vaccine used in the Department of Defense anthrax vaccination program.

(2) MATTERS TO BE STUDIED.—The Director shall include in the study under paragraph (1) determination of the following with respect to that vaccine:

(A) Types and severity of adverse reactions.

(B) Long-term health implications, including interactions with other (existing and planned vaccines and medications.

(C) Efficacy of the anthrax vaccine for protecting humans against all the strains of anthrax pathogens members of the Armed Forces are likely to encounter.

(D) Correlation of animal models to safety and effectiveness in humans.

(E) Validation of the manufacturing process focusing on, but not limited to, discrepancies identified by the Food and Drug Administration in February 1998 (especially with respect to the filter used in the harvest of anthrax vaccine, storage times, and exposure to room temperature).

(F) Definition of vaccine components in terms of the protective antigen and other bacterial products and constituents.

(G) Such other matters as are in the judgment of the Director required in order for the Director to make the determinations required by subsection (b).

(3) LIMITATION.—The Director may not use for purposes of the study any data arising from the experience of inoculating members of the Armed Forces with the vaccine studied because of the lack of informed consent and inadequate recordkeeping associated with such inoculations.

(b) REPORT.—Upon completion of the study, the Director of the National Institutes of Health shall submit to the Committee on Government Reform of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Governmental Affairs of the Senate and to the Secretary of Defense a report setting forth the results of the study. The report shall include the Director's determination, based upon the results of the study, as to each of the following:

(1) Whether or not the vaccine used in the Department of Defense anthrax vaccination program has an unacceptably high systemic reaction rate.

(2) Whether or not the vaccine is effective with respect to noncutaneous transfer of anthrax.

(3) Whether or not the vaccine will be produced in a manner acceptable to the Food and Drug Administration.

SEC. 5. GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE STUDY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Comptroller General shall conduct a study of the inoculation program referred to in section 3 and of the effect of the use of contractor-operated facilities for that program. As part of the study, the Comptroller General shall study the following with respect to the inoculation program:

(1) Effects on military morale, retention, and recruiting.

(2) Civilian costs and burdens associated with lack of military medical care and loss of civilian sick leave and work capacity for members of the reserve components who experience adverse reactions while not in military status.

(3) A system of accurately recording medical conditions of members of the Armed Forces and other patients before and after inoculation, including off-duty reactions and treatment of reserve component members and including screening for allergens and contraindication, to include prior adverse reactions.

(b) PUBLIC COMMENTS.—The Comptroller General shall publish the study under subsection (a) for public comment.

(b) GAO REVIEW.—The Comptroller General shall review the Secretary's written report and provide comments to Congress within 75 days after the Secretary files the report.

SEC. 6. BOARDS FOR CORRECTION OF MILITARY RECORDS.

The Secretary of Defense shall direct that the respective Boards for Correction of Military Records of the military departments shall, upon request by individual members or former members of the Armed Forces, expedite consideration of applications for remedies for adverse personnel actions (both voluntary and involuntary) that were a result of the mandatory anthrax vaccine immunization program, to including rescission of administrative discharges and separation, rescission of retirements and transfers, restoration of flying status, back pay and allowances, expunging of negative performance appraisal comment or ratings, and granting of physical disability certificates.

SEC. 7. CONTINGENT RESUMPTION OF VACCINATION PROGRAM.

(a) CONTINGENT AUTHORITY FOR RESUMPTION.—If the Director of the National Institutes of Health determines in the report under section 3(b) that the vaccine used in the anthrax vaccination program of the Department of Defense meets each of the criteria stated in subsection (b), the Secretary of Defense may resume the Department of Defense anthrax vaccination program. Any such resumption may not begin until the end of the 90-day period beginning on the date of the submission of the report under section 3(b).

(b) CRITERIA FOR PROGRAM RESUMPTION.—the criteria referred to in subsection (a) are the following:

(1) That the vaccine used in the Department of Defense anthrax vaccination program does not have an unacceptably high systemic reaction rate.

(2) That the vaccine is effective with respect to noncutaneous transfer of anthrax.

(3) That the vaccine will be produced in a manner acceptable to the Food and Drug Administration.

(e) REQUIREMENT FOR USE OF NEW VACCINE.—If the anthrax vaccination program is resumed under subsection (a), the Secretary of Defense may only use newly produced vaccine for vaccinations after the resumption of the program.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

SPEECH OF

HON. TOM BLILEY

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 14, 1999

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2466) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Chairman, section 322 of H.R. 2466 is a funding limitation to prevent monies appropriated under the bill to be used by the National Telecommunications and Information Administration (NTIA) for spectrum purposes, GSA Telecommunication Centers, or the President's Council on Sustainable Development. I rise in opposition to this provision's applicability to NTIA's spectrum functions because of its potential impact on telecommunications policy and efficient use of the radio spectrum by government users.

Spectrum management issues fall within the jurisdiction of the Commerce Committee. As our Members have learned over the years, spectrum management is a complex task that requires detailed and analysis and consideration. Under the current process, the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) oversees the use of spectrum by private entities and NTIA oversees the use of spectrum by government entities, including the Department of Interior.

NTIA currently is required to be reimbursed by all federal agencies for the spectrum management functions NTIA does on behalf of the agencies. Today, federal agencies typically reimburse NTIA for about 80 percent of the costs associated with spectrum management. Since its inception, reimbursement by federal agencies to NTIA for spectrum functions has had a positive impact on the spectrum efficiency of federal agencies. Putting a cost on government spectrum has caused agencies to reassess exactly how much spectrum and what precise frequencies they need to complete their mission. This cost, however, is not an attempt to decrease or interfere with the valuable functions that federal agencies use spectrum for. In practice, the concept has promoted spectrum efficiency and promoted the efficiency of NTIA's spectrum management functions.

Section 322 would, in effect, prohibit the Department of Interior from reimbursing NTIA for spectrum functions. The Department of the Interior has already been required to reimburse NTIA since FY1996 and had to take into account such provisions prior to submitting a budget request to the Congress for FY2000. Section 322 is a direct effort to undermine the reimbursement effort and provides the Department of Interior with extra funding for other purposes for FY2000 that they wouldn't have otherwise. Providing the Department of the Interior with a statutory mechanism to avoid paying its fair share for spectrum management functions is not sound policy.

Further, section 322 could harm the Department of Interior's use of spectrum because under current restrictions NTIA is prohibited from providing any spectrum functions to a federal agency that does not reimburse NTIA for such functions. To the extent that the Department of Interior does not have funding outside of the monies provided in H.R. 2466, the Congress may be limiting the spectrum functions and capabilities of the Department of Interior. In effect, this provision may be prohibiting the Department of Interior from reimbursing NTIA for spectrum functions and as a result preventing the Department of Interior from using spectrum.

The Commerce Committee intends to move legislation reauthorizing NTIA this session. In particular, the Subcommittee on Telecommunications, Trade, and Consumer Protection is considering legislation to codify the current reimbursement practices and expand on the level of reimbursement from federal agencies to 100 percent. If any effort is necessary to adjust, alter, or exempt any federal agency from reimbursing NTIA for spectrum functions it should be through this vehicle and not through an appropriations bill.

Accordingly, I believe that section 322 may have a negative impact on spectrum policy. The Commerce Committee will be active to ensure that the inclusion of any provision within the final version of this bill not interfere or cause harm to telecommunications policy. I respectfully request that these concerns be taken into account during further consideration of this legislation.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. CHRISTOPHER SHAYS

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 19, 1999

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, July 15, I inadvertently voted ''nay'' when I meant to vote ''aye'' on rollcall vote 303, the Lowey amendment to H.R. 2490, the Fiscal Year 2000 (FY 00) Treasury-Postal Appropriations Act.

I support the provision in H.R. 2490 to require Federal Employee Health Benefit Plans (FEHBP) which provide prescription plans to include coverage of all FDA-approved contraceptive drugs and devices.

I oppose the amendment offered by Congressman CHRIS SMITH to allow health plans to opt out of providing contraceptive coverage by claiming a ''moral conviction.'' I was happy to see the passage of the Lowey substitute amendment to strike this exemption for health plans.

It is my hope the Lowey amendment will help reduce unwanted pregnancies while providing women with contraceptive coverage. While the FY 00 Treasury-Postal Appropriations Act covers only women in the FEHBP, I believe it is a positive step forward in ensuring contraceptive coverage is available to women in a majority of health plans.

As an original cosponsor of H.R. 2120, the Equity in Prescription and Contraceptive Coverage Act, introduced by Representatives JIM GREENWOOD and NITA LOWEY, I will continue to work to provide access to family planning services.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Tuesday, July 20, 1999 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

JULY 21

9:30 a.m.

Indian Affairs

To hold hearings on S. 985, to amend the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act.

SD–106

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

To hold hearings on the nomination of William Rainer to be Chairman of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission and to conduct an oversight review of the farmland protection program.

SR–328A

Armed Services

To hold hearings on the nomination of F. Whitten Peters, of the District of Columbia, to be Secretary of the Air Force; and the nomination of Arthur L. Money, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Defense.

SR–222

Environment and Public Works

Fisheries, Wildlife, and Drinking Water Subcommittee

To continue hearings on the habitat conservation plans.

SD–406

10 a.m.

Budget

To continue hearings to review the President's budget for fiscal year 2000.

SD–608

Judiciary

To hold hearings on combatting methamphetamine proliferation in America.

SD–628

Joint Economic Committee

To hold hearings to examine the financial structure of the International Monetary Fund, focusing on IMF costs, including quotas, reserves, gold holdings, and the treatment of the IMF in the budget.

311 Cannon Building

Finance

Business meeting to continue markup of the proposed Taxpayer Refund Act of 1999.

SH–216

Foreign Relations

East Asian and Pacific Affairs Subcommittee

To hold hearings on issues relating to Taiwan-China relations.

SD–419

2 p.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Forests and Public Land Management Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 1184, to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to dispose of land for recreation or other public purposes; S. 1129, to facilitate the acquisition of inholdings in Federal land management units and the disposal of surplus public land; and H.R. 150, to amend the Act popularly known as the Recreation and Public Purposes Act to authorize disposal of certain public lands or national forest lands to local education agencies for use for elementary or secondary schools, including public charter schools.

SD–366

Governmental Affairs

International Security, Proliferation and Federal Services Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine the purpose of Russian space launch quota.

SD–342

Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe

To hold hearings to examine the scope of bribery and corruption in the OSCE region.

SD–138

Judiciary

Criminal Justice Oversight Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on Federal asset forfeiture, focusing on its role in fighting crime.

SD–628

3:30 p.m.

Foreign Relations

To hold hearings on the role of snactions in United States National Security Policy.

SD–419

4:30 p.m.

Foreign Relations

To hold hearings on the nomination of J. Richard Fredericks, of California, to be Ambassador to Switzerland, and to serve concurrently and without additional compensation as Ambassador to the Principality of Liechtenstein; the nomination of Barbara J. Griffiths, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Iceland; the nomination of Richard Monroe Miles, of South Carolina, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Bulgaria; and the nomination of Carl Spielvogel, of New York, to be Ambassador to the Slovak Republic.

SD–419

JULY 22

9:30 a.m.

Environment and Public Works

To hold hearings on S. 835, to encourage the restoration of estuary habitat through more efficient project financing and enhanced coordination of Federal and non-Federal restoration programs; S. 878, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to permit grants for the national estuary program to be used for the development and implementation of a comprehensive conservation and management plan, to reauthorize appropriations to carry out the program; S. 1119, to amend the Act of August 9, 1950, to continue funding of the Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection and Restoration Act; S. 492, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Act to assist in the restoration of the Chesapeake Bay; S. 522, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to improve the quality of beaches and coastal recreation water; and H.R.999, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to improve the quality of coastal recreation waters.

SD–406

Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings on the nomination of Curt Hebert, Jr., of Mississippi, to be a Member of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission; and the nomination of Earl E. Devaney, of Massachusetts, to be Inspector General, Department of the Interior.

SD–366

10 a.m.

Year 2000 Technology Problem

To hold hearings on the impact of Year 2000 on global corporations.

SD–192

Foreign Relations

Near Eastern and South Asian Affairs Subcommittee

To hold hearings on the United State's policy with Iran.

SD–419

Judiciary

Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.

SD–628

2 p.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Forests and Public Land Management Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 1320, to provide to the Federal land management agencies the authority and capability to manage effectively the Federal lands, focusing on Title I and Title II, and related Forest Service land management priorities.

SD–366

Intelligence

To hold closed hearings on pending intelligence matters.

SH–219

Finance

To hold hearings on the President's proposal to reform Medicare and the modernization of the current benefit package.

SD–106

Judiciary

To hold hearings on issues relating to cybersquatting and consumer protection.

SD–628

2:30 p.m.

Foreign Relations

To hold hearings on the nomination of J. Brady Anderson, of South Carolina, to be Administrator of the Agency for International Development.

SD–419

JULY 23

10 a.m.

Foreign Relations

To hold hearings on the nomination of Michael A. Sheehan, of New Jersey, to be Coordinator for Counterterrorism, with the rank and status of Ambassador at Large.

SD–419

JULY 27

9:30 a.m.

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

To hold hearings on agricultural concentration and anti-trust issues.

SR–328A

2:30 p.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Forests and Public Land Management Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 719, to provide for the orderly disposal of certain Federal land in the State of Nevada and for the

acquisition of environmentally sensitive land in the State; S. 930, to provide for the sale of certain public land in the Ivanpah Valley, Nevada, to the Clark County, Nevada, Department of Aviation; S. 1030, to provide that the conveyance by the Bureau of Land Management of the surface estate to certain land in the State of Wyoming in exchange for certain private land will not result in the removal of the land from operation of the mining laws; S. 1288, to provide incentives for collaborative forest restoration projects on National Forest System and other public lands in New Mexico; and S. 1374, to authorize the development and maintenance of a multi-agency campus project in the town of Jackson, Wyoming.

SD–366

JULY 28

9:30 a.m.

Indian Affairs

To hold hearings on S. 979, to amend the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act to provide for further self-governance by Indian tribes.

SR–485

Energy and Natural Resources

Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.

SD–366

2:30 p.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Water and Power Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 624, to authorize construction of the Fort Peck Reservation Rural Water System in the State of Montana; S. 1211, to amend the Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Act to authorize additional measures to carry out the control of salinity upstream of Imperial Dam in a cost-effective manner; S. 1275, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to produce and sell products and to sell publications relating to the Hoover Dam, and to deposit revenues generated from the sales into the Colorado River Dam fund; and S. 1236, to extend the deadline under the Federal Power Act for commencement of the construction of the Arrowrock Dam Hydroelectric Project in the State of Idaho.

SD–366

JULY 29

2:15 p.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

National Parks, Historic Preservation, and Recreation Subcommittee

To hold hearings on S. 710, to authorize the feasibility study on the preservation of certain Civil War battlefields along the Vicksburg Campaign Trail; S. 905, to establish the Lackawanna Valley American Heritage Area; S. 1093, to establish the Galisteo Basin Archaeological Protection Sites, to provide for the protection of archaeological sites in the Galisteo Basin of New Mexico; S. 1117, to establish the Corinth Unit of Shiloh National Military Park, in the vicinity of the city of Corinth, Mississippi, and in the State of Tennessee; S. 1324, to expand the boundaries of the Gettysburg National Military Park to include Wills House; and S. 1349, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct special resource studies to determine the national significance of specific sites as well as the suitability and feasibility of their inclusion as units of the National Park System.

SD–366

AUGUST 3

9:30 a.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

To hold hearings on S. 1052, to implement further the Act (Public Law 94–241) approving the Covenant to Establish a Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands in Political Union with the United States of America.

SD–366

AUGUST 4

9:30 a.m.

Indian Affairs

To hold hearings on S. 299, to elevate the position of Director of the Indian Health Service within the Department of Health and Human Services to Assistant Secretary for Indian Health; and S. 406, to amend the Indian Health Care Improvement Act to make permanent the demonstration program that allows for direct billing of medicare, medicaid, and other third party payors, and to expand the eligibility under such program to other tribes and tribal organizations; followed by a business meeting to consider pending calendar business.

SR–485

SEPTEMBER 28

9:30 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to review the legislative recommendations of the American Legion.

345 Cannon Building

CANCELLATIONS

JULY 21

2 p.m.

Intelligence

To hold closed hearings on pending intelligence matters.

SH–219