United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 146 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, APRIL 10, 2000 No. 44

House of Representatives

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

□

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
April 10, 2000.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ROGER F. WICKER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

□

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

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

□

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There being no Members seeking recognition, pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

The Reverend Dr. Ronald Christian, Lutheran Social Services, Fairfax, Virginia, offered the following prayer:

O God, with these words and our thoughts, we acknowledge Your almighty power and recognize our ultimate dependence on Your great mercy.

So we pray, deliver us in Your might this day from callous hearts so that we may be agents of your goodness and orderlies of Your compassion.

Grant that from Your great storehouse of grace, we may receive the blessings of seasonal weather for the spring planting, comity for all communities in their life together, and joy in our pursuit of liberty and justice for all.

Gracious God, dispose our days and our deeds in Your peace.

□

THE JOURNAL

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

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

□

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. TRAFICANT led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

□

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1832. An act to reform unfair and anticompetitive practices in the professional boxing industry.

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

S. J. Res. 43. Joint resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the President of the United States should encourage free and fair elections and respect for democracy in Peru.

The message also announced that pursuant to the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 89 (106th Congress), the Chair, on behalf of the Vice President, appoints the following Senators to the Joint Congressional Committee on Inaugural Ceremonies—

the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. LOTT);

the Senator from Kentucky, (Mr. MCCONNELL); and

the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD).

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 96–114, as amended, the Chair, on behalf of the Majority Leader, announces the appointment of the following individuals to the Congressional Award Board—

Blaine L. Chao, of Kentucky; and

Linda Mitchell, of Mississippi.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 93–415, as amended by Public law 102–586, the Chair, on behalf of the Majority Leader, after consultation with the Democratic Leader, announces the reappointment of the following individuals to serve as members of the Coordinating Council on Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention:

Michael W. McPhail, of Mississippi, to a one-year term;

Dr. Larry K. Brendtro, of South Dakota, to a two-year term; and

Charles Sims, of Mississippi, to a three-year term.

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

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

Printed on recycled paper.

WASTEFUL SPENDING

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, bureaucracy is a word we hear every day. The Federal Government has become so large that it is difficult to follow how individual agencies are spending taxpayer dollars.

Take the Federal Aviation Administration, for example. The FAA spent $4 billion on an air traffic control modernization program that was unreliable, did not work, and was shut down before it was completed. Mr. Speaker, $4 billion just flew out the window.

The General Accounting Office remains concerned about the agency's poor accounting and lack of control over costs, as the agency proceeds with its new $42 billion air traffic modernization program. The GAO has every reason to be concerned about the FAA's decision-making process.

According to the Department of Transportation's report, FAA employees are using programs designed to acquaint air traffic controllers with cockpit operations for personal travel. And as my friend and colleague, the gentleman from the 17th district of Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT), would say, ''Just beam me up, Scotty.''

One employee took 12 weekend trips in a 15-month period to visit his family in Tampa, Florida, at taxpayers' expense.

Mr. Speaker, the waste of taxpayer dollars just will not fly any more.

□

NEED FOR INVESTIGATION AT WACO

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, infrared video technology has proven beyond a reasonable doubt that rapid-fire semiautomatic weapons were fired into the Branch Davidian compound after the explosive fire had ignited. Yet all this time, the Justice Department and the FBI have maintained in their knowledge they never fired into the compound after or before the fire had started.

Janet Reno further said she believed the FBI was telling the truth. Beam me up. 80 Americans were killed, many of them innocent women and children. They continued to lie. Stop the lies. Stop the coverup. Stop lying to Congress and Congress stop letting agencies get away with it. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the need for an investigation into the lies at Waco.

□

BREAST AND CERVICAL CANCER TREATMENT ACT

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

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, as you know, on May 14, we will celebrate Mother's Day. To honor that day, I am pleased that the leadership has agreed to schedule a vote on H.R. 1070, which is the Breast and Cervical Cancer Treatment Act.

This legislation will provide treatment for low-income, uninsured working women who are diagnosed with breast or cervical cancer. H.R. 1070 will give States the option of providing Medicaid coverage for these women if they are screened by the CDC's early detection program and found to have cancer, that is, the Centers for Disease Control. The program now provides screening for breast and cervical cancer, but can you believe it does not provide for treatment? H.R. 1070 will correct this. If we offer this screening, we must offer the treatment.

Mr. Speaker, the funding for H.R. 1070 is included in the budget resolution that the House recently passed. It enjoys strong bipartisan support. Let us do the right thing.

In honor of Mother's Day, let us pass H.R. 1070.

□

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

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

□

AUTHORIZING THE 2000 DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SPECIAL OLYMPICS LAW ENFORCEMENT TORCH RUN TO BE RUN THROUGH THE CAPITOL GROUNDS

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 280) authorizing the 2000 District of Columbia Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run to be run through the Capitol Grounds.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 280

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

SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION OF RUNNING OF D.C. SPECIAL OLYMPICS LAW ENFORCEMENT TORCH RUN THROUGH CAPITOL GROUNDS.

On June 2, 2000, or on such other date as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate may jointly designate, the 2000 District of Columbia Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run (in this resolution referred to as the ''event'') may be run through the Capitol Grounds as part of the journey of the Special Olympics torch to the District of Columbia Special Olympics summer games at Gallaudet University in the District of Columbia.

SEC. 2. RESPONSIBILITY OF CAPITOL POLICE BOARD.

The Capitol Police Board shall take such actions as may be necessary to carry out the event.

SEC. 3. CONDITIONS RELATING TO PHYSICAL PREPARATIONS.

The Architect of the Capitol may prescribe conditions for physical preparations for the event.

SEC. 4. ENFORCEMENT OF RESTRICTIONS.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) each will control 20 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 280 authorizes the 2000 District of Columbia Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run to be conducted through the grounds of the Capitol on June 2, 2000, or on such date as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration jointly designate.

The resolution also authorizes the Architect of the Capitol, the Capitol Police Board, and the D.C. Special Olympics, the sponsor of the event, to negotiate the necessary arrangement for carrying out the event in complete compliance with the rules and regulations governing the use of the Capitol Grounds.

The sponsor of the event will assume all expenses and liabilities in connection with the event and all sales, advertisements, and solicitations are prohibited.

The Capitol Police will host the opening ceremonies for the run starting on Capitol Hill and the event will be free of charge and open to the public. Over 2,000 law enforcement representatives, Mr. Speaker, from local and Federal law enforcement agencies in Washington will carry the Special Olympics torch in honor of the 2,500 Special Olympians who participate in this annual event to show their support of the Special Olympics.

For over a decade, the Congress has supported this worthy endeavor by enacting resolutions for the use of the grounds. I am proud to support this resolution and urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to join forces with my neighbor, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE), in supporting this legislation. Rather

than being redundant, I will not give my entire statement because I believe the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) has described the legislation quite thoroughly.

I would like to add that this was started by Eunice Kennedy Shriver, however, in the mid-1960s as a summer camp for handicapped children; and now this event has grown to involve, as the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) has stated, 2,500 Special Olympians competing in more than a dozen events. So I think it is worthy. I support it.

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

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

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) for yielding to me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to indicate my strong support for the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Special Olympics Torch Run. It is very important and I wholeheartedly support it.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I would urge passage of the resolution, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 280.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□

DEEPEST SYMPATHIES TO THE FAMILIES OF DR. GARY POLIS AND MICHAEL ROSE FROM THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT DAVIS

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

Mr. OSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer my deepest sympathies to the families of Dr. Gary Polis and Michael Rose. The University of California at Davis community lost two valuable members when these two men were involved in a tragic boating accident in Mexico's Sea of Cortez.

Dr. Polis chaired and taught at UC Davis' Environmental Science and Policy Department. He traveled to Mexico to lead a research expedition with a group of UC Davis students, Japanese visiting scholars, and Earth Watch study tour participants. Michael Rose, postgraduate researcher at the university, was also on that trip. After a routine visit to a nearby island, the boat they were in capsized. Dr. Polis, Mr. Rose, and three advising Japanese scholars drowned.

While we understand that words cannot ease the pain everyone experienced during this tragic time, let us take solace in the fact that these people died doing the work they so loved and so willingly shared with the world. Both Dr. Polis and Michael Rose shared the passion for adventure and learning that epitomizes the spirit of the university. We were blessed by their distinguished academic accomplishments.

Mr. Speaker, please join me and the entire Davis community in offering our deepest heartfelt condolences to the family and friends of Dr. Polis and Michael Rose. Please know that our thoughts and prayers are with you during this difficult time.

□

AUTHORIZING USE OF CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR GREATER WASHINGTON SOAP BOX DERBY

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 277) authorizing the use of the Capitol grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 277

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

SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION OF SOAP BOX DERBY RACES ON CAPITOL GROUNDS.

The Greater Washington Soap Box Derby Association (in this resolution referred to as the ''Association'') shall be permitted to sponsor a public event, soap box derby races, on the Capitol Grounds on June 24, 2000, or on such other date as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate may jointly designate.

SEC. 2. CONDITIONS.

The event to be carried out under this resolution shall be free of admission charge to the public and arranged not to interfere with the needs of Congress, under conditions to be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board; except that the Association shall assume full responsibility for all expenses and liabilities incident to all activities associated with the event.

SEC. 3. STRUCTURES AND EQUIPMENT.

For the purposes of this resolution, the Association is authorized to erect upon the Capitol Grounds, subject to the approval of the Architect of the Capitol, such stage, sound amplification devices, and other related structures and equipment as may be required for the event to be carried out under this resolution.

SEC. 4. ADDITIONAL ARRANGEMENTS.

The Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board are authorized to make any such additional arrangements that may be required to carry out the event under this resolution.

SEC. 5. ENFORCEMENT OF RESTRICTIONS.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) each will control 20 minutes.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 277, as amended, authorizes the use of the Capitol Grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby qualifying races to be held on June 24, 2000, or on such date as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration jointly designate. The resolution also authorizes the Architect of the Capitol, the Capitol Police Board, and the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby Association, which is the sponsor of the event, to negotiate the necessary arrangements for carrying out the event in complete compliance with the rules and regulations governing the use of the Capitol Grounds.

□ 1415

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

The races are going to take place on Constitution Avenue between Delaware Avenue and Third Street, N.W. The participants are residents of the Washington Metropolitan area and range in age from 9 to 16. This event is currently one of the largest races in the country, and the winners of these races will represent the Washington metropolitan area in the national finals to be held in Akron, Ohio.

I support this resolution. I urge my colleagues' support.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA), as well as the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), and the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), and certainly the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the sponsor, for working together. Certainly there is some bipartisanship on this committee for sure.

But I want to take a couple minutes to filibuster, hopefully, so that the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), who would like to speak, might make it here. But if he does not, then he can speak on the next one.

So taking that minute, I would like to thank Mr. Rick Barnett and Ms. Susan Brita of the staff. They probably do more work in the Congress than any other committee. This little subcommittee passes more legislation

than anybody. They laugh when I say that, but there is an awful lot of work attached to it.

But I would like to talk about the efforts of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER). For years, he has taken this upon himself to make sure that that soap box derby is conducted, and he does it with a passion. As my colleagues can see, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA), she was right there, and there are other Members probably who want to speak on it, too.

But I want to just say that the heavy hitter has come in, and I want to personally pay him that respect, because he has made it a personal issue. Everybody joins together with him.

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

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

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly support this resolution. I am delighted to join the sponsors of this resolution, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS), and the gentlewoman from the District of Colombia (Ms. NORTON), in supporting House Concurrent Resolution 277; and that, as we have heard, allows for participants in the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby to use the Capitol grounds and race along Constitution Avenue on June 24.

For the past 8 years, I have cosponsored this resolution, and it has gotten the almost unanimous support of this House, along with the rest of the Greater Washington Metropolitan Delegation, to promote this annual community service, which is now in its 63rd year of running.

From 1992 to 1999, the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby has been considered one of the largest races in the Nation, averaging over 40 contestants each year.

This year, the first Greater Washington Soap Box Derby of the new millennium expects to top previous enrollment numbers with 50 cars. Participants in the derby, ranging from ages from 9 to 16, live in communities in the great State of Maryland, the District of Columbia, and Virginia. The winners of the local events in June will have the honor of representing the Washington metropolitan area at the National Derby Race in Akron, Ohio on July 22.

The derby truly is a community event, with scores of children, parents, and volunteers working tirelessly to construct and operate the soap boxes. The region's youth have the opportunity to learn the lessons of teamwork, competition, and sportsman and sportswomanship, as well as the physics and mechanics that are involved in building an aerodynamically-shaped soap box car.

I also want to applaud one of my constituents, George Weissgerber of Rockville, Maryland, for his work this year as the derby director. I invite the Members of the House to, not only support this resolution today, but also to attend the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby on June 24.

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

Mr. Speaker, let me say this before I introduce my only speaker, from what I understand, there are many volunteers involved in this derby that give of their time, and time is money. I think the entire delegation has worked to really bring in those types of volunteers. I think that is where they deserve a lot of credit.

I thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) for his efforts for all of the young people who are involved in this.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, timing is important, and I had the opportunity to come into the room just as the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) was talking about my efforts on this matter.

But I would like to mention as well one additional person who sits to the chairman's right, or to the ranking member's right, chairman-in-exile, as I call him, Susan Brita, who has been an extraordinary asset to the House and, frankly, to the committee, the full Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for an awful lot of years.

She probably knows as much about these matters, about construction matters and the General Services Administration and so many other matters related to our infrastructure as any staffer on this Hill. I want to thank her for all the efforts she has made. I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT), the ranking member, too, for working very closely with her so he does not make mistakes. It is always a good judgment that all of us make to have good staff.

Also, I want to thank the chairman, who is not in exile, but who is on the job, for his efforts and my colleague from Montgomery County, Mrs. MORELLA, for rising in support of this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, we have obviously, as the House of Representatives, responsibility for this hallowed Hill, this center of democracy in the world. It is, I think, extraordinarily appropriate that, for the last few number of years, we have made available a part of this Hill over which we have authority for an enterprise that has literally taught thousands and thousands of young people, entrepreneurial spirit, competitive spirit, family working together, because, although those young people are responsible for building their carts, they do get some advice from and counsel from dad and mom and brothers and sisters from time to time, I know.

But this is truly an American enterprise. The Soap Box Derby is something that I think all of us have known about for almost all of our lives. It is an enterprise that takes the contributions of American business, of American volunteers, and certainly of the young people and their families.

This will be the 63rd running of the greater Washington Soap Box Derby, and it will take place as my colleagues have heard, Mr. Speaker, on June 24 of this year.

This resolution authorizes the Architect of the Capitol, as is necessary, as I have said, as well as the Capitol Police Board and the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby Association to negotiate the necessary arrangements for carrying out the running.

That obviously will not be, I think, a difficult job, although the concerns of the Capitol Police and the Architect must be met and, in fact, are met. In the past, the full House has supported this resolution, of course, unanimously.

But I do want to thank all of those in the Washington metropolitan area. This is not a partisan issue, obviously. The gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) who has spoken, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. WYNN), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS), the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WOLF), and others spoke supporting this resolution.

From 1992 to 1999, the greater Washington Soap Box Derby welcomed over 40 contestants per year which made the Washington, D.C. race one of the largest in the country. Participants, as my colleagues have been told, I am sure, range from approximately 9 years of age to 16 years of age and come from communities in Maryland, the District of Columbia, and Virginia.

The winners of this local event will represent the Washington metropolitan area in the national race which will be held, as it has been through history, in Akron, Ohio on July 22 of this year.

The derby provides our young people with an opportunity to gain valuable skills, not only in those that I mentioned, but in practical skills of engineering, aerodynamics, and other skills necessary to make that go-cart go faster than any other go-cart down that hill. Of course this is a beautiful Hill, Capitol Hill, to use as they go down on the west side of our Capitol.

Furthermore, the derby promotes teamwork, a sense of accomplishment, sportsmanship, leadership, and responsibilities. These are attributes that we should encourage our young people to carry into adulthood. That is why this enterprise, like so many others, is critically important.

I, Mr. Speaker, like so many in this Chamber, have the opportunity to be

very much involved in the Boys and Girls Clubs of America. They have a national charter from this Congress, and they report to us annually.

Like the Boys and Girls Club, this enterprise gives young people a positive focus and positive way to participate in directing their energy in ways that will result in benefits to themselves and to our community.

Mr. Speaker, I am more than honored to have been involved in this effort and thank all of the corporate sponsors, all of the volunteers, all of the parents, and, yes, certainly all of the young people who participate in this event. It is right that we give them the opportunity to do so on this historic Hill. I rise in strong support of the resolution.

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

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the efforts of the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER) and the entire delegation. I urge an ''aye'' vote.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, as the great chairman of our committee says, there is no such thing as a Republican soap box and no such thing as a Democratic derby. I urge passage of the resolution.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NETHERCUTT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 277, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□

EXPRESSING SENSE OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES IN CONTINUED SYMPATHY FOR VICTIMS OF OKLAHOMA CITY BOMBING ON OCCASION OF 5TH ANNIVERSARY OF BOMBING

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 448) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives in continued sympathy for the victims of the Oklahoma City bombing on the occasion of the 5th anniversary of the bombing.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 448

Whereas on April 19, 1995, as the result of an act of terrorism, a bomb exploded in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, collapsing the north face of the 9-story Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building;

Whereas April 19, 2000, marks the 5th anniversary of this tragic event;

Whereas the explosion killed more than 168 people, including 19 children, and injured more than 700 others in the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building and in and around surrounding buildings;

Whereas the explosion destroyed a childcare facility located in the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building, killing 15 children;

Whereas 320 surrounding buildings were impacted from the explosion;

Whereas flying glass and debris from the explosion were a major cause of injury; and

Whereas greater awareness and sensitivity to the safe design and operation of buildings could help make the people who live and work in and around the buildings safer: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) recognizes the countless acts of goodwill by the thousands of volunteers (including those who donated goods and services), rescue workers, and Federal, State, and local officials who assisted in the rescue and recovery efforts following the bombing in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, on April 19, 1995;

(2) sends continued condolences to the families, friends, and loved ones who still suffer from the consequences of the bombing;

(3) pledges to make Federal buildings safer, while still maintaining a level of openness to the citizens served by the buildings;

(4) pledges to create an awareness of the dangers of flying glass and debris resulting from an act of terrorism, an explosion, or a natural disaster; and

(5) pledges to support efforts to make buildings more secure for people from flying glass and debris and to promote the use of available technology to protect people from such glass and debris.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT) each will control 20 minutes.

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

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

House Resolution 448 expresses the sense of the House of Representatives in continued sympathy for the victims of the Oklahoma City bombing on the occasion of the fifth anniversary of that bombing.

On April 19, 1995, one of the worst acts of terrorism in the United States took place. A bomb exploded in Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, collapsing the north face of the Alfred P. Murrah Federal Building. The explosion resulted in the death of 168 people, including 19 children, and injuring more than 700 other people in the area.

This resolution recognizes the countless acts of goodwill, of thousands of volunteers, including those donating goods and services, who aided in rescue and recovery efforts following the bombing. It also sends continued condolences to the family, friends, and loved ones who still suffer from the consequences of that act. It also pledges to make Federal buildings safer while maintaining a level of openness to its citizens.

This resolution also pledges to create an awareness of the dangers of flying glass and debris in the case of such tragedies.

Finally, it pledges to support efforts to make buildings more secure for people by promoting the use of available technology to protect people from flying glass and debris.

Two weeks ago, Mr. Speaker, our subcommittee received testimony from Aren Almon-Kok, a young mother who lost her 1-year-old daughter, Baylee, in this senseless act. This woman has put aside her grief over this loss to speak out on the dangers of flying glass and to promote safety in child care centers.

Ms. Almon-Kok has also established a Web site for individuals concerned about flying glass and child safety at www.protectingpeople.com.

This awareness is slow in coming to the government; but with the help of citizens like Aren, those who attend child care centers can be made safer through conscious efforts on our part. I wholeheartedly support this resolution. I urge our colleagues to do the same.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to echo the comments and associate myself with the words of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) whom I believe has spoken the predicate elements of this particular resolution.

I would just like to add that the events of April 19, 1995 have forever changed the ways in which we shall view the safety of American citizens and all visitors in public places. The tragedy of the bombing of the Murrah Federal Building in Oklahoma City has regrettably become part of an American history we would prefer not to have to remember.

In the aftermath of this senseless act, however, we saw numerous acts of great bravery and countless acts of sacrifice and goodwill by many people. Thousands of volunteers, including Federal, State, and local personnel and workers, as well as rescue teams from all across this great Nation, provided immediate help and support. Even today as Congress convenes, condolences continue to be sent to the victims and their families.

We are here today to join once again in offering our sympathy and our prayers to the victims of this tragic bombing.

Mr. Speaker, I close by saying that the Committee on Ways and Means is working to better secure and make our buildings safe for the visiting public.

I urge an ''aye'' vote, and I compliment my neighbor, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) for his efforts in this regard as well.

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

□ 1430

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, 5 years ago on April 19, America was glued to radio and TV broadcasts for the latest news, sights and sounds for Oklahoma City. The minutes, hours, and days that followed the senseless destruction of the Murrah Federal

Building filled our citizens with shock, horror, anger, rage, and sadness. Each story of pain and loss was shared by everyone in America, each story of heroic rescue by Federal and State safety officials made us proud, and each memorial service caused us to pause and mourn as a Nation.

The character and resilience of the Federal workforce posted in the Murrah Federal Building and the people of Oklahoma City remain a symbol of courage for the Nation, and it is only fitting and appropriate that the Congress of the United States remember, honor, and commemorate the 5th anniversary of this insane act of terrorism.

And since I have so much time left, Mr. Speaker, if it is not inappropriate, I ask my neighbor and colleague from Ohio to join me in a moment of silence for the victims in Oklahoma City.

Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, on April 19, 1995 the greatest act of domestic terrorism occurred in my home state of Oklahoma. This heinous bombing of the Alfred P. Murrah building was supposed to strike fear and terror into the hearts of every Oklahoman and every American. 168 people were killed. Including 19 innocent children. To this day the image of little Baylee Almon lying lifeless in the arms of an Oklahoma City firefighter brings tears to my eyes.

However, despite this tragic loss of life, the men who were responsible for this bombing did not succeed in terrorizing America. In the aftermath of the bombing, Oklahomans and Americans did not show signs of fear or terror, they showed signs of love and compassion. I saw Americans respond not as Republicans or Democrats, not as rich or poor, not as black or white, not as man or woman, but I saw this country respond in a difficult time as unified Americans. When I look back on that terrible day 5 years ago, the first thing I remember is not the pain, I remember the compassion.

Today, this House stands together to let you know we will never forget. We will never forget the events that transpired on April 19, 1995, we will never forget the pain we felt, but most importantly we will never forget the overwhelming love that overcame the pain.

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I urge passage of the resolution. And, Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NETHERCUTT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, House Resolution 448.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LATOURETTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on House Concurrent Resolution 277, as amended, House Concurrent Resolution 280, and House Resolution 448, the measures just approved by the House.

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

There was no objection.

□

DECLARING ''PERSON OF THE CENTURY'' FOR 20TH CENTURY TO HAVE BEEN AMERICAN G.I.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 282) declaring the ''Person of the Century'' for the 20th century to have been the American G.I., as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 282

Whereas the 20th century was a century of conflict between forces of totalitarianism and dictatorship and forces of democracy and freedom;

Whereas American soldiers, sailors, airmen, and Marines (collectively referred to as ''G.I.'s'') fought, bled, and died in a number of conflicts during the 20th century, including two World Wars, to secure peace and freedom around the world;

Whereas in large measure due to the heroic efforts of the American G.I., more people around the world enjoy the benefits of freedom at the end of the 20th century than at any other time in history;

Whereas the American G.I., in fighting the forces of totalitarianism and dictatorship, had a strong personal sense of right and wrong and did not want to live in a world where wrong prevailed;

Whereas it may truly be said that during the 20th century the American G.I. accomplished great things while doing good things, becoming recognized throughout the world as a representative of freedom and democracy and, fundamentally, as a force for good in the face of evil;

Whereas at the end of the 20th century numerous organizations and publications sought to identify and designate a ''Person of the Century'' based upon achievements and contributions during that century; and

Whereas in light of the accomplishments of the Armed Forces of the United States during that century both in defeating the forces of tyranny and dictatorship and in embodying a sense of honor, decency, and respect for mankind, it is appropriate that the American G.I. be recognized as the single most significant force affecting the course of the 20th century: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress hereby declares the ''Person of the Century'' for the 20th century to have been the American G.I.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES) and the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) each will control 20 minutes.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on House Concurrent Resolution 282, now under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, as a part of the honor of serving North Carolina's 8th district in the U.S. Congress, I represent Fort Bragg and Pope Air Force Base. I am continually impressed and made proud by their dedication, commitment, and patriotism.

We are just turning the corner on a period in which we ask the American G.I. to do more and more with less and less. As I have gotten to know these brave men and women, one statement continues to ring in my ears, the statement made during a military personnel hearing at the Norfolk Naval Base was, ''Sir, whatever you give us, we will get the job done.'' The spirit of the American G.I., soldier, sailor, airman, and Marine, that ''can do spirit,'' is why we honor today the American G.I. as the Citizen of the Century.

To help make clear why we honor these men and women, let me quote Stephen Ambrose, author of Citizen Soldiers. ''American soldiers fought hard to win the war, but strove every step of the way to create peace.'' My friend and colleague, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), said in a hearing held before the Committee on Armed Services that this should be the Year of the Troop. I could not agree more. And it is in that same spirit that I offer this resolution honoring the American G.I. as the Citizen of the Century.

Quoting Stephen Ambrose again, ''At the core, the American citizen soldiers knew the difference between right and wrong, and they didn't want to live in a world in which wrong prevailed. So they fought and won. And we, all of us living and yet to be born, must be forever profoundly grateful.''

We are grateful but must never forget what has been done for us, the Nation and the world, by the American citizen soldier known affectionately as the American G.I.

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

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

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

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I commend my friend, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES), for introducing this resolution and for bringing it to the House floor today. As he stated, the 20th century was a century marred by conflict between forces of totalitarianism and dictatorship and the forces of democracy and freedom. It was a century of tremendous turmoil, bloodshed, destruction, and displacement.

But by the end of that century, freedom and democracy flourished in more places than at the century's start. And this was due most of all to the courage and the bravery of millions of American G.I.'s: soldiers, sailors, Marines,

airmen, merchant mariners and coasties, both active and reserve.

It was the American G.I., known at different periods of the century by names such as doughboys, Yanks, Buffalo soldiers, Rough Riders, or the American Expeditionary Force, who carried America's value system abroad and demonstrated unselfish courage aiding those who struggled against tyranny and oppression.

It was the American G.I. who helped defeat fascism, Nazism and Communism.

And it was the American G.I. who undertook the great offensives along the Western Front, who scoured up the beaches of Normandy and across the bloody Solomon Islands into Okinawa. It was the American G.I. who fought in the deserts of North Africa and the jungles of Burma, the Philippines and Indochina.

It was the American G.I.'s who secured air superiority against the Germans and continuously supplied an embattled Britain before finally mastering the sea lanes of the North Atlantic.

The American G.I. secured an uneasy peace on the Korean Peninsula and, for members of my generation, fought in Vietnam.

Reflecting on the last quarter of the 20th century, it is clear that the plight of the people of Grenada, Kuwait, Haiti, Bosnia, and Kosovo would have been considerably different had it not been for the intervention of America and the American G.I.

Indeed, there is probably not a region of the world whose people have not benefited from the presence of the American G.I. during the 20th century.

The role of the American G.I., of course, was not limited to intervening during crises and war. In fact, we cannot forget it was the American G.I. most often called to ensure the peace and who most often delivered and distributed humanitarian aid around the world, whether following a war or internal crisis, or after a natural or man-made disaster.

We also cannot forget the hundreds of thousands of American men and women who served as sentinels of peace and gave their lives defending freedom and Democratic values.

Many of us have personal friends we served with who are buried in cemeteries near and far. Some were childhood friends. Others, men and women that fate and war introduced to us. Each paid another installment of the great debt that will never be erased as long as there is tyranny in the world.

Just like the generations before them, they kept up the payments for all of us. And like their predecessors, they paid in time and effort and in blood.

I do not know any soldier who went to war for personal gain. They did not indulge in parlor room debates about politics or the economies of conflict. They did not engage in finger-pointing or scapegoating.

They reported for duty, and they did so with an intuition about history and a clear understanding about the Hitlers and the Husseins who turn up to remind us all that there are things worth sacrificing for.

General Sherman said, ''War is hell and combat is worse.'' Nobody wants peace more than the veterans and the G.I.'s. Those of us who have been there know that there is a better alternative to war. Bobby Kennedy said that he believed ''many Americans share the broad and deep hope of a world without war, a world where the imagination and energy of mankind is dedicated not to destruction but to the building of a spacious future.''

Mr. Speaker, that is patriotism in the truest, most unadulterated sense of the word. Let us also hope that the bloodshed and the conflict that came to characterize the 20th century does not characterize the 21st century.

As my colleague said when he began, the course of the 20th century was changed for the better as a result of the unselfish courage and sacrifice of the American G.I. Today, we recognize the contributions of these men and women by passing a resolution declaring the person of the 20th century to have been the American G.I. I urge support of this resolution.

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

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS), a steely-eyed fighter pilot. But before he begins, I wish to identify myself with the most kind and appropriate and very worthwhile remarks of my airborne friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON).

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, as a veteran of two wars, on active duty during Vietnam and as a National Guard pilot called to active duty during the Persian Gulf War, I rise to lend my voice to the chorus of those who urge this body to honor the American G.I. as the person of the 20th century.

The United States, through two hot World Wars and a long Cold War, and numerous wars and conflicts in all the far-flung reaches of this troubled globe, has been called the arsenal of democracy. Mr. Speaker, the American G.I. was the bearer of those arms and our American flag. He was, and still is, the guardian of our and our allies' security and freedom.

It is fitting that we are here to honor the G.I., the ''Government Issue'' soldier, the average and anonymous American citizen who became a soldier by setting down his tools of trade and picking up the unfamiliar weapons of war. And upon completion of his glorious and historic task, set them down again and to regain his primary status of citizen, to enjoy the rights of freedom he secured for others, secured with his life, his liberty and his sacred honor.

When the call went up, the Nevada ranch hand, the railroad worker, and the miner answered that call. To stop fascism in its evil tracks in Europe and the Pacific, the young man rose from his job in the subways of New York or the fields of California and went to the nearest recruiting station. And he returned to Asia later on to valiantly struggle to return peace to the Korean Peninsula. The jungles and skies of Vietnam rang with the bravery of North Carolina farm boys and the California college students. And in the hot desert sands of the Middle East, the young woman from Ohio toiled mightily for our Nation alongside her fellow soldiers.

Through it all, the sacrifice, dedication, and honor of our soldiers has been a lamp unto the world, the shining beacon of liberty. The American G.I. kept our flame of freedom burning brightly through the grim and dark skies; through blood, sweat and tears; through times of adulation and, sadly, through times of unreasonable contempt. But stand they did.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), the ranking member on the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) for yielding me this time so that I might have this moment to support this concurrent resolution declaring the American G.I. to be the person of the century.

I commend the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES) for introducing this resolution and the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) for the work that he has done to further its cause today.

Last December, I joined more than 100 of my House colleagues in urging Time Magazine to select the American G.I. as its Person of the Century. And although the magazine did not select the G.I. for its end-of-the-century cover story, it is more than fitting that the Congress of the United States recognize our Nation's men and women in uniform for their contributions.

□ 1445

The American G.I. changed the course of world history in helping to defeat fascism and communism. Victorious in World War I, World War II, down through Operation Desert Storm, bravely fighting in Korea, Vietnam, and confronting the struggles of the Cold War, U.S. soldiers, sailors, airmen, and Marines have protected our freedom and given hope to freedom-loving people around the world.

The American G.I. has played an indispensable role protecting freedom and preserving the peace through the course of the 20th century. I have no doubt the American G.I. will continue to make all of us proud in the next hundred years.

On a more personal note, Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that my

family has been represented in the first World War, as my father was aboard the U.S.S. *Missouri* in 1918 and our son was in Operation Desert Storm as a member of the First Cavalry Division. So I am pleased to say that our family has, through this century, been a part of the opening and the closing of those victorious moments that made the American G.I. the person of the century, in my opinion.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. KUYKENDALL), a former Marine.

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, these remarks are to some extent for me off the cuff because I did not know this was coming up right before I was supposed to have some floor duty here.

But the point I would like everyone to think about in honoring these young G.I.s of America is they are young. Because we do not fight wars with old people. They are always young. They are young men and young women who serve in the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Air Force, Merchant Marines. And they have all been recognized in various times for combat actions that they were involved in, or some were recognized because they showed up. And thank goodness they did not have a combat action during their time in the service.

We all need to think and look around. If we look at some of us now, we are a little older, we are a little wider, our hair is a little grayer, or we have lost some of it. But today there are young men and women doing the same thing that these veterans did starting clear back at the turn of the 19th century to the 20th.

And it was America's commitment, America's commitment of its youth all across the world, that defended freedom and democracy. We were never committed in an imperialistic mode. We were always committed to keep a country free, regain its freedom, retain the right to have a free election in their country.

That is the reason these young men and women should be America's person of the century. They were young. They did not necessarily know what they went to do, and yet they stood tall when called and voluntarily put themselves in harm's way in many cases.

The Nation should recognize this, and I am glad we are doing so and urge the passage of this resolution.

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

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA).

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to commend the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES) for introducing this resolution. It is most appropriate. I support it wholeheartedly. I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) for his leadership in that regard.

We recently had an event here on Capitol Hill for those veterans in my congressional district who had served in Normandy who were not able to go to Normandy for the anniversary 50 years after it had occurred in 1944. Of that number, I was surprised I had almost 100 in my own district who had served in Normandy. And of the group that attended, about 65 of those who were able to attend, they brought their families. We had over 250 people on the Hill.

When I spoke to these veterans and their families, they were so appreciative of the simple acknowledgment that they had received. The genuine thanks that these veterans conveyed to us reminded me of how important it is to take time out to recognize and honor these heroes from the past. Their sacrifices resulted in the promising future that is now before us.

I can remember my three older brothers served in the Second World War, and I remember as a child how we used to have a little banner in the window with the three stars indicating that they served. There were some families that had gold stars, which indicated that they had lost someone in the war who had totally sacrificed. We recognize that the people in this resolution played an important role in victory.

Now, I want to mention that in 1941 to 1945, over 16 million American women and men joined forces to combat the Axis powers. Of the 16 million, there were two segments of the population that had never before been properly integrated into a war effort and had played significant roles, African Americans and women.

While both groups played a crucial role in the defense of our country since the Revolutionary War, their efforts during World War II were especially important. For example, the Tuskegee Airmen and the Women Army Corps demonstrated their fortitude in battle and forever dispelled any notions of the capabilities of African Americans and women in battle.

I enjoyed Brokaw's book ''The Greatest Generation,'' and I think this resolution confirms and underlines that and says that we in Congress do recognize those people, the American G.I., whose sacrifices produced an extended period of peace and warrants our eternal praise.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that, once again, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES) for bringing this measure forward. I would like to thank all the Members who spoke and those who would have spoken had they been able to today.

But, most important, I would like to thank everyone who sacrificed and served in our U.S. military over the last century and those who are serving today. I ask for an ''aye'' vote on this resolution.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) for his leadership and for his cooperation and for being a part of this memorable resolution.

Let me pause for just a moment, if I may, to particularly thank the moms and the dads, the husbands, the wives, the children who lost loved ones fighting the wars of this and other centuries.

I lost an uncle flying the Hump in Burma, Charles A. Cannon, Jr. I never will forget that my grandfather never forgot. When the door bell rang or the phone rang, he always hoped it was some word that they had found his son.

So in closing, Mr. Speaker, I am proud to bring to the floor a resolution that declares the American G.I. the person of the 20th century. As we reached the end of 1999, people throughout the world had reason to celebrate. Mankind had progressed into a new year, a new century, and a new millennium. Such occasions provide an opportunity to reflect upon our past so that we may remember the people, places, and events that have shaped our culture and our future.

Over the past 100 years, we have enjoyed advancements in almost every facet of our daily lives. In our Nation in particular, the end of the 20th century served occasion to celebrate an era marked by American accomplishment. We, as a Nation, tackled and overcame challenges deemed insurmountable by our forebearers. Most notably, the American commitment to liberty, justice, and freedom has served as a model for democracy for peoples around the globe.

Our achievement has not come without its price, however. As former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff General Colin Powell has expressed, the 20th century can be called many things, but it was most certainly a century of war. Throughout this period, the forces of tyranny and dictatorship rose time and again to wage war on an unsuspecting world. How easy it is to forget those dark moments of our past. But we must not. We can never take for granted the freedom we, as Americans, enjoy. Our liberty is not free and always comes with a price. It has been secured through the years of American sacrifice and American bloodshed.

That is why I put before the Congress a resolution to recognize the American G.I. as the most influential figure of the 20th century. I offer this legislation not to glorify war and the atrocities that accompany it. To do so would be an insult to every American who made the ultimate sacrifice in service to our Nation.

Instead, I wish to commemorate the soldiers, sailors, airmen, Marines and coasties, collectively referred to as the American G.I., who left their families and their homes to fight on foreign soil for a nobler cause. I offer my resolution to celebrate generations of Americans who refused to live in a world

where wrong prevails. Without their sacrifice, the history of the 20th century would have taken a very different course.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to represent the soldiers and airmen stationed at Fort Bragg and Pope Air Force Base. I visit these installations regularly and over the last 18 months have enjoyed getting to know the young men and women who proudly serve our Nation. Their patriotism and sense of duty reflects the same spirit of generations who served before them. These young men and women would in a moment's notice defend our Nation from her foes. In honoring these courageous Americans who fought for this Nation during the 20th century, we also honor all those who serve today.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H. Con. Res. 282, which recognizes the American G.I. as the Person of the Century.

This resolution recognizes the defining role that American soldiers have played in charting a safe course for our nation and for democracy around the world. Unlike a certain magazine which recognizes the discrete accomplishments of individuals in its annual ''Man of the Year'' issue, the contributions of American soldiers cannot be so easily defined. The Americans who have served their country in the last 100 years as soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines are many, and the sum of their combined contributions defy a simple summary. Nor should the heroism of this group be reduced to a brief summary, for this would only serve to minimize the depth of American sacrifice over the last century.

Americans fought in two world wars for the basic principles of self-determination, democracy, and liberty. In both wars, Americans fought abroad to preserve values that transcended national interest, creating a foundation for a peaceful Europe and Asia that would have been unthinkable in the early years of the century. The rejection of totalitarianism evident in the defeat of the Third Reich continued to define the contributions of the American GI throughout the century. Bloody conflicts in Korea and Vietnam tested American resolution, but the GI unfailingly carried forward the flag in support of liberty and democracy. The stalwart resolves of the American GI checked Soviet aggression in Western Europe and contributed directly to the collapse of the Soviet Empire.

And the fight continues even today. While the official Cold War may be faded into history, Americans stationed on the front lines in South Korea, Saudi Arabia, Bosnia, or any of a myriad of other countries continue to play an important role as guarantors of peace and stability.

Fifty years ago, the second half of the Twentieth Century was dubbed ''America's Century,'' because of the formative role the United States has played in reshaping the world in our image at the conclusion of World War Two. I join my colleagues today in recognizing that we owe the American Century to the steady, faithful efforts of the American GI, the Person of the Century.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I am in support of this resolution. Throughout this sad and bloody century, it was the GI—the American citizen soldier—who left hearth and home, put his or her personal plans on hold, and traveled to every corner of the world to save the concept of democracy and preserve the value of freedom. Despots and dictators throughout this century were halted in their tracks and driven back to their lairs because Americans were not, as they thought, too soft and decadent to resist their battle-hardened armies.

The warlords of Imperial Germany were the first to learn that the American fighting man was not a pushover. American soldiers at Chateau Thierry and United States Marines at Bellau Wood brought the German's last chance offensive in 1918 to a halt. Later, the Doughboys would be sent into the most difficult terrain in Northern France—the Argonne Forest—to drive the Germans out of positions that had stymied the Allies for over four years. Meanwhile the United States Navy was helping to sweep the seas clear of U-boats and the American Air Service was dueling in the skies with the students of the Red Baron.

The Nazis of Germany, the Fascists of Italy, and the militarists of Japan were the next to try to, in Churchill's words, ''plunge the world into a new Dark Age.'' And again, it was the New World, with all its power and might, stepping forth to the rescue and liberation of the Old. Hitler had nothing but contempt for American fighting prowess. From Kassarine Pass, through Salerno and Anzio, to the maelstrom of Normandy, all the way to final victory in the heart of Europe—the GI shattered the same Wehrmacht that had marched through the Arc de Triomphe and past the Acropolis. In the air, Americans devastated the Luftwaffe that had terrorized Warsaw and destroyed Rotterdam, and then laid waste to the Nazi industrial complex.

The Japanese believed that their troops, culturally imbued with the spirit of Bushido, would easily outfight the soft Americans. They did not expect that Americans would fight in places such as Guadalcanal, Tarawa, New Guinea, or Iwo Jima—where uncommon valor was a common virtue.

The GI managed to so this at the end of supply lines stretching thousands of miles. They could only do this because their colleagues in the Navy kept those sea-lanes safe against submarines, surface raiders and aircraft. The merchant mariners who manned those supply and transport ships were the unsung heroes of that mission—suffering great travails as they got their vital cargoes through. Very few stories of the Second World War are as compelling as the ordeal of Convoy PQ–17, which suffered terrible losses on its way to Murmansk.

As a result of these sacrifices, most Americans believed that tyranny was decisively defeated, that the second half of the century would be free of the perils that market the first. Instead, the GI was forced to wage a long twilight struggle against another form of totalitarianism—Soviet Communism—and stand on guard for nearly another 50 years.

American troops were forced to remain in Europe, to hold back the Iron Curtain from sweeping the entire continent into darkness. Millions of American families grew to recognize places such as the Fulda Gap and Rhein-Main air base. The Sixth Fleet patrolled the Mediterranean to a degree not dreamed of by their ancestors that had stormed the shores of Tripoli.

In Asia, the Cold War grew hot in Korea, where the term ''Frozen Chosen'' entered the lexicon. Even now, GI's remain on alert to keep the North Korean Peoples Army on their side of the DMZ. Further south, Americans fought, bled, and died in Vietnam—America's longest war—and our most divisive since our Civil War. At last, all recognize that the GI's service there was honorable.

Even now, after the global threat of Communism has collapsed, it is the GI who is called upon when freedom is seriously threatened. From Kuwait to Kosovo, it is only when the American fighting man arrives, that the world knows that aggression will be resisted.

There have been many great people this century who have symbolized the struggle for freedom in the twentieth century—Churchill, Roosevelt, Reagan—but it is the millions of people behind them, the American GI's, who actually delivered on that promise. I ask my colleagues to join me in passing H. Con. Res. 282, to declare that the ''Person of the Century'' is truly the American GI. He enabled us to be debating in this chamber today.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Con. Res. 282—Declaring the ''Person of the Century'' for the 20th century to have been the American G.I.

As a co-sponsor of this resolution, I strongly believe that the United States House of Representatives must officially be on record as supporting it.

Mr. Speaker, there is not enough time on this floor today for us to pay full tribute to the importance the American G.I. played in the history of this century. Our democracy, freedom, and liberty owe themselves to the sacrifices of the American G.I.

From World War I to the Persian Gulf, the American G.I. has always stood proud and tall. Ordinary men and women from across every walk of life, when asked, answered the call to duty.

When we think of the darkest moments of the 20th century, it was always the American G.I. that stepped into the breach to defend freedom. It was the G.I. that huddled low while crossing the beach at Normandy. it was the G.I. that bravely fought in the cold at Cho-San. It was the G.I. that did their duty, with honor, at Da'Nang. it was the G.I. that was the lightning in Desert Storm. And, it was the G.I. that has always stood guard between freedom and tyranny. It is for these very reasons that the American G.I. should be recognized as the person of the century.

Defending the Constitution of the United States on foreign soil is the greatest duty the nation can ask of its citizens. The American G.I. answered the call to duty and performed it to the highest standard. What Winston Churchill said of his soldiers rings true for ours, ''Never have so few given so much for so many''.

Mr. Speaker, as we speak today we must never forget our duty to our veterans. Our veterans were there when the nation called; now we must be there when they need our help. There can be no compromise when it comes to veterans' health care. I am proud of the actions we have taken so far and to the fact that we will not let our veterans down.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I am supporting H. Con. Res. 282, a bill to declare the American G.I. as ''The Person of the Century for the 20th Century.'' I urge my colleagues to join in supporting this timely, appropriate measure.

As the year 1999 drew to a close, it became fashionable among pundits and academians to

nominate a person of the century, for the outgoing 20th century. Many such people were selected, including Time magazine's choice of Albert Einstein. Writing for the New York Times, columnist Charles Krauthammer presented an eloquent defense of his nominee, Winston Churchill, without whom, he argued, Britain would have eventually sought a separate peace with Nazi Germany, drastically altering history. Many other distinguished journalists and pundits offered their own choices for this honorable position.

H. Con. Res. 282 takes a different approach to this nomination. Instead of presenting an individual for the award, it makes a collective nomination in declaring the American G.I. to be the best choice for person of the 20th century. Mr. Speaker, I can think of no better choice for this honor.

In the past century, no group of people have given more of themselves in the cause of defending freedom and liberty than the American people. Twice this century the American citizen-soldier left his family and occupation to take up arms in defending freedom on the continent of Europe.

The arrival of the first members of the American expeditionary force served as a vital morale boost to their exhausted British and French counterparts on the western front in 1917. Later, more than 2 million American soldiers arrived in France to check the last desperate offensive of the Kaiser's army and eventually broke the back of imperial Germany's war effort. Without the contributions of the American G.I. the western allies surely would have fallen to the German offensive of 1918 and the U-boat campaign against the British shipping lifeline.

Twenty-five years later, the American G.I. led the first western counteroffensive against Nazi Germany and took on imperial Japan almost single-handedly. Beginning in North Africa, American soldiers rolled back the German war machine, through Algeria, Sicily, the Italian peninsula and later from Normandy to Paris to Germany itself. In the Pacific, American Marines launched a two-pronged island-hopping campaign from springboards in Hawaii and Australia, supported by our Nation's Air Force, against Imperial Japanese forces, culminating in the bitter hard fought conquest of Iwo Jima and Okinawa. Backed by an industrial base with overwhelming production capacity, the American G.I. liberated Europe from the grip of Nazi totalitarianism and the Pacific from Imperial Japanese tyranny.

The American G.I. spent the second half of the 20th century defending freedom from Communist aggression, in Europe, the Middle East, Latin America and in the Far East. While many during the cold war questioned American defense of nations with little or no democratic government in practice, history has vindicated the cold war American G.I. through today's examples of South Korea, Taiwan and most Latin American countries, where democracy is both alive and well.

Mr. Speaker, the world would indeed be a much different place today, were it not for the contributions of the millions of courageous American citizen-soldiers, who, when called upon by their country, selflessly put aside their personal interests and stepped forward to defend freedom and democracy. While we have not done it alone, the American contribution has almost always meant the difference in ultimate victory for the United States and her allies.

Accordingly, I strongly support this as befitting legislation, and strongly urge my colleagues to support its passage.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, I cannot support H. Con. Res. 282. I take a back seat to no one in my support, appreciation, and admiration for the individuals who served our Nation in the military over the course of the 20th century. I would support a resolution which recognized their contributions, although I would far prefer a more tangible showing of appreciation, such as fulfilling the promises of health care made to those who served.

I cannot support this resolution, however, for several reasons.

First, it seems to me that the House has enough business on its plate fulfilling its responsibilities under Article I of the Constitution and need not enter into an interesting but purely theoretical debate fostered by a magazine topic.

Secondly, if we were to offer an opinion on the ''Person of the Century,'' it should actually be a person, not a class or category of persons. Words have meaning, and as we alter or stretch those meanings, we may well encourage inaccuracy or stretching of the truth. We have had enough of that recently.

I also believe that we should not diminish the importance of the individual human being. The contributions to world history by American service men and women were accomplished by individuals. A man or woman is brave; an organization or class of persons is not. We should not diminish the importance of what a brave individual can do by redefining ''person'' to mean an entire category of persons.

The key question to ask in assessing ''Person of the Century'' is how would things have been different without him or her. I have my personal view on who that should be, but my views are better argued in a magazine article rather than on the floor of the House of Representatives.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NETHERCUTT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 282, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□

HONORING MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES AND FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES WHO SERVED NATION DURING VIETNAM ERA AND FAMILIES OF THOSE INDIVIDUALS WHO LOST THEIR LIVES OR REMAIN UNACCOUNTED FOR OR WERE INJURED DURING THAT ERA

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 228) honoring the members of the Armed Forces and Federal civilian employees who served the Nation during the Vietnam era and the families of those individuals who lost their lives or remain unaccounted for or were injured during that era in Southeast Asia or elsewhere in the world in defense of United States national security interests.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 228

Whereas the United States Armed Forces conducted military operations in Southeast Asia during the period (known as the ''Vietnam era'') from February 28, 1961, to May 7, 1975;

Whereas during the Vietnam era more than 3,403,000 American military personnel served in the Republic of Vietnam and elsewhere in Southeast Asia in support of United States military operations in Vietnam, while millions more provided for the Nation's defense in other parts of the world;

Whereas during the Vietnam era untold numbers of civilian personnel of the United States Government also served in support of United States operations in Southeast Asia and elsewhere in the world;

Whereas May 7, 2000, marks the 25th anniversary of the closing of the period known as the Vietnam era; and

Whereas that date would be an appropriate occasion to recognize and express appreciation for the individuals who served the Nation in Southeast Asia and elsewhere in the world during the Vietnam era: Now, therefore, be it

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

(1) honors the service and sacrifice of the members of the Armed Forces and Federal civilian employees who during the Vietnam era served the Nation in the Republic of Vietnam and elsewhere in Southeast Asia or otherwise served in support of United States operations in Vietnam and in support of United States national security interests throughout the world;

(2) recognizes and honors the sacrifice of the families of those individuals referred to in paragraph (1) who lost their lives or remain unaccounted for or were injured during that era, in Southeast Asia or elsewhere in the world, in defense of United States national security interests; and

(3) encourages the American people, through appropriate ceremonies and activities, to recognize the service and sacrifice of those individuals.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Con. Res. 228.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 228 to recognize and honor members of the Armed Forces and civilian employees

who served this Nation during the Vietnam era and the families of those individuals who lost their lives, remain unaccounted for, or were injured during the Vietnam war.

Twenty-five years ago, we ended our involvement in the Vietnam War. And unlike World War II or Korea, our objectives for being in the conflicts in Southeast Asia were not very clear. Why were we there? What forces of evil or wrongdoing compelled the potential sacrifice of American lives? What national security or economic interests of the United States were at stake?

Our involvement in Vietnam sparked tremendous domestic controversy, largely because we could not answer those questions. Our soldiers came home without fanfare or ticker-tape parades or their hero's welcome we have historically showered on returning veterans. Our veterans became an easy target for those who questioned our participation in Vietnam; and, as a country, we turned our backs on them.

As a Nation, we struggle to find solutions to world issues that do not require military force. However, when needed, the young men and women of this Nation answer our call to service.

□ 1500

We must never again let the popularity of any war effort be the measure of when we honor our veterans' service. I will say that again. We must never again let the popularity of any war effort be the measure of when we honor our veterans' service. We cannot rewrite our past, but we can correct those mistakes by acknowledging the service of our Vietnam veterans, military and civilian.

Let me quote Dan Mauro, a Vietnam veteran, to reintroduce my colleagues to our Vietnam patriots. In Dan's words, our Vietnam veterans ''are men and women. We are dead or alive, whole or maimed, sane or haunted. We grew from our experiences or we were destroyed by them or we struggle to find some place in between. We lived through hell or we had a pleasant, if scary, adventure. We were Army, Navy, Marines, Air Force, Red Cross and civilians of all sorts. Some of us enlisted to fight for God and country, and some were drafted. Some were gung-ho, and some went kicking and screaming.

''Like veterans of all wars, we lived a tad bit—or a great bit—closer to death than most people like to think about. If Vietnam vets differ from others, perhaps it is primarily in the fact that many of us never saw the enemy or recognized him or her. We heard gunfire and mortar fire but rarely looked into enemy eyes. Those who did, like folks who encounter close combat anywhere and anytime, are often haunted for life by those eyes, those sounds, those electric fears that ran between ourselves, our enemies and the likelihood of death for one of us. Or we get hard, calloused, tough. All in a day's work.''

We recognized the heroism of those who lost their lives in Vietnam with the creation of the Vietnam Veterans Memorial in 1993. Today, with 2.5 million visitors annually, this memorial is the most visited place in the Nation's capital. This memorial is a fitting tribute to the men and women who served in Vietnam. The wall has helped family members and friends say a final farewell. It has helped others come to terms with their Vietnam service. It has taught a generation about the heroism of those who lost their lives in Vietnam.

It is time now to embrace the service of all our Vietnam veterans, those who lived, those who died, those still missing, and all of us whose lives were unalterably changed by the experience. It is for this reason that House Concurrent Resolution 228 is so important.

May 7, 2000, marks the 25th anniversary of the end of the Vietnam era. House Concurrent Resolution 228 marks this historic anniversary by honoring the duty, courage, service and love of family and country demonstrated by the 2.7 million Americans who served in Vietnam. Let this resolution also stand as notice to those who serve us now, in places like the Balkans, Korea, and the Persian Gulf and for the next generations of patriots: America will stand by you and will praise your service, bravery, and commitment.

I am proud to have served my country in Vietnam and am honored to be recognized as a veteran of that war. Today, I am deeply privileged to salute all who served, lost their lives, were injured or are still missing in Southeast Asia by supporting this resolution. I thank my colleague, the gentleman from California, for his service in Vietnam and his efforts to acknowledge the contributions of Vietnam veterans and their families. I urge my colleagues in Congress and people across the Nation to recognize the contributions of these heroes.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. KUYKENDALL) for bringing House Concurrent Resolution 228 to the floor today. This resolution allows Congress and the American people to commemorate the service of the men and women who served in both uniformed and civilian roles during the Vietnam era. On May 7, 2000, our Nation will observe the 25th anniversary of the end of that era. This resolution's genesis are the veterans that I have the honor of representing who live today at the California veterans home in Yountville in my district. I thank all of them and, in particular, John Schmucker, Tom Sarciapone, Sam Hollis, Jr., Robert Moak, and the other members of the Allied Council of the Yountville veterans home for their generous suggestion for honoring Vietnam-era service members and Federal civilian workers.

Like so many others before us, my generation was called to arms. Most of us responded, notwithstanding the controversy and the turmoil the Vietnam War caused. Seventy-nine of our current House colleagues and 16 Senators served, and several served with extraordinary bravery and courage. The images of Vietnam are still vivid in our individual and collective memories. But what is most surprising is the passage of time since our service.

As I mentioned, May 7 will mark the 25th anniversary of the departure of the last U.S. servicemen from Vietnam, a departure that closed the Vietnam era and for many of us an important chapter in our lives. Between 1961 and 1975, more than 3.4 million Americans served in the armed services in Vietnam and throughout Southeast Asia. Elsewhere in the world, other U.S. forces stood as sentinels. Whether it was along the 38th parallel, at Checkpoint Charlie, the DEW line, Diego Garcia, or patrolling undetected under the world's oceans, U.S. servicemen and women ensured the peace.

The Departments of Defense and Veterans Affairs estimate that more than 9.2 million active duty, reserve, and guard personnel protected U.S. national security interests throughout the world during the Vietnam era. Untold millions of Federal civilian workers also contributed to our Nation's defense at a time tensions were growing between world superpowers. On the eve of this anniversary, we pause to commemorate their service and their sacrifice as well.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution commemorates the sacrifice of every individual who served our Nation during that period called the Vietnam Era. As important, the resolution expresses appreciation to the families of those who died, remain unaccounted for, or who were injured during the course of their service during this era. While it is defined in the statute by specific dates, until the last of our missing service members is found or accounted for, the Vietnam era will never be completely closed.

I again thank the majority leader, the Democratic leader, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPENCE), the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BUYER), the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER), and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR) for their help in making sure this resolution came to the floor at this particular time. I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. KUYKENDALL) for his leadership and urge the support of House Concurrent Resolution 228.

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

Mr. KUYKENDALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS).

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. KUYKENDALL) for introducing this and the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) for their support of this issue as well. As a Vietnam veteran and former fighter pilot, I stand in this well honored and privileged to speak out in support of this issue.

As my colleagues said, it was just 25 years ago that the Vietnam era officially ended with the infamous fall of Saigon. Although many Americans have turned away from this sad chapter in our national history, this country cannot and it will not turn away from those young men and women who wrote that history with their blood, their pain, and their heroic sacrifices. I am proud, as I said, to join my fellow veterans of the Vietnam War and the rest of our country in honoring the service and the sacrifice of all these men and women wearing our Nation's uniform during that very trying time. Let us not forget to honor the families, those who sacrificed with the parent, the child, the brother or a sister off in a distant land defending their Nation, defending our freedom. Some are still in pain with loved ones still missing and unaccounted for but never forgotten.

Honoring these men and women is the least we can do as we start a new millennium, as we start a new era. But one thing is and always will be certain: our need for the types of men and women like these brave soldiers, sailors, airmen and Marines in Vietnam. We need types that are as dedicated and selfless as those who were sacrificing their lives in Vietnam for us.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride and thanks I urge all my colleagues to support this issue. I urge unanimous passage of this humble recognition and fitting commemoration of our fellow citizens, Vietnam-era veterans and their families.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON), ranking member of the Committee on Armed Services.

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I wish to pay special commendation to my friend and my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON), for introducing this resolution. I might also note, besides being a very active member of our committee, he was a member of the 173rd Airborne Brigade in Vietnam and served his country well and with dedication during the Vietnam era and during that conflict. I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. KUYKENDALL) for his strong support of this resolution.

Although it may not seem it, 25 years have elapsed since the United States military forces fought in Vietnam. While not everyone may agree that the United States should have participated in the conflict, the matter is we did. More important, hundreds of thousands of patriotic Americans gave their lives or were wounded while serving this country. Still others remain unaccounted for. It is only fitting that we recognize their sacrifice on behalf of our great Nation.

This resolution honors the service of the military members and civilians who served during the Vietnam era and also recognizes and honors the families who suffered during this conflict. The heroism and sacrifices made by these individuals deserve to be recognized, and this resolution takes that step.

In these days when we consider how best to improve access to health care for our service members and our military retirees, we must not forget that our efforts are really aimed at fulfilling a commitment to servicemen and women who served not just in Vietnam but also in the Second World War and Korea and the Persian Gulf and elsewhere around the globe. We owe them for their service and for the promises our government made to them. We cannot and must not let them down regarding the very serious issue of health care.

Mr. Speaker, our soldiers, sailors, airmen, Marines, and civilians who served in Vietnam did their duty to protect our freedom and gave hope to the oppressed people of that country. As we approach the 25th anniversary of the Vietnam conflict, it is wholly appropriate that we commend the service and sacrifice of those who served. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution.

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

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

The newspaper back in my district had a front page story this weekend with many pictures in the body of it talking about the Vietnam War's 25th anniversary. For each group of people that served in whatever time period you were in, you cannot help but have your memories come flooding back when you see these newspaper stories, seeing it now with the hindsight of history. It is much different than the day we lived it, when we were serving in that particular capacity.

It is great today as a Member of Congress to be able to recognize on the Vietnam War's 25th anniversary the service of those men and women who served with the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) and myself in that Southeast Asian conflict. Today, I now have a daughter who serves, and I now recognize what my parents must have thought when they put me on a plane for several trips to Asia. It is a different feeling and yet it is the same feeling you get whether you are doing it today or you were doing it 25 years ago or 25 years before that. That is the reason we have these recognitions, because a Nation that ever forgets to recognize that service has taken one step down a path we do not want to be on.

I would like to encourage everybody, today in this resolution, to recognize Vietnam veterans. Just a few minutes ago, we recognized G.I.'s for the 20th century.

□ 1515

But everybody should look around and say ''thank you'' to that uncle or that grandfather or that son or daughter or brother or sister that you saw serve in the military.

I was proud of my service. All of us that served were proud of our service, and today Congress has a chance in this resolution to recognize on the 25th anniversary the service of veterans, both military and civilian, who served in Southeast Asia. I urge the passage of this resolution.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Con. Res. 228, a bill to recognize and honor the sacrifice and service of those members of our Nation's Armed Forces and their civilian defense counterparts who served during the Vietnam era. I urge my colleagues to join in supporting this worthy legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the Vietnam war was neither a popular nor a fully supported conflict among the American public, for a large number of reasons. The remote location of the fighting, the apparent hesitancy of two successive administrations to seek a decisive victory, the deterioration, over time, of the United States' established commitment to fighting communism in southeast Asia, and the gradual increasing unpopularity of the war among the Nation's youth all contributed to the eventual withdrawal of United States forces from South Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia. A similar, but not quite as severe outcome had occurred in the earlier Korean conflict.

While the returning G.I's from the Korean war had encountered indifference from the American population, those returning from Vietnam were often met with outright hostility. Moreover, it took more than a decade for proper recognition, in the form of a national memorial, to be provided for our Vietnam veterans.

There are still a number of unresolved issues from the Vietnam war. Chief among these is the POW/MIA issue. There still remain over 2,000 unaccounted for servicemembers from the conflict in southeast Asia. Regrettably, in recent years, many have sought to downplay the need for the fullest possible accounting of those missing personnel in pursuit of the establishment of commercial interests in southeast Asia. May this resolution be of some solace to the families and loved ones of our missing and POW's that there are many of us in the Congress committed to a full and final accounting of our missing.

It bears noting that for today's generation entering college, the Vietnam war is as distant as World War II was to the baby boomer generation. It is my hope that this resolution will help to preserve the memory of the dedicated service and ultimate sacrifice made by the members of our Armed Forces who chose to serve their Nation at a time when military service was decidedly unpopular.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Con. Res. 228. This Resolution honors the sacrifice that so many Americans gave during the Vietnam conflict.

There is no way that any American can view the Vietnam Wall without their heart becoming heavy with both pride and sadness. Although this war caused so many different views from so many different people, the one thing that we all can and should agree upon is the honor of the service of those who served in Vietnam.

They served with the same commitment to honor, duty, and country as every American has in wars past. They served during a particularly difficult time in our history. But despite the times, they never wavered from their devotion to duty. Their actions speak volumes about their character when you consider that the average age of the American service person in Vietnam was 19.

Anyone who has read the letters from home between service members and their families know the tremendous toll that the war took on both. We must never forget their sacrifice.

Mr. Speaker, there are still open wounds of the heart that have not healed yet. That is because there is the unresolved cases of our missing MIAs and POWs. Our families can not be at peace until we know the whereabouts of their loved ones' remains. Our government must take every action necessary to resolve these cases as soon as possible.

In sum, Mr. Speaker, today I offer praise and respect to all the Americans, both military and civilian that served in Vietnam. Their sacrifice will never be forgotten.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NETHERCUTT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. KUYKENDALL) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 228.

The question was taken.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□

FREEDOM TO E-FILE ACT

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 777) to require the Department of Agriculture to establish an electronic filing and retrieval system to enable the public to file all required paperwork electronically with the Department and to have access to public information on farm programs, quarterly trade, economic, and production reports, and other similar information, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 777

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 ''Freedom to E-File Act''.

SEC. 2. ELECTRONIC FILING AND RETRIEVAL.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF INTERNET-BASED SYSTEM.—The Secretary of Agriculture shall establish an electronic filing and retrieval system that uses the telecommunications medium known as the Internet to enable farmers and other persons—

(1) to file electronically all paperwork required by the agencies of the Department of Agriculture specified in subsection (b); and

(2) to have access electronically to information, readily available to the public in published form, regarding farm programs, quarterly trade, economic, and production reports, price and supply information, and other similar information related to production agriculture.

(b) COVERED AGENCIES.—Subsection (a) shall apply to the following agencies of the Department of Agriculture:

(1) The Farm Service Agency.

(2) The Risk Management Agency.

(3) The Natural Resources Conservation Service.

(4) The rural development components of the Department included in the Secretary's service center initiative regarding State and field office collocation implemented pursuant to section 215 of the Department of Agriculture Reorganization Act of 1994 (7 U.S.C. 6915).

(c) TIME-TABLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall—

(1) to the maximum extent practicable, complete the establishment of the electronic filing and retrieval system required by subsection (a) to the extent necessary to permit the electronic information access required by paragraph (2) of such subsection;

(2) initiate implementation of the electronic filing required by paragraph (1) of such subsection by allowing farmers and other persons to download forms from the Internet and submit completed forms via facsimile, mail, or related means; and

(3) modify forms used by the agencies specified in subsection (b) into a more user-friendly format, with self-help guidance materials.

(d) INTEROPERABILITY.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary shall ensure that the agencies specified in subsection (b)—

(1) use computer hardware and software that is compatible among the agencies and will operate in a common computing environment; and

(2) develop common Internet user-interface locations and applications to consolidate the agencies' news, information, and program materials.

(e) COMPLETION OF IMPLEMENTATION.—Not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall complete the establishment of the electronic filing and retrieval system required by subsection (a) to permit the electronic filing required by paragraph (1) of such subsection.

(f) PROGRESS REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report describing the progress made toward establishing the electronic filing and retrieval system required by subsection (a).

SEC. 3. AVAILABILITY OF AGENCY INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY FUNDS.

(a) RESERVATION OF FUNDS.—From funds made available for each agency of the Department of Agriculture specified in section 2(b) for information technology or information resource management, the Secretary of Agriculture shall reserve an amount equal to not more than the following:

(1) For fiscal year 2001, $3,000,000.

(2) For each subsequent fiscal year, $2,000,000.

(b) TIME FOR RESERVATION.—The Secretary shall notify Congress of the amount to be reserved under subsection (a) for a fiscal year not later than December 1 of that fiscal year.

(c) USE OF FUNDS.—Funds reserved under subsection (a) shall be used to establish the electronic filing and retrieval system required by section 2(a). Once the system is established and operational, reserved amounts shall be used for maintenance and improvement of the system.

(d) RETURN OF FUNDS.—Funds reserved under subsection (a) and unobligated at the end of the fiscal year shall be returned to the agency from which the funds were reserved, and such funds shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 4. CONFIDENTIALITY.

In carrying out this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture—

(1) may not make available any information over the Internet that would otherwise not be available for release under section 552 or 552a of title 5, United States Code; and

(2) shall ensure, to the maximum extent practicable, that the confidentiality of persons is maintained.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

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

Mr. Speaker, the Freedom to E-File Act, introduced by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD), requires the United States Department of Agriculture to establish an electronic filing and retrieval system to enable the public to file with the Department all required paperwork electronically. In doing so, the act would allow producers, farmers, and rural America to have access to information on farm programs, quarterly trade, economic and production reports and other similar information. The bill of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) allows farmers to do business with the Department of Agriculture over the Internet.

The rapidly evolving e-commerce economy of the 21st century continues to assert itself as the future of worldwide commerce. Like any business today, farmers are using computers and the Internet for a variety of purposes, including financial management systems and market information. It is becoming increasingly important to ensure that all segments of our economy are technologically efficient.

Currently, the United States Department of Agriculture operates in a progressively antiquated computer environment. The continued use of such a system threatens to disable producers and farmers from access to a maturing information technology market. Rural Americans face the very real potential of being left behind in this era of sweeping technological advances. It is vital to empower producers and farmers by providing them with the technological tools to do business via the Internet with the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

The continued absence of a viable common computing environment at the Department will result in the failure to assist the very constituency it is obliged to serve. The Freedom to E-

File Act achieves the most important objective of allowing the public the access and freedom to do effective, better business with the U.S. Department of Agriculture via the Internet.

The globally integrated e-commerce economy demands that private and public entities move quickly to establish efficient avenues of commerce. This legislation forces the USDA in the right direction, the direction of enabling producers, farmers, and rural Americans to benefit in an age of technological revolution.

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Congressional Internet Caucus, I want to commend the gentleman from Illinois for his leadership on this issue. This legislation is badly needed. Changes at the Department of Agriculture to get up to speed, even with other government agencies, much less with what is happening in the private sector, is long overdue. I also thank the gentleman from Texas for his support of this bipartisan legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 777 as amended by H.R. 852, the Freedom to E-File Act. H.R. 852 was sponsored by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD), and I, too, commend him for his leadership in this area. It was approved by the House Committee on Agriculture on March 29. It would require the Secretary of Agriculture to establish an Internet-based system to allow farmers and ranchers and other persons to complete and submit program applications electronically and to have electronic access to all relevant economic and administrative program information and data.

The legislation before us today also contains a provision that will ensure that the Secretary of Agriculture maintains the confidentiality of persons, and ensures that that information is released only in accordance with current law.

Mr. Speaker, I have long been a proponent of initiatives at USDA to provide better service to farmers and ranchers through streamlining and the use of new technologies, while at the same time saving taxpayer dollars.

To date, USDA's progress in the information technology arena has been disappointing. For example, a February 2000 General Accounting Office report states that USDA's progress in implementing its initiatives, reorganization, and modernization efforts has been mixed. The report then identifies two primary reasons for its lack of success, the lack of a comprehensive plan to guide the modernization effort and the lack of a management structure with the accountability and authority to resolve differences among the agencies. These findings give me little confidence and further validate my concerns that USDA cannot overcome its stovepipe culture without the intervention of Congress. USDA recognizes this, and, at certain levels, supports this bill.

Growing numbers of farmers and ranchers are using home computers. This fact, coupled with budget demands, is putting enormous pressure on USDA's field service employees. It is, therefore, imperative that USDA take advantage of the Internet for the efficiencies it can offer. Doing so will benefit overworked field service staff, save taxpayer dollars, and allow farmers and ranchers to spend more time on their operations and less time visiting USDA offices.

For these reasons, I believe USDA must improve electronic access to its programs and services. Consequently, I support the goals of S. 777, as amended, otherwise known as the Freedom to E-File Act. While I would prefer a more comprehensive look at USDA reorganization and modernization needs, it unfortunately appears that changes at USDA are only going to be made on an incremental basis.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD), the author of the legislation.

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

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank very much the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) for his leadership as the chairman of the subcommittee that held hearings on the bill; and the ranking member of that subcommittee, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON), also for her leadership and support; and certainly the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), the ranking member of the full committee, for his encouragement over the last year to move ahead with this important legislation.

To put it simply, this legislation will bring the Department of Agriculture into the 21st century by allowing farmers, producers, and people in rural America to do their business with the USDA over the Internet. Like any business, farmers are using computers for a variety of purposes, including financial management, accessing market information, and utilizing precision agriculture management systems.

As I have traveled around the 14 counties that I represent in central Illinois, much of which is agriculture, and visited farm families and visited farm homes, every farmer has a computer today. Every farmer in America has access to the world. One of the first things that farmers do in the early morning hours is they get on their computer and they check the weather. Then in my area they check the price of corn and beans and livestock. Then they look and see how their stocks are doing, if they have the good fortune of having that kind of capability to own stocks.

But then what we are offering them under this legislation is the fact that they do not have to hop in their truck and go down to the FS office to file their forms or to find out what the USDA has to offer them. All of this information will be available to them. After they check the price of corn and beans and after they check the weather, they can find out what else is going on at USDA, a marvelous opportunity. I believe, if given the opportunity, many farmers would choose to file necessary farm program paperwork from their home or office computer.

The interesting thing is that, this year alone, 34 million taxpayers have already filed or will file their income taxes before April 15th over the Internet, electronically. The Internal Revenue Service has moved taxpayers into the 21st century; and we should be doing that for our farmers and ranchers, and particularly for those who represent large masses of agriculture area, Wyoming, the Dakotas, areas where farmers and ranchers have to travel long distances. This will avail them of wonderful opportunities to save time and energy by having access to this information and filing their forms electronically.

Mr. Speaker, I say that the Freedom to E-File Act is a reasonable, sensible way to help farmers spend less time filling out paperwork and more time doing what they know how to do best, which is farming and ranching. This legislation will not only increase the efficiency of farmers and ranchers, it will also increase the efficiency of the USDA, as has been mentioned, by reducing the amount of paperwork that needs to be filled out in local county offices.

USDA has already started down the road to providing some of the benefits of the Internet to the American farmer. Freedom to E-File will provide the Department with the necessary flexibility and resources to allow USDA to bring agriculture into the Internet age.

Again, I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Chairman COMBEST), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE), and the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) and all the staff people on both sides for your help in crafting this legislation, and also to USDA. We have kind of brought them along kicking and screaming in this process, but we think they are with us now; and we hope that they will be able to implement this legislation after it is signed by the President.

Finally, Senator PETER FITZGERALD from the other body was most helpful in having this legislation pass there; and I want to acknowledge his work and encourage all Members to support this very, very important legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would just say in conclusion, I encourage our colleagues to support this bill. We have heard from

the gentleman from Illinois all of the reasons why this is needed. The disappointment is that we have not been able to move it faster within USDA, but it is certainly my hope that all of those who may be in the category of ''foot-draggers'' within the various agencies and various employees of USDA might take this legislation and the support of many at USDA and recognize that we will have some additional opportunities this year to do more in this area of information technology, and, in doing more, we will be able to serve our farmers more efficiently.

Mr. Speaker, I thank all of those who have been involved in this legislation; and I urge the support of it.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would join in urging my colleagues to support this legislation. It is very true that farmers in many respects are some of our best users of computer technology and the Internet, and it is time that the Department that is designed to support their efforts moves into the 21st century, as the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD) indicated.

□ 1530

So I strongly support this bill. I thank the gentleman for his efforts in this matter.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NETHERCUTT). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 777, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on S. 777, the Senate bill just considered.

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

There was no objection.

□

RECESS

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

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

□

□ 1703

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PEASE) at 5 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.

□

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H. Con. Res. 290. Concurrent Resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2001, revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2000, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2002 through 2005.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the resolution (H. Con. Res. 290) ''Concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2001, revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2000, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2002 through 2005,'' requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. BOND, Mr. GORTON, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. CONRAD, and Mr. WYDEN, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

□

ANNOUNCEMENT OF INTENTION TO OFFER MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 1501, JUVENILE JUSTICE REFORM ACT OF 1999

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I want to announce my intention to offer a motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 1501 tomorrow.

Pursuant to clause 7(c) of rule XXII, I hereby announce my intention to offer a motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 1501. The form of the motion is as follows:

Mr. Conyers moves to instruct conferees on the part of the House that the conferees on the part of the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill, H.R. 1501, be instructed to insist that the committee on conference meet and report a committee substitute that includes both:

One, measures that aid in the effective enforcement of gun safety laws within the scope of conference and, two, common sense gun safety measures that prevent felons, fugitives, and stalkers from obtaining firearms and children from getting access to guns within the scope of the conference. Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Congresswoman JULIA CARSON, Congresswoman JUANITA MILLENDER-MCDONALD, and Congresswoman CAROLYN MCCARTHY are cosponsors of this motion.

□

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H. CON. RES. 290, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2001

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1 of rule XXII, and by the direction of the Committee on the Budget, I move to take from the Speaker's table the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 290) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2001, revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2000, and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2002 through 2005, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH).

The motion was agreed to.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. SPRATT

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct the conferees on the budget resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. SPRATT moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the concurrent resolution H. Con. Res. 290 be instructed, within the scope of the conference,

(1) to insist that the tax cuts set forth in the reconciliation directives in the concurrent resolution be reported on September 22, 2000, the latest possible date within the scope of the conference, and to require that the reconciliation legislation implementing those tax cuts not be reported any earlier, thereby allowing Congress sufficient time to first enact legislation to reform and strengthen Medicare by establishing a universal Medicare prescription drug benefit, consistent with section 202 of the Senate amendment and provisions in section 10 of the House concurrent resolution, recognizing that more than half of Medicare beneficiaries without drug coverage have income above 150 percent of poverty as officially defined; and

(2) to recede to the lower and less fiscally irresponsible tax cuts in the Senate amendment, which do not include a reserve fund for additional tax reduction contingent on improved projects of future revenues, in preference to tax cuts of $200 billion or more as embodied in the House-passed Resolution, which Chairman Kasich identified during Budget Committee markup and House debate on the budget resolution as a paydown' on the tax cuts proposed by Governor George W. Bush, in order to conserve the budgetary resources needed for the universal Medicare prescription drug benefit and for debt reduction.

Mr. KASICH (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent

that the motion be considered as read and printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am offering this motion to instruct the House conferees on the budget resolution, basically to say to the conferees, let us put the Medicare drug prescription benefit first and foremost, ahead of everything else. Let us do it ahead of the tax cuts. Let us put it on a priority schedule, let us go first with it.

Just today we read in the newspaper that Medicare beneficiaries who do not have drug coverage typically pay at least 15 percent more than those who have the benefit of insurance. I have the experience just a week or two ago with visiting a pharmacist in my district who by mistake had received a billing from an HMO intended for an HMO in Atlanta, Georgia. And when he opened it up, he saw what the HMO was paying for drugs like Zocor and Vasotec and Cumadin, as opposed to what he was paying, and the difference between what he was paying and charging his customers at his pharmacy and what the HMO was paying was as much as 65 or 70 percent in favor of the HMO in certain cases. That is not right.

Mr. Speaker, when we combine that with the fact that drug costs are going up at a rate that is two or three times the rate of the increase in health care generally and the elderly, those over 65 and on Medicare have a greater need for prescription drug benefits than anybody else, we have a crisis on our hands. One cannot go to any senior citizen center in my district, and I dare say this is true across America, without having someone relate some really sad and affecting story about their problem with obtaining prescription drug benefits.

We just had a study done by Boston University School of Public Health, they found that a significant fraction of the prescriptions that are written by doctors for their Medicare patients are never filled, they cannot afford it. This is a problem that is not only pressing, it is becoming urgent.

We need to deal with it now. Before we turn to tax cuts, before we turn to other major budget decisions, we should put this one first and foremost and try to fit it into our budget. In our budget, the Democratic budget, we did it the standard and time-honored way. We said let us have reconciliation directions to the Committee on Ways and Means and the Committee on Commerce, the two committees with jurisdiction, and tell them, ''By a date certain, get your act together. Here is $40 billion for the first 5 years, $155 billion for the second 5 years; within the limits of these resources, report to the floor a prescription drug benefit that will begin to take effect next year for Medicare beneficiaries.'' That is the way to do it.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) chose a less compelling way of doing it. He put $40 billion in a trust fund, so-to-speak, a reserve fund, and said if the Committee on Ways and Means is able to come up with a bill that reforms Medicare structurally or does Medicare reform, then it can also use this $40 billion to report a drug bill. I would have preferred and did prefer something much more compelling than that, but at least the gentleman put the $40 billion on the table. The Senate has done something similar.

What we are saying now is let us not just do this for show, let us not just do this to tantalize the elderly citizens in our district with the prospect of getting prescription drug coverage. Let us do it in earnest. We can do it right now by passing a motion to instruct our conferees to go to conference and say to the conferees, prescription drug coverage will come first, and principally this will come first ahead of tax cuts.

One of the problems I have with the Republican budget resolution is it puts tax cuts first and foremost, ahead of everything else. Now, our budget resolution provided for $50 billion in net tax cuts in the first 5 years, and $201 billion over the 10-year period of time. We are for tax reduction and tax relief too, but we also had other priorities that we wanted to serve, and not to do tax cuts to the exclusion of those.

The problem we had with their resolution as the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) presented it, their budget resolution, the tax cut could easily go up to $250 billion over the next 5 years. We showed by charts in the well of the House, if it went that high, if it went over $200 billion, we not only could not fund the $40 billion for the prescription drug benefit, you would risk putting the Social Security trust fund in danger again.

We are saying, put the tax cuts second. Do the prescription drugs first. Get in earnest about prescription drug coverage. Do that, and then by a date certain, report your tax bill to the floor; and we will take it up in due course. But, in first course, let us do prescription drugs.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, we want to go back just for a second and review precisely what was contained in this Republican budget proposal that passed the other day.

As Members will recall, the first thing we did was to protect 100 percent of the Social Security surplus. That is the first time, I believe in my lifetime, that that has been done, where the government will not take money from the Social Security surplus to fund any other programs.

The second item that we did was we strengthened Medicare and, in fact, created a $40 billion fund. And this fund is available for the purposes of funding a prescription drug program that will pass through the Committee on Ways and Means.

First of all, I would hope that the wealthiest of our seniors would not qualify for this program. Children in many respects have the lowest priority in America, and it is a tragedy that our children are neglected. I begin to wonder if they are neglected because they do not vote or we do not value them. We value them with our rhetoric, but many times we do not value them with our actions.

The fact is that a prescription drug benefit for seniors that are in need of that benefit because they cannot afford it would be right. But what we would not want to do was take resources that can be used either to make families stronger through tax cuts or other programs that may be developed to help our children, to use those dollars to fund the Medicare program for wealthy senior citizens.

□ 1715

We would not want to do that. This does not make any sense here in the 21st century. Members might also recall that we had other actions in there, including paying down $1 trillion of the national debt, and in addition to that, tax fairness.

I must say that it would be a mistake for us not to have passed that earnings limit exclusion program so that our seniors who want to go out, who want to work, who want to be independent, do not lose social security in the process. Thank goodness we pushed that program through. We intend to push other programs like that through, including the easing of the marriage penalty.

So we want to be able to have a process that allows us to pass these tax bills that help various segments of our society, and we believe that is consistent with our program to strengthen Medicare and to provide a prescription drug benefit.

What is interesting is that President Clinton himself has no prescription drug benefit in 2001 and 2002. In fact, he makes very significant reductions in Medicare in order to pay for what program he is going to create in 2003. Frankly, Democrats ought to be embracing this program if they would like to see a strengthening of Medicare. They ought to be really embracing the Republican budget, because we get about it right away.

Also contained in the Democrat motion to instruct are the incendiary words ''irresponsible tax cuts.'' To me, that is an oxymoron. There is no such thing as an irresponsible tax cut. There are plenty of irresponsible government spending programs, but I do not think there is such a thing as an irresponsible tax cut.

I do not know what we would call an irresponsible tax cut. Is it something that lets families keep more of what they earn? Is it something that lets a senior keep more of what he or she earns, rather than being penalized through reductions of their social security benefits? Is a fiscally irresponsible tax cut one that provides relief to married couples? If people get married today, they can get punished because they get married. They pay more in taxes. Is that fiscally irresponsible?

How about for a small businessman who works a lifetime to build a pharmacy, like my friend, Max Peoples in Westville, Ohio, or friends of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN) in Janesville, Wisconsin? They work a lifetime, and then when they die, they have to visit the undertaker and the IRS on the same day.

How about reducing or eliminating the death tax so people who work a lifetime can pass their legacy on to their children, rather than having to pass it on to the Federal government?

I do not know what it even means when we talk about a fiscally irresponsible tax cut. It does not make any sense to me. It seems to me as though we ought to stay with the Republican budget plan. That Republican budget plan will keep our mitts off of social security, something that my friends in the majority party were not able to do for 40 years. It is going to strengthen Medicare and provide a prescription drug benefit starting in 2001.

I am told it will be very soon that Republicans in the House will unveil their bill. I hope it will be means-tested. We will pay down $1 trillion of the publicly-held debt by 2013. We will continue to promote tax fairness for families, farmers, and small businesses.

There is no reason to fix something that is not broken, so I would request that the Members on both sides of the aisle defeat the motion to instruct the conferees offered by my good friend, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), who I have, by the way, a lot of regard for. He is a very smart man, a very nice man, and I wish everybody would know him and be the recipient of his kindness and intelligence.

But on this motion, I am forced to say that we should object, stick with the Republican budget. It will be the better budget for our seniors, for our children, and frankly, for Americans across the country.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his compliments, but I would point out that a tax cut that precludes us from obtaining the very priorities they set out in their budget is potentially an irresponsible tax cut. A tax cut, which we showed here in the well of the House, which would take us perilously close to invading social security again surely is not one that we want to undertake. Yet, we are concerned that the gentleman's resolution leads us in that very direction.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion to instruct conferees. We simply say, before any tax cut, and certainly it is irresponsible to make sure that we have a tax cut before we achieve the goals that we want to achieve.

One of the goals stated was that we would have a prescription drug benefit. Therefore, before any tax cut is enacted, we must make sure that our senior citizens, especially those rural citizens who live in rural communities without access to health care, and who pay, by the way, for their medicine higher rates than those in other urban areas, we make sure that they have the medicine and the ability to pay to be free of pain and to live a comfortable life. That is essentially basically and fundamental, that we make sure that our program is enacted before we have a serious and a large tax cut.

Older Americans and people with disabilities without drug coverage typically pay 15 percent more for the same prescription drugs as those with insurance. Many seniors do not have drug coverage at all, and therefore, this particular bill is essential for life and the quality of life that seniors deserve.

The gap between drug prices for people with and without insurance discounts nearly doubled, from 8 to 15 percent, between 1996 and 1998. Uncovered Medicare beneficiaries purchased one-third fewer drugs than those who are covered, but they paid twice as much money. They are denying themselves a prescribed prescription for their health care, but yet, they pay twice as much out of pocket.

Overall, all of these beneficiaries have an annual out-of-pocket cost that is twice as high as those, and with fewer medications.

Chronically ill uninsured Medicare beneficiaries spend over $500 out of pocket for that same coverage. Rural beneficiaries are particularly, particularly vulnerable because the infrastructure to provide that health care is not there.

From what I am hearing, if there is to be an insurance model, I can tell the Members that we do not have the structure, the HMOs, nor do we have other structures that can make this accessible to rural citizens. Rural Medicare beneficiaries are over 50 percent more likely to lack prescription drug coverage for the entire year than urban beneficiaries.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of this motion to instruct. It is urgent, it is timely, and it is vital to the health and welfare of many millions of senior citizens.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN).

(Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I would like to first discuss what this motion to instruct actually does. The motion to instruct right now talks about having a prescription drug plan immediately, but I find it interesting to note that the minority side, when advancing prescription drug legislation in the Committee on the Budget, was proposing a prescription drug plan very similar to the President's plan which did not begin until the year 2003.

More importantly, it dedicated a little over $34 billion to enacting prescription drug legislation when the Committee on the Budget, the majority's plan, dedicates $40 billion for prescription drugs beginning immediately.

Let us go back and remember that the minority side was proposing a prescription drug plan dedicating less resources starting in 2 years versus the Republican plan, which dedicated $40 billion starting immediately.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk about some of the benefits of this budget plan. For 30 years, for 30 years this institution, Washington, D.C., has been raiding the social security trust fund. People have been paying their FICA taxes, it has been going into social security, and people in Washington have been taking that money and spending it on other totally unrelated items.

This budget seals that trust fund. This budget says, not a penny of money should come out of social security. Instead, we are going to pay off the debt and fix the problems we have with social security. That is what we are trying to do here.

So what happened last year when the President brought his budget here on the House floor in the State of the Union Address? He called for dedicating 62 percent to the social security surplus, and 38 percent of social security would go to finance other government programs.

Last year we said, that is enough. We should dedicate 100 percent of the social security surplus to social security. That is in fact what we have achieved. If we take a look at what we have done over the last 2 years with this Congress, we have paid back so much debt that we have actually stopped the raid on the social security trust fund beginning last year.

This budget completes that. This budget says no longer will we go back to the days of red, no longer will we go back to the days of taking money out of the social security trust fund to spend on other programs that have nothing to do with social security. Instead, we are going to pay off our national public debt, we are going to put money back into social security, and we are not going to let politicians dip into the social security trust fund.

Last year when the President brought his budget to the floor, he wanted 62 percent in social security and 38 percent out of it. He called for

creating 84 new government programs, 84 new government programs in this year's budget, and significantly increasing 160 other government programs, for a grand total of 244 new programs and higher spending on new programs in Washington coming from the social security trust fund.

Mr. Speaker, we have actually achieved a historic goal here. We have stopped the raid on the social security trust fund. Let us build on that success. Let us continue to do that. Let us pass the Republican budget and say no to the motion to instruct.

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

Mr. Speaker, what the gentleman has done is, with his charts there, he has set up a straw man. He has attacked a budget that was never before the House. The minority side's budget, the Democratic side's budget, called for $40 billion beginning in 2001 for a Medicare prescription drug benefit. And not only that, to say it once again, we did it the good old-fashioned way that worked. We said to the Committee on Ways and Means, by a date certain, here is $40 billion. Report out, bring to the floor a resolution, a bill that will provide prescription drug coverage.

They did not have that kind of language in their resolution. Theirs was totally iffy. That is what we are trying to do here today, stiffen the resolve of the conferees and see to it that we do indeed get some legislation that will provide a drug benefit.

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

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

Mr. MCDERMOTT. Mr. Speaker, the reason this is such an important set of budget instructions is that this House is balanced on a very interesting policy point: Should we provide a tax-supported prescription benefit package for all senior citizens, or should we do what the Republicans are talking about, and that is, find the poorest ones and say, here is a little welfare program. Go on and down and register at the welfare office, and you can get the drug benefit?

The President has proposed that we put a package that covers all senior citizens. Some of us are not very satisfied with the President's plan because it is not very generous, but at least, at least it covers everyone. For us to come out and pass a budget and say that, in the last resort, if we have a little money left after we have passed all these tax cuts we are going to give a little drug benefit, that is simply not good public policy.

The Senate has picked the number of $140 billion in tax cuts. I personally think that is too much. I do not think we need that. I would rather pay down the debt.

However, if they are going to do it, let us take the conservative number in the Senate, the conservative number in the Senate, instead of this liberal wild spending on the Republican side in the House, and use that money to give a benefit for all senior citizens.

Now, when we go out and realize what the average senior citizen spends out-of-pocket, my mother is a perfect example. She lives on the minimum social security benefit, along with 9 million other widows in this country, $888 a month. She spends $400 for where she lives and where she gets her food, okay?

□ 1730

Now she has $400 and she on average across this country is spending $200 a month, $2,500 out of pocket, for pharmaceutical costs in this country. That is simply inexcusable.

We can fix it, but it should be for all senior citizens because even those who have the benefit now, because of the fact that they work for some company or they have the insurance policy or whatever at the moment, may lose it and then where are they? My view is that we should not drive seniors into poverty before we help them with their pharmaceutical costs.

Any sensible person looking at the Medicare program today would say the single biggest problem that we have not dealt with has been the issue of pharmaceutical costs.

I think that it makes sense to take the Senate number. The Senate is not overly generous, but at least we would have the $40 million for a universal benefit.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), a member of both the Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, it is pretty obvious that over the weekend the Democrats did a poll. They rush in here with a motion to instruct conferees on the budget resolution with a time stamp on here of 3:45, not too long ago. The ink is not even dry on this. They rushed in here with this motion to instruct conferees. What does it say? It says, know what? We are getting our brains beat in on this prescription drug benefit. The Republicans beat us when it came to the budget resolution; they are beating us when it comes to public relations on prescription drugs because they know that our original proposal did not have a thing.

The President's proposal did not have a prescription drug benefit. The original proposal that the Democrats brought forth in the Committee on the Budget did not have a prescription drug benefit that started until the third year. In fact, it cut Medicare. Oh, no, we didn't cut Medicare on beneficiaries. We cut it on providers is what they will say.

In my area, as the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) was saying, in rural areas those kind of cuts will be devastating. They may say in the third year that they have a prescription drug benefit; but when all the rural hospitals close, they do not have health care.

Well, this is the situation: we put into our plan instructions that suggest that there is only one thing that the Committee on Ways and Means can do with this $40 billion. It can either reform Medicare and provide a prescription drug benefit or nothing else can happen to that money except it can be used to pay down the debt. That is it.

What do the Democrats suggest? They came in with a technicality on the floor right at the end of the budget debate, and they said but we have a better motion to instruct. They say the Committee on Ways and Means has to use it. Guess what? If they do not, it does not go to debt reduction; it does not go to tax relief. Guess where it can go? To a risky spending scheme that the Democrats have put in place for the last 40 years that wasted social security, that brought us to the point in time where we had this massive debt in the first place, and now they want to start all over again.

Mr. Speaker, this is the situation: this is not just a little drug benefit, as my friend, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT), suggested. This is the only drug benefit that is going to pass this particular year because we are not going to pass a drug benefit where the money, if not spent, can be used for other risky spending schemes. We are not going to use this money for anything else except for reform of Medicare and for prescription drugs, different than what the Democrats' plan does.

So instead of voting for this motion to recommit that was drafted just a few hours ago, after it is obvious the Democrats took a poll this weekend, let us vote against this motion to instruct conferees, which would gut the Medicare reform proposal, which would gut the prescription drug proposal, and which would not recognize that in 5 days we have tax day and Americans all over the country have been paying their taxes. This thumbs their noses at the taxpayers of America.

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

Mr. Speaker, once again let me inform the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) that we in committee we did not offer a resolution. We brought our resolution to the floor, and it had $40 billion over 5 years; $150 billion over 10 years for prescription drug coverage; and it was in reconciliation, mandates to the Committee on Ways and Means, with a date certain for getting it done.

When we were in committee marking up their budget resolution, we took

their iffy, mushy language and we said let us convert this to a mandate, let us send it to the Committee on Ways and Means, and we offered to make it reconciliation language and they refused it. They rejected it in committee.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN).

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

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, let me make a couple of points. First of all, to my colleague, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE), I took no poll over the weekend; but I can say when I was running for Congress 6 years ago, going to senior citizen centers throughout southeast Harris County, Texas, I ran into more and more seniors who said the biggest concern they had was the cost of prescription drugs, and the problems that they had of having to choose between buying their groceries at the end of the month or buying the pharmaceuticals that were being prescribed to them by the doctors. That was the issue, and that was the poll. That was a real poll.

Now let us talk about what this motion to instruct is. I do not think my friends on the other side have read it. All we are saying, if they look at the budget resolution, throughout the budget resolution it is very clear on which dates the Committee on Ways and Means shall, shall report tax reconciliation language. When we look at the Medicare language in there, it says if, it says whenever, but it certainly says nothing about a date certain of what it should be.

My colleagues on the other side have felt the need to use placards. I do not like these. I wish that we would ban these from the floor; but if we are going to use them, I am going to show what the Republican prescription drug plan under Medicare is. It is right here, right here. Now the American people can see it as well. It is laid out pretty clearly what the Republican plan is. There is no Republican plan.

Here is the problem: there are about 70 legislative days left in this Congress. We still have not passed a budget resolution. We have not passed any appropriations bills. We passed a number of tax cutting bills, generally scoped toward the upper-income levels, but we do not even have a prescription drug bill from the Republican side. So I do not know how they think we are going to get this done; and, in fact, their budget resolution does not think we are going to get it done because it says if, whenever.

What Democrats are saying today, what Democrats are saying is let us make prescription drug benefits for all senior citizens as certain as they want to make tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans among us. That is what this resolution is about today. I do not see how they can be against this. It all fits within the budget numbers that both sides use. It does not touch one dollar of the Social Security surplus, we are quite certain on our end.

Their tax cut plan, it can get into the Social Security surplus later on, but most of my colleagues will be gone by then so all we are saying right now is let us put prescription drug benefits for senior citizens on par with their tax cuts, and let us tell the Committee on Ways and Means that they have to come up with a bill and bring it up before this Congress adjourns.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for offering this resolution, and I commend it to all of my colleagues.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU).

Mr. SUNUNU. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take the debate back to the fundamentals of this budget resolution and away from a lot of the rhetoric, some of which we have just heard.

Let us talk about what is really in the budget resolution and what is not. First and foremost, we set aside every penny of the Social Security surplus. Now there is a lot of rhetoric on the other side about whether do we protect all of Social Security, do we not protect all of Social Security? This budget resolution does it, and it does it for the second year in a row.

We had a budget that was put up by the minority last year that spent 40 percent of the Social Security surplus. We have ended that problem in budgeting, set aside every penny of the Social Security surplus. We set aside $40 billion for prescription drug coverage for Medicare beneficiaries.

Now it is true there is no formal piece of legislation before this body right now, but that is reflective of the fact that we know we have to work on a bipartisan basis to try to put together a good piece of legislation, not just one that provides prescription drug coverage for Medicare beneficiaries but one that reforms and strengthens the program and hopefully gives those beneficiaries more options and more choices.

We pay down the debt. We actually set a course to pay down the entire public debt by 2013. We have tax relief in this legislation. Of course, we do. We try to make the Tax Code more fair by getting rid of the marriage penalty, getting rid of death taxes, repealing the Social Security earnings limit, and giving individuals full deductibility for their health insurance, and we also invest in defense and education.

I want to focus a little bit in the minute or so remaining, however, on the debt relief I spoke about, because if one travels anywhere in this country, people recognize that it is important that we continue the process of paying down the public debt.

Here is what we have done in just the past 3 years: in 1998, we paid down over $50 billion in public debt; in 1999, last year, we paid down over $80 billion. This year we will pay down $163 billion; and, in fact, over the 4 years, including this budget year that we are debating now, 2001, we will pay down over $450 billion in debt.

That is because of the determination of this Republican Congress to set aside funds, not just for social security but also for debt retirement and to keep that debt going in the right direction.

Now the minority has said repeatedly in this very debate we should get rid of all of these tax cuts, get rid of any tax cuts and pay down more debt. Of course we could do that. We could decide not to repeal the penalty that seniors pay if they choose to continue working and pay down a little bit more debt, but if we did that it would be wrong. We could decide not to eliminate the marriage penalty, to keep penalizing married couples simply because they choose to get married, and pay down a little bit more debt, but if we did that it would be wrong. It would be wrong to sustain a Tax Code that is so unfair.

We could refuse to give individuals health insurance deductibility, but that also would be wrong. We could decide not to give individuals health insurance deductibility and pay down a little bit more debt, but again that would simply be the wrong approach to take.

We need a Tax Code that is more fair. We need to continue to pay down debt, and we need to recognize that what is important is that just as one views their home mortgage, if they have additional income, additional funds, they do not pay down their entire home mortgage in one year. They might put a little bit more toward that mortgage, but what is most important is that they pay down a little bit every year, a little bit with every payment. They reduce the size of the mortgage gradually, and they keep the country and their own budget on a course of fiscal responsibility.

I urge my colleagues to reject the motion to instruct.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would respond to the gentleman from New Hampshire (Mr. SUNUNU) by saying that if he has a $250 billion-plus tax cut instead of $147 billion, which is what the Senate has proposed, that is $103 billion less debt reduction and $103 billion less to work with, fewer resources to work with to provide for a Medicare prescription drug benefit, and that is what this debate is all about.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. WEYGAND).

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

Mr. WEYGAND. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Republican members of the Committee on the Budget were not there during the process they were going through then when we actually passed a resolution that they promoted, but they refuse to understand the actual alternative that we have proposed.

I offered the amendment, I offered the budget amendment in the committee that actually would provide for the prescription drug benefit. Nowhere in our amendment, nowhere in our resolution, did we require this program to begin in 2003.

My dear colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), talked about that this would not start for another couple of years. That is not the truth. The Democratic amendment, the proposal that we put forth, would simply instruct the Committee on Ways and Means to begin immediately to provide a $40 billion benefit for prescription drugs for our seniors.

What came out was a plan that I referred to here as the Bentsen plan that he referred to earlier. This chart that I show right here is the Republican plan for prescription drugs. It was mushy, as our ranking member said. It had nothing to it, no substance whatsoever. They proposed a plan that did nothing for prescription drugs.

Back in Rhode Island where I come from, many seniors who have worked all their lives are facing now $5,000, $6,000, $7,000 and even $8,000 a year with prescription drug costs. A small contractor by the name of Paul Smith and his wife Judy came to me and said, I am 70 years olds and my wife is 66. I have to go back to work part time to pay for my $8,300-a-year worth of prescription drugs.

We as Democrats and Republicans should not tolerate that whatsoever. We should be working together to make a plan that is truly a plan, not a white piece of paper.

What we have proposed is simple. Give the money to the Committee on Ways and Means to come up with a proposal right now. We are not adverse to tax cuts. As a matter of fact, our proposal was to have over $50 billion worth of small business tax cuts, but prioritize our business before the Committee on the Budget; put our seniors first.

Those people who cannot afford prescription drugs should have a plan, not a blank piece of paper, and that is what the Republican proposal is.

□ 1745

It has no substance, no plan, no direction.

Today, what we are asking with this motion with regard to instructing conferees is put our seniors first, put our seniors above all of those other groups that really are begging us for tax cuts, but provide our seniors with a benefit for the prescription drugs.

I recently completed a commission to report on Rhode Island that showed the comparison between what our seniors pay and what our pets pay for the very same prescription drug. The very same prescription made by the same manufacturer, the same FDA requirements, the same dosage was 83 percent cheaper for my dog than my mother. We treat our pets better than we treat our senior citizens when it comes to prescription drugs.

How can we not have a plan? How can we tolerate a white piece of paper? How can we tolerate what my colleagues have put forward? Vote to approve the motion to instruct conferees.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Does the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY) claim the time from the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) who claimed the time from the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH)?

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time for purposes of control.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, the bottom line is we are going to protect 100 percent of Social Security. We did that last year, the first time since 1960. We are doing it in this year's budget, and we are going to do it in next year's budget, the plan that we are bringing forward.

We are strengthening Medicare and prescription drugs. We are setting aside $40 billion to implement our ultimate plan. It is no different than the motion to instruct the conferees. It is basically a blank paper. It sets aside money like we do. We retire the public debt by the year 2013, and we promote tax fairness for families, farmers, and seniors, and restore America's defense and strengthens support for education and science.

Our GOP plan ends the marriage penalty. It is interesting, the Democrats voted for it, but I guess they do not want to cut taxes, but they voted for it. It repeals Social Security earnings test. They voted for it but say they do not want to set aside money for a tax cut. We reduced the death tax. They voted for that, many of them. We expand educational savings accounts. We increase health care deductibility. We provide tax breaks for poor communities. We strengthen private pension plans.

What interests me, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) called this an irresponsible tax cut. It is interesting because, in the next 5 years, we have $10 trillion of revenue. We want a tax cut of $200 billion. That is 2 percent of all revenue. What is irresponsible about reducing taxes 2 percent? Maybe it is irresponsible that we are not doing more.

Then I heard this was wild spending. Only the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) could call tax cuts spending.

I will tell my colleagues what I think is irresponsible. The President increases taxes by $10 billion in the first year of his plan. We cut it by $10 billion. We ultimately set aside $200 billion for a tax cut. We lock in $150 billion. We set aside a reserve of $50 billion. If there is a potential surplus, we will have another $50 billion, just slightly over 2 percent of all revenues that will come in the next 10 years.

No, a tax cut is not irresponsible unless it is not enough. It is certainly not spending, as the gentleman from Washington (Mr. MCDERMOTT) would call it. It is a tax cut. We give it back to the American people.

The bottom line, we set aside $40 billion for the Committee on Ways and Means to bring forward a Medicare plan, a Medicare plan that will have prescription drugs payments for our seniors. That is what we do, and that is why we are so strongly in support of our plan.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I stand in favor of this motion to instruct, which would tell the conferees to make a Medicare prescription drug benefit a higher priority than a tax cut that would override all other priorities.

This motion to instruct conferees rejects the House's fiscally irresponsible $200 billion tax cut which our Republican friends describe as a down payment on the $483 billion plan outlined by Governor Bush, a tax cut that would eat up the entire nonSocial Security surplus and begin to eat into funds borrowed from Social Security.

Mr. Speaker, we can afford a modest tax cut, but we cannot afford the kind of tax cut that would compromise the future of Social Security and Medicare. We need to address the future of Medicare. We need to address the deficiencies of Medicare. The most striking deficiency, the most important deficiency is its failure to cover prescription drugs.

We need a prescription drug benefit now, not later. Prescription drugs now account for about one-sixth of all out-of-pocket health spending by the elderly. Almost 40 percent of those over age 85 do not have prescription drug coverage.

Spending and utilization of prescription drugs is growing at twice the rate of other health spending. Between 1993 and 1998, spending for prescription drugs increased at an annual rate of 12 percent compared to about 5 percent for other kinds of health spending.

So this motion to instruct conferees takes the lower tax cut number in the Senate resolution so that the tax cut does not use all of our budgetary resources. Then it instructs conferees to use the latest date possible for tax cuts, September 22, so Congress will have time and will have the resources

to enact a Medicare prescription drug benefit before it acts on the tax cuts.

Mr. Speaker, let us put first things first. Let us support this motion to instruct conferees.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, seniors in my district are very concerned about the costs of prescription drugs, and they are glad that we will be addressing that issue this year. But seniors in my district are also very concerned about being able to pass along the fruits of their labors to their children, because many of the seniors in my district are farmers and ranchers and small business people, and they are weighed down by the effects of the death tax and their inability to pass along what they have worked for all their lives to their children and grandchildren. Many of them are still involved in their farms and ranches and small businesses. So as taxes go higher and higher, their costs of production go higher, and it is harder for them to make a living. So tax relief is an important part of this bill for seniors and for their children and for their grandchildren.

The budget resolution that the House passed is a good balance that includes a prescription drug benefit and tax relief, and it also includes strengthening our country's defense. This budget resolution increases defense spending 6 percent over last year. It helps us do a better job of taking care of our people.

But we know that more money alone doesn't solve all of our problems. We also have to reexamine our commitments and all of the deployments around the world. We have to address the fact that, in fiscal year 1998, $24 billion of defense spending is in unreconciled transactions. We do not know where it was spent.

We have got to do a better job of making sure our money is spent smarter and more effectively, and this budget resolution as well as the continuing activities of this committee will help get us in that direction.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY).

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, America is completely entranced by the television show, ''Who Wants to be a Millionaire?'' I think that is the game that is being played out here on the floor today. The Republicans, they are starting the game kind of with the faster finger contest.

So what they do is they put a chart together, and they list six things that they want to accomplish. They want to protect 100 percent of Social Security. They want to strengthen Medicare. They want to retire the public debt. They want to promote tax fairness. They want to restore America's defense, and they want to promote education.

Now, the trick in the fastest finger contest is which order does one think the Republicans are going to put the answers in. Because we think and the American people think that the Republicans are really playing a different game. They think, as we do, that the real game on the Republican side is who wants to help a millionaire?

So number four down here, yes, they want tax fairness for families, but the families they are talking about are the families in the country club. They want big tax breaks. So answer number one for them is helping the wealthiest families in the country with a big tax cut. But the Democrats, we are saying our answer is, who wants to help the elderly? Who wants to help the sick? Who wants to help kids get an education.

So we are moving up those issues up to number one, two and three. That is what the Democratic resolution says out here on the floor.

Let us make sure that we get this answer correctly, because there should be no taxation breaks before medication benefits for senior citizens in our country. We should ensure that the list, which is up here as a wonderful set of objectives that the Republican Party is listing, but they do not tell us what their priorities are. It tells us nothing about what they want to do first.

If we look back to past history, their first and primary objective is cutting social programs, especially for senior citizens in our country so they can have the biggest tax breaks for those that have been most benefited by the enormous prosperity of the 1990s.

So do not kid ourselves. This is all about who wants to make more money for more millionaires in our country. That is the game which the Republicans are playing. The Democrats are just making sure that we get the order first, prescription drugs to senior citizens before more tax breaks for millionaires.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) seek unanimous consent to reclaim his time?

Mr. SHAYS. I do, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) controls the time.

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I remind the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) that the first two tax cuts that went through were ending the marriage penalty so that young couples would not have to pay $1,400 more, and ending Social Security penalty, which I think the gentleman voted for, hardly cuts tax for the wealthy.

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

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Connecticut for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, the budget passed by this Chamber provides the framework and the foundation for continued prosperity. We know where the Republican priorities are. In 1993, I came to Washington. I came to Washington because I watched the other side spend the Social Security surplus for 40 years. We are now on our way to the 3rd year balancing the budget by not spending one dime of Social Security.

The Republicans have their priorities right. We are going to strengthen Medicare by setting aside $40 billion for a prescription drug program. We are going to work at retiring public debt rather than accumulating public debt as we did for 40 years. We are going to promote tax fairness for families, farmers, and seniors. We are going to restore American defense. We are going to strengthen education in America.

I want to talk a little bit more about how we strengthen education in America. We have seen one approach to strengthening education, which is creating program after program after program here in Washington, throwing $35 billion into an agency that cannot even keep its own books. It cannot balance its own books.

What does that mean? It means that it does not even think enough about our kids to make sure that every dollar that we invest in education makes it into a classroom, makes it to a child where it actually can make a difference.

There is a better way. Rather than having an education bureaucracy in Washington which is mandating to local school districts and to parents how to spend their educational dollars, the Republican plan, we maintain the funding, we increase the funding, but we give it to the school districts in a way that gives them maximum flexibility.

We increase funding for the Individuals With Disabilities Act. As we give the school districts and local districts more money, it frees up their money to move those dollars to the areas that they feel are most important.

We preserve funding for the Innovative Education Program Strategies. What is this? This is a very flexible block grant back to local school districts. It says we trust them to take some of this money and allocate it to the things that they think are most important. The President has not even requested funding for this program since 1994.

We reject cuts in impact aid. This is where money flows to local school districts because they have a significant impact because of Federal programs and facilities in their districts. We increase spending for Pell Grants. The Pell Grant program helps lower income students attend college.

□ 1800

There is a clear difference. One program says we are going to invest in Washington; the other says we are going to invest in our local schools and our local kids.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining on this side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The gentleman from South

Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) has 6 minutes remaining; and the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the gentleman from South Carolina for this motion. I rise to endorse it and ask my colleagues to accept it.

My district showed a definitive difference in the amount of monies paid by senior citizens for prescription drugs. It was higher in the 18th Congressional District in Houston than in Canada and in Mexico.

We find that those who are 85 years old, 40 percent of them do not even have the ability to pay for any drugs. They have no benefit whatsoever, and we must realize that seniors are living longer.

We also find that seniors are paying twice as much for their prescription drugs if they are Medicare beneficiaries and they do not have that provision, and so they are buying one-third less drugs. What does that mean? It means sicker seniors. That is what it means. Mr. Speaker, these are individuals who have worked hard in our communities.

Then we find the cost of our prescription drugs, the amount of money our seniors pay, is far more than any other health need that they have. And this, I would say to my colleagues, begs for us to have a prescription drug benefit under the Medicare provisions.

I do not know why it is so difficult. This is something we should support. I cannot go home and tell my seniors in the 18th Congressional District that in the United States of America they cannot have a drug benefit; but yet in Mexico and Canada prescription drugs are cheaper.

I would say it is time now to support this motion to instruct, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of the Spratt motion to instruct the conferees on the budget resolution. The Spratt motion sets the stage for enacting a Medicare prescription drug benefit or other legislation to improve Medicare before the reporting date for a tax cut reconciliation bill by setting September 22 as the date for reporting a tax cut bill protected by reconciliation. Furthermore, the Spratt motion recedes to the Senate's slightly smaller tax cut and also recede to the Senate by dropping the reserve fund language in the House-passed resolution that provides for an additional $50 billion in tax cuts.

While the Republicans propose large tax cuts over the next 5 years and reconcile the Finance and Ways and Means Committees to report legislation, Republicans do not show the 10-year cost of this tax cut which could be as large as the $792 billion that the Republicans proposed and the American people rejected in 1999. Moreover, the Republicans do not intend to strengthen or support Medicare due to the fact that there are no reconciliation instructions to require legislation that would actually use the $40 billion ''reserve'' earmarked in the budget resolution. In addition, the Republicans have cut non-defense appropriations while defense significantly increased.

For the third consecutive year Republicans have chosen to provide large tax breaks for the wealthy. This budget resolution provides at least $200 billion in tax breaks over the next 5 years for the financial elite of America. Furthermore, this resolution is a major down payment for George W. Bush's proposed trillion-dollar tax scheme. I will not stand by while our children's future is bankrupted to fund this irresponsible budget resolution.

This budget contains deep cuts in domestic spending by $114 billion over the next 5 years; fails to provide anything to strengthen Social Security or Medicare; cuts nondefense discretionary spending by $19.7 billion in 2001 and $138 billion over the next 5 years below the level needed to maintain purchasing power after adjusting for inflation; and pretends to reserve $40 billion for a Medicare prescription drug benefit contingent upon essentially turning Medicare into a voucher program. Republicans have used slight of hand to hide the facts of their irresponsible budget by showing the effects of proposed tax cuts for only the first 5 years and not the full 10-year projections commonly used during the last 4 years.

I am disappointed in the budget resolution because I do not believe that it provides adequate investment in our Nation's future. America's future depends on that of her young people—in providing them adequate resources and opportunities to become our future leaders including providing them education and access to adequate health care.

The budget resolution provides inadequate resources for the education of our young people. I firmly believe that we must focus our attention and our energy on one of the most important challenges facing our country today—revitalizing our education system. Strengthening education must be a top priority to raise the standard of living among American families and to prolong this era of American economic expansion.

Education will prepare our nation for the challenges of the 21st century, and I will fight to ensure that the necessary programs are adequately funded to ensure our children's success.

We must provide our children access to superior education at all ages from kindergarten to graduate school. Recent studies emphasize the importance of quality education early in a child's future development. And yet despite these studies, the Budget Resolution still inadequately funds programs that would provide for programs targeting children in their younger years.

In addition, we need to open the door of educational opportunity to all American children. It is well known that increases in income are related to educational attainment. The Democratic budget alternative rejects the Republican freeze on education funding and allocates $4.8 billion more for education for fiscal year 2001, than the Republican budget. Over 5 years, the Democratic Party demonstrates its commitment to education by proposing $21 billion more than the Republican budget resolution.

The Congressional Black Caucus [CBC] offered an amendment in the nature of a substitute that promised to invest for the future of our Nation. The CBC substitute is a budget that maximizes investment and opportunity for the poor, African-Americans, and other minorities. This Budget for Maximum Investment and Opportunity supports a moderate plan to pay down the national debt; protects Social Security; and makes significant investments in education and training.

The CBC budget requests $88.8 billion in fiscal year 2001 for education, training, and development. This is $32 billion more than the Republican budget provides. The CBC substitute proposed a $10 billion increase over the President's Budget for school construction. Other projected increases include additional funding for Head Start, Summer Youth Employment, TRIO programs, Historically Black Colleges and Universities, and Community Technology Centers. In an age of unprecedented wealth the CBC has the vision to invest in the American family and not squander opportunities afforded by a budget surplus.

I will not support the failed policies of the past. Senator MCCAIN has best characterized this budget resolution as one that is fiscally irresponsible. I support a budget that invest strengthening Social Security; provides an affordable prescription drug benefit for all seniors; helps communities improve public education with quality teachers, smaller classes, greater accountability and modern schools; and pay down the national debt. These are the policies that invest in our children and in the future of our Nation in the 21st century.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 20 seconds to just remind my colleagues that I was here for 13 years, and I never saw in a Democrat budget any prescription drugs. In the Republican budget we have prescription drugs.

It is interesting to note that my colleagues on the other side want to make it universal, so they want to give millionaires prescription drugs. Somehow that does not bother them. So I guess they like some millionaires and not others. I guess taxes, whatever.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER).

Mr. HERGER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to outline the six points of the Republican budget plan and compare it a bit with the Democrat plan, or the plans they have had over the last 30 years when they were in power.

Number one. Last year the House of Representatives passed a measure that I sponsored, the Social Security Lockbox, by an overwhelming 416 to 12 vote. This budget reinforces that effort by ensuring that Social Security dollars will not be spent on unrelated programs. It protects 100 percent of the Social Security.

In this budget all of the $166 billion Social Security surplus is off limits to Clinton-Gore spending. This will be the second year in a row that Republicans have protected the Social Security surplus.

Secondly, we are strengthening Medicare with prescription drugs. It sets aside $40 billion to help needy seniors to be able to afford their prescription drugs; and at the same time, it rejects the $18.2 billion Clinton-Gore Medicare cuts. The other side would like to cut Medicare.

Point three. Our Federal public debt stands now at $3.6 trillion. This equates to $56,000 for the average family of four. This year, nearly $1,000 in taxes from every man, woman, and child in the United States will be used just to pay the interest on the debt. The Republican budget resolution leads our Nation on the path towards eliminating public debt by paying off $1 trillion over the next 5 years. Our budget discipline has already repaid $302 billion since 1998.

Mr. Speaker, those are numbers; but paying off the public debt is not just about numbers, it is about people. It is about the future of our Nation. It is about children living in my northern California district and elsewhere in our Nation that are saddled by this debt unless we pay it off. This budget takes the bold step for ourselves and future generations by taking on the challenge to pay off this national public debt.

The next point it promotes, point number four, is tax fairness for families. Farmers and seniors. This is not for fat cats, as the other side would have us believe. It provides for those in the House-passed marriage tax penalty provision who, on average, pay $1,400 extra just because they are married.

It also provides for a small business tax relief and education and health care assistance amounting to $150 billion, and it rejects the $96 billion growth tax increase over the next 5 years in the Clinton-Gore budget.

Number five. It restores American defense 6 percent more than last year for our overdeployed armed forces. The GOP defense budget provides $1 billion more than the Clinton-Gore plan.

And finally, number six, it strengthens support for education and science, 9.4 percent more for elementary and secondary education, and IDEA increases of nearly $2 billion. Also, it fights cancer, AIDS, diabetes, and other diseases with $1 billion more for NIH, as well as $1 billion extra for basic research in biology, science, engineering, and math.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good budget resolution; and I urge my colleagues to reject this motion to instruct.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. BALDACCI).

Mr. BALDACCI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, let us put first things first. First things first are the seniors who cannot afford their medications; who are cutting their pills in half, cutting the potency, thereby running the risk that they do not get better earlier. Those are the people who we are trying to put first; the people who cannot afford their prescription drugs because they are too expensive.

We have developed all this taxpayer-funded research, and the people who are supposed to be benefiting from it cannot even afford the drugs once they are developed. We need to put first things first, and this motion puts first things first.

Our seniors are being forced to choose between food, fuel, and prescription drugs. A study that just came out showed that those paying 15 percent more than anybody else are the ones who do not have the insurance or on Medicare. The ones that are the most vulnerable are the ones paying the most.

Mr. Speaker, these are individuals who have contributed to their communities. They have sacrificed; they have worked for their families and lived their whole lives and tried to make their families and their communities better. They are the most vulnerable amongst us, and they are the ones we should help first. Not a very large tax break providing for the very wealthy people to be able to enjoy, but the most vulnerable amongst us who need our care and support in their prescription medication, who have led a full and productive life for their families and their communities.

Mr. Speaker, this motion is putting first things first.

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

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I believe I have the right to close.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time to close.

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KASICH) is recognized for 2¾ minutes.

Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I would have to say this is the most overused chart I think I have seen on the House floor in maybe a dozen years. It is used by the Republicans and the Democrats alike. And we would like the Democrats to use it more and keep repeating our themes because we think it is really a good message.

In fact, I was in Reading, Pennsylvania, the other night and I made a talk; and I never really talk about the budget but I talked about the budget, and I said, ''I want you to know what is in it because I am so amazed that we were able to accomplish the fact that we are going to keep our mitts off Social Security and keep that surplus there and use it to fix Social Security for three generations of Americans. Not just the seniors, but the baby-boomers and particularly the kids, who are really at risk.''

And we are going to strengthen Medicare. Frankly, Medicare has got to become a much more free market program. And we have to provide supplements in private savings accounts in order to really solve the Medicare problem long term. But at this point we want to strengthen it, and we want to make sure our seniors have access to the prescription drugs because, frankly, we may be able to avoid surgeries, for example, and have a more inexpensive way of keeping people healthy through the use of prescription drugs.

But we certainly do not want people of real means to qualify for another entitlement program offered by the Federal Government that, frankly, takes away from people who are more needy.

We pay down $1 trillion in the publicly held debt. That is better than Regis Philbin did if we add up all his shows together. We are going to pay down $1 trillion in the publicly held debt, and we are going to cut taxes. And we are going to cut taxes for people who pay taxes.

I am in favor of that. I am not a big fan of cutting taxes for people who do not pay any taxes. So we are going to have a program that will help the family farmer and the small businessperson. We are going to help the married couples. We are going to help everybody who is out there paying taxes and let them pay a little less and get this government to clean itself up a little bit.

We are going to restore America's defense. We do not want our troops to be up against the wall without the training money they need, the basic supplies that they need.

And, finally, we are going to strengthen support for education. We believe in basic science. We love the human genome project. As one philosopher once said, advanced science is sometimes indistinguishable from magic. And the fact is that human genome project almost looks like magic; it is so amazing and it offers so much hope to everybody.

So with these six principles, we do not think we ought to change course. We think we are headed in the right direction. We think this will strengthen America, will strengthen our families, our communities; and so I would ask my colleagues to reject the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina.

Let us stay the course and get this budget done and offer something to the American people that I believe will improve their lives.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

This whole debate began when the President sent us a budget and said let us do prescription drug coverage; there is a gaping hole in the comprehensive care we ought to provide in Medicare. And I absolutely agree with that.

When the Republicans brought their resolution to the Committee on the Budget, they provided for prescription drug coverage in an iffy conditional kind of way. The usual procedure in a budget resolution, the one tool we have to get something done on the Committee on the Budget, is to impose reconciliation instructions on the committees of jurisdiction, to tell them by a date certain to report out language to the House floor so that we can act upon the purpose that we have set for ourselves.

We, in our resolution on the Democratic side, did just that. We resorted to the time-honored tool of reconciliation and said to the Committee on

Ways and Means and to the Committee on Commerce, reconcile the budget; here is $40 billion for the first 5 years, $155 billion over the next 10 years, establish a prescription drug benefit for Medicare.

That is all we want to do today. We want to take this iffy, mushy language now in this resolution and stiffen it up. We want to stiffen the spine and resolve of the conferees and tell them, go to conference determined to see that the first order of business of this House is not tax cuts, it is a prescription drug benefit. Then they can turn to tax cuts. We do not rule that out.

We provide in our budget resolution for tax reduction of $50 billion over the next 5 years, $201 billion over the next 10 years, and we say in this resolution recede to the Senate tax proposal, which is $147 billion.

Why do we say that? Because, Mr. Speaker, going back to a chart I used repeatedly when we argued this resolution, we think that the other side is coming perilously close to putting us in the position of being back in the red, back into the Social Security surplus once again.

The budget resolution the Republicans brought to the floor produces, according to their numbers, a surplus of $110 billion over 5 years, provided they can hold discretionary spending below the rate of inflation to the tune of $117 billion over 5 years. A very big proviso.

□ 1815

But if they then go from a $150 billion tax cut to a $200 billion tax cut, that $110 billion is reduced by 50. And then if they do the prescription drug benefit at 40, they take another 50 off. They are down to a $110 billion surplus over the next 5 years. By our calculation, Mr. Speaker, they will have a $10 billion surplus next year, but every year thereafter they will have a zero surplus.

They are skating on thin ice. They are putting us in danger of invading the Social Security surplus again. And when that crunch comes, prescription drug coverage will never get done. That is why we say do it first.

Now, this is simply a test of their sincerity. If they are earnest, if they are sincere, if they really want to do prescription drugs, vote for this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following chart for the RECORD:

THE REPUBLICAN BUDGET RESOLUTION USES UP THE ENTIRE SURPLUS—AND MAYBE MORE

[All figures exclude the Social Security surplus; negative signs indicate savings; dollars in billions]

	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	Five years	Ten years
CBO Surplus w/o Social Security	27	15	29	36	42	48	171	893
Tax cuts (before use of ''reserve'')	.....	10	22	31	42	45	150	750
Non-defense cuts including timing shifts	12	−16	−13	−21	−30	−37	−117	−377
Defense	.....	3	2	2	3	2	12	23
Farm payments	6	1	1	2	2	2	7	18
Extend expiring Customs Service fee	.....	.....	.....	.....	−1	−2	−3	−13
Medicaid/CHIP access and benefits	.....	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	(1)	1	2
Interest costs of policies	(1)	1	1	2	3	4	11	75
Surplus claimed by Republicans	8	17	16	20	24	33	110	415
Reserve for $50 billion additional tax cuts	.....	5	10	10	10	15	50	250
Reserved for Medicare ''reform'' and drugs	.....	2	5	8	11	14	40	155
Interest cost of reserves	.....	(1)	1	2	3	4	10	80
Surplus/Deficit(−) when reserves are used	8	10	0	0	0	0	10	−70

[1] means ''less than $½ billion''.

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

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will now put the question on each motion to suspend the rules and then on the motion to instruct conferees on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today in the order in which that motion was entertained.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H. Con. Res. 282, by the yeas and nays; H. Con. Res. 228, by the yeas and nays; S. 777, by the yeas and nays; and the motion to instruct conferees on H. Con. Res. 290, by the yeas and nays.

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

□

DECLARING AMERICAN G.I. ''PERSON OF THE CENTURY'' FOR 20TH CENTURY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 282, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 282, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 397, nays 0, answered ''present'' 1, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 111]

YEAS—397

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth-Hage
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde

Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Napolitano
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

ANSWERED ''PRESENT''—1

Thornberry

NOT VOTING—36

Ackerman
Bilbray
Blunt
Borski
Buyer
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Clement
Coburn
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
DeGette
Frost
Gutierrez
Jenkins
Jones (OH)
Martinez
McCollum
McIntosh
Mink
Moakley
Nadler
Neal
Owens
Oxley
Pryce (OH)
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ryun (KS)
Schaffer
Stark
Tanner
Weldon (PA)
Wise

□ 1837

Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut and Mr. SMITH of Michigan changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for electronic voting on each additional motion to suspend the rules on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

□

HONORING MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES AND FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES WHO SERVED NATION DURING VIETNAM ERA AND FAMILIES OF THOSE INDIVIDUALS WHO LOST THEIR LIVES OR REMAIN UNACCOUNTED FOR OR WERE INJURED DURING THAT ERA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 228.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. KUYKENDALL) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 228, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 399, nays 0, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 112]

YEAS—399

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth-Hage
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Napolitano
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield

Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—35

Ackerman
Bilbray
Blunt
Borski
Buyer
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Clement
Coburn
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
DeGette
Frost
Gutierrez
Jenkins
Jones (OH)
Martinez
McCollum
McIntosh
Mink
Moakley
Nadler
Neal
Owens
Oxley
Pryce (OH)
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ryun (KS)
Schaffer
Sisisky
Tanner
Wise

☐ 1845

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

☐

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. BILBRAY. Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, my flight from San Diego, California to Washington, D.C. was delayed this evening, and I was unable to record my vote for H. Con. Res. 282 and H. Con. Res. 228. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye'' on H. Con. Res. 282 and ''aye'' on H. Con. Res. 228.

☐

FREEDOM TO E-FILE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the Senate bill, S. 777, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 777, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 397, nays 1, not voting 36, as follows:

[Roll No. 113]

YEAS—397

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth-Hage
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Napolitano
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Ose
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter
Portman
Price (NC)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weiner
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—1

Sanford

NOT VOTING—36

Blunt
Borski
Buyer
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Clement
Coburn
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
DeGette
Frost
Gutierrez
Herger
Jenkins
Jones (OH)
Maloney (NY)
Martinez
McCollum
McIntosh
Mink
Moakley
Nadler
Neal
Owens
Oxley
Pryce (OH)
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ryun (KS)
Schaffer
Sisisky
Tanner
Tierney
Wise

☐ 1852

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the Senate bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the Senate bill was amended so as to read: ''A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to establish an electronic filing and retrieval system to enable farmers and other persons to file paperwork electronically with selected agencies of the Department of Agriculture and to access public information regarding the programs administered by these agencies.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

☐

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent from the House chamber for roll call votes held the evening of Monday, April 10. Had I been present I would have voted ''yea'' on H. Con. Res. 282, H. Con. Res. 228, and S. 777.

☐

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON HOUSE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 290, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET, FISCAL YEAR 2001

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES OFFERED BY MR. SPRATT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of agreeing to the motion to instruct on the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 290) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2001, revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2000, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2002 through 2005, offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT).

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from South

Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 198, nays 201, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 114]

YEAS—198

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Barcia
Barrett (WI)
Becerra
Bentsen
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Bonior
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Carson
Clay
Clayton
Clyburn
Condit
Conyers
Costello
Coyne
Cramer
Crowley
Cummings
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
DeFazio
Delahunt
DeLauro
Deutsch
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doyle
Edwards
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Forbes
Ford
Frank (MA)
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green (TX)
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hastings (FL)
Hill (IN)
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hoeffel
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
John
Johnson, E. B.
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
Kleczka
Klink
Kucinich
LaFalce
Lampson
Lantos
Larson
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McKinney
McNulty
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Millender-McDonald
Miller, George
Minge
Moore
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Napolitano
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Phelps
Pickett
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Rivers
Roemer
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Schakowsky
Scott
Serrano
Sherman
Shows
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stenholm
Strickland
Stupak
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thurman
Tierney
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Waters
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weiner
Wexler
Weygand
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn

NAYS—201

Archer
Armey
Baker
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Bereuter
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bliley
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bono
Brady (TX)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth-Hage
Coble
Collins
Combest
Crane
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeLay
DeMint
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Doolittle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
English
Everett
Ewing
Fletcher
Foley
Fossella
Fowler
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hansen
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hobson
Hoekstra
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Isakson
Istook
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kasich
Kelly
King (NY)
Kingston
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kuykendall
LaHood
Largent
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lucas (OK)
Manzullo
McCrery
McHugh
McInnis
McKeon
Metcalf
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Myrick
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Ose
Packard
Paul
Pease
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Pombo
Portman
Quinn
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Reynolds
Riley
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Salmon
Sanford
Saxton
Scarborough
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Skeen
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Toomey
Upton
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—35

Blunt
Borski
Buyer
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Clement
Coburn
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
DeGette
Frost
Gutierrez
Jenkins
Jones (OH)
Lee
Martinez
McCollum
McIntosh
Mink
Moakley
Mollohan
Nadler
Neal
Owens
Oxley
Pryce (OH)
Reyes
Rodriguez
Ryun (KS)
Schaffer
Sisisky
Tanner
Wise

□ 1903

Mr. BOEHLERT changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr, JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on the following: H. Con. Res. 282; H. Con. Res. 228; S. 277; and H. Con. Res. 290.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Without objection, the Chair names the following conferees: Messrs. KASICH, CHAMBLISS, SHAYS, SPRATT, and HOLT.

There was no objection.

□

COMMUNICATION FROM HON. JOE SCARBOROUGH, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable Joe Scarborough, Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 27, 2000.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you, pursuant to Rule VIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that I have been served with a deposition subpoena for documents issued by the Circuit Court for Escambia County, Florida.

After consultation with the Office of General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House.

Sincerely,

JOE SCARBOROUGH.

□

INTERNATIONAL ABDUCTION—KENNETH AND JODI CARLSEN

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

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to tell a story of Kenneth and Jodi Carlsen, the father and stepmother of one of the 10,000 American children who have been abducted internationally.

The United States court system awarded Mr. Carlsen custody of his daughter and gave visitation rights to the mother. In September of 1993, her mother and her boyfriend picked up Mr. Carlsen's daughter from school and abducted her to Germany.

When Mr. Carlsen filed for a court hearing in Germany, he was asked by the German authorities to pay 1,400 to initiate proceedings. Fourteen months later, he got a hearing and the German Youth Authority testified that his daughter was settled in her new environment and objected to being returned to the United States. The Youth Authority never interviewed Mr. Carlsen and the lower court in Germany denied the return of his daughter.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Carlsen's daughter was 8 when she was abducted and now is 15 years old. Since then, she has seen her father only twice and both times were under strict supervision of the German Youth Authority.

Mr. Speaker, this House has the responsibility and the duty to help American parents bring their children home. I urge my colleagues to support H.Con.Res. 293, American children need our help.

□

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

TRAIN WHISTLES TO DISRUPT MILLIONS OF LIVES

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

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to highlight a serious problem that all of America will soon experience. As early as next January, thousands of cities, towns, villages, and hamlets will be deafened by the wail of a train whistle. That is right, if the Federal Railroad Administration's proposed rule on the sounding of locomotive horns at every highway crossing goes into effect as planned, the earsplitting sounds of train whistles will wake people at night and generally disrupt people's lives.

Unfortunately, few Members of Congress know about the problem that confronts us. As mandated by the Swift Rail Act of 1994, the FRA came up with rules on train horns, and in January the FRA came out with a proposed rule.

While I understand that the rule is intended to save people's lives, the way in which the rule was written will severely impact millions of people in a negative way. For instance, although the FRA states that over 74,000 people in Illinois currently living near a crossing that does not allow whistle-blowing will be severely impacted by this rule, in reality, according to the Chicago Area Transportation Study, 2.5 million residents in Illinois live within one quarter mile of a crossing, and would be severely impacted.

This is a tremendous number of people that will be impacted by train whistles that range from 92 decibels to 144 decibels, an unhealthy level that rises above the threshold of pain.

So what can be done about this rule? I and other Members of the Illinois delegation could argue that Illinois, and specifically Chicago, should have an exception from the FRA's rule because Illinois has done a good job in reducing accidents at crossings.

In northeastern Illinois, injuries have declined by 70 percent and fatalities have declined by 65 percent since 1988. During the same period of time, the number of incidents dropped. Train traffic and average motor vehicle miles have both increased by 45 percent. Clearly, Illinois has been doing a good job with a tough assignment, and they should be allowed to continue with their rail safety program.

But what if this rule does go into effect? In order to avoid the disruption of the whistles, money is needed to implement alternatives to whistle blowing, money that local communities do not have. The FRA estimates costs of $116 million for whistle ban communities based on assumptions that every community will install the lowest-cost alternative to whistles.

The Chicago Area Transportation Study estimates the cost of reality-based alternatives to be between $440 million and $590 million for whistle ban communities across the Nation. This is a huge amount of money that our local communities simply do not have, and they will turn to their Congressmen to help them find the funding.

So I say to my colleagues, join me and others in finding a solution that is available to everyone. Let us work on this rule so crossings could be made safer and so people can go along with their lives in a livable manner.

At the very least, let us increase the amount of money going to grade crossings by passing my rail safety bill, H.R. 2060, that will double the amount of money that DOT gives to States for grade crossing safety. Because when next January rolls around, we had better be prepared for the train that is coming down the track for all of us.

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

(Mr. NORWOOD addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

□

THE NAVY'S MANIPULATIVE USE OF PREVAILING WAGES ON GUAM FOR THE PWC BOS CONTRACT

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

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I speak again on the issue of the implementation of a commercial study, the A–76 program, which basically is designed to outsource a number of jobs in my home island of Guam.

I rise again to point out some very serious difficulties with this process, and point out to the Members and especially the Members of the Committee on Armed Services that these kinds of problems which we are experiencing in Guam will inevitably be experienced by everyone as they undergo this A–76 process.

Yesterday on Guam, Raytheon Technical Services commenced their contract with the U.S. Navy for base operation support functions. Approximately 800 Federal civil service workers were laid off, and most of them were immediately rehired by Raytheon under the so-called right of first refusal to perform the very same jobs as they did last week, only they will be paid a salary of 40 to 60 percent less.

The Navy has told us that the wages that the contractor is required to pay are based on a ''prevailing wage determination,'' as is calculated by the U.S. Department of Labor. These are calculated by a prevailing wage survey. This survey is a composite of job-specific wage rates by industry in a particular community. They do not, however, account for the price of local consumer goods and foodstuffs which must be purchased in order to survive in that community, so Federal jobs also include a cost-of-living allowance that makes up this difference.

□ 1915

The private contractor is not required to pay this. In attempting to comprehend the situation on Guam between the high cost of consumables and the depressed prevailing wage rates, we spoke with the Prevailing Wage section of the Guam Department of Labor. We were informed that the Guam Department of Labor is responsible for the wage determination for foreign laborers under the H–2 program and is based on survey results done on Guam and reflective of local conditions.

Furthermore, the Guam Department of Labor noted that the wages established as a result of these surveys have complied with the requirements of the Davis-Bacon Act. The Guam Department of Labor is aware that the Navy contract with Raytheon is neither in line with Guam Department of Labor prevailing wage, nor mainland wage standards. Guam DOL has said that the wage survey for the Navy contract was not done on island and thus questions the survey's methodology.

Mr. Speaker, the question now begs where did the Navy get this wage data from? Well, one conclusion that we can draw from these depressed wages is that they pick the lowest possible salaries as determined from a whole range of areas of unofficial wage-study areas.

Now, I provide an example. We will use a real live Raytheon job offer against similar positions on Guam, using the Guam DOL prevailing wage survey, again a survey that is done under U.S. DOL supervision and is intended for foreign workers. For administration and accounting services, under the Navy service contract an accounting clerk is now being offered a wage of $5.80 an hour, compared with the Guam prevailing wage rate of $8.48 an hour. For a data entry operator, Raytheon has offered $11.86 an hour versus the Guam prevailing wage of $13.25 an hour.

Mr. Speaker, this is outrageous. Not only does it seem that the Navy was utilizing faulty data of an unknown source, but the Navy is taking advantage of the fact that the U.S. Department of Labor does not have sufficient oversight capabilities to enforce the requirements made on the Navy under the Services Contracting Act.

In fact, under the provisions of the Services Contracting Act, the Navy is required to request the U.S. Department of Labor to conduct a wage determination by filing a notice with the U.S. DOL for such a survey, and I believe that the U.S. Navy has violated this requirement and thus created an environment whereby wage busting could occur.

Let me just summarize here. What has happened on Guam has happened in other communities, perhaps unbeknownst to those communities, and will continue to happen, and that is if the Navy is allowed to compute their own prevailing wages apart from the actual wages in that community, they will continue to not only pay the people less than they would have under

civil service, they will continue to pay them less than even the prevailing wages in that community.

This has happened on Guam, and it is ironic that if one was a foreign worker coming to Guam, and this disincentive that is created under the Guam prevailing wage one would be getting more money today than they would under this Navy-induced contract with Raytheon. It is an outrage.

I call again upon the Department of the Navy and the Pentagon to halt this contract, to call for an Inspector General investigation, and I call for a congressional hearing on this matter.

□

ANY PARTICIPATION IN MULTILATERAL ORGANIZATIONS THAT AFFECTS THE INDEPENDENCE AND SOVEREIGNTY OF UNITED STATES IS WRONG AND SHOULD BE DISCONTINUED

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

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, many have asked me why I have cosponsored House Joint Resolution 90, which gives Members of this body the opportunity to vote on the United States continued participation in the World Trade Organization. A simple answer: I firmly believe that any participation in multilateral organizations that in any way affects the independence and sovereignty of these United States is wrong and should be discontinued.

Unfortunately, it has become obvious that the WTO will be able to remove jurisdiction over virtually any economic activity from Federal, State, and local governments. Global elitists have gravitated to the new centers of power, the transnational corporations, believing that we are evolving beyond the nation state. If that is the case, we are moving from a condition of rule under law, created by representative government, representing all the needs and interests of society, toward rule by unelected elites representing only the most powerful of interests, the only entities which have the power and reach across the world to really influence new international forms such as the WTO.

Corporate governance, in fact, is the newest concept being pressed forward at the WTO, the OECD, the IMF, and the World Bank. There has been little written on the topics outside the confines of independent governance organizations. The independent state is to be replaced with the corporate state; the concept of the people as sovereigns replaced by the notion of corporations as the new sovereigns.

The increasing centralization of industries, through monopoly mergers and acquisitions, has been given much of its global impetus through the mechanism of the WTO. This anti-competition evolution, when far enough along, will end any sense of free enterprise being the normal global market norm. Corporations are not good or evil, but corporate boards prioritize actions that increase the profitability and power of the corporation. Their officers increasingly speak and act as if they do not affiliate or identify with any one country or any one home.

Do the large transnational corporations have the same degree of concern for the defense of the United States as the average citizen? What about environmental standards which are the product of our system of governance, or hard-fought labor protections jeopardized by drastic wage and labor standard differentials between the United States and the Third World? What decisions will be made by the unelected, corporate-influenced members of the WTO in the long run?

Corporatism never implied a need for democracy. We hear about the WTO adhering to recognized international core labor standards, but we do not hear how little the wages of foreign workers have increased, how often they have fallen to new lows, just how little the standards of living have changed for the average citizens of these countries. The only way to protect American jobs from further disappearing to lesser developed countries is by foreign workers receiving higher wages. Lowering trade barriers is lowering standards, period.

When we read about the growing irrelevancy of national governments in dealing with the transnational corporations, we must ask where does that leave the citizens of our Nation? Every nation that is a free republic, based upon democratic principles, has a citizenry who are the sole sovereigns. If they are not sovereign, there is no true democracy. This is why the word sovereignty has real meaning. This is why this fight for the sovereignty of the United States, challenged by the emergence of the WTO, is a real fight for the constitutional rights of each and every American. Many believe the undemocratic WTO, ruling far from our homeland, can be reformed. I sincerely doubt this, and I ask, are we really willing to take that kind of a gamble with American independence, with the liberty that we aspire to for each citizen? I hope not.

□

OUR DEEPEST SYMPATHIES ARE EXTENDED TO THE FAMILIES OF MAJOR GRUBER AND ALSO STAFF SERGEANT NELSON

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

Mr. JONES of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I have been coming to the floor once a week for the last 2½ months to talk about our men and women in uniform that are on food stamps and how I think it is unacceptable that this Congress, and this government quite frankly, would ask anyone that would be willing to die for this Nation to be on food stamps; but tonight, Mr. Speaker, I am here on the floor because there was a tragedy on Saturday night. I think we all know that a V–22 Osprey on a training mission in Arizona went down and 19 Marines were killed. It so happens that two of those Marines were from eastern North Carolina.

Major Brooks Gruber was a pilot on the mission and also there was a Staff Sergeant William B. Nelson, who was stationed at New River Air Station in Onslow County, North Carolina.

I just started thinking, as I heard about the terrible tragedy, that many of us, not just talking about Members of Congress but those of us around this Nation, we do take our military for granted. I do not think we intend to do that, but it is just maybe because out of sight out of mind. But when we hear about a training accident where men and women are killed, in this case it was 19 men, that it does remind us that our freedoms are guaranteed by those who are willing to serve.

I just wanted to come to the floor tonight, and I am sure all Members of Congress would join me in extending our deepest sympathy to the families of Major Gruber and also Staff Sergeant Nelson, as well as the other 17 men that were killed on this training flight in Arizona.

I think that it is a reminder to all Americans that the members of the United States military make the ultimate sacrifice on a daily basis, whether it is here in this country or outside of the borders of the United States of America. It is a tragedy, because we think that our men and women in training are always going to be safe and protected, but it does not always happen that way. Certainly there is an investigation going on now. We will find out soon what happened to the V–22 that made it fail in the air and kill these wonderful, brave American military Marines, it happens to be in this case.

I am going to cut my remarks short tonight because, again, I sense the sadness from talking to the Marines in the liaison office today as I am saddened myself; and again I am sure each and every Member on the floor tonight is saddened. I do hope, as I close, after extending my deepest sympathy to the families of these 19 Marines, that those of us in the House will remember that we do have those on food stamps and that we will do something before this session of Congress ends to make sure that we do show those 7,000 men and women in uniform on food stamps that we care about them and we are going to do something to help them so they will not be so dependent on food stamps.

Mr. Speaker, I do again extend to the families of these 19 my deepest sympathies on behalf of my colleagues who serve on the floor of the United States, the House of Representatives, and in a very trivial way say thank you for giving that son to this country and may God be with you and God bless you through this time of sadness.

CENSUS DAY PLUS 10

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, this is census day plus 10. My message to the American people is, if they have not already filled out their form, please do so now and mail it in. Be part of this great civic ceremony.

As of today, over 61 percent of Americans have responded to the census, with 39 percent to go. This is a critically important milestone for the 2000 Census, and I am extremely encouraged by the American people's effort and by the Census Bureau's transparent tabulation efforts. Just months ago, the General Accounting Office warned that the initial response rate for the 2000 Census might peak at 61 percent. Well, with 8 days still to spare, the 2000 Census has reached this point and forms continue to flow in daily.

I am extremely heartened by the response thus far, and tonight I say to the remaining 39 percent, please complete your forms. Do it today. Put it in the mail. As always, this is our main message. Fill out your form today.

Unfortunately, we have reached 61 percent despite the amazing comments of some of my Republican colleagues and even Members of the Republican leadership. With 39 percent of the American people still not heard from, we have Members of Congress who should all know better telling the American people that the census is optional. We have Members of Congress saying that they, and I quote, ''believe in voluntarily cooperating,'' end quote, with the government; but beyond that they will not follow the law. Since when did following the law in this country become a voluntary, optional thing?

□ 1930

Others have compared the long form to a college exam where some questions can be skipped. Is it because some people do not know the answers? I certainly hope not. Do they want participation, or do they want to make participation optional?

Last week, Census Director Ken Prewitt testified that the initial response rate for the long form has been almost 12 percent below the response rate for the households receiving the short form. This is almost double the differential from the 1990 census and could seriously threaten the accuracy of the final count.

What is really disheartening is the fact that most of the questions on the long form have been around for decades. They were part of the Bush and Reagan census. Even more astonishing about this new-found concern about the census is that, over 2 years ago, the content of the long and short forms, while they were being finalized, absolutely every Member of Congress received a detailed list of the questions to be asked, including a description of the need for the asking of it, along with the specific legal requirements supporting it.

Notification of Congress is required by title 13 for a very good reason, to prevent the very situation we face today, a census effort at risk because Members of Congress simply do not know or do not care about the importance of the census data.

Members of Congress received this information with all of the questions in 1997 and 1998. I know that all of the Members who are complaining about the census got a copy. Did they not read their mail? The time for input on the questions was then, not now when they will do more harm than good.

Even last week, the Republican leadership convened a press conference supposedly in support of the census. But they went on to urge Americans to skip questions they were uncomfortable with. Maybe the Republican leadership should be reminded that the questions asked by the census represent a balance between the needs of our Nation's communities and the need to keep the time and effort required to complete the form to a minimum. Only information required by Congress to manage or evaluate programs is collected by the census.

Federal and State funds for schools, employment services, housing assistance, road construction, day care facilities, hospitals, emergency services, programs for seniors, and much more are distributed based on census figures.

Also, the Census Bureau uses data acquired from the long form to establish the baseline for many of the economic reports they release year-round, including data on the Consumer Price Index and unemployment. Without accurate data, we would be forced to manage our economic policies with even less information than we currently have available.

We should remember that the Census Bureau has gone to great efforts to make both the short and long forms as brief as possible. The 2000 Census short form contains eight questions, down from nine in 1990. The 2000 Census long form contains 53 questions, down from 57 in 1990, the shortest long form in decades.

The only new question in the census, which was added with my support as part of welfare reform, asked for information on grandparents as care givers.

I am a bit confused, too, because the same people who today are making such a fuss over the long form just 6 months ago tried to add a question to the short form which everyone has to complete.

I have a series of editorials from around the country urging Americans to stand up and be counted for their communities, for their representation, for their distribution of Federal funds. I would like to put in the RECORD an editorial from the Daily News from New York City, the city that I am proud to represent. The editorial is as follows:

STAND UP AND BE COUNTED

That's the slogan of Census 2000, and nowhere is that cry more urgent than in New York. Last time around—10 years ago—New Yorkers sat down. There was an undercount. And the state lost out on everything from political representation to new schools. New York, particularly New York City, must not let this happen again.

The filing deadline came and went April 1. But the ''Be counted'' Web site doesn't shut down until tomorrow. So if you haven't returned your census form, take a few minutes (or a few seconds, if you have the eight-question short form) and do so. Now.

And, please, try not to get your dander up about how nosy some of the questions seem to be. Answers on how you get to work and what time you leave each morning, for example, can be used by local officials for highway and mass-transit improvements. Nobody's tracking your movement. Other answers will aid in planning for health, housing, education, employment, police and so forth. As for those racial-identification categories, just follow the Census Bureau's advice: Put down whatever race or ethnicity you identify with. It's simply a part of drawing an accurate population profile in this multicultural nation.

So far, returns here are hovering about 55%—with some areas (like central Brooklyn, with a dismal 37%) considerably lower.

A study by Price Waterhouse Coopers after the 1990 census determined that New York State was undercounted by 277,000 residents—245,000 of them in New York City. That cost the city three Assembly seats, a state Senate seat and half a congressional seat.

As Rep. Carolyn Maloney (D–Queens), the ranking member of the House census subcommittee put it: ''It's your future, don't leave it blank.''

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), an outstanding leader and actually a new Member of Congress, representing the City of Chicago. She has been very active on the Subcommittee on Census and has worked very hard to bring up participation.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentlewoman from New York for her tremendous leadership on assuring a complete count of all Americans.

I wish I could be as optimistic. Unfortunately, in the city of Chicago, we are 10th out of the 10 largest cities in the response to the census so far. My hope is that all responsible elected leaders will be encouraging people from our States, from our cities and communities to fill out that census form.

I have heard a lot of political pandering, we all have in our days, but rarely have I heard anything quite as irresponsible as the trashing that is going on of the census long form. One would think that some of those elected officials who are doing it, Members of this body on the Republican side of the aisle who are doing that, one would think that they had never seen that form before.

As the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) pointed out, every single Member was able to scrutinize every single question. As a consequence, we came up with a form, a long form that is, in fact, shorter than

it was in 1990 and adds only one question. All of us are interested in knowing how many grandparents now are taking care of children. We hear that all the time from our constituents.

They had total control over what was going to be in there. There were no complaints in 1990 from them.

How long does it take to get to work? People say, oh, why do you have to know that? Well, why does one think that we want to know that, so that we can understand where we need transportation dollars. Do we need a new road? Do we need more transit to shorten that time? Do we need more affordable housing so that people can live near the jobs?

Employment questions. What is this new economy about? Let us use the census to understand that better. Is our prosperity really being shared? Are there more people who are working for themselves, and are they making a decent living when they are working at home?

In Illinois, in the Chicago area, in Cook County, we undercounted enough children in 1990 to fill 78 schools. That is why we need an accurate count, so that we can make sure that we get the educational opportunities to our kids.

Now, one listens to John Stossel on 20/20 last Friday night, and one would think that the census is simply a tool of big government, in fact, he said a government that is selling dependency, that is his word, that is what the census is about in his conspiratorial tone.

But who really is using this census data? I would posit that ABC, the very station he was on, that 20/20 probably uses the census data to figure out who the audience is, where to sell advertising. The private sector surely as much as the public sector uses the census data to figure out where investments should be made, where are we going to put our money in communities, who is living out there.

This is not a conspiracy of government. This is a partnership with the people of the United States so that we can distribute public dollars and private dollars.

We need to be doing the census form for ourselves. This is not a favor to anybody. This is going to bring results to every single community. There is not a district in this country that will not be better served if there is a complete count.

So for any politician to get up and pander and say, oh, you do not have to fill this out, it is really intrusive, is counterproductive for their own constituents. Leadership is about explaining to constituents why this is important, why it is in their interest to fill it out. When people complain, we encourage them to understand what the real meaning of this complete count is.

I am so proud to join with the gentlewoman from New York in her work and so many of us who are trying every single day to make sure that the people in this country get what they deserve. Anyone who has ever said, ''I send my tax dollars to Washington, what do I get back, am I getting my fair share?'', if they have not filled out the census form, then that is not an appropriate question, because if they do not fill out this form, then they will not be counted.

So I join my colleagues in urging all Americans to get this census form in. They have got a few more days to do it. I encourage my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to inform their constituents about the importance.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. NAPOLITANO), another leader for a complete count.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I certainly want to add to the comments that my colleagues have made in just the last few minutes. But I, most of all, want to thank everyone who has completed their census form so far. Wherever you are, whether you are an American citizen, a recent immigrant or whoever, you are making a difference for your community and setting our Nation on the best path for the new century.

For those of you who have not yet filled out and returned your census questionnaires, please, you have 10 days to finish. Do it today. Do it now. Do it this very minute. It is not too late.

As of last night, over 60 percent of Americans have completed and sent in their census form. This is very exciting news. But we must keep working with the census, with our communities, with our neighborhoods across the Nation to reach out to the remaining 40 percent of Americans who have yet to return their census questionnaire.

As we have heard, 61 percent return has already been received. In my district alone, 68 to 71 percent of the people in the 34th Congressional District have completed and returned their census form. The City of Norwalk completed 71 out of 78 percent targeted; Whittier, 70 out of 72; Montebello, 70 out of 73; Pico Rivera, 68 out of 77 percent; Santa Fe Springs, 71 out of 78 percent; Industry, 69 out of a targeted 33 percent; and La Puente, the best in the area, 70 percent out of a targeted 67. They have overpassed their target. This is better than the anticipated rate out of California and nationwide.

However, there are a lot of people that still have to be counted. If 30 percent of our people go uncounted, that is 30 percent less money to pay for schools. That is less money for repairing our roads, for funding hospitals, for providing services to our senior citizens and for our recreational programs for our youth.

Now, we all know that some people have had difficulties with our census forms, especially the long form which asked 53 questions. Some people find some of those questions intrusive and awkward. Personally, I question the way in which the form asked about my race and my ethnicity. But what I do not question is that it is vitally important to my community of Norwalk and to my surrounding communities, that I be a responsible citizen and complete and return my census form.

An important fact to remember, whether one is filling out the long form or the short form is that one's responses are confidential. The information one gives is not, I repeat, it is not sold to marketing firms. It is not handed over to the IRS, nor to the INS, nor to the FBI. In fact, it is against the law for the Census Bureau to give or sell information to anyone. That is including this House. The law works. In the last census of 1990, not one single case of information leaking occurred.

The Census Bureau has gone to great effort within the mandates of Congress to make the forms as brief as possible. The 2000 Census short form contains eight questions, down from nine in 1990, and the long form contains 53, down from 57 in 1990, the shortest form in history.

The Census Bureau uses long form data as a baseline. That means the bottom line for every single economic indicator they publish. Without this accurate baseline, we cannot produce any economic information needed to run our Nation's economy effectively, to identify the areas in need, and take on other indicators to be able to help our communities.

We need a more accurate count of America's blacks, America's Hispanics, America's Asians, and American Indians. Regardless of what my colleagues on the other side, regardless of their arguments or what they state, for us, it is not optional. For us, it is a necessity.

Republicans have done everything possible to harm Census 2000 effort. We must not fall for their rhetoric. This latest effort to paint questions which had been on the long form for over 50 years as intrusive and unneeded is just another attempt to derail the accurate count of census.

To the people in my district, to the people of the United States and across this great land of ours, I ask that they please remember how important it is to their community, to our community. So I plea again, please complete and return your census form.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK), a great leader on a complete count. She even hosted a public hearing in her district and has been a leader here on the floor and in the committee work, and I welcome here tonight.

☐ 1945

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. I thank my dear colleague, the gentlewoman from New York. The gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) hails from New York, but her influence on the census has gone throughout this country, and we thank her for that leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I am privileged to come back again tonight. If the gentlewoman were to call us in tomorrow, if she were

to call us in every day this week, I would be here, because we do not have enough voices speaking out for the census.

Regrettably, we have had some ill winds. They came in during the Ides of March and they are still here, they are still talking. We are trying our very best to say to the country that the census is a good thing. It is in the Constitution. It is something that we should do. We keep talking about we are a Nation of laws. Well, if that is the case, why can we not stick to our laws? Let us not just use them when they are customized to fit our political ideas, but to use them at all times.

It is extremely disappointing to see some of my good friends in the Republican Party saying to all of our constituents that the census is optional; that they do not have to fill out all the questions; that it is not mandatory; that citizens do not have to do this. Well, it is. It is important that all of our constituents fill out the census forms.

Now, it is not too late. We do not have the return I would like to see in my district. We have, like, 53 percent. I would like to see 66, 76, 90 percent return. But we still have time. We are still going to churches; we are going to wherever people congregate and saying to them, fill out the forms. For those who have not filled theirs out yet, please fill it out and return it. We are doing our very best to help.

I am just really astounded to see that our most noble elevated body, the Senate, passed a Sense of the Senate Resolution essentially reinforcing the idea that not completing your form is okay. This is completely unacceptable. It is completely irresponsible. The Senate should set a standard for the country instead of undermining an effort which this Congress has seen fit to participate in.

Now, this thing about the questions, maybe we should not have to go over that over and over again because the questions are there and they are not that hard. They are only asking those kind of questions every 10 years. Americans are used to answering questions, particularly questions that will lead to good representation in their community. It is going to lead to a good school board member, it will lead to some good elected representatives, it will lead to some good Congress persons. Now, that is not a trivial thing.

But there are some radio announcers and disk jockeys and pundits in this country who are making that just a trivial thing. It is not trivial when it affects your elected representatives that will go into a governing body and represent you. People keep saying, We don't have a voice. You do have a voice. Be counted and you will have a voice, because there will be enough of you to say, yes, we do deserve another Congressperson in our area; yes, we do deserve another State representative in our area; yes, we do deserve another school board member.

So it is irresponsible and irrational, as far as I am concerned, to tell people that it is optional; that they should not fill out all the forms or they should not fill out any of the forms. The time has come now. We have been talking about the census, and the gentlewoman from New York has led this thing notably and with great merit throughout this process. It is time now that our people step up to the plate.

They will not be able to talk, the pundits will not be able to talk about government does not do what it is supposed to do. They are the first to criticize government. They say government is not doing what it should do. Government wants to do it. It is a good thing if people go out and turn in their census form.

Now, I am a little embarrassed because the governor of my State has come out saying, ''I take the same position as other Republicans do.'' Well, it is not a good idea, Mr. Governor, to say that you take that same position and that it is optional. Florida now has 23 representatives in this Congress. If our people do not go out and be counted, Mr. Governor, you may not have 23 Congresspersons another year from now.

So we are saying to all the people, support the census. Fill out the forms. It is not a cursory thing; it is not something that is fly by night and you can just flippant say, oh, no, we are not going to do it. It is important. Not only does the lifeblood of your community depend on it, your roads, your transportation, and your representation.

And particularly poor people and underserved people. My voice goes out to them every time I stand up. Turn the forms in. You will probably benefit from it more than a lot of other people because you depend on government for most of your basic services. Go to it; turn in those forms. If you need help, call the Census Bureau. If you need help, call your local Congressperson; wake them up. They are the ones depending on this count as well as you are.

So I do hope that everyone within the sound of our voices tonight will go out and be counted. The ball is in their court.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The gentlewoman will suspend.

The Members will be reminded that it is not in order to characterize Senate action, nor is it in order during debate to specifically urge the Senate to take certain action.

Members will be also reminded that they should make their comments to the Chair and not to the listening or the viewing audience.

The gentlewoman may proceed.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, another of our colleagues, the gentlewoman from the great State of Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE), had a conflict and could not stay with us. She was here, however, and I will submit her statement later for the RECORD.

Another colleague from Texas, however, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), is here. This Member holds many leadership positions in this body. He is the ranking member on the Committee on Agriculture and is the policy chair of the Blue Dogs, in addition to being a leader in this body on getting a complete and accurate count during the census.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from New York for yielding to me to talk tonight about the general subject we have already heard our colleagues from California and Florida speaking about, and that is encouraging, Mr. Speaker, encouraging all Americans to fill out the form and to send it in.

I guess one of my disappointments tonight is that we do not have the time equally divided between Democrats and Republicans so that we might all stand up tonight and encourage people to fill out the forms and to send them in, instead of some divided voices that we have been hearing from lately, Mr. Speaker. I think that is not in the best interest of this House of Representatives. I hope that we, under the Speaker's leadership, will find ways to encourage all Americans to return their census forms.

As we have already heard, current figures indicate that 61 percent of all citizens have returned their forms. This is good news. But that means 39 percent have not. In Texas, unfortunately, we are running a bit behind the national average. As of last night, 57 percent of Texans have responded.

I want to single out a few counties in my district back home that are not doing as well as California was doing a moment ago, but we are exceeding the national averages: Hood County, Taylor County, Tom Green County, and Young County. So to those people living in towns like Granbury and Tolar, and Abilene and Merkel, and San Angelo and Graham and Olney, I commend you and encourage you to continue to publicize and to work to see that your neighbors in fact send their forms in.

It is all the more important for people in rural areas to respond to the census. In 1990, the census missed approximately 1.2 percent of all rural residents. We must have an accurate count for rural America also in order that we might receive our fair share of representation and tax dollars.

It is very disturbing to me when I look at my rural district and see that when we get outside of the more populated counties that I mentioned, that we are way behind in our response rate. This is disturbing and something that I hope we will in fact be counting soon.

The editors of the San Angelo Standard Times wrote about the importance of responding to the census in their March 15 editorial whey they wrote:

Texas probably lost a congressional seat in 1990 because an estimated 483,000 Texans either refused to be counted or were missed by

census takers. The State also lost nearly $1 billion Federal funding, which is the other primary purpose of the census now, to determine how much money each State will receive for roads, education, health care and other programs.

Mr. Speaker, I would provide the full text of the editorial for the RECORD.

Now, I know there are some citizens that are concerned about the long form. The data is extremely important to administering Federal programs, everything from housing programs and community development grants to highways, education and health care. The Census Bureau uses long-form data as a baseline for every single economic indicator. Without an accurate baseline, we cannot produce the economic information to better serve our citizens.

The San Angelo Standard Times editors hit on this point as well when they wrote:

It is helpful to have a detailed snapshot of the country and the conditions its citizens are living in, because such information can be useful to policymakers. While it may be annoying, there is no real down side. All census information is confidential and by law cannot be shared either with other government agencies or private entities.

I think the important thing to point out to our constituents is the extensive privacy constraints that we, the Congress, have imposed on the census. Anyone who violates the law and discloses any individual household data will be subject to 5 years in prison and $5,000 in fines. The Census Bureau has a great track record of protecting this data. In 1990, millions of questionnaires were processed without any breach of trust.

So, in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to encourage all Americans, and in particular my constituents in west Texas, who have not returned their census forms to send them in today. It is not too late. You deserve to be counted, and it is in your community's best interest and it is in our Nation's best interest that we count every individual citizen of America so that our representation in this body and in the State legislatures around the country will be based on the most accurate information.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back to the gentlewoman from New York and submit herewith the text of the article I referred to above:

[From the San Angelo Standard Times, Mar. 15, 2000]

TAKE TIME TO FILL OUT CENSUS QUESTIONNAIRE

Some West Texans already have received their 2000 census forms, and the rest will be receiving them in the coming days.

Those who are ambivalent about filling out the forms need to remember a couple of things: There are many reasons to participate and, aside from the time it takes, not a single reason not to. And considering that the short form—which will go to 80 percent of households—takes only about 10 minutes to complete, the time argument doesn't hold much water for most people.

The census has occurred once each decade since the country's beginning. Originally the purpose was to ensure proper representation—that is, since congressional seats are apportioned based on population, it was necessary to know how many people lived in each state to determine how many representatives it would send to the U.S. House of Representatives.

Texas probably lost a congressional seat in 1990 because an estimated 483,000 Texans either refused to be counted or were missed by census-takers. The state also lost nearly $1 billion federal funding, which is the other primary purpose of the census now—to determine how much money each state will receive for roads, education, health care and other programs.

Both arguments for participating matter in San Angelo and Tom Green County as well. The local share of funding is lost for each person who fails to respond to the census. And with West Texas being tremendously outgrown by the rest of the state, our clout in this part of the state is diminished with each person that is missed.

For the first time, a local committee will undertake an aggressive outreach effort to try to limit the number of people who fall through the census cracks. Plans call for having offices where people can go to get help in filling out their census forms, and interpreters will be available for those newer arrivals who need assistance.

It's unfortunate that the Census Bureau got off to a bad start, putting an extra digit on addresses for letters that went out recently informing people that their forms would be arriving and erroneously sending out some information in foreign languages

Still, that doesn't alter the importance of filling out and returning the forms, which, when compiled, will tell much about the nation at the turn of the century.

Some 15 million homes will receive the long form, which does take longer to fill out (about 38 minutes, the U.S. Census Bureau estimates) and does ask some questions that will cause many to wonder why they are necessary.

The answer is that it is helpful to have a detailed snapshot of the country and the conditions its citizens are living in, because such information can be useful to policymakers. While it may be annoying, there is no real downside—all census information is confidential and by law cannot be shared either with other government agencies or private entities.

Consider it a civic duty that pays dividends—and that only has to be performed once every decade.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his statement, and I would now like to yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS). He represents the 7th Congressional District in Maryland. The gentleman from Maryland chairs the Complete Count Committee for Baltimore and has served on really the oversight committee for the census, the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, and I thank him for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentlewoman for all that she has done. Ever since the subcommittee was first formed, I remember that she made it clear that she was going to do everything in her power to make sure that we had a complete count, and she has continued to do that. I really thank her not just on behalf of the Congress of the United States of America but for all Americans for what she has done. I really do appreciate it.

I also want to take a moment to recognize the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MEEK), who just spoke. She has brought this matter to the attention of the African American people over and over again. It has been a major, major concern of the gentlewoman from Florida, and I want to thank her.

This morning, Mr. Speaker, I visited Windsor Hills Elementary School, and this is a school in my district which has a number of young people who are in special education, beneficiaries of Title I funds.

I watched those little children as they put their hands up to their hearts and said, ''I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the republic,'' and I watched them as they talked about this one Nation under God. As I watched them, I thought about a great writer who once said, ''Our children are the living messages we send to a future we will never see,'' and I could not help but think about the census, because the census affects them. It will affect them for the next 10 years.

The fact is those first graders will, in the future, 10 years from now, be 11th graders. The question is how will they have benefited from our actions or fail to benefit from our inactions?

□ 2000

Sadly, we have Members of Congress and prominent leaders of the Republican party telling the American public that the census is optional. I could not believe that.

On Friday, the Senate passed a sense of the Senate resolution essentially reinforcing the idea that not completing one's form is okay. It is not.

Further, Republican Presidential Nominee, Governor Bush has sided with the Republican majority in Congress that has objected to the use of modern scientific methods to provide accurate census data.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The gentleman must be reminded not to characterize Senate actions.

The gentleman may proceed.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Speaker, as a candidate for the presidency, his opposition to using modern scientific methods sends a strong message that has outreached a minority community those traditionally undercounted is not genuine.

It is unfortunate but not surprising that compassionate conservatism does not include the community I represent. Currently, Baltimore City has a dismal 48 percent response rate. The target was 68 percent. Despite our best efforts, we cannot improve this rate nor ensure a complete and accurate census when constituents are bombarded with messages from elected officials that they do not have to fill out the form.

I urge naysayers to stop spreading these negative messages and encourage residents to fulfill their civic duty by completing and returning their census

forms. A complete and accurate Census 2000 will ensure that education, accessible health care, child care, access to jobs, and the protection of civil rights are available for all.

Again, those first-graders sitting there and then standing and pledging allegiance to the flag, where will they be in 10 years? What will they have accomplished if we do not do what we are supposed to do and fill out our forms? It is a simple act. And as I told some constituents the other day, when they fail to fill out that form and they have five people in their house, that means six people are not counted.

And so, Mr. Speaker, again our citizens deserve no less. I want to thank again the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) for yielding.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, our next speaker will be the gentleman from the 42nd Congressional District of California (Mr. BACA) the inland empire. But before he speaks, I would like to read a short quote from an editorial published in the Minneapolis Star Tribune on April 2.

A handful of conservative lawmakers in Washington have come up with a creative response. They're urging constituents to simply ignore the questions they don't like. That's a cynical and irresponsible approach from elected officials who should know better. The census long form might be a nuisance, but there is no question that it provides useful, sometimes required, information for Federal agencies to allocate taxpayer's money for private scholars to conduct research and for the government to serve citizens more effectively.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think anybody could have said it any better.

Mr. Speaker, I include the following entire editorial for the RECORD:

[From the Star Tribune, Apr. 2, 2000]

CENSUS RUCKUS; DON'T BOYCOTT THE LONG FORM

One in six American households has received the Census Bureau's dreaded ''long form'' in recent weeks, and most are reacting to its 52 detailed questions with an understandable combination of patience, impatience and procrastination.

But a handful of conservative lawmakers in Washington have come up with a more creative response. They're urging constituents to simply ignore the questions they don't like.

That's a cynical and irresponsible approach from elected officials who should know better. The census long form might be a nuisance, but there is no question that it provides useful—sometimes required—information for federal agencies to allocate taxpayers' money, for private scholars to conduct important research and for the government to serve citizens more effectively.

Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott has led the attack, arguing that the census questionnaire is overlong and intrusive. But the Census Bureau has added only one item since 1990, and it provided all the questions for congressional review two years ago, as required by law.

Rep. Tom Coburn, R–Okla, says the questions are too personal. When pressed for an example last week, a Coburn aide cited a question about bathing habits. But it turns out that the question is actually about mental and physical disability. As a series of examples, the question asks whether the respondent has a disability severe enough to interfere with schooling, holding a job or conducting normal household activities such as eating and bathing.

Granted, that's personal. But it's also a perfectly good example of the census' value. Washington hands out billions of dollars every year to disabled Americans, and every year skeptical lawmakers ask how many Americans are truly so disabled that they need government assistance.

The same could be said for the billions of dollars that Washington spends every year on highways, parks, mortgage subsidies, tuition assistance and so forth. It would be irresponsible for Congress to spend the money without good data on the nation's housing stock, travel habits, recreation needs and educational deficiencies. And that says nothing about the small army of scholars who will dig into census data in coming years to conduct important research on health care, mobility, poverty, education and countless other subjects.

Lott and Coburn say their constituents don't trust the Census Bureau to keep their answers confidential. But responsible leaders would not inflame groundless suspicions. They would remind their constituents of the Census Bureau's excellent 200-year records of vigorously protecting the confidentiality of personal information.

What's most depressing about the Lott-Coburn critique is that it's one more effort to depict the government as an enemy of the people, not an extension of their will. Americans who want their government to function more effectively should support a thorough census. A sophisticated society cannot function without good information about itself. And for those busy souls who haven't labored through the long form yet, we trust they'll approach the task more responsibly than some of their leaders in Washington.

Last Friday, the Senate passed a misguided Sense of the Senate resolution that will only encourage more Americans not to participate in this critically important civic ceremony.

Ironically, many of the Senators raising questions also cosponsored an amendment offered by Senator HELMS which would have asked every American what their marriage status was. Those Senators should realize that they cannot have it both ways.

It is much too late to be raising these questions.

At this time, I would like to read a few quotes from an editorial published in the Minneapolis Star-Tribune on April 2nd.

A handful of conservative lawmakers in Washington have come up with a creative response. They're urging constituents to simply ignore the questions they don't like. that's a cynical and irresponsible approach from elected officials who should know better. The census long form might be a nuisance, but there is no question that it provides useful—sometimes required—information for Federal agencies to allocate taxpayer's money, for private scholars to conduct research, and for the government to serve citizens more effectively.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. BACA).

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to thank the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) for doing an outstanding job in getting out the word to all American people of the responsibility that we have in assuring that every American is counted. It has taken a lot of effort and a lot of time on her part. I commend her for her part, because she realizes the importance of what it means to our Nation to have everyone counted. She is to be commended for her leadership, her vision, and her foresight in assuring that every State receives its fair share of dollars. And the only way that it is going to be done is by doing an accurate count.

By doing an accurate count, I am really appalled at what is going on and am outraged by what is going on or has been suggested by parties on one particular side that has said that it is optional to count. It is not optional. It is our responsibility, it is everybody's responsibility, it is Americans' responsibility to make sure that we all are counted. It is irresponsible and unpatriotic not to be counted.

Let me tell my colleagues I stand here as a veteran, a veteran who has served our country, and many other veterans who have served us, they believe they have fought to assure that we enjoy those freedoms that we enjoy today because they were willing to put themselves and to sacrifice, that we enjoy those freedoms today to make sure that everyone is counted, that everyone enjoys the freedom that we have to assure they participate in our American democracy.

They cannot participate in that American democracy if they do not participate and they are not counted. I ask every individual to participate. We now have had 61 percent of individuals that participated at this point. That is not enough. We need 35 percent additional of the total of Americans to participate in filling out their forms. We need every individual to fill out their form.

We are in an information age. We need reliable information in order to make good decisions for this Nation. Without good data, we cannot administer the laws of this country fairly.

The Census Bureau has long forms on a baseline for every single economic independent indicator to be published. Without an accurate baseline, we cannot produce economic information needed to run this Nation's economics effectively.

Not too long ago, I came here and was elected during a special election. I voted for the budget at that time. It was the first budget that I ever voted for. It was approximately a $790 trillion budget. When I look at that budget, I am saying, how much of that money is coming back to California? In California we have continued to do an undercount.

In Fontana recently, we have had a lot of growth and development in that area. We need to make sure that we do have an accurate count in that immediate area. We are going to lose a lot of funding that goes back, monies that need to go back for education, monies that need to go back for parks and recreation, monies that need to go back for special ed, monies that need

to go back for infrastructure and transportation, monies that need to go back for health services, monies that need to go back for senior citizens.

If we do not do an accurate count, we will not get the monies that we deserve. It is our responsibility to make sure that we receive the funding that is necessary for all of us. It cannot happen unless we take our responsibility.

I urge all Americans to make sure they fulfill their obligation, they take that responsibility. We are in a country where we have those freedoms. Many other individuals do not have those freedoms. We have the freedom to complete the form and look at every dollar that we reserve.

If California wants to reserve its dollars to get back what it deserves, we need to make sure that an accurate count is done. The only way that California will get the additional dollars is that we make sure we do that count.

We have 52 Members in the State of California. We need to continue to make sure we ask for an accurate count. We need to make sure that blacks, Hispanics, Asian-Americans, the American-Indian population, and the total population is actually counted. We need all of them to participate, to make sure they do fill out their forms, that they are not frightened and sabotaged by anyone telling them not to complete the form. I ask them to please complete the form. We urge them. It is important for this Nation. It is important for our country.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I put a brief quote in from the Atlanta Journal Constitution on April 3. It says, ''Participation in the census may also be harmed by the political grandstanding it continues to inspire.'' Presidential candidate George W. Bush has criticized the long census sent to one in six American households as some sort of government intrusion on privacy.

However, the Census Bureau takes very seriously its responsibility to keep individual responses absolutely confidential. Leakers inside will be sought out and prosecuted. And hackers on the outside have not been able to get in. If they were caught, they would be prosecuted. In fact, the Bureau is working with leading computer security experts to make sure its data remains untapped.

Mr. Speaker, I include the entire article for the RECORD:

[From the Atlanta Journal Constitution, Apr. 3, 2000]

CONSTITUTION: KEEP THE CENSUS FROM BECOMING POLITICAL FODDER AND PARTICIPATE

Roughly half of America's households did their civic duty and answered the U.S. Census Bureau's Year 2000 postal survey by its April 1 deadline. That level of participation is not nearly good enough if America is to get the accurate picture of itself essential to governing fairly and efficiently at local, state and federal levels.

Fortunately, the bureau still has a ''final, final deadline'' for mail and e-mail replies. It's April 11, the day it will send out its enumerators to count Americans who didn't respond. So if you have yet to fill out your census form, please do so and mail it this week.

Participation in the census may also be harmed by the political grandstanding it continues to inspire. Presidential candidate George W. Bush and Senate Majority Leader TRENT LOTT (R-Miss.) have criticized the long census—sent to one in six American households—as some sort of government intrusion on privacy.

However, the Census Bureau takes very seriously its responsibility to keep individual census responses confidential. Leakers inside will be sought out and prosecuted, as will hackers on the outside. In fact, the bureau is working with leading computer-security experts to make sure its data remain untapped.

Is this year's census survey exceptionally burdensome or intrusive, as its critics suggest? No, the questions on the long form are almost all similar to those asked in previous censuses, including the 1990 census conducted when Bush's father was president. And every question on this year's long form was presented to members of Congress for their comments two years ago. To find fault with those queries at this late date is a cheap shot.

The information being gathered will be used to redraw political districts, calculate how government benefits like Medicare are to be shared equitably, and predict public needs such as mass transit, roads, libraries, schools, fire and police protection. Census figures from 1990 helped federal emergency officials determine quickly where shelters were most needed after Hurricane Andrew smashed south Florida in 1993.

The alternative, as urged by Bush, Lott & Co., would be to operate government uninformed of its people's needs.

Mr. Speaker, the next speaker is the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) a leader not only in the census but in the Women's Caucus. She is the co-chair of the Women's Caucus.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, let me first thank this outstanding Member out of the State of New York (Mrs. MALONEY) who not only leads the census and has been absolutely strong in her deliberations on this issue but is the chairwoman of the Woman's Caucus. She, too, understands, Mr. Speaker, that of the 4 million people who were undercounted, 50 percent of those were our children.

And so, this is why, Mr. Speaker, I am appalled a leading presumptive presidential candidate, a man aspiring to lead this great Nation, cannot figure out whether he will fill out his own confidential census form. This is the same man who wants to take charge of the American people and its government to make public policy based on population figures that affect our daily lives in health, education, transportation, appropriations, and other public responsibilities.

Carrying out his own education proposal unveiled last week would depend upon, Mr. Speaker, accurate data that all of the census produces. How does he plan to produce an accurate Consumer Price Index without accurate long form data? Still, he has not committed enough to government fairness to fill out one of these forms himself.

Now, I have worked with the Census Bureau now for about 2 years to make sure that they count every hard-to-count group. I spearheaded a special project to make sure Africans and Caribbean residents in the Diaspora understood the importance of the census and trusted our laws of confidentiality governing the process.

I also called on homeless shelters, battered women shelters, colleges, universities, and families with children to make sure that we count them, because they will have been historically undercounted individuals.

Shame on any elected official who would undermine our Nation's effort to gather vital information we need for appropriations and planning. The census numbers are extremely important to Government leaders.

In 1990, the census undercounted 486,000 persons in the State of Texas, causing that State to lose about $1 billion in Federal funding for health care, housing, transportation, and other Federal programs. Even California lost $2.3 billion, Mr. Speaker, and a congressional seat.

Children, the target of this presidential candidate's education reform package, are one of the most undercounted groups in America. How many of them fell through the cracks in Texas this past decade because of underfunded public services? It seems, out of self-interest, one would want an accurate assessment of one's home State.

Remember, these same officials who do not want residents filling out census forms oppose using modern scientific methods for a more accurate census count.

Come now, they cannot have it both ways. If all public leaders, no matter what party affiliation, would encourage every resident to fill out and return their forms, we could get the results we need, Mr. Speaker.

Maybe those now questioning the census have other motives for spoiling an accurate census count. Maybe they do not want a true accurate count. Frankly, this reminds me of the 1980s, when South African apartheid government decided not to count the majority of African people as South Africans. Did undercounting tens of thousands of residents who were not acceptable but lived in Johannesberg make them go away? Did it drive down actual unemployment figures and increase the real infant mortality rate? Of course not. This statistical chicanery only lets those in power fool themselves to the realities they need to face.

The Census Bureau has done a great job and has gone to great lengths to carry out the mandates of Congress to make sure the forms are as brief as possible. In fact, the long form is shorter than the 1990 form by four questions and it is the shortest form in history.

My friends, this is the information age. We need the data from these forms to administer our public duty in this country fairly. Those encouraging citizens to voluntarily suppress an accurate count are doing it as a grave disservice to their State and to Americans across this Nation.

As leaders, they should know the laws of confidentiality governing the census in our great country. This is our process governed by our laws that our courts have upheld. Reasonable and sensible officials swear to uphold the law. And this law has never been violated. Let us stop playing games, my friends, with America's future. Follow the advice of sensible leaders in all political parties. Fill out that census form, and encourage everyone who comes within their purview to do the same.

I thank again the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) for her leadership.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), a member of the Census Subcommittee of the Committee on Government Reform. He has been fighting for an accurate census through two threatened government shutdowns and a flood relief bill held hostage. He fought against the designation of the census as an emergency.

The census has been around since the beginning of our Nation, and he fought every day to get the funding for the census. He is continuing as one of our outstanding leaders for a complete and accurate count. I thank him for all of his hard work.

□ 2015

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, as I have listened to the discussion this evening, I have been thrilled and delighted. First of all, I want to commend the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY) for her continuing outstanding leadership day after day, night after night. The gentlewoman talks about leaving no stone unturned. She is talking about taking a message to the American people. I really do not think, I say to the gentlewoman, that anybody has ever put more into an issue, into an idea, into a concept than what she has displayed during these last 2 years of trying to make sure that there is an accurate count, an honest count, and that everybody person in this country is, indeed, counted.

Mr. Speaker, I thank her, along with all of those who have expressed all of their appreciation. Listening to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD), I said to myself, if I was not going to fill out the form, listening to the gentlewoman from California that would have caused me to grab up a pencil, a pen, or whatever it was that I could get my hands on, and run to that form and fill it out.

Unfortunately, there are many people in our country who do not understand the importance. I represent a district that has over 165,000 people who live at or below the level of poverty. Obviously, many of these individuals are at the lower end of the socioeconomic scale, many of them, obviously, are not as well-educated as some other people. Obviously, many of them do not understand. I want to thank all of the people in my community, the churches who have been making the announcements, who have been trying to convince people on a regular basis, the volunteers who went out with me on Saturday.

We ran into people who just did not understand. I ran into one woman who said to us, you know, I am saved and sanctified and filled with the Holy Spirit, and I am not going to fill out these forms. I said to myself, yes, you will be saved and sanctified and broke, filled with the Holy Spirit and your children cannot get daycare. And the Holy Spirit is going to help you do a lot of things, but the Holy Spirit is not going to put a daycare center in your neighborhood so that your grandchildren can go and get early childhood education.

Mr. Speaker, I ran into people who said to us that they did not get the forms, and I looked in their hallways, and there were the forms on the floor. I said, well, you did not get it, but it is here; you have got to pick it up and fill it out and send in the information.

I ran into people who said that we filled it out on the first floor, but the people on the second floor, I am not sure that they got one.

I make a plea to all Americans, notwithstanding anything that anybody else might say, and, yes, I have some problems with those who would encourage people not to fill the forms out, but the real responsibility is on each and every one of us.

We have an old saying in my community that if you fool me once, shame on you; fool me twice, shame on me. Notwithstanding what anybody might say, whether they are elected, appointed, community activists who just do not understand, anybody that is encouraging you or suggesting that you should not fill out your form, then, they do not have your interests at heart.

You have got to say the way that they say at the church that I attend: it is not my mother, it is not my father, but it is me oh, Lord. It is not the deacon. It is not the preacher, but it is me. It is not the Democrats. It is not the Republicans. It is not the House. It is not the Senate, it is my form, and if I do not fill out my form, then it means that I do not count.

So I thank the gentlewoman from New York for her leadership, for all that she has done. Please, Americans, please, residents of the 7th Congressional District in the State of Illinois, please make absolutely certain that you count by filling out the form, because if you do not, then all of America loses.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Illinois. I think what he just said he said it beautifully. Added to his words are Senator JOHN MCCAIN who recently exhibited the kind of leadership all Members of Congress should emulate, when he urged all Americans to fill out the entire census form.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. I congratulate certain Members of the other body who are urging everybody to fill out the form.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will suspend. The gentlewoman may not characterize legislative positions of Members of the other body.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I would like to remind the House that many of the questions are essentially the same questions approved by former President Ronald Reagan and President Bush, except that they are less than the questions in 1990. I would ask some of my more conservative Members to think about that before they criticize the census.

In the information age, we need reliable information in order to make good decisions for this Nation. Some Members of Congress must be stuck in the 18th century. They do not seem to want to know how America is doing. Without good data, you cannot administer the laws of this country fairly. Their comments are rash and inappropriate.

The good news for the census is that the Census Bureau is following the law. It will try to get the long form questions answered, because the professionals at the bureau do what the law says, the law Congress passes. They go out and try to get an accurate picture of this country and report back to Congress. I guess we now know why the 2000 census was designated an emergency in last year's budget. We just did not know that some Members of Congress were the ones who would be creating the emergency.

On average, the long form takes a little over half an hour to complete. Only information needed to manage or evaluate government programs is collected by the census. Just a half an hour every 10 years for good data on your country, a photograph of where your country is going. The short form just takes several minutes, just several minutes to be a good citizen. $180 billion a year in Federal money depends on census data. That is close to $2 trillion over the decade. Clearly that is reason enough to fill out the long form which, by the way, goes to only one in six American households.

As I said, Members should remember that they were informed of the questions that would be in the census over 2 years ago. Every single Member got a book that had every question, they had the reason for the question, and they had the congressional law that required it. They had an opportunity to criticize or complain then. But that

time has passed. Now is the time to urge everyone to participate in this civic ceremony together as one Nation. It is your future. Do not leave it blank. Please fill out the form.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD a series of editorials across the country from Seattle to Washington, Sacramento, Palm Beach, Minneapolis, Atlanta; David Broder in the Washington Post; Gail Collins, New York Times; Los Angeles, USA Today, Atlanta Journal; along with many, many other articles that have come out in support of being good citizens and filling out the long form, being part of an accurate census.

[From the Seattle Times Company, March 29, 2000]

OVERLY OVERWROUGHT ABOUT THE 2000 CENSUS

On any given day, citizens are bombarded with dozens of legitimate, stress-producing worries. The U.S. Census Bureau, even its much-maligned long-form questionnaire, ought not be one of them.

Census questionnaires have been mailed to 120 million American households. The seven-question short form was sent to most households; a longer, more-detailed, 52-question form was delivered to one in six households.

Then the yowling began—The Snoops! The invasion of privacy!

The complaints are nine parts hype, one part hooey.

Two important developments have occurred since the last census was taken in 1990. The long form got shorter by four questions, and talk radio got louder.

In fairness to those with census jitters, more people nowadays are concerned about personal privacy. Frequent calls by solicitors and marketing companies wear down a person's patience and goodwill.

Remember, though, the census is the head count prescribed by the Constitution.

The people who make money by whipping up fear—and those who buy into it—substitute paranoia for logic.

The loudest concerns focus on question 31 on the long form, which asks people to report wages, salaries, commissions, bonuses or tips from jobs. This is not a scary question. The federal government, the Internal Revenue Service, already knows the answer for individuals. The Census Bureau is looking for data to report in the aggregate.

Before people allow themselves to be whipped into an unnecessary froth, remember the manner in which the data is reported. It is much like a series of USA Today headlines, ''We're older,'' ''We're more mobile, more diverse'' and so on. The census doesn't announce that Joe Dokes at 123 Pine Street does or says anything. Nor does the Census Bureau share personal information with other agencies.

The questions provide a telling snapshot of America and help determine how large pots of tax dollars are spent on social programs, highways and mass transit, and how congressional seats are distributed among the states. Smile. A big family portrait is being painted with numbers. Nothing scary about that.

[From the Tulsa World, March 30, 2000]

COBURN: DOWN FOR THE COUNT

Rep. Tom Coburn is never going to come to his census. Count on it.

But the Second District Republican congressman should admit that the appropriate time to protest queries on the long form of the Census 2000 questionnaire was more than two years ago when the questions, all required by law (and who passes law?) were circulated among members of Congress.

On Wednesday, Coburn essentially urged his Second District constituents to violate federal law by refusing to complete certain portions of their long-form questionnaires. One in six homes receives the long form.

''The Census Bureau's desire for information is out of control and a violation of privacy rights,'' Coburn said, adding, however, that his constituents should answer the ''essential'' questions on the short form covering a person's name, sex, age, relationship, Hispanic origin and race.

The long form asks 27 more questions about 34 subjects, including marital status, income, mode of transportation to work and work status for the past year.

Coburn said that if a census worker shows up to collect omitted information, Oklahomans should ''politely refuse'' to give it.

Coburn's position doesn't square with that of Gov. Frank Keating and other leaders who have encouraged Oklahomans to fill out the forms so that the state can receive the largest share possible of the $2 trillion in federal funds that are handed out on the basis of census figures. Some of the questions in the long form help agencies calculate the specific needs of a community.

''While I understand the reservations that some Oklahomans may have with regard to some of the questions on the long-form census questionnaire, I urge them to complete and promptly return the entire form to the census bureau,'' Keating said.

Coburn took his position after receiving complaints that long forms were invasive. He accused the census bureau of being ''out of control'' and of violating Americans' privacy.

Even some other conservative members of the Oklahoma congressional delegation, including Rep. Steve Largent and U.S. Sens. Don Nickles and James Inhofe, do not appear to embrace Coburn's position.

If the Census Bureau is asking too many nosy questions, the time to protest is before the questions become law, not in the middle of a census. We should be able to count on our elected officials to know what's going on in time to do something about it.

[From the Virginian-Pilot (Norfolk, VA), March 30, 2000]

HEAD COUNT: YOU'VE GOT UNTIL SATURDAY TO TACKLE THOSE CENSUS QUESTIONS

I am one of the army of people hired to help answer questions about the 2000 census. Many people receiving the long form understand the questions but are reluctant to provide answers. They feel the government ''already knows too much about my personal life and income. And why do they want to know how many flush toilets I have or how much it costs to heat my home?''

There are reasons for including these questions as an adjunct to the main purpose of the census, which is to get a head count of all people residing in the United States on April 1, 2000. Let me try to allay some of the misconceptions.

First, the data is absolutely confidential. Nobody, not the President, the Supreme Court, the FBI, the INS or any local police department, will ever have access to your individual questionnaire. All census workers are sworn to maintain the confidentiality of the data provided, under penalty of a stiff fine and a prison term. This confidentiality has not been breached since the census started in 1790.

Second, the answers that you provide are compiled into statistics, which are then made available to the public and all governmental agencies. These statistics are used to determine how to distribute about $200 billion per year of federal funds to schools, employment services, housing assistance, highway construction, hospital services, child and elderly programs.

When the data show, for instance, that the city of Chesapeake has had phenomenal growth since the past census, additional funding to Chesapeake will be forthcoming in many of the above categories.

Why the questions about toilets and heating costs? The statistical data on plumbing facilities is used by the U.S. agriculture and housing departments to determine rural development policy, grants for residential property rehabilitation and identification of areas for housing rehabilitation loans.

Knowledge derived from the census is essential also to the drawing of samples for all kinds of surveys, for the computation of birth and death rates and the making of actuarial tables, and for the analysis of economic development and business cycles. Above all, the census makes possible the estimation of future trends and is therefore part of all kinds of planning—national, state, local, tribal, citizen groups, business and industry.

Please take the extra time to answer the seemingly ''personal'' questions on your census long form. The official deadline is Saturday. After April 11, you may be visited by a census enumerator if you failed to return your questionnaire. Please don't shoot the messenger. We'll only be doing our job because you didn't do yours.

EDWARD SAMSON,
Chesapeake.

[From the Washington Post, March 31, 2000]

CENSUS BASHING

The Census always produces complaints that an intrusive government is asking for more information then it has a right to know. Usually the complaints are scattered and come the fringe. But this year some radio show hosts have taken up the issue, and now some national politicians who otherwise yield to none in insisting on law and order are telling constituents not to answer questions they feel invade their privacy.

The Senate majority leader, Trent Lott, is one such. He believes that people ought to provide ''the basic census information'' but that if they ''feel their privacy is being invaded by [some] questions, they can choose not to answer,'' his spokesman says. Likewise Sen. Chuck Hagel, whose ''advice to everybody is just fill out what you need to fill out, and [not] anything you don't feel comfortable with.'' Yesterday, George W. Bush said that, if sent the so-called form, he isn't sure he would fill it out, either.

And which are the questions that offend these statesmen? One that has been mocked seeks to determine how many people are disabled as defined by law, in part by asking whether any have ''difficulty . . . dressing, bathing, or getting around inside the home.'' When it mailed the proposed census questions to members of Congress for comment two years ago—and got almost no response—the bureau explained that this one would be used in part to distribute housing funds for the disabled, funds to the disabled elderly and funds to help retrain disabled veterans. Are those sinister enterprisers? A much-derided question about plumbing facilities is used in part ''to locate areas in danger of ground water contamination and waterborne diseases''; one about how people get to work is used in transportation planning. All have been asked for years.

Earlier this year, Mr. Lott's Senate complained 94 to 0 that a question about marital status had been removed from the basic census form. That was said to be a sign of disrespect for marriage. Come on. This is a critical period for the census. All kinds of harm

will be done if the count is defective. A politician not seeking to score cheap political points at public expense might resist the temptation to demagogue and instead urge citizens to turn in their forms. But in an election year such as this, that's apparently too high a standard for some.

[From the Milwaukee Journal Sentinel, March 31, 2000]

CENSUS TOO IMPORTANT TO IGNORE

It seems that lots of people are complaining about having to answer what they claim are invastive questions on this year's census form. Of course, some of these are people who willingly give their credit card numbers to telemarketers offering the latest in siding or to Internet sites that sell really cool lava lamps.

There are also plenty of members of Congress who are now all in a huff, saying they sympathize with citizens who are threatening to refuse to fill out the forms. One wonders what these guardians of the public good were doing when they reviewed—and apparently approved of—the same census questions they are now complaining about. And where they were 10 years ago, when the questions were virtually the same.

The fact is, it's important to fill out the census so the government has an accurate count and so the average citizen has adequate representation in Washington and receives his or her fair share of federal funds.

Admittedly, some of the questions are goofy, and threats to privacy should be of concern to everyone. But asking how many toilets you have is hardly sinister. Besides, the government already knows. Just ask your local assessor.

Government also already knows what race you are and whether you are a veteran. It keeps records on those kinds of things, just as businesses keep records of your commercial transactions.

It's easy to rail against government, but the greatest threat to privacy is not found in government census forms, but in the vast databases being built by private companies about their customers and potential customers.

Want something to worry about? Go to the Internet and search for information about yourself. What some of you may learn there is really scary.

And since the census gives the nation a profile of itself, determines the number of representatives a state has in Congress and decides where federal funds are distributed, the information serves a larger public purpose than that gathered by eBay or Amazon.com.

It is OK to be annoyed by the government for asking all these fool questions. But it's important to fill out the form and make sure the annoying information is at least accurate. Besides, the Census Bureau is barred by law from sharing its informaiton about individuals for three-quarters of a century.

So the informaiton on your toilets will be safe for at least that long.

[From the New York Times, April 1, 2000]

CIVIC DUTY AND THE CENSUS

Some Congressional Republicans are seriously undermining the 2000 census by suggesting that the national head count, which officially takes place today, is an invasion of privacy. That bizarre complaint could discourage the public from participating in a project that is crucial to the functioning of state and federal government. The questions on this year's census form—including questions on household income, plumbing facilities and physical disabilities—have been part of the census for decades. The only new question asks for information on grandparents who are caregivers for children. In fact, this year's long form is the shortest one in 60 years. All answers on census forms are kept confidential. Yet Senator Chuck Hagel of Nebraska has suggested in recent days that people can simply ignore questions on the long form—which goes to one out of six American households—that they find intrusive. A spokesman for Senator Trent Lott, the majority leader, has made similarly inappropriate suggestions. Gov. George W. Bush of Texas has said that people should fill out the forms, but that if he received a long form, he was not sure he would want to fill it out either. These comments are irresponsible. Completing the census form fully and accurately is not optional; it is a civic duty that is required by law. Senator hagel now says that he does not want to encourage people to break the law, but will introduce legislation to make most of the questions on the long form voluntary.

The federal government has spent billions of dollars trying to produce an accurate count as response rates have continued to decline with each decennial count. Accuracy is critical because the census is used to apportion seats in Congress, draw legislative districts within the states and distribute more than $185 billion in Federal funds. The government uses information from the long form of the census to allocate money to communities for housing, school aid, transportation, services for the elderly and the disabled and scores of other programs. The data are also necessary to calculate the consumer price index and cost of living increases in government benefits.

When individuals fail to give complete information about their households, they risk shortchanging their communities of government aid that they may be entitled to. That is why many state and local government officials are working hard to increase census response rates in their communities. The mindless complaints of some politicians could well sabotage those efforts.

[From the Sacramento Bee, April 1, 2000]

TRASHING THE CENSUS: IRRESPONSIBLE BUSH COMMENTS COULD SABOTAGE COUNT

Just two days ago before Census Day, as U.S. Census Bureau officials were urging Americans to cooperate in the crucial once-in-a-decade national count, Texas Gov. George W. Bush made their job harder. If he had the long census form, Bush told a campaign crowd, he's not sure he'd want to fill it out either. How harmful to this important civic exercise, how irresponsible and unpatriotic.

Bush's remarks come on the heels of Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott's advice to his fellow Americans not to answer any questions on the census long form that they believe invade their privacy. Taken together, those remarks by the leading Republican in Congress and the likely Republican presidential nominee can easily be interpreted as a deliberate attempt to sabotage the 2000 census. They raise questions about the integrity of the census that are unwarranted, unfair and irresponsible.

Once in six households receives the census long form. Beyond the basic eight questions about the number, age, and gender and race or ethnicity of people living in the household, the long form asks other questions designed to measure the well-being of Americans, to help government agencies to plan where to put schools or highways or health funding. Included in the long forms are 53 questions such as. How many bedrooms in the house? Has anyone been disabled by health problems in the last six months? Is there a telephone? What is the income of the household? Is there indoor plumbing?

By law the responses are strictly confidential. The U.S. Census cannot share individual household answers with the IRS, FBI, INS or any other government agency or private entity.

Moreover, every single question on the long and short forms is there because of a specific statutory requirement. Most of these questions have been on the form for decades. The only new question added since 1990 was put there at the behest of Republicans in Congress, including Lott. It asks grandparents whether they are caregivers for their grandchildren. The wording of each question was reviewed by Congress in 1997 and 1998. Lott, who now raises objections, pushed a resolution urging the Census Bureau to return to the short form a question about marital status that it had moved to the long form.

The census is the law of the land, enacted by the first Congress. When Bush says he wouldn't fill out the form, he's saying he's prepared to break the law. When Lott advises Americans not to answer questions they don't want to answer, he's telling them to break the law. And although both Lott and Bush limit their specific objections to the long form, the impact will inevitably reverberate more widely—to those who only receive the short form.

In Sacramento, census officials report that the response to the census is already lagging. Only 39 percent of Sacramento households have returned the form so far. Every man, woman or child not counted costs $1,600 in lost federal funds. That's money that would go to our schools and highways and mental health and police protection.

Participating in the census is a civic duty, like voting, serving on juries and defending the country. As duties go, it's not burdensome, for most people, filling out the long form is a once-in-a-lifetime chore. With their thoughtless comments that feed mindless anti-government sentiment—do they really think they can govern better by knowing less about America?—Bush and Lott have done a disservice to the census and the country.

[From the Palm Beach Post, April 1, 2000]

THE CENSUS FOLLIES

Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott, R-Miss., should just be quiet about the census. Greenacres has a complaint. Sen. Lott doesn't.

The Census Bureau, once again, overlooked at least 1,500 apartments in Greenacres, which were fairly new when it missed them 10 years ago. The city, apparently tucked out of government's sight in west-central Palm Beach County, worked with census officials to make sure everyone is counted. The city has a gripe.

Senl Lott, and some others, now say the long census form, which went to one household in six, is terribly intrusive. Sen. Lott said recipients can list name and address but ''choose not to answer'' other questions. He didn't complain in 1997, when he and all members of Congress received a copy of this year's long form for gathering data that they had ordered. And guess who cosponsored the law requiring a line on the form for marital status?

But three years ago, Sen. Lott was in court with other Republicans insisting on an ''actual enumeration,'' counting individuals, and no use of sampling techniques. If people take his advice now, the Census Bureau will have to get the information Congress requires in the off-years, by sampling. Maybe by then, it will be able to find Greenacres.

[From the Chattanooga Times/Free Press, Apr. 1, 2000]

DON'T LEAVE CENSUS FORM BLANK

After months of preparation, today marks Census Day, when our national head count moves into higher gear.

Questionnaires have been mailed to every household. With much riding on a full and accurate count, it's significant to look at how we are responding.

As of March 29, 46 percent of households across the country had already completed and returned their forms. Comparable rates of response were 43 percent in Tennessee and 41 percent in Georgia. Hamilton County, at 47 percent, leads the five counties in our metropolitan area. Within the county, the town of Signal Mountain shines with a 59 percent response rate. In contrast, the city of Chattanooga lags with 44 percent answering.

These are only preliminary reports and will be updated daily. The more meaningful measurements will come on April 27, when Census 2000 enumerators will initiate a series of follow-up visits and calls to households that have failed to complete their forms.

By that time, local Census officials expect to have over 60 percent of questionnaires returned. The higher the rate of response, the sooner they can focus their efforts on counting population groups and neighborhoods that are harder to reach.

There are plenty of excuses for not complying, but most of them are not valid. Some people just hate paperwork. Yet the short form that went to five out of six households takes only 10 minutes or less to complete.

Some fear creeping big-government intrusion. The longer forms include some questions that may be helpful for statistical purposes, but many citizens find them too nosy about their personal lives and home conditions.

Some census questions do go too far, arousing opposition. And some people will question the promised confidentiality of their records. By law, no individual response (only aggregated information) can be legally reported to any other agency of government.

An official count has taken place every 10 years since 1790. The census is required by the Constitution solely for the purpose of fairly dividing U.S. House of Representatives seats among the states on a population basis, and dividing among the states the votes in the Electoral College, which actually elects our presidents following the popular vote.

But also of great importance is the fact that billions of dollars of your tax money are distributed according to the census count, with more money going where the count is higher.

Amazingly, some heads of households will forget to include the names and ages of their children. An estimated 7,000 people were missed in Hamilton County alone during the last census. The children in those households, if counted, would have demonstrated the need for our new schools and 139 new teachers. Overcrowding of schools and classrooms seems a heavy price to pay for parental omission.

With Census Day upon us, let's resolve to do our personal part to get it right this time. Count us all in.

[From the Memphis Commercial Appeal, Apr. 2, 2000]

CENSUS—POLITICAL BASHING WON'T HELP ACHIEVE FULL COUNT

Mississippi has the lowest response rate of any state so far to this year's federal census: 38 percent as of late last week—and 48 percent in DeSoto County—compared to a 50 percent national rate. (Memphis has nothing to brag about, either, just 39 percent of Memphians have returned their census forms.)

At the same time, Mississippi is threatened with the loss of one of its five U.S. House seats in the population-based reapportionment that will follow the 2000 Census. So you'd think that officials throughout the state would be bending over backward to urge residents to take part in the fullest and most accurate count possible.

Why, then, did Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott (R–Miss.) propose that citizens refuse to answer any census questions they find too ''invasive''? Although the senator insists he supports maximum participation in the census, it's easy to see how people who already are suspicious of the federal government might interpret Lott's suggestion as an invitation to blow of their civic—and legal—duty to take part in the national headcount.

Census bashing has become something of a national sport in recent days, as critics such as Lott allege that the initiative too often amounts to an invasion of privacy. Texas Gov.—and presumptive Republican presidential nominee—George W. Bush said last week that if he had gotten the long (53 question) census form that one of every six households has received, he wasn't sure he would fill it out.

These defenses of personal privacy ignore the fact that members of Congress reviewed each of the questions that appear on the long and short census forms two years ago. Instead of striking ''intrusive'' questions then, senators voted unanimously this year to protest the Census Bureau's removal of a question about martial status.

So it ill behooves lawmakers such as Lott to complain now about the questionnaire. Remember, too, that many lawmakers have opposed the use of statistical sampling to correct the census undercount of millions of Americans because they said it would violate the ''integrity'' of the process they now condemn.

It's understandable that some Americans might object to revealing their income on the census questionnaire, although individual census data must remain confidential as a matter of law. It's timeconsuming to gather the information needed to answer some of the long-form questions accurately, such as annual utility and insurance costs.

But many of the questions routinely ridiculed by census bashers—whether residents of a given household have indoor plumbing, whether they have difficulty dressing or bathing, how they commute to work—have been asked in previous censuses without generating controversy. This year's long form has six fewer questions than the 1990 version.

The questions will yield data that will help federal official fairly distribute aid to help disabled Americans, to fight water pollution and to improve local transportation planning. Are these illegitimate activities?

Bush has proposed allowing parents to use federal Title I money under some circumstances to send their children to private or charter schools. That money is distributed according to census data.

Many Mid-South residents insist they haven't returned their census forms yet because they haven't gotten them. If that is a systematic problem, then the Census Bureau must deal with it, fast.

But that is different matter from encouraging citizens not to cooperate fully with the national enumeration.

Census officials are making special efforts to get millions of households to return their census forms this weekend. In light of the complaints, Census Director Kenneth Prewitt said he fears many Americans have decided ''this information is not very important at all.''

Americans have learned to their chagrin that there isn't an issue, even the constitutionally mandated census, that politicians can't turn into a matter of partisan division, especially in an election year.

But how will Sen. Lott respond if Mississippi, because of a below-average census count this year, does wind up losing a House seat?

And what is it's Republican seat?

[From the Atlanta Journal Constitution, Apr. 3, 2000]

CONSTITUTION: KEEP THE CENSUS FROM BECOMING POLITICAL FODDER AND PARTICIPATE

Roughly half of America's households did their civic duty and answered the U.S. Census Bureau's Year 2000 postal survey by its April 1 deadline. That level of participation is not nearly good enough if America is to get the accurate picture of itself essential to governing fairly and efficiently at local, state and federal levels.

Fortunately, the bureau still has a ''final, final deadline'' for mail and e-mail replies. It's April 11, the day it will send out its enumerators to count Americans who didn't respond. So if you have yet to fill out your census form, please do so and mail it this week.

Participation in the census may also be harmed by the political grandstanding it continues to inspire. Presidential candidate George W. Bush and Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott (R–Miss.) have criticized the long census—sent to one in six American households—as some sort of government intrusion on privacy.

However, the Census Bureau takes very seriously its responsibility to keep individual census responses confidential. Leakers inside will be sought out and prosecuted, as will hackers on the outside. In fact, the bureau is working with leading computer-security experts to make sure its data remain untapped.

Is this year's census survey exceptionally burdensome or intrusive, as its critics suggest? No, the questions on the long form are almost all similar to those asked in previous census, including the 1990 census conducted when Bush's father was president. And every question on this year's long form was presented to members of Congress for their comments two years ago. To find fault with those queries at this late date is a cheap shot.

The information being gathered will be used to redraw political districts, calculate how government benefits like Medicare are to be shared equitably, and predict public needs such as mass transit, roads, libraries, schools, fire and police protection. Census figures from 1990 helped federal emergency officials determine quickly where shelters were most needed after Hurricane Andrew smashed south Florida in 1993.

The alternative, as urged by Bush, Lott & Co., would be to operate government uninformed of its people needs.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 4, 2000]

DON'T TOY WITH THE CENSUS

(By David S. Broder)

Something about the census makes Republicans crazy. For the better part of two years, they battled the scientific community and the Clinton administration to prevent the use of statistical sampling techniques to correct for the undercount of people—mainly low-income, minority, immigrant, transient and homeless—that marred the 1990 census.

After reaching an impasse in Congress, the Republicans took the issue to court and had to be satisfied with a Supreme Court ruling that barred the use of sampling for apportionment of seats in the House of Representatives but approved it for everything else.

Then last week, just as the publicity effort to persuade people to return their census

forms was reaching its peak, several prominent Republicans said that Uncle Sam was getting too personal in some of the census questions and suggested that it would be okay for people to skip over those items they found offensive.

Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott told Mississippi reporters that if he had received one of the long forms (delivered to one of every six households) he might have demurred at answering some of the questions. Texas Gov. George W. Bush, the GOP's presidential choice, said he hadn't opened his census form yet but wasn't sure if he would fill out the whole thing.

Later, both men retreated part-way from their positions (Bush after learning that he was in the short-form majority) and said people should return the forms with as much information as they could in good conscience provide. But Rep. J. C. Watts of Oklahoma, chairman of the House Republican Conference, blamed the bureaucracy for including questions that ''have raised an unprecedented level of concern,'' and other Republicans said they would introduce legislation to make responding to the census voluntary, rather than requiring it by law.

All of this is basically nonsense—the kind of politicians' talk that gives hypocrisy a bad name even as it has serious policy consequences. Every single question on the census 2000 form was vetted with Congress two years ago, and every one has its origin and justification in a requirement included in a law passed by Congress.

In my files on census topics, I have a March 1998 report (that's two years ago, folks) titled ''Questions Planned for Census 2000.'' That same report, I am informed, went to every member of Congress. In the back of that report is a table showing the first census in which each category of questions was asked. One of the questions on census 2000 to which some Republicans have objected asks for the family income. That has been asked in every census since 1940.

Another, the subject of much ridicule, asks, ''Do you have complete plumbing facilities in this house, apartment or mobile home, that is, hot and cold piped water, a flush toilet, and a bathtub or shower?'' That question, too, has been on the long form since 1940.

The plumbing question is asked, along with other measures of housing adequacy, as a way of targeting federal grants to the communities where the need for decent housing is greatest. Is there anyone who doubts that more help should go to South Central Los Angeles than to Beverly Hills?

The income question is used for a much wider variety of federal programs. In all, more than $185 billion of federal grants to state and local governments is distributed on the basis of census information. One of the major concerns about the 1990 undercount—which later surveys suggested may have missed 8 million people while double-counting 4 million others—is that it deprived areas with large numbers of low-income people of the assistance they deserved.

A study released last month by the U.S. Census Monitoring Board and done by the accounting firm Price-waterhouseCoopers estimated that in 169 metropolitan areas where the poorly counted demographic groups are concentrated, the likely net loss of federal assistance may well reach $11 billion in a decade.

Some of the estimated losses are enormous. The Los Angeles-Long Beach area, where hospitals, schools and other public facilities are chronically facing financial crisis, could be a $1.8 billion loser. Miami has a $300 million stake in an accurate count; New Orleans, $97 million. And it is not just the big cities. Flagstaff, Ariz., is at risk for $25 million—in effect, a 3.5 percent local tax or penalty for the undercount.

There's not a bit of evidence to justify the expressed concerns that the Census Bureau professionals will violate the privacy of individual families' responses. There is all too much proof that a flawed census hurts the most vulnerable Americans.

It is time the politicians stop messing around with the census.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 4, 2000]

PUBLIC INTERESTS; DOWN FOR THE COUNT

(By Gail Collins)

How many of you out there have strong reservations about the United States Census? May I see a show of hands?

I thought so. Everybody's cool. Once again, the radio talk-show circuit has plunged us into a violent debate about an issue that stirs the passions of average Americans slightly less than the cancellation of ''Beverly Hills 90210.''

You have no doubt received a census form, probably the short one that takes just a few minutes to fill out. The long form, which goes to about one-sixth of all American households, contains 53 questions, including whether your toilets flush and your relatives are all in their right minds. The answers are going to remain confidential for the next 72 years; at that point a Ph.D. candidate may grant you immortality by writing a dissertation on your indoor plumbing.

Census opponents appear to be mainly opponents of government, period. (James Bovard, the author of ''Freedom in Chains,'' called the census ''a scheme for generating grist for the expansion of the welfare state.'') But they've created some nervous roiling in Congress. Senator Chuck Hagel of Nebraska is working on legislation to remove the $100 penalty for failure to answer the questions, even though the fine hasn't been imposed in decades. He's being assisted by Senator Charles Robb of Virginia, a Democrat up for re-election who's determined to leave no group unpandered to.

The census is actually a noble public enterprise. It represents the founding fathers' breakthrough concept that people should have power not because of their property or titles, but simply because they're there. If we cannot expect election-fevered politicians to be reasonable about, say, Elian Gonzalez, it does seem they could muster up the grit to tell folks that they should regard filling out census forms like voting, and pretend to appreciate the opportunity.

But George W. Bush regards the issue as too hot for rationality. First he announced that ''all of us need to encourage people to fill out the census,'' then instantly added that he could understand why some ''don't want to give all that information to the government. And if I had the long form I'm not sure I'd want to, either.''

A spokesman for Mr. Bush said the governor had received the short form, this year's equivalent of announcing you got a high draft number. An aid to the Senate majority leader, Trent Lott, said recently that Mr. Lott was telling people to just skip over any question they felt was intrusive. Now, the senator's constituents in Mississippi make out like bandits when it comes to federal aid, receiving an average of about $2,000 per person more than they pay in federal taxes. On behalf of all the states that pay more than they get back, let me say: Go to it, Mississippians. Skip the long forms, and the short forms too. We'll give the money to some less conflicted state, perhaps one that hasn't just received a contract to build a monster aircraft carrier the Pentagon doesn't even want . . .

. . . We interrupt this harangue to report that Mr. Lott's office now says the senator wants everybody to fill out the forms, and tells people to skip questions only if they threaten to toss their forms into the river unless their objections are met. When it comes to penalties for non-compliance, his spokesman added, ''the senator is completely agnostic.''

This possibly the first time in history that Mr. Lott's name has been used in the same sentence with the word ''agnostic.''

For every politician who's trying to distance himself from the census, there are four others desperately trying to get their constituents to fill out the forms, and raise their chances of getting more Federal aid. The governor of Georgia has gone on television with an ad urging his state to cooperate ''or our Georgia money will be educating New York children for another 10 years.''

Now, I'm a little wounded by that. Certainly we New Yorkers disagree with Georgians about some minor matters, such as the relative charms of John Rocker. But our elected officials—appalling as they may be—don't try to scare us into doing what they want by threatening to give our tax dollars to kids in Atlanta.

Go yell at the Mississippians for a while.

[From the San Francisco Examiner, Apr. 4, 2000]

WHAT REALLY COUNTS; POCKETS OF NON-COOPERATION WITH THE TAKING OF THE U.S. CENSUS DEMONSTRATE AN OVERREACTION TO FEARS OF INVASION OF PRIVACY

In an age of prosperity and sophistication, it's odd but understandable that people have doubts about so many things. On subjects ranging from the sanctity of confidential information to the good will of government institutions, we have become a nation of skeptics.

We may live in the global village, but command central is in some place far away, information is collected by unseen hands and essential decisions about our lives are made without consulting us.

These disconnects are reasons some people choose to rebel against seemingly innocuous practices such as the taking of the federal census every 10 years.

The U.S. Census carries out the useful objective of counting the noses of the country's populace and collecting information about their living conditions and habits. But because individuals have no control over the information once it leaves their hands, and because governments have not always guarded privacy, a minor rebellion has erupted.

Five of every six households get the short census form, which has only seven basic, unintrusive questions. It isn't causing problems. Every sixth household gets the long form, which has 53 questions—some of them more personal. It's the bone of contention.

Some people are refusing to return census forms, even though that is required by law. Some politicians haven't helped matters. Republican presidential candidate George W. Bush said he wasn't sure he would answer all the questions.

Good reasons exist to cooperate. A big enough boycott could affect how federal money, programs and services are divvied up. Census workers are redoubling their efforts to make sure that everyone is counted—which wasn't the case in 1990—so that every city and region gets its fair share of federal help.

The Census is a statistical snapshot of the United States. It tells a lot about who we are as a people and is a manifestation of e pluribus unum (out of many, one), the motto that appears on U.S. currency.

It's irresponsible for any politician, especially one who aspires to be president, to suggest breaking the law by refusing to fill

out census forms. And while skepticism toward government is healthy, if citizens weigh all factors, they should be inclined to cooperate with the census takers.

The cure for any potential breaches of confidentiality isn't refusal to answer. It's strict enforcement of privacy laws that prohibit the Census Bureau from sharing confidential information with anyone else, including other government agencies.

The time to demand changes in the census isn't in the midst of one. It's in Congress, in the form of legislation that updates questions, strengthens safeguards and perhaps increases penalties for violating citizens' privacy.

Census officials need to do a better job of explaining the agency's existing protections against leaks and other privacy abuses. Why are Census officials so faceless? It's easier to trust people you've met, or at least seen on television.

Skeptics are fond of asking to see the evidence. In the case of the census, we all know there's a potential for misuse. What true skeptics should be asking is, ''Just where and when have any abuses occurred?''

Failing a convincing answer, the reasonable course for all of us—skeptics or not—is to put away any residual fears and allow ourselves to be counted. For the good of one and all.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Apr. 5, 2000]

DON'T SHRED THE CENSUS

ONE IN six American households are facing a question this week: is it really necessary to fill out a lengthy census form that borders on nosy and antiquated? The answer is a resounding yes.

The head count is especially contentious this time around. Along with the time required and the odd questions, there is a political overlay. Republican leaders, including likely GOP presidential nominee George W. Bush, suggest that folks toss the form if they feel it is too intrusive. This suggestion is irresponsible neglect of an important duty.

The census has made its share of mistakes. Some were mailed incorrectly. Its laundry list of 53 questions takes more than half an hour to fill out. For city and suburban residents, who make up the overwhelming majority of Americans, there are quaint questions about farm income and indoor plumbing. Why should citizens be bothered with these far-fetched queries?

There are other arguments. High-tech boosters are upset there are no questions about computer use, a topic that could use some exploring. But census bureaucrats said they were under pressure from single-issue groups ranging from pet lovers to religious leaders for special questions. The census ended up largely as a repeat of the last one, which will limit its potential.

But for better or worse, the census remains an essential task. It asks citizens to complete a picture of their country, not give away personal secrets. Income, ancestry, job history and even driving habits are useful ingredients in depicting America, circa April 2000.

More specifically, the census plays a role in doling out federal aid and congressional districts. It can be used by schools, public health and transit agencies in planning. Change can be measured.

This evolution of the country is exactly why San Francisco officials, civil rights organizations and school boards are pushing hard to get every household to fill out the paperwork. Opponents are wrong to depict a basic government service as an invasion of privacy.

[From the Los Angeles Times, Apr. 5, 2000]

IT'S THE LAW, COUNT ON IT

Senator Majority Leader TRENT LOTT (R–Miss.) and a few of his congressional colleagues seem to have forgotten the oath they swore to uphold the Constitution and the laws of the United States. Responding to constituent complaints about parts of the long-form census questionnaire, they have suggested that questions that some might consider objectionable can simply be ignored. That is plainly and simply, advice to break the law, and considering the source it's especially reprehensible.

About one household in six—approximately 20 million in all—was mailed the long census form; all others got a mere eight questions about the people in the household. The long form aims to gather information that is essential for directing certain federal outlays. In the current decade, expenditures linked directly to census-provided information could total close to $2 trillion.

So there are a purpose and a policy consideration behind every census question, no matter how dubious its relevance may seem. Questions that some find intrusive and none of the government's business—about indoor plumbing or household income, for example—contribute to a national economic and demographic profile that is of great value to both government and the private sector. This information helps determine where roads and schools will be built, where Medicare and Medicaid funds should be channeled, where shopping centers are best located, where the needs of the disabled may be most acute. The Census Bureau would have done well to emphasize this point much earlier.

The census has steadily evolved beyond its limited 18th century purpose of congressional reapportionment. Those in Congress who now counsel leaving some census questions unanswered suffer from a convenient memory lapse: Every one of the questions, many of which are mandated by statute or court rulings, was approved by Congress two years ago.

[From the USA Today, Apr. 6, 2000]

200 YEARS PLUS: CENSUS NOSINESS ISN'T NEW

More than 200 years ago, Thomas Jefferson warned George Washington that taking the first U.S. Census, done in 1790, wouldn't be easy. A Census taker could wind up with a musket in the face. And those were the days of a well-regulated militia.

The Census today faces equal mistrust. This is due to the public's innate aversion to government prying, amplified by an unsubtle campaign to discredit the Census as too intrusive. Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott, R–Miss., has told Americans they need not answer questions they find too invasive. So has Republican presidential candidate George W. Bush. Sen. Charles Hagel, R–Neb., wants to change the law to make answering most questions voluntary.

Whether the campaign to malign the long form will affect results won't be known for weeks. But Kenneth Prewitt, director of the Census Bureau, testified in Congress on Wednesday that the return rate is lagging well behind 1990 figures. The Census was aiming for a 61% return over all. Below that, Congress will have to allocate extra money for door-to-door head counting.

That's just one reason the anti-Census crowd is giving bad advice.

Among the others: It's illegal not to answer all of the questions. And self-defeating. Over 10 years, up to $2 trillion in spending will be directed by Census findings. Lott's beloved Mississippi, with one of the lowest response rates and highest illiteracy rates, could be shortchanged on education dollars. It also could lose private-sector investment that is guided in part by Census data.

Lastly, the Census isn't uncommonly intrusive. The sort form is the shortest since 1820. The long form, received by 1 in 6 households, is the shortest ever. And some of the most criticized questions—about employment, disability status, etc.—have been asked since the 19th century. The question about income, since 1940. Indeed, Americans give more personal information, more publicly, when they buy a house, pay their taxes or fill out a medical form.

Still, the Census raises predictable questions about nosiness. The long form wants to know about your job and your mortgage, subjects you might not comfortably share with your brother, much less Big Brother.

Plainly, the government has done a poor job of preventive promotion. Worries about privacy are historic, yet the long form's cover letter barely addresses them.

Most people still answer the forms with speed and candor. But expecting them every 10 years to remember why they are providing personal information without immediate gratification is asking for trouble.

The irony is that many critics today also helped defeat the use of statical sampling to make the head count more accurate.

Their understood motive was to prevent a reapportionment of congressional districts to represent undercounted populations, which tend to vote Democrat. Opponents demanded an actual head count, which is less accurate. Now the motive is simply to align Republican leaders with the public's general distrust of federal data-gathering.

Finally, let's not forget that Congress had a chance to review all of the questions two years ago. If they had problems, that was the time to stand up and be counted. Today's debate: Census forms, but politics, privacy concerns needlessly stoke anger.

IF YOU WANT TO COUNT, BE COUNTED

(By Lynn Sweet, Washington Bureau)

Chicagoans have made a lousy initial response to the 2000 census, and the entire state of Illinois is lagging as well. This is a sort of collective passive-aggressive behavior for which there is no excuse. And don't start saying that census questions are intrusive.

The early trend shows that the mail-in responses from suburban Cook County and the collar counties are running as much as 20 points higher than the 40 percent from the city. This will only ensure, if the pace keeps up, that the suburbs will have more political muscle than they deserve in the state redistricting that follows each census.

And if Illinoisans don't let themselves be counted, the potential of losing a seat in the House of Representatives because of reapportionment will easier become a reality. The return of Federal funds to Illinois also is dictated largely by census-driven formulas.

Filling out the census form is a ''marvelous opportunity'' for Americans ''to prove they can reverse the trend of civic disengagement,'' said Census Bureau director Kenneth Prewitt, A Downstate Alton native who is a former director of the National Opinion Research Center at the University of Chicago.

Across the nation, people are mailing in census forms—short and long—in disappointing numbers, and Prewitt earlier this week sounded an alarm because the nationwide response rate was at 55 percent, below the 61 percent the bureau had expected by now.

It's not too late to get a mail-in census form by calling (800) 471–9424. And the numbers still can be vastly improved as the census moves on to the next phase, where census employees, called enumerators, start making house calls.

''Someone will be knocking on their door,'' said Prewitt, though it will make the counting operation needlessly more expensive. It costs about $3 to process a mail-in form compared with $35 for a household visit.

The cheap-shot comments of some Republicans—including Texas Gov. George W. Bush, the GOP presidential candidate, and Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott (R–Miss.)—could, knowingly or not, hijack the census.

On the average, about one in six households gets a long census form that asks a total of 53 questions, compared with seven on the short questionnaire.

Lott and Bush suggested that individuals don't answer any census question they consider impertinent.

''If they are worried about the government intruding into their personal lives, they ought to think about it,'' Bush said. Lott was forced to backtrack after he realized that his home state, Mississippi, is near the bottom when it comes to mail-in response rates, 47 percent on Wednesday, compared with 56 percent for Illinois and 58 percent for Indiana. Ohio is the champ so far, with 62 percent.

Lott and the other complaining congressional Republicans—no Democrats so far—are whiners and intellectual phonies. They are objecting to questions that (1) were presented for review to Congress in 1997 and 1998 and (2) were on census forms that went out under Presidents Ronald Reagan and George Bush.

The census has asked about plumbing facilities for decades. There are bigger privacy issues looming right now, especially with the Internet, than being asked about flush toilets in your home.

And for those who don't like the questions about income and mortgages and the like, well, the government already has a lot of information from tax returns. The Census Bureau does not swap data with other agencies. Tax cheaters or people who keep things from spouses or partners may not like answering the questions. But there is no right to absolute privacy in the United States. If there were, height, weight and date of birth would not be on a driver's license.

Cooperating with the census means getting more from the government you already are paying for. It is selfish—and self-defeating—not to be counted.

[From the Daily Bruin, Apr. 7, 2000]

COMPLETING CENSUS FORM HAS FAR-REACHING BENEFITS

Though some people are skeptical of the United States Census, completing these forms can lead to real benefits—including better schools and libraries, quality health care and up-to-date national demographic profiles.

Though the official due date passed nearly a week ago, residents can still be counted. The Census Bureau reports that only 55 percent of U.S. residents have returned their forms so far.

The slow response is caused, in part, by the popular sentiment that the census, especially the long version of the form, invades individuals' privacy. While worries about privacy are understandable, those who fear filling out the census should remember a consequence of their inaction: Neglecting to participate can lead to a significantly inaccurate count.

The short form poses generic questions like name, age, gender and race, while the longer form asks for more specific social and economic characteristics, such as individuals' occupations and housing types. Responses to these questions help determine how critical resources are distributed and which areas need those resources the most.

Specifically, demographic information is used to plan for services like schools, hospitals and roads. It may alert the government to focus its resources in areas reporting high rates of unemployment, or pinpoint regions that require better child care. State and federal governments also allocate funding to individual counties, cities and congressional districts for health care, schools and libraries; all of this information is based on the census results. The government's support is critical to the maintenance of these institutions, and so the number of people who report living in a given community is directly related to how much financing will be allocated to that particular community.

The number of inhabitants reported in each region also determines congressional apportionment. District lines are drawn with respect to census reports, and the number of members in the House of Representatives accorded to each state is also based on census information. If more underrepresented citizens completed their census forms, they might begin to claim deserved representation in Congress.

According to the Los Angeles Times, low responses to the 1990 Census deprived California of an estimated $2 billion and four congressional seats over the last decade. Unless an increasing percentage of forms are returned, this discrepancy may only get worse.

Not only can the new census correct the omissions made by the 1990 version, but the revised questions provide previously unexplored, yet important, statistical data. The 2000 Census is unique because it allows individuals to claim mixed ethnic and racial backgrounds. Compiling this information will give the government a more accurate perspective on racial dynamics in our society and can only help in overcoming one of America's biggest social problems—racial conflict.

Worries about the long form's intrusiveness, however, are legitimate considering the detailed nature of some questions. Still, the census count is a vital responsibility that helps facilitate the functioning of a democratic government.

If you haven't completed the census, you can still do so. Internet census forms are available until April 15. In addition, census workers will be following up with non-respondents by telephone. Go to www.2000.census.gov for more information.

Take a few minutes to finish the questionnaire, obey the law and practice some civic responsibility. Make sure your voice is heard.

[From the Atlanta Journal, Apr. 8, 2000]

CONVERSATION STARTER: DON'T FALL PREY TO PARANOIA ABOUT QUESTIONS

(By Harvey Lipman)

Fear is a natural human emotion. It keeps us safe in times of danger. Fear based on facts is caution, but baseless fear is just paranoia.

The fact is that the Census Bureau has never released any of the individual information that it gathers, not to the IRS, not to the FBI, not to the president, not to anybody. Never. That is a fact. The information gathered once every 10 years is compiled and the summary information, and only the summary information, is used to determine allocations essential to all of us, things like representation in Congress and federal funding of education.

The Census Bureau has proposed using statistical-sampling techniques as an alternate, less burdensome way, to obtain some of the data, but it has been rebuffed by Congress, the Supreme Court and even The Atlanta Journal. Until such time as these less invasive methods are permitted, there is simply no other way to collect this necessary and constitutionally required information.

We have very few obligations as citizens of this country. If our participatory form of government is to work we must honor those obligations. Answering the census is such an obligation. As an American I am proud to do so, since I have no evidence whatsoever to fear that my government will divulge the personal information that I give them.

[From the Washington Post, Apr. 9, 2000]

ANSWER THIS QUESTION: HOW DID THE CENSUS BECOME OUR WHIPPING BOY?

(By William Casey)

Ten years ago this month, I was wearing a Boston Red Sox batting helmet to work.

No, I wasn't playing in the shadow of Fenway Park's hallowed Green Monster of a wall or tending a BoSox souvenir concession. The helmet was just a tool I used during my short-lived career as an enumerator for the 1990 Census. It was my job to track down miscreants who—for one reason or another—had not returned their census forms in a timely fashion. The buildings I covered in downtown Minneapolis were overflowing with young people, so setting myself up at a table in the lobby—official headgear in place—seemed a good way to pull in the curious and disarm the suspicious. As residents trickled in from shift work or nights out, they invariably wandered over to see what was up. With a little pleasant persuasion, presto, the short form—even the long form!—was complete.

It worked. Back then, anyway.

Today, given the grumbling in some quarters about the intrusiveness of the 2000 Census, I might need more than a batting helmet to do that job. We have such unhappy customers as Mr. M. Smith, a gentleman from Virginia Beach who was so annoyed by the long form that ''I threw mine in the trash where it belongs'' and then made his civil disobedience public in a letter to Norfolk's Virginian-Pilot. (Dear Mr. Smith: Those questions have been standard on the census for many decades.)

Then there is Mr. P. Graham of Saline, Mich., who wrote a letter to the Detroit News accusing the Census Bureau of promoting ''alienation'' from government and asserting that most of the long form's 53 questions are ''none of its business.'' (Dear Mr. Graham: Contrary to popular belief, the Census Bureau is asking those specific questions at the direction of Congress, which likes to use the census to collect information it has decided it needs.)

Add the comments from such Republican heavyweights as Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott, Texas Gov. George W. Bush and Oklahoma Rep. Tom Coburn—all of whom have obligingly bashed the census for allegedly invading the nation's privacy—and you would think that the Census Bureau has suddenly transformed itself from an agency that once just counted noses into one that is just plain nosy.

This is—excuse my bluntness, please—a lot of nonsense. It's not the Census Bureau or its forms that have changed. It's us.

Or, more precisely, the fuss is one more dismaying result of the pervasive presence of consumerism and marketing in our lives. I find it puzzling, I admit, that people are bent out of shape by a form sent to them once a decade when—on a daily basis—they habitually reveal (willingly and unwillingly) the most private of data to advertisers, health insurers and Internet companies. Over the past 10 years, even the simplest sales transaction has become an opportunity to capture personal details that can be sold and resold (why do you think the cashier wants to know your phone number?). It's come to the point

where you can rarely sit down to dinner without receiving a ''courtesy call'' from someone who knows a lot more about you than just your area code. Those of us concerned about confidentiality might focus on the staggering amount of personal information maintained by largely invisible companies with names like Acxiom and Experian. Yet people think that they still have their ''privacy'' and that the government looms as the greatest threat to taking it away.

How did the census become the whipping boy, the embodiment of Big Brother, a waste of time, a symbol of oppression? The Census Bureau has an exemplary history of keeping the data it collects confidential, but that fact does not seem to have made a dent in the collective consciousness. It's easier to blame the census than to confront the world we've created.

Besides functioning as a worker bee on that 1990 census, I am a long-time user of census information. On both academic and journalistic projects, I've come to appreciate (and depend on) the richness and reliability of the material—which just about anyone can acquire, understand and put to work in a thousand ways. The notion of turning to particular census-driven data sets a few years from now and discovering that the 2000 information is unusable because of ''citizen noncooperation'' is more than an annoyance. It makes my blood run cold.

A good deal of the complaining is directed toward the long form, a questionnaire sent to one of every six households in the past month. It's about the same length as the 1990 version and shorter than some previous census. There are changes—additions, deletions, rewordings—but it's basically the same old thing.

Continuity is a strong factor when it comes to census matters. It's not as if every 10 years, things start from ground zero. Just the opposite. The national statistical snapshots that census results help construct are most useful when they build on what went before.

It's true that census questionnaires are longer and more complex than they were in the first half of the 20th century—but that's hardly surprising. Those were times before the increased scope of governmental activity and responsibility that we take for granted today: an era when there was no Medicare, Medicaid or Social Security, no program of federal assistance to housing, minimal federal involvement with transportation spending and so forth.

There's a certain irony, however, in the fact that the census hasn't changed much last time around. Census 2000 mechanics could have been vastly different—more efficient, more accurate and much less expensive—but they're not. Carefully field-tested efforts to streamline the counting process via statistical sampling were opposed during the past few years for political reasons. It's common knowledge—although it's typically wrapped in layers of doublespeak—that Republicans see undercounting in urban areas as equating to a GOP advantage. (To be sure, if the sampling method threatened Democratic voting bases, then sides would no doubt be switched.) A count based on statistical sampling not only would have been less expensive, it would have helped prevent the higher levels of background noise we're experiencing at the moment.

There have always been ample numbers of people who balk at completing their questionnaires. In 1990, my fellow enumerators and I had to deal with people who—like our friends Mr. SMITH and Mr. GRAHAM above—were not inclined to cooperate. Mostly they were reluctant; occasionally they were almost hostile. But the majority of them completed their forms when asked to do so directly. Sometimes a chance to sound off about their objections was required. I was happy to oblige. ''Whatever it takes'' was my motto—at least during those six weeks.

This year's census has become a snapshot in a way that I didn't expect: It reflects not just how we live, but how we feel about ourselves and our society.

Take, for example, the subject of race. If, as a society, we are stalemated on issues of race, then how can we expect a census form to solve them, or even make them clearer? After reading through the seemingly endless and convoluted choices that the census short form offers (''If person 1 considers his/her race to include two or more races . . .''), is it any surprise that the precooked racial and ethnic categories seem unsatisfactory? I've heard more than a few people say they wrote in ''human''—which seems, in fact, like a very human reaction to the country's current fascination and obsession with race and ethnicity.

Because the census at its core serves a political purpose—determining the number of representatives from each state—the count has always had a political dimension. But I don't recall the census forms being a hot item in the presidential election years of 1960 and 1980. This year, it appears, any issue properly framed and spun is fodder for ''principled'' stands by presidential candidates. One day is could be AL GORE'S sudden, self-serving switch on the Elian Gonzalez case; the next, it could be George W. Bush, aiding and abetting census resisters. ''I can understand,'' the GOP nominee-to-be said, ''why people don't want to give over that information to the government. If I had the long form, I'm not so sure I would do it, either.''

Not to be outdone, Nebraska's rising star of a senator, Republican CHUCK HAGEL, offered to introduce legislation that would make question-answering optional. (Memo to the esteemed Mr. HAGEL: The Census 2000 questions were sent to Congress for review in 1998. No squawk was raised then.) With this kind of ''leadership'' out there—explicitly undermining a program that requires individual citizens to pull together in the interest of the larger whole—no wonder skepticism about the process is rising.

After litigation over the Census Bureau's proposed use of statistical sampling went to the Supreme Court—and sampling was ruled out for apportionment purposes, although its use for redistricting within states remains an open question—one might have hoped that by the time April 1, 2000, rolled around, we would have gotten our act together as a nation and proceeded with the job. I cannot help but wonder if the census is falling victim to our new millennium's variety of cultural solipsism. Societal building blocks such as family, neighborhood and community are subjected today to a wide range of pressures—largely destructive. These institutions were, to a substantial extent, the basis for successful past censuses. But the principle of doing something for the common good—for society's good—doesn't stand a chance if society's leaders won't speak up for it.

On Thursday, I read that hopes are ''dimming for a timely and accurate count'' in Census 2000. If response rates remain underwhelming, that will necessitate time-consuming and expensive enumerator work to track down, cajole, persuade and gather information from those who have not yet submitted it. Remember, ''whatever it takes.''

But later on, after things have settled down, perhaps a lesson regarding the fragility of our social and political fabric will have been learned. It's often said, but still true: It's easier to tear things down than it is to build them up.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about an issue of great importance in the year 2000.

I wish to express thanks to all Americans who are participating in the Census 2000. You are making an enormous difference to your community and setting our nation on the best path for the new century.

As of last night, 60% of Americans have completed and sent in their census forms. Nevertheless, we have much work to do, Mr. Speaker. We need to reach to the 40% of Americans who have yet to complete their census forms.

Regrettably in previous weeks, when everyone has been working to improve the initial response rate, we had Members of Congress, including prominent leaders of the Republican party, people who should better, tell the American public that the census was optional.

Unfortunately, the reality remains that the Census Bureau has missed millions of persons in conducting each decennial census, especially minorities, the poor, children, newly arrived immigrants, and the homeless. We cannot allow this to happen again.

For these reasons, of course, it should come as no surprise that I am disappointed by recent comments by highly respected individuals that advise Americans not to perform their civic duty. As reported in numerous news stories, some lawmakers on the other side urged citizens not to answer questions regarding the long form.

Yet over two years, every Member of Congress received a detailed list of the questions to be asked on the long form, including a description of the need for asking it and specific legal requirements supporting it. The time for input on the question was then. The time to achieve an accurate census count is now.

The low percentage of census forms being returned in certain cities with high minority populations is alarming. We must do all we can to change response rates. These remarks only discourage faster response rates.

Even the Governor of the State of Texas has said he supports his party's position against the use of modern statistical methods—methods that would get a more accurate count of America's African Americans, Hispanic, Asian American, and American Indian populations.

As a member of the Congressional Caucus Task Force on Census, I am obliged to convey my concern that no one is left out of the Census process. Unlike in the 1990 Census where so many minorities were disproportionately missed or ''undercounted'' as we say, everyone must be counted in the Census 2000.

Our goal for Census 2000 must be the most accurate census possible. We all know that accurate census data has proven vital to people of color, both economically and politically.

Texas lost almost $1 billion due to the 1990 undercount. Over 486,000 Texans were missed in the 1990 Census, which prevented Texas from securing critically-needed federal funding for health care, transportation, housing, and community development.

In the city of Houston, 67,000 people were undercounted in 1990.

A comprehensive analysis of federal funding was prepared by PriceWaterhouseCoopers. The analysis was one at the request of the Presidential members of the U.S. Census Monitoring Board. According to

PriceWaterhouseCoopers, the population ''undercount'' similar to that which occurred in the 1990 Census would cost 26 states a minimum of $9.1 billion. States with the largest numerical undercounts would be hit the hardest. California would lose more than $5 billion, Texas nearly $2 billion, and Florida $5 million. I am particularly concerned that 120,267 are estimated to be undercounted from Census 2000 in Harris County, Texas.

Moreover, $185 billion in federal funds are allocated each year based on each state's respective share of the population, as determined every 10 years by the Census. The PriceWaterhouseCoopers study examined the 15 programs analyzed by the General Accounting Office in its 1999 report on the funding impact of the 1990 census undercount.

The eight programs most affected by the census are Medicaid, Foster Care, Rehabilitation Services Block Grants, Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment Block Grants Adoption Assistance, Child Care and Development Block Grants, and Vocational Education Block Grants.

Our communities cannot afford to squander the opportunity to secure desperately needed resources to make these programs available to everyone. An accurate Census is the only way to assure that local communities receive their 'fair share' of federal spending; an inaccurate count will shortchange the affected communities for an entire decade.

Keeping response rates high must remain a primary purpose in obtaining an accurate census. Recent news stories have only highlighted this need. Texas has a 33 percent return, but the fourth largest city in the nation only has 26 percent return. That is the city of Houston. This is precisely what we must change. Only a high response rate to the Census 2000 questionnaires will enable our community to secure desperately needed funds.

And while some have recently raised concerns about the legality or constitutionality of the long form, those only serve as a distraction. In fact, the Census Bureau has not prosecuted anyone for not sending in their Census form since the 1960s. They are interested in getting complete and reliable data; they do not want to jeopardize the public trust.

The long form is a sound investment—for a relatively small additional cost, information of very high quality about a number of subjects is collected for many geographic areas. The return on this investment is concrete information that serves the basis for sound public policy decisions and that supports the accurate allocation of over billions of dollars.

Community leaders use the long form for planning a wide range of activities, including neighborhood revitalization, economic development and improved facilitates and services.

We need the long form to build highways, roads, bridges and tunnels in areas that need them. And planners need information about where people live and work and the times they leave for work.

Each long form question provides valuable, indeed essential, information for important public policy and business decisions.

For example, data from the question on the number of telephones in the home area is used to help plan local 911 emergency services. They also are used to help implement the Older Americans Act to provide emergency and health-care services to homebound seniors without phone service.

Data from the question on how long it takes to commute to work is used by federal, state, local and private transportation planners to help design new roads, bus routes, and mass transit transportation and to manage traffic congestion, as well as to distribute federal transportation dollars.

Indeed, data from the question on the veteran's status are used to plan the location of veteran's hospitals and to efficiently deliver veterans health-care and nursing services.

Your answers to Census 2000 are absolutely critical to ensure that every possible dollar is made available to the poor, the sick, and the neglected in our communities.

The U.S. Census only comes around once every ten years, but its information is used throughout the decade. Together, let's make sure that everyone is heard.

□

TAX LIMITATION CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity tonight to discuss a very important issue that is going to be on the floor of the House of Representatives this week. It is called the tax limitation amendment. The tax limitation amendment, known as H.J. Res. 37, is a very, very simple amendment that was first brought to life some 10 years ago by the gentleman from the 6th District of Texas (Mr. BARTON).

Last week we had a press conference where we talked about, in essence, the passing of the mantle from the gentleman from Texas to myself, being the lead for the tax limitation amendment where we will bring to the floor of the House of Representatives on Wednesday an opportunity for all Members not only to fully debate but also to vote on something which I believe is very, very important.

The essence of H.J. Res. 37 is that we are going to make it more difficult for Washington to raise taxes on America. That is what this debate is all about. It will be about doing those things that Washington talks about, making it more difficult by requiring a supermajority, a two-thirds vote on the floor of the House of Representatives and in the Senate to raise taxes. Part of what we are talking about today, we would assume, is just a conservative idea, and I think that that would be correct. But it is a bipartisan idea. It is an idea not only that has grassroots all across America, people who are pro-business but it also has people who consider themselves Democrats, Democrats even, who understand that raising taxes should not be easy, because taxes come from people who get up and go to work every day, work diligently, honest people, taxpayers, and then are giving too much money to Washington, D.C.

One of the persons who is the co-chairman of this effort, a coleader in this effort, is the gentleman from the 4th District of Texas (Mr. HALL). This evening I am very honored to have the gentleman from Texas with me to help not only the discussion about the tax limitation amendment but also for an opportunity for us to discuss this.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the 4th District of Texas, a lifelong Democrat, a conservative, and a man who understands it is important to make it more difficult to raise taxes on taxpayers.

Mr. HALL of Texas. I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am here today, of course, to express my support for the tax limitation amendment. I have been for this amendment from the word go. I really do not understand that it ought to be a Republican or a Democratic thrust or a liberal or conservative thrust because I think it is an American thrust. Requiring a two-thirds vote to raise taxes would force very serious consideration on this legislation at any time that they would attempt to raise taxes; and it would require, as the gentleman from Texas has said, a supermajority vote on any proposal that would impact the pocketbooks of every hard-working American.

The major test of this legislation would be not what class supports it. We are in for at least 5 wonderful years in this country. We now have, rather than the deficits of the 1980s and the 1990s, a surplus; and we are going to have good times for the next 5, maybe for the next 10, years to have money to be that that we ought to be for people who have no lobby, pay a lot of it on our debt. That is tantamount to a tax break for everyone.

I think that if we would go into our district, and I say ''our district'' because the gentleman and I share districts in Texas. I have part of Dallas County in my district. He has a much larger part of it. I have most of Kaufman. He has a part of Kaufman in his district. He has a part of Smith County which is Tyler; Tyler, Texas. We represent the same type of people, people who want less government, people who want to keep the money that they work for, people who want to plan ahead, people who want to have money in September to buy school clothes without having the taxes that are put on them, that have been historically put on them by a 50 percent vote. A lot of those votes like the Tax Reform Act of 1986 would never have happened if it had taken a two-thirds vote.

□ 2030

So I think if they would go out into their district, into any part of our district, and talk to the first 10 people they see and ask them would you like to see it a little bit more difficult for the Congress of the United States to take money out of your left hip pocket, what do you think their answer would be?

Mr. SESSIONS. Let me say this: the gentleman from Texas, whose district

is literally overlaid on my district, the 4th District overlaid on the 5th District, very, very similar, the kind of people, the kind of people's thoughts and ideas, I believe that if you went in the 4th or 5th Districts of Texas, that people would say, I think Washington, D.C. has enough money. First of all, they have got enough money. They don't need to tax us more. They ought to be more efficient.

The second thing I think they would say, as the gentleman has pointed out, is let us make it more difficult. There is no need to go back to the American public to ask for a tax increase, especially when we are in a surplus condition. Right now, today, in America we are working off of a surplus, and yet we know that there are people in Washington, D.C., that want more and more and more money.

I would say to the gentleman from the 4th District of Texas that if we made it more difficult, it would immediately cause this Congress and the administration, whoever is President, to have to go and look within the administration, to go look in these agencies to find where there is waste, fraud and abuse, to find where there was opportunity to save money, rather than going back to the taxpayer.

Mr. HALL of Texas. I think as the gentleman well knows, we represent a conservative area. We both represent a part of the old Rayburn congressional district. We talk about balanced budgets and all that. Mr. Rayburn had a balanced budget the last 8 years of his service here; and as he went back home to Bonham, Texas, to die, he looked back over his shoulder at a balanced budget.

I think we could use some of that good common horse sense now. I think the people of this country want to be able to keep more of the money they are making. I just do not believe the argument that we have a lot more money now, so this amendment is not as important. I think this amendment is more important now than it was during the deficit times, because they have more to lose, and it is going to look like it is easy to put taxes on people.

I just think it is a golden opportunity to raise the bar and protect hard-working Americans from tax increases in the future that are not supported by a majority of two-thirds of the people. I think it is critical that we make a statement that we are committed to controlling government spending, rather than raising taxes, in order to maintain a balanced Federal budget.

I just think that the 10 people that I would talk to on Front Street in Tyler, Texas, or any part of Kaufman County, or any part of the district we share in Dallas County, we would talk to these people and ask this simple question; and I think we ought to invite the rest of the Congress to go home and do the same thing, ask them what do you think about the fact we are trying to make it a little bit more difficult to put taxes on you. What do you think their answer would be?

Mr. SESSIONS. Absolutely. I believe the answer from people, if you talk to people who live in the districts that get up and go to work every day, they would say, We are very pleased. We love America. We support government and the essence of what it does. But today there is more than enough money in Washington, D.C. Make do with what you have. Do not come back to us. We are out producing, meaning the people back home, producing not only in efficiencies, but to the economy, to the local communities and to government, to make it work. This needs to be a bar that gets raised because it is that important of an issue.

You know that there are several parts of the Constitution that put a two-thirds vote that is a requirement to be able to pass something. I believe, and I think the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL) agrees, that raising taxes should be one of those things that we make more difficult, that should require a consensus and a two-thirds vote.

I thank the gentleman. I know that the gentleman has got a dinner that he has got to go to, but I thank the gentleman for not only working on behalf of the people of the 4th District of Texas, but also doing it in a national leadership capacity here tonight. I thank him so very much for being a part of what we are doing.

Mr. HALL of Texas. I thank the gentleman for the time, and I certainly am pleased that he has accepted the leadership of this amendment. I pledge that I will work side by side with the gentleman and we will work this floor.

I do not know how we are going to come out, but I do know that we are going to still be swinging at it. I suggest that, no matter how the vote turns out, that we start anew the day we have either won or lost it, to working the other end of the situation and asking those 10 people what they think about it, and asking each Member of Congress here to go home and ask their first 10 people what they think about it. Maybe we are working at the wrong end of the deal here in Washington, D.C. Maybe we ought to be working at home.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the gentleman so very much.

This evening we are also joined by one of the stalwarts of freedom, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH), who is not only a very good friend of the taxpayer, but a person who understands whose money this really is we are talking about. At this time I would yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank my colleague from Texas, and I thank my colleague from across the aisle from Texas also for joining us here tonight.

Mr. Speaker, observers could not help but note the differing tone of those who preceded us in this Chamber this evening.

Mr. Speaker, I was astounded, but I guess not really surprised, at the level of bile, the venom, the mean-spiritedness and deliberate mischaracterizations that preceded us in this Chamber, and I could not help but notice the difference, Mr. Speaker, as we come here on a bipartisan basis.

Our good friend from Texas asked, what would the people at home say? And, Mr. Speaker, one of the things I hear repeatedly is how sick and tired they are of the endless partisan haranguing and insults and deliberate mischaracterizations of matters of public policy, because, Mr. Speaker, we are involved in dealing with the public trust. All 435 of us in this Chamber are entrusted with an awesome responsibility, to represent the peoples of our districts to the best of our ability, commensurate with full allegiance to the Constitution of the United States.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would just appeal to the American people to understand that we are talking about a bipartisan amendment, and, in the words of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), it really should not be liberal, conservative, Republican or Democrat. It is quintessentially American, because what will take place on this floor, through the leadership of my good friend from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) and many of others of us, we will come to this floor and ask for a supermajority vote, ask for 290 of us to line up to say that it should be harder for Congress to raise taxes on the American people.

We were talking about what folks say at home. The 6th Congressional District of Arizona, in square mileage almost the size of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. From the small hamlet of Franklin in southern Greenlee County, north to Four Corners, west to Flagstaff, south again to Florence, encompassing parts of Phoenix, Mesa, Scottsdale, a fast growing area, where people come from all over the country, a near universal lament has been well, you common sense folks can get some things done, but that is no guarantee that in 2 years if there is a change in the composition of the Congress, if something happens, that your hard work will not be reversed.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, that is precisely why we are bringing this amendment to the floor of the House again, this proposed amendment, because we believe, just as important, just as challenging as it is to amend the Constitution of the United States, to deal with questions such as impeaching a chief executive, or, in the other body, ratifying international treaties, we believe the same standard should apply to the Government reaching into the pockets of everyday, hard-working Americans. That is the key to this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I would point out that, as is often the case, many of our States, often characterized as laboratories of democracy, the places where we apply with our dynamic system of Federalism the principles of our constitutional Republic, 14 of our 50 states

have already adopted State tax limitation provisions, including my home State of Arizona, when in 1992 the legislature and the people decided that a two-thirds vote would be required for any, any, increase in taxation.

Now, it is important, Mr. Speaker, to make this distinction: this does not prohibit tax increases, but it does say to the American people we understand a simple truth. The money does not belong to the Washington bureaucrats; it belongs to you. And we believe that if you work hard, play by the rules, want to provide for your family, want to provide for your children, have an obligation to your parents and other seniors in your community, are glad to shoulder that obligation, since it is your money, it should be tougher for Washington to get to it. It should be a question every bit as important as amending the Constitution of the United States.

So we will come here again seeking a supermajority to enact this notion of a higher standard for tax increases. We are reminded over the last 2 decades, 1980, 1982, 1983, 1990, and, of course, the largest tax increase in American history, which passed in this Chamber and the other body by one vote, which was characterized by some in this town, principally those at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, as an ''investment on our future,'' when in fact it really was an assault on seniors, on children, on Americans who had even left the here-and-now to go to the hereafter, so excessive was that tax increase it was retroactive to the first of the year in the grave, if the Congress or a future administration is tempted again to take the easy way out, to pickpocket hard-working American citizens, Mr. Speaker, this amendment would say, whoa, not so fast. Because we are a government of laws, because we are a government where the first three words of the Constitution talk about ''We the people.''

We are accountable to the people, and we want to make it more difficult, we want to raise the standard, so that the same Americans, whether they are in the 5th or 4th Congressional District of Texas, or the 6th Congressional District of Arizona, or any district across the country, will understand that we are going to think long and hard and have compelling reasons to make a change, should we decide to do so collectively in this body with the support of the American people. But that will take away a temptation that has been too often easily employed.

Let us raise the standard and return to the notion that the money belongs to the people, not to Washington. I know my friend from Texas has a few things to say.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, what the gentleman from Arizona has now clearly laid out is not only the essence of the reason why this is important to people back home, but I now want to add to those reasons and talk about why Washington needs to pay attention to the tax limitation amendment, H.J. Res. 94. I said H.J. Res. 39. That is wrong. That was last year. I have caught up now. H.J. Res. 94.

We must make it harder for Congress to raise taxes on the American people. Now, many people would say, Well, Washington has it down. We have already created a surplus. We are going to have a surplus now for as far as the eye can see.

I would say that, yes, that probably is true, provided we stay in power. But there is so much more that must be understood, and that is that just because the majority party believes that that is the right thing to do, it does not mean that that is what everybody agrees.

Back in 1995, when we were in the midst of the battle, the battle to determine that we would have a balanced budget, that we would be able to work within the confines to balance the budget based upon what the American people have given us before the Committee on Ways and Means, Alice Rivlin, the OMB, Office of Management and Budget, personnel director, said, ''I do not think that adhering to a firm path,'' which means a balanced budget, that you are going to stick to it, ''for a balance by 2002 is very sensible.''

□ 2045

She did not believe it was sensible. It is not always a good policy to have a balanced budget.

Let me say that that was 1995. Here we are, the year 2000, and lo and behold, not only does Alice Rivlin represent her boss, and they said in 1995 the way things would be, but here we see it in print now, this President's budget that he presented, that he took 2 hours to describe to the American public in the State of the Union Address.

We find out that President Clinton and Vice President Gore have more tax increases. Even when we are in the middle of trying to not only take care of and shore up not only social security and Medicare and a lot of other things, but we have a surplus, and what do they want to do? They want to raise taxes, a $96 billion tax increase, President Clinton and Vice President Gore, tax increases.

Yet we know that there was another person, another group of people, who were right there saying, we will not raise taxes. We are in a surplus circumstance.

Now what we have to do, because we recognize that we have people who even when we have a surplus they want more and more and more not only spending but tax increases, we have to go tell the story. We need to make it more difficult.

Mr. HAYWORTH. If the gentleman will continue to yield, Mr. Speaker, as my friend, the gentleman from Texas, was relating not only the recent history but also the facts and figures amidst the flowery rhetoric that is so often part of what transpires in Washington, I could not help but note the successes that we have had as a commonsense conservative majority, and point out, Mr. Speaker, to the American people that it is very interesting the way Washington has worked heretofore.

We have had some success here, and indeed, we have rolled back taxes, as we were able to enact in the 105th Congress the $500 per child tax credit; as we were able to work to make sure that there was a higher level of tax fairness; when in fact just this past week we were able to procure at long last the signature of the President of the United States on legislation to end the unfair penalty confronting senior citizens who chose to work beyond their assigned retirement age; seniors who, if they were making in excess of $17,000 a year, were taxed to the tune of $1 out of every $3 of their social security benefit, lo and behold, Mr. Speaker, that was finally changed.

But I would note for the record that piece of legislation was first introduced well nigh in excess of two decades ago by the current chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER); that our current speaker, when he first arrived here in 1987, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), introduced the self-same legislation.

While we welcome epiphanies, whether they come in election years or at other times, we are so pleased that at long last those who resisted that fundamental act of fairness finally saw the wisdom in letting seniors hang onto more of their own hard-earned money. Because I think, Mr. Speaker, that truly defines compassion.

The reason I mention it is because it took so long. The anachronistic policies of the mid 1930s that accompanied what at that point was a labor shortage, it took all the way to the dawn of a new century, 70 years, to make that change, the modest but important tax relief we offered in 1997, which came a decade and a half after the tax relief offered in the Reagan years.

So it is extremely difficult here to get this institution, to get those denizens of Washington and those folks in the bureaucracy, focused on actually letting people hang onto more of their own money. We have made some progress, as I have just documented.

One of the reasons is institutionally it has been so easy to raise taxes: A simple majority vote; a chief executive who is of a mind to do that because of previous Congresses and free-spending ways.

Again, this is not a partisan argument. Our friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), was talking about the days of former Speaker Rayburn and the balanced budgets that were formulated with a Republican president, Dwight Eisenhower, and a previous majority in Congress of the other party. But following that time, whether the days of Speaker Martin or the days of Speaker Rayburn, that was then and what followed later was a complete role reversal.

Always, always, always, Mr. Speaker, the notion was, we just need to raise taxes a little bit more. Mr. Speaker, I ask Members to think of what that says to the family in Payson, Arizona, in my district where the husband and wife are doing all they can to establish a fledgling printing business. They are working hard to make that business work, they are creating jobs in their small communities, they are providing a service, and more importantly, they are providing for their children.

I think, Mr. Speaker, one of the key problems we have faced as a people is as follows. For years folks came to this Chamber and asked or told the American people, you have to sacrifice so Washington can supposedly do more. That premise, we understand, in the fullness of time is exactly turned around: Washington bureaucrats should sacrifice, Mr. Speaker, so that American families can have more.

This tax limitation amendment is the right thing to do because it changes constitutionally and institutionally the bias toward always picking the pockets of hard-working Americans. It raises the standard even as we, in a signal both to Wall Street and to Main Street, in a new commonsense conservative Congress have at long last instituted policies of fiscal sanity.

The risky scheme, Mr. Speaker, is to always dip into the pockets of hard-working citizens. The real test of trust and responsibility is to make government more responsive, to make governmental decisions more rational, to reduce the debt and empower everyday hard-working Americans to keep more of what they earn and send less here.

Mr. SESSIONS. I thank the gentleman from Arizona. Wonderful points. We believe, I believe, that the thing that Congress should focus on is to make sure that we are not putting more debt not only on people who work today, but also for our children and our grandchildren.

This chart so accurately describes this, really, and it goes back to 1941. But as we see, the numbers are small until we head to about 1976. The numbers are astronomical. They go up to $350 billion in debts. This is what happened when Republicans and Independents and people who are from other parties, including Ross Perot, began talking about how America's greatest days are not behind her, America's greatest days are ahead; but that it would require responsibility, it would require, as the gentleman from Arizona said, sanity, the ability to balance and to comprehend what was happening to America.

So what happened is that a different vision was given. That was, we should not spend more than what we make. We should take the power that comes with the money to Washington, D.C. and put it back home. That is exactly what happened.

We now see where there has been a debt reduction directly as a result of what we have now accomplished. This did not happen overnight. It was based on a set of principles which we believe, as Republicans, are critical to the country. They include that we are going to protect 100 percent of social security. We have now done that.

Lo and behold, 30 years after spending not just some of social security but all of the surplus from social security, Republicans said that not only will we not do that, but we are going to make sure that we lock it away into a lockbox.

Strengthen Medicare with prescription drug coverage, that is what this marvelous House will be debating in a few short weeks. Forty billion dollars has been set aside, that is the Republican plan, $40 billion to make sure that citizens, not just like the people in the Fifth District of Texas, but like people that the gentleman has in Arizona, who live better lives today because of technology, because of investment that has been made by the private sector.

Yes, we have great doctors, but we have great drugs. Here is one thing we know. We understand and know that for every $1 that is spent on drugs, prescription drugs, we save $4 in hospital stay. It makes sense. It is the right thing to do.

We made sure that we are going to retire the debt by 2013; not add to it, not just let it stay out there, but we are going to pay it off a little at a time. It did not happen overnight, it took 40 years of Democrat-controlled Congresses to do that. We will get it done by 2013.

We are going to support and strengthen education, technology, research. We are going to make sure that education and science work together. That is why we are trying to double, and sticking to it, a commitment that was made by former Speaker Newt Gingrich that we would send double funding to NIH, the National Institutes of Health. Because we understood, and we still get it today, that if we invest in research and development, if we do the things by letting scientists and others who can make breakthroughs in not only prescription drugs and techniques, that what we can do is we can save lives and make life better.

We will promote fairness for families, farmers, and seniors. Half of the Fifth District of Texas is rural. Half of the Fifth District of Texas went through, in an agricultural setting, a terrible drought the last few years. We need to pay attention to rural America.

Restoring America's defenses. We have been able to accomplish so much because we were able to put on a sheet of paper the things that are important to America and Americans. People in the Fifth District of Texas, like the people in the Sixth District of Arizona, represent the topsoil of America. It is not the dirt, it is the people. They are the topsoil of our country. We are paying attention to people. We are going to get it right, and we are going to balance out the things that are important in America.

I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague the gentleman from Texas, for yielding to me.

In listening to the people of Arizona, as the gentleman so eloquently stated some of the goals there, we look at prescription coverage for seniors as we try to strengthen Medicare.

I think it is important to make this distinction. Almost two-thirds of the senior community currently enjoys some prescription drug benefit through current insurance plans. But I think of the lady in Apache Junction, Arizona, who works not by choice but out of necessity at a fast food restaurant because she and her husband are not in a financial circumstance that enables them to have a complete insurance plan.

So what we say is for the truly needy seniors, for those one-third of the senior community that have somehow eluded this opportunity at prescription drug benefits, we want to provide them. But we are being very careful, because as another one of my constituents reminded me, she came up one day, Mr. Speaker, and said, J.D., I don't want to end up seeing my Medicare premiums rise so that I have the honor and opportunity to pay the prescription bills of Ross Perot.

□ 2100

I think that is a valid point. We want reasonable, rational reforms that strengthen Medicare and help those truly needy seniors.

Mr. SESSIONS. It sounds like that part of this debate is now into the two plans, essentially the two plans that are floating in Washington; one which would tax all seniors, and as I described in the Fifth District of Texas where all the seniors in the room would please take $20 out of their pocket, place them on the table, and then those people who placed the money, everybody placed the money, then if they did not need it, based upon their poverty level, if they did not qualify for prescription drug coverage, just please get up and walk outside the room. It is about 75 to 80 percent of senior citizens who would be paying $20 more out of their own pocket.

I would say to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH), here is a $20; $20 out of their own pocket every month for about 15 percent of the seniors who could not afford it. Why did we not come up with a plan, oh but there is one, the Republican plan, that will say, senior citizens, all senior citizens, put that money back in their pocket, put it back in their pocket; we have a budget surplus in Washington, D.C. We will take care of those people who need it most. We are not going to tax every senior citizen to help 15 percent of them. Sounds like a better idea to me.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I thank my colleague, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), for again very eloquently

and practically pointing out the difference.

There is something else we should note. Even as we turn to the subjects of Medicare and Social Security, the institutional bias that always asks for tax increases, even as we celebrate in bipartisan fashion the fact that the President signed into law the end of the earnings penalty on seniors who chose to work past retirement age and we restored fairness that had been 70 years in the making, or should I say 70 years in the waiting, it is worth noting, the gentleman spoke about the largest tax increase in American history, it disproportionately affected seniors. It jacked up Social Security taxes. It hit Americans all across the board but it nailed seniors, and while we have taken this first step to restore tax fairness, it was born of another important step that was taken as the President of the United States was kind enough to come down a couple of years ago and stand at the podium behind my friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS), and he said something that was a wonderful rhetorical flourish, but once we took away the bells and the whistles and the theatrics it was a shot across the bow and a warning to all American seniors, and my colleague from Texas I think he has more on that topic right here as we look at this chart.

Mr. SESSIONS. We do, and I thank the gentleman for mentioning that. The President of the United States, just a few short years ago, said Social Security first, Social Security first.

It took the Republican Party and a plan to get that done. We ended the raid of Social Security because it was the right thing to do. 1998 was the last year that the Congress of the United States will allow the surplus in Social Security, the hard-earned money that people have put into it, to then be spent for general budgetary items.

There, as always, are at least two different views. Let us role back the tape. Let us remember just a year ago, when we talked about the year 2000, the Republican plan said 100 percent of Social Security, meaning that if people gave that money for Social Security, it should only be used for Social Security. It should not be used for something else. That is what savings plans are about. That is what the government took it for. The government took the money, it is required by law, and we believe that 100 percent of it, that is the way it should go.

There was another side. There is another story. The other story in Washington, D.C. is, the President has his own plan. We understand that. We are willing to debate it, even on the floor. Of all of the surplus, the President said 62 percent of the surplus goes to Social Security, but 38 percent of Social Security goes to new government spending. How much money are we talking about? We are talking about, in fact, a lot of money. The surplus in the year 2000, $137 billion. That is $137 billion that instead of going to general revenue will be put directly into Social Security.

Now, one would say that is exactly what the gentleman from Arizona said, and I say, yes, that is close, except that the Democrats are still holding back our lockbox. They will not allow us to designate it. So the best we can say is, no money should be spent. The President still has $85 billion of the $137 billion.

In fact, the gentleman from Arizona and I are getting very good at this. If I can find my penny, every single penny that is given by an American for Social Security should only be used for Social Security, and that is what this is all about.

Mr. HAYWORTH. The gentleman has heard it in his district. One of the first things I heard, when I was honored and entrusted with this responsibility of service in the Congress of the United States, at innumerable townhall meetings across the width and breadth of my district, was a concern that funds were commingled. There was a fancy Washington term for it, of course there always is; the bureaucrats spoke of a unified budget. Well, that is a nice word, but what we really should have called it, Mr. Speaker, was a commingled budget, where Social Security money was not set aside and preserved for Social Security and to the point even now would we have those who lead the executive branch always talk about these plans for spending and trusting government more, it is very interesting that they forget about the basics.

Thank goodness, Mr. Speaker, that a common sense Congress reminds Washington's bureaucrats and big spenders, no, we need to restore that firewall. It has been our intent since day one and now we have done it in our budgetary plans, not a single dime, not a single cent of Social Security money spent on any other program; all of it, all of it, going to save and strengthen Social Security. That is the difference, is it not, Mr. Speaker? Because as I mentioned at the outset, we are entrusted with this constitutional responsibility. We take an oath of office and we are given a responsibility, a role, a mandate, an oath, not to deceive the American people, either by pandering to foreign governments to solicit campaign donations in what is a cynical, sad and macabre twist on the notion of having political opponents, and somehow confusing political opponents with enemies to the point where in a free society those in the highest offices in our land, who took, presumably the same oaths of office, entrusted with those responsibilities, would live up to them. In the same sort of rhetoric here on this House floor, in a speech two years ago, it was said, let us set aside 62 percent of the Social Security surplus for Social Security. What was left unsaid, when we do the math as my colleague pointed out, 38 percent of that money is set aside for Social Security to go to new government programs.

Mr. Speaker, it has been said of those who head up the other branch of government by columnists from their own State, do not listen so much to what they say; watch what they do.

We best secure America's future by restoring trust, by resurrecting that firewall, by putting Social Security funds in a lockbox to be used exclusively for Social Security, by making it more difficult to raise taxes. Rather than having Washington succumb always to the siren song of picking the pockets of hard working Americans, we reaffirm the truth that the money, when all is said and done, does not belong to the Federal Government or the Washington bureaucrats. It belongs to hard working Americans and they ought to hang on to more of it and send less of it here.

Mr. SESSIONS. The gentleman has led directly to the point that I believe is the essence of the tax limitation amendment, and that is in the era of surpluses, when the government has effectively, as a result of the Republican Congress, made sure that Social Security and Medicare will not be spent, it was given for a reason. It will be used for that reason. Then lo and behold, we have extra money called a surplus, that came about, the very essence of it came about because we cut taxes. We encouraged America not only to go work harder but to work smarter. We encouraged America to invest in America.

Just a few short years ago, we were worried about all the jobs in America going offshore. Ten years ago we were told America's greatest days are behind her. The best education is somewhere else; the best of technology is somewhere else; the best of future is somewhere else. We today and every Member of this body tries to take credit for it and that is okay, of the things that have happened in the last 5 years. It is the right thing to do for us to understand that we had to balance the budget; we had to take Social Security off budget; we had to make sure that we created a surplus.

Now tonight we are talking about making it more difficult to raise taxes, a simple thing. We want to make it more difficult for Washington to take your money. H.J. Res. 94, the tax limitation amendment, will be voted on on Wednesday, will be voted on because it is the right thing for America today. What is going to happen with more of the money, the money that is today a surplus? Here is what we are going to do: We are going to make sure that it goes back to the people who gave it to Washington. I am not sure they gave it because they wanted to necessarily, but they gave it and they expect us to do wise things with it.

Responsibility, here is what we are doing: We want to end the marriage penalty. Just a few short months ago in January, President Clinton stood right behind me and he stated he would be more doing away with the marriage penalty.

We are now talking about repealing the senior earnings limit. The President of the United States signed that

last Friday in the White House garden. It was beautiful. We are now going to have senior citizens who are no longer penalized with an unfair tax. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER) worked on that for 30 years.

We want to reduce, eliminate the death taxes. We want to expand education savings accounts. Lo and behold, in my home I have a 6-year-old Down's Syndrome little boy who could use the money. We could also, by spending it efficiently on all sorts of not only educational tools for our baby, our son, our child, but also to help nurture him to where he will be able to be self sufficient.

We have a 10-year-old at home, a 10-year-old who every single day reads every book and takes everything that we can get our hands on, gobbles it in, understands that his future is the same as our country's future. We are going to spend more money on education. My son understands and so does my wife.

We are going to increase health care deductibility. We want every single working American, and especially those today who are not allowed to, by law, to be able to deduct their health care. We want every single person to have health care. Every single person deserves a right to have their own doctor, not just show up at some clinic, not just to have a doctor available but their doctor who they know and understand.

We want to provide tax breaks for communities that do not have as much money as others, and we want to strengthen private pension plans to where people have an opportunity to save for their future.

What we are talking about is the tax limitation amendment that will be the crowning jewel on responsibility, it is the crown jewel of responsibility, to make it more difficult for the Members of Congress to vote for tax increases. We have enough money. We should do the right thing and yet we recognize, I recognize, that in this town we have not flipped everybody.

□ 2115

The real spenders are still out there, people who will take money. This is why we have to have a tax limitation amendment, a two-thirds majority.

Oh, the debate will happen here on the floor, trust me, the debate where people will stand up and talk about we have got to spend more and more and more and more and raise taxes more and more.

I would say that discipline and responsibility is what will make the difference, and the responsibility comes down to what my party stands for. My party deeply believes that, if we want to have America's greatest days ahead of her, then we will empower people back home, men and women, children, small businesses, large businesses, people to invest in America because they know they can do so because the risk is not there to say, when one becomes successful, the government in Washington, D.C. wants their share, too. I think that they would understand fair share is okay. But in Washington, if one is successful, that means Washington wants more and more and more and more.

That is why we offer the tax limitation amendment. That is why this is bipartisan. It is bipartisan. It makes sense, because we want to create wealth and opportunity for generations to come. We want to get away from where Washington, D.C. all of a sudden sees where, oh, there is now an Internet out there, we ought to tax that. There is something else out there, we have got to raise taxes on that.

We still have been paying, for 70 years, a telephone tax that was done, ah, to raise money for the war. By the way, that was World War II.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, it is even more profound than that. In doing our research, we have crafted, again, bipartisan legislation to end this. But, Mr. Speaker, I am sure the American people will note with interest that a luxury tax was imposed on the telephone really before the advent of the 20th Century. It came in the Spanish American War.

So, Mr. Speaker, Teddy Roosevelt led the charge up San Juan Hill, and patrons of this new technology of the telephone, I guess at that time it was fairly called a luxury, we are paying a luxury tax. Telephone users since that time up until the present day at the advent of the Internet is still paying a luxury tax on telephones instituted in the Spanish American War.

We are taking steps to roll that back. Perhaps that is the most graphic example of the institutional bias in Washington, D.C. toward taxes.

Let us not forget that, in fact, what paved the way for the 16th Amendment to the Constitution that allowed for the direct taxation of personal income was a Supreme Court opinion that said direct taxation of personal income would be constitutional provided it was a temporary measure. That leads to what will transpire in our Committee on Ways and Means this week, hearings on changing our tax system, on offering real reform.

But, Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SESSIONS) for shouldering the burden of responsibility and leadership and bringing to the floor the tax limitation amendment. Because real reform starts with this institutional change where we say, if raising taxes is so important to us as a people, let us at least raise the standard, make it difficult, make it more difficult, require a two-thirds majority, a supermajority, as we do on questions of constitutional amendments, as we do on questions of impeachment, of constitutional issues.

If we are willing to take these steps, there should be a standard of accountability and a lack of institutional bias that always favors the bureaucrat. There should be a leveling of responsibility and a higher standard to protect the taxpayer. That is the key, the measure that will be offered by the gentleman from Texas on this floor in the days ahead. It is an important first step.

Mr. Speaker, as I think about Americans who may be within the sound of my voice electronically, who may be there pouring over that Form 1040, maybe succumbing to the EZ Form because the hour grows late or the deadline of April 15, I would hope, Mr. Speaker, that those Americans would take time to write, call, and fax their Members of Congress to let them know where they stand, to let them say to their advocates on Capitol Hill, you should advocate the notion that we should raise the standard and eliminate the institutional bias toward more and more and more taxation and higher and higher spending.

Just one final amendment to the amendment offered, in a friendly rhetorical fashion, to the gentleman from Texas. There is really a better word to use for surplus. Really what we have right now that is widely referred to as a surplus is, in fact, an overcharge of the American people who are now taxed at the highest level in our history parallel only by a period of grave crisis in World War II.

There is no excuse in a time of relative peace, to be assured there are challenges that confront us internationally, and we must provide for the common defense, and we are willing to take those steps to rebuild and restore our national defense, but having said that, there is no excuse for the American people to be taxed at the same level at which they found themselves taxed in World War II.

So with this tremendous overcharge, after setting aside a massive portion for what it was designated for to begin with, strengthening Social Security, strengthening Medicare, we owe it to the people who have placed their trust in us to give that overcharge back.

When one pays for something at a store, if one gives a greater amount of money in that retail exchange, one expects a return, one expects cash back. With this overcharge, we are saying it is time to give that money back to the people to whom it belongs.

That is why I applaud the gentleman from Texas, and that is why I hope Americans, Mr. Speaker, within the sound of my voice will call, write, fax, e-mail, phone their Congressional Representatives and ask them to support this tax limitation amendment.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona, from the 6th District. Tonight we have had my colleagues hear a wonderful debate about the tax limitation amendment from the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HALL), a Democrat from the 4th District of Texas, and the gentleman from the 6th District of Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH). They had the opportunity to talk about, not only their districts,

but their vision of what America is all about, and it should be more difficult to raise taxes.

We heard the story about the senior earnings limit, the earnings limit put on seniors years ago. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER), chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, this was the very first bill that he presented upon being a Member of Congress 30 years ago. After years of working on this effort, he finally succeeded in giving the President of the United States, the House, and the Senate, the other body, the opportunity to agree to this bill, what turned out to be unanimous. What 5 years before was impossible, because the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARCHER) sat in the chair as the majority party representative to the Committee on Ways and Means, it got signed into law.

The tax limitation amendment, H.J. Res. 94, will be debated on Wednesday. I hope my colleagues will join us to support this.

□

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Reyes (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business.

□

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MCNULTY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. LIPINSKI, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. UNDERWOOD, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. JONES of North Carolina) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. EHLERS, for 5 minutes, April 11.

Mr. SWEENEY, for 5 minutes, April 12.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG, for 5 minutes, April 12.

Mr. NORWOOD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SOUDER, for 5 minutes, April 12.

Mr. PEASE, for 5 minutes, April 11.

Mr. METCALF, for 5 minutes, today, April 11, 12, and 13.

Mrs. MORELLA, for 5 minutes, April 11.

Mr. JONES of North Carolina, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART, for 5 minutes, April 11, 12, and 13.

□

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A joint resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S.J. Res. 43. Joint resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the President of the United States should encourage free and fair elections and respect for democracy in Peru; to the Committee on International Relations.

□

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, April 11, 2000, at 9:30 a.m., for morning hour debates.

□

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

7001. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—National Poultry Improvement Plan and Auxiliary Provisions [APHIS Docket No. 98–096–2] received February 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7002. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Marketing Order Regulating the Handling of Spearmint Oil Produced in the Far West; Revision of the Salable Quantity and Allotment Percentage for Class 3 (Native) Spearmint Oil for the 1999–2000 Marketing Year [Docket No. FV00–985–3 IFR] received February 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7003. A letter from the Administrator, Risk Management Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—General Administrative Regulations; Reinsurance Agreement-Standards for Approval; Regulations for the 1997 and Subsequent Reinsurance Years—received February 23, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7004. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Tomatoes Grown in Florida; Partial Exemption From the Handling Regulation for Producer Field-Packed Tomatoes [Docket No. FV98–966–2 FIR] received February 23, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7005. A letter from the Administrator, Risk Management Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Common Crop Insurance Regulations; Forage Production Crop Provisions; and Forage Seeding Crop Provisions—received February 23, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7006. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Ports Designated for Exportation of Horses; Dayton, OH [APHIS Docket No. 99–102–1] received February 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7007. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Polyoxyethylated Sorbitol Fatty Acid Esters; Tolerance Exemption [OPP–300971; FRL–6490–8] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received February 24, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7008. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Ethoxylated Propoxylated C12–C15 Alcohols; Tolerance Exemption [OPP–300973; FRL–6491–3] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received February 24, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7009. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Dimethyl Silicone Polymer With Silica; Silane, Dichloromethyl-, Reaction Product With Silica; Hexamethyldisilizane, Reaction Product With Silica; Tolerance Exemptions [OPP–300972; FRL–6490–9] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received February 24, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

7010. A letter from the Under Secretary of the Navy, Department of Defense, transmitting notification of the Department's decision to study certain functions performed by military and civilian personnel in the Deparmtnet of the Navy (DON) for possible performance by private contractors, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2461; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7011. A letter from the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Selected Acquisition Reports (SARS) for the quarter ending December 31, 1999, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2432; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7012. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Emergency Management Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Final Flood Elevation Determinations—received February 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

7013. A letter from the Director, Corporate Policy and Research Department, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule—Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing Benefits—received February 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

7014. A letter from the General Counsel, Consumer Product Safety Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Safety Standard for Multi-Purpose Lighters—received February 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7015. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Law, Office of Hearings and Appeals, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule—Criteria and Procedures for DOE Contractor Employee Protection Program (RIN: 1901–AA78) received February 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7016. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy Management and Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Indirect Food Additives: Adhesives and Components of Coatings and Paper and Paperboard Components [Docket No. 92F–0111] received February 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7017. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Indirect Food Additives: Adhesives and Components of Coatings [Docket No. 92F–0443] received February 15, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7018. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Drinking Water

Tribal Set-Aside Grants Guidance to Applicants— received February 4, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7019. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Technical Amendment to the Finding of Significant Contribution and Rulemaking for Certain States for Purposes of Reducing Regional Transport of Ozone [FRL–6542–9] (RIN: 2060–AH10) received February 24, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7020. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Missouri: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revision [FRL–6543–5] received February 24, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7021. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Louisiana: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions [FRL–6543–3] received February 24, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7022. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval of the Clean Air Act, Section 112(l), Delegation of Authority to Three Local Air Agencies in Washington; Amendment [FRL–6541–2] received February 24, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7023. A letter from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Killeen and Cedar Park, Texas) [MM Docket No. 98–176 RM–9363] received February 15, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7024. A letter from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Stanfield, Oregon) [MM Docket No. 99–44 RM–9469] received February 15, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7025. A letter from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Silverton and Bayfield, Colorado) [MM Docket No. 99–76 RM–9400] received February 15, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7026. A letter from the Special Assistant to the Bureau Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b), Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations (Walton and Livingston Manor, New York) [MM Docket No. 99–10 RM–9435 RM–9688] received February 15, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

7027. A letter from the Lieutenant General, USA, Director, Defense Security Corporation, transmitting a report containing an analysis and description of services performed by full-time USG employees during Fiscal Year 1999, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2765(a); to the Committee on International Relations.

7028. A letter from the Executive Director, Committee For Purchase From People Who Are Blind Or Severely Disabled, transmitting the Committee's final rule—Procurement List: Addition—received February 29, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7029. A letter from the Executive Director, Committee For Purchase From People Who Are Blind Or Severely Disabled, transmitting the Committee's final rule—Procurement List: Additions—received February 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7030. A letter from the Director, Office of General Counsel and Legal Policy, Office of Government Ethics, transmitting the Office's final rule—Executive Agency Ethics Training Programs Regulation Amendments (RIN: 3209–AA07) received February 14, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

7031. A letter from the Director, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Determination of Threatened Status for Newcomb's Snail From the Hawaiian Islands (RIN: 1018–AE27) received January 24, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7032. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Vessels Catching Pacific Cod for Processing by the Offshore Component in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 991223348–9348–01; I.D. 020700A] received February 22, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

7033. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—IFR Altitudes; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 29899; Amdt. 420] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7034. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 29896; Amdt. No. 1969] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7035. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 29895; Amdt. No. 1968] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7036. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 29885; Amdt. No. 1967] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7037. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 29884; Amdt. No. 1966] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7038. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 29864; Amdt. No. 1965] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7039. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 29863; Amdt. No. 1964] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7040. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 29908; Amdt. No. 1972] received February 24, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7041. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Standard Instrument Approach Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No. 29906; Amdt. No. 1970] received February 24, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7042. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney JT8D–200 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 99–NE–32–AD; Amendment 39–11465; AD 99–26–06] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7043. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A310 and A300–600 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 96–NM–194–AD; Amendment 39–11467; AD 99–26–08] received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7044. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A300 B2 and B4 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98–NM–248–AD; Amendment 39–11475; AD 99–26–15] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7045. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Agusta S.p.A. Model A109A and A109A II Helicopters [Docket No. 99–SW–64–AD; Amendment 39–11472; AD 99–26–13] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received February 11, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7046. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Guidance for Project Eligibility and Design Under the Region IX Tribal Border Infrastructure Program—received February 4, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

7047. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Service's final rule—Determination of Issue Price in the Case of Certain Debt Instruments Issued for Property [Rev. Rul.

2000–9] received February 14, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7048. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Import Administration and Assistant U.S. Trade Representative for WTO and Multilateral Affairs, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Subsidies Enforcement Annual Report to the Congress; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7049. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Weighted Average Interest Rate Update [Notice 20000–2] received February 29, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

7050. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Special Rules Relating to Debt Instruments [Rev. Rul. 2000–12] received February 29, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

□

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COMBEST: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 852. A bill to require the Department of Agriculture to establish an electronic filing and retrieval system to enable the public to file all required paperwork electronically with the Department and to have access to public information on farm programs, quarterly trade, economic, and production reports, and other similar information; with amendments (Rept. 106–565). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ARCHER. Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 4163. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for increased fairness to taxpayers; with an amendment (Rept. 106–566). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BLILEY: Committee on Commerce. H.R. 3439. A bill to prohibit the Federal Communications Commission from establishing rules authorizing the operation of new, low power FM radio stations; with amendments (Rept. 106–567). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

□

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker:

The following action occurred on April 7, 2000

H.R. 1742. Referral to the Committee on Commerce extended for a period ending not later than April 11, 2000.

□

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. KUYKENDALL:

H.R. 4220. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to add certain firearms related crimes to the list of crimes giving rise to a presumption of dangerousness for purposes of hearings on the release of defendants before trial; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 4221. A bill to amend the Service Contract Act of 1965 to require entities that enter into certain services contracts with the Federal Government or the District of Columbia to offer the employees that carry out the services before the award of a contract the right to continue employment after the award of the contract; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas:

H.R. 4222. A bill to provide for the establishment of a task force within the Bureau of Justice Statistics to gather information about, study, and report to the Congress regarding, incidents of abandonment of infant children; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JEFFERSON:

H.R. 4223. A bill to reduce temporarily the duty on Fipronil Technical; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PETRI:

H.R. 4224. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to reform the financing and conduct of campaigns for elections for Federal office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. TANCREDO:

H.R. 4225. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on Fructooligosaccharides (FOS); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THUNE:

H.R. 4226. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell or exchange all or part of certain administrative sites and other land in the Black Hills National Forest and to use funds derived from the sale or exchange to acquire replacement sites and to acquire or construct administrative improvements in connection with the Black Hills National Forest; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. JACKSON of Illinois:

H.J. Res. 95. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to taxing the people of the United States progressively; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of Illinois:

H.J. Res. 96. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States regarding the right of citizens of the United States to health care of equal high quality; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JACKSON of Illinois:

H.J. Res. 97. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States regarding the right of all citizens of the United States to an education of equal high quality; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TERRY:

H. Res. 467. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the tax and user fee increases proposed by the Clinton/Gore administration in their fiscal year 2001 budget should be adopted; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

□

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 274: Mr. BEREUTER and Ms. SANCHEZ.
H.R. 357: Mr. WU.
H.R. 516: Mr. ROHRABACHER.
H.R. 518: Mr. ROHRABACHER.
H.R. 632: Mr. OXLEY.
H.R. 664: Mr. JEFFERSON.
H.R. 809: Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 860: Mr. BEREUTER.
H.R. 920: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 960: Mr. SAXTON.
H.R. 1020: Mr. BONIOR, Ms. MCKINNEY, and Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 1071: Mr. KUCINICH.
H.R. 1115: Mrs. FOWLER and Mr. COSTELLO.
H.R. 1168: Mr. KINGSTON and Mr. MCINTOSH.
H.R. 1128: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. EHRLICH, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. DEFAZIO.
H.R. 1285: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.
H.R. 1304: Mr. BOSWELL.
H.R. 1310: Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, and Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 1322: Mr. LATHAM, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. CRAMER, Mr. TERRY, Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. UDALL of New Mexico, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. MCINTOSH, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. GILMAN, and Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 1398: Mr. HOSTETTLER.
H.R. 1413: Mr. EDWARDS.
H.R. 1495: Mr. BERMAN.
H.R. 1515: Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. WEYGAND, and Mr. DOYLE.
H.R. 1560: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.
H.R. 1645: Mr. BENTSEN.
H.R. 1806: Ms. RIVERS.
H.R. 1885: Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. GUTIERREZ, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. DOGGETT, and Ms. WOOLSEY.
H.R. 1899: Mr. REYNOLDS.
H.R. 1912: Ms. CARSON and Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA.
H.R. 1926: Mrs. CAPPS.
H.R. 2002: Mr. WAXMAN.
H.R. 2175: Mr. RANGEL.
H.R. 2321: Ms. DELAURO.
H.R. 2485: Mr. WAMP.
H.R. 2498: Mr. MCKEON and Mrs. JONES of Ohio.
H.R. 2543: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 2596: Mr. DREIER, Mr. CANNON, Mr. DELAY, Mrs. FOWLER, and Mr. SWEENEY.
H.R. 2640: Mr. OXLEY.
H.R. 2641: Mr. SHIMKUS.
H.R. 2722: Ms. CARSON.
H.R. 2736: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. TURNER, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H.R. 2790: Mr. HORN and Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 2842: Mr. FROST.
H.R. 2883: Mr. GALLEGLY and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 2892: Ms. PRYCE of Ohio.
H.R. 2909: Mr. WAXMAN.
H.R. 2955: Mrs. CLAYTON.
H.R. 2973: Mr. PORTMAN.
H.R. 3113: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN and Mr. WOLF.
H.R. 3125: Mr. DUNCAN, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. PETERSEN of Minnesota, Mr. TRAFICANT, and Mr. WAMP.
H.R. 3192: Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Mr. GREENWOOD, Ms. CARSON, Mr. OLVER, and Mr. PORTER.
H.R. 3293: Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. HYDE, Ms. BALDWIN, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. MINGE, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. WYNN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. THUNE, and Mr. BERRY.
H.R. 3301: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HORN, and Mr. FILNER.
H.R. 3319: Mr. DICKS and Mr. BERRY.
H.R. 3439: Mr. GORDON.
H.R. 3466: Mr. PALLONE.
H.R. 3485: Mr. HORN.
H.R. 3573: Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. EVERETT, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, and Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 3575: Mr. FLETCHER.
H.R. 3580: Mr. WELDON of Florida, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky,

Mr. POMEROY, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. TURNER, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. COOK, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. GILCHREST, Mr. HAYES, and Mr. PASTOR.

H.R. 3600: Ms. LEE.

H.R. 3609: Mr. PAUL.

H.R. 3634: Ms. ESHOO and Mr. HOYER.

H.R. 3698: Mr. COOK, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. LEE, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. HAYES, Mrs. NORTHUP, Mr. COMBEST, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, and Mr. PASTOR.

H.R. 3766: Mr. GILMAN, Mr. BARCIA, Mr. WEYGAND, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. LUTHER, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, and Mr. SANDLIN.

H.R. 3825: Mr. SAWYER, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota.

H.R. 3861: Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. SANDERS, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. LEE, and Ms. MCKINNEY.

H.R. 3915: Mr. SMITH of Washington and Mr. BUYER.

H.R. 3916: Mr. BAKER, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, and Mr. BEREUTER.

H.R. 3981: Ms. WOOLSEY.

H.R. 3983: Mr. BOEHNER and Mr. GREENWOOD.

H.R. 4022: Mr. MCINTOSH and Mr. HOSTETTLER.

H.R. 4033: Mr. RUSH, Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WAMP, and Mr. KIND.

H.R. 4036: Mr. JACKSON of Illinois and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 4040: Mr. PETRI and Mr. WELDON of Florida.

H.R. 4051: Mr. SKEEN, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. TERRY, Mr. ENGLISH, and Mr. KINGSTON.

H.R. 4053: Mr. LEACH.

H.R. 4059: Mr. BARR of Georgia.

H.R. 4064: Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. COOK, Mr. LEACH, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, and Mrs. EMERSON.

H.R. 4069: Mr. FOLEY, Mr. GONZALEZ, and Mr. WYNN.

H.R. 4071: Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mr. GILMAN, and Mr. ENGLISH.

H.R. 4074: Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 4091: Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. SANDERS, and Mrs. MEEK of Florida.

H.R. 4118: Mr. ARMEY.

H.R. 4149: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. SALMON, and Mr. BILBRAY.

H.R. 4152: Mr. RAMSTAD.

H.R. 4163: Mr. TANNER, Mr. MCNULTY, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. TERRY, and Mrs. BIGGERT.

H.R. 4199: Mr. REYNOLDS.

H.R. 4207: Mrs. BONO, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. WELDON of Florida, and Mr. MARKEY.

H.R. 4218: Mr. HERGER and Mr. DOOLEY of California.

H.J. Res. 77: Mr. NEY.

H. Con. Res. 108: Mr. BACHUS.

H. Con. Res. 228: Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. ROHRABACHER, and Mr. BACA.

H. Con. Res. 262: Mr. HEFLEY, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. BLILEY, and Ms. PELOSI.

H. Con. Res. 282: Mrs. FOWLER, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. COX, Mr. SHOWS, Ms. DANNER, Mr. FORBES, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. BAKER, Mr. BERRY, Mr. BILBRAY, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. CAMP, Mr. CHABOT, Mrs. CHENOWETH-HAGE, Mr. CLEMENT, Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. EVERETT, Mr. GOODE, Mr. GOSS, Mr. HAYWORTH, Mr. HILL of Montana, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. HOUGHTON, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. KASICH, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. LATHAM, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. MCCRERY, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. METCALF, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, Mr. LAZIO, Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. MORAN of Kansas, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. OLVER, Mr. OXLEY, Mr. PETERSON of Pennvylvania, Mr. PICKERING, Mr. PITTS, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. ROEMER, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. SANFORD, Mr. SHADEGG, Mr. SHAW, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. SKELTON, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. STUMP, Mr. TAUZIN, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. TOOMEY, Mr. WALSH, Mr. WAMP, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. WEYGAND, Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. WICKER, Mr. CHAMBLISS, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. SWEENEY, Mrs. BIGGERT, and Mrs. ROUKEMA.

H. Con. Res. 295: Mr. BEREUTER, Mr. DAVIS of Virginia, and Ms. SANCHEZ.

H. Res. 442: Mr. STUPAK.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 146 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, APRIL 10, 2000 No. 44

Senate

The Senate met at 12 noon and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

PRAYER

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

Lord of creation, You have written Your signature in the bursting beauty of this magnificent spring day in our Nation's Capital. We thank You for the rebirth of hope that comes with this season of renewal. You remind us: Behold, I make all things new. As the seeds and bulbs have germinated in the earth, so You have prepared us to burst forth in newness of life. We forget the former things and claim Your new beginning for us. Help us to accept Your forgiveness and become giving and forgiving people. Clean out the hurting memories of our hearts so we may be open communicators of Your vibrant, creative spirit as we tackle problems and grasp possibilities of this day for the sake of our beloved Nation's future. By Your power. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable THAD COCHRAN, a Senator from the State of Mississippi, led the Pledge of Allegiance, as follows:

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

RECOGNITION OF THE ACTING MAJORITY LEADER

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The acting majority leader is recognized.

SCHEDULE

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. President, on behalf of the majority leader, I am pleased to announce that today the Senate will be in a period of morning business throughout the day with time reserved for Senators DURBIN, THOMAS, CRAIG, MURKOWSKI, and BROWNBACK. Cloture was filed on the gas tax bill on Friday. Therefore, pursuant to rule XXII, all first-degree amendments must be filed by 1 p.m. today. By previous consent, the cloture vote has been scheduled to occur at 2:25 p.m. on Tuesday. That vote will be the first vote of this week. The Senate will also consider the marriage tax penalty bill during this week's session and the budget conference report. Therefore, Senators can expect votes to occur on Friday.

I thank my colleagues for their attention and cooperation.

GAS TAX CONSIDERATION

Mr. REID. Mr. President, we were able to work our way through the budget this past week. It took a lot of time and cooperation, but I think we were able to make a lot of headway. We are disappointed that a number of our amendments were not adopted.

The good news—and I think we should focus on this a little bit this morning—is the fact that gas prices are actually declining, on an average of almost 3 cents a gallon this past week. There is a long way to go to decline to where they first started picking up, but progress has been made.

With the vote on the gas tax bill coming up this week, I think we should recognize that the crisis we did see is certainly being diminished, if not alleviated. No one is happy about the cost of a gallon of gasoline. I stopped over the weekend with my daughter, and she filled up their vehicle's gas tank and commented about the price of gasoline. That is the way it is. Gas is too high. However, what we are attempting to do this week is something we should reexamine. We should recognize that if this bill is passed by the Senate, it will either be held at the desk indefinitely or would be what we call blue slipped, if it is sent to the House of Representatives.

We should focus on things other than this legislation. For example, if the majority is serious about this matter, we could call up H.R. 3081, the House-passed tax bill which concerns the minimum wage. That is on the Senate Calendar. We could work on that. That would allow other amendments to be offered that are meaningful.

There isn't anyone in this body who does not want to see a decrease in the cost of fuel prices. Simply stated, this is not the way to go about it. OPEC has signaled its willingness to produce more oil. Non-OPEC nations have agreed to contribute some 700,000 barrels a day to alleviate this crisis.

We would be better off focusing on doing things so we are not as dependent on foreign oil. We have to import 55 percent of the oil we consume in this country. For example, we need to do something to make sure that the oil that is produced in Alaska is used in the United States and not shipped to Asia. We have to do something to make sure we develop a long-term energy policy and do something with alternative fuels. Solar, wind, and geothermal are areas we need to explore. We have spent very small amounts of money each year on hydrogen fuel development; this, some day, will overtake the fossil fuels that we use.

There are a lot of things we need to do. One of the things we need not do is try to explain to the American public that we are doing something by reducing the 4.3-cent-a-gallon tax for part of this year. No. 1, in a number of States, if the Federal tax is knocked off, the States are obligated by law to pick up that extra 4.3 cents, or whatever it is, that the Federal Government knocks off.

In short, I think we could be using this time in a much more productive fashion than debating the 4.3-cent-per gallon tax reduction which is cosmetic in nature only and is certainly not even a short-term fix.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

—

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

—

MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There will now be a period for the transaction of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

Under the previous order, the time until 1 p.m. shall be under the control of the Senator from Illinois, Mr. DURBIN, or his designee.

Mr. DORGAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota is recognized.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

—

CONGRATULATING THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH DAKOTA HOCKEY TEAM FOR THEIR NCAA CHAMPIONSHIP

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I came to the floor today as we begin business this week to talk about two issues. First, let me describe what happened Saturday evening on the east coast. There was a hockey team from the University of North Dakota that went to the east coast to play in the NCAA Division I hockey championship. When they finished that competition, the North Dakota Sioux were Division I national champions once again. In fact, it is the seventh Division I national championship for the University of North Dakota hockey team.

I am an alumnus of that great school, and it was with great pride I watched the game on television last Saturday evening and saw the North Dakota Fighting Sioux win that contest. We are the home of great skaters, great hockey players, and great tradition. This year, once again, we demonstrated that you don't have to have a 40,000-student population to be a Division I national champion.

I called the White House this morning and asked if they would invite that team to the White House, as is often the custom for championship teams—college football, basketball, and other teams, including professional teams who have been invited to the White House by the President to say congratulations to them. I hope he will do the same for this wonderful group of young men from North Dakota who are now this Nation's champions in Division I hockey.

So my hat is off to the University of North Dakota. It is a wonderful school. I am proud to have gotten my undergraduate degree there. I am increasingly proud year after year as I watch that school. Not only are they great athletes and hockey players, these are also great students and good young men. This is an athletic program without parallel around the country, in my judgment. Again, I congratulate those young men. I am very proud of them.

—

THE SENATE AGENDA

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I will discuss for a moment the issues that face the Congress, where we are and why we are here, and suggest perhaps a slightly more robust agenda for the next couple of months.

It is now a Monday in April, and it is not quite clear to me what the agenda will be on the floor of the Senate this week. I guess it is not quite clear yet to anyone. We know that in the coming weeks we will do our work as appropriators. I am on the Appropriations Committee, and we will do our work as appropriators and bring appropriations bills to the floor of the Senate, and there are some authorization bills that must get done. But beyond that, it is not quite clear what the agenda is.

Recognizing that my political party, the one I represent in this Chamber, did not win the election, it is also clear we don't set the agenda in the Senate. The political system has a unique way of describing who controls institutions such as this. And those who have the most members, who get the most votes in a general election, have the opportunity to control and create an agenda. That is as it should be. But it is perhaps frustrating for me and others that our agenda is not nearly as robust as it could or should be.

Let me describe some of the things I think we ought to be doing and that I hope the majority leader and others will agree at some point in the coming weeks that we will do.

First, we passed some long time ago a Patients' Bill of Rights. I didn't support the Senate version of it because I didn't think it was a good bill. But the House of Representatives passed a bipartisan piece of legislation coauthored by a Democrat and a Republican in the House of Representatives. It was a very vigorous battle in the House. They passed a real Patients' Bill of Rights bill.

It says in this contest of wills between patients, doctors, the insurance companies, and HMOs, that there are certain rights that patients ought to have.

Every patient in this country who seeks medical treatment ought to have the right to understand all of their options for medical treatment—not just what's the least expensive.

Those who need emergency room treatment ought to be able to expect to have emergency room treatment when needed.

When a woman falls off a 40-foot cliff and is hauled into an emergency room comatose, and then the HMO later says: We will not approve your emergency room cost because you didn't get preapproval for emergency room treatment—there is something wrong with the system.

Are there certain rights that patients ought to have in this health care system? The answer yes. Among those are the rights embodied in the bill in the House of Representatives called the Patients' Bill of Rights. It is now in conference. It is not likely to produce 67 votes, unfortunately, under current circumstances because the House-appointed conferees, who in most cases didn't vote for the bill, sent it to conference.

The Senate, of course, has a piece of legislation that does not do the job. But those of us who support a strong Patients' Bill of Rights remain hopeful that between now and the end of this legislative session we will pass a bipartisan piece of legislation called a Patients' Bill of Rights that really provides the rights and the assistance to patients in dealing with their insurance companies with respect to their health care treatment.

Juvenile justice: We passed a juvenile justice bill in the Senate. That bill was passed in Senate legislation that many do not like.

Among the two pieces of legislation that people do not like on that bill—and the reason I guess it is stalled—is some legislation dealing with guns. We provided two simple components to that piece of legislation.

I come from North Dakota. I grew up hunting. I had a gun when I was a teenager. I pheasant hunted, I deer hunted, and practiced target shooting. I know about guns. I am not somebody running into this Chamber saying let's have gun control. That is not my orientation at all.

But the two pieces dealing with guns that we added to the Juvenile Justice Act are so sensible. One is mandatory trigger locks for handguns. When 6-year-olds go to school and shoot another 6-year-old, ought we not to understand the need for trigger locks on handguns? It seems to me that is eminently sensible.

Second, the issue of gun shows, and the question of whether at gun shows that people set up around this country on Saturdays or Sundays there ought to be an instant check when guns are sold to find out whether you are selling a gun to a convicted felon.

Go to a gun store anywhere in this country and try to buy a gun. They are going to run your name through an instant check to find out if you are a convicted felon because if you are, you cannot buy a gun. But we have a loophole at gun shows which are big, and getting bigger. There are more of them. Many feel—including the Senate, incidentally, by a rather close vote—that we ought to have the opportunity to close that loophole and say if you are

going to buy a gun, it does not matter whether it is in a gun store or at a gun show, you ought to have to have your name run through an instant check so we can make sure we are not selling a gun to a felon.

Those two issues—trigger locks for handguns for the safety of children in this country, and closing the gun show loophole—have meant that the juvenile justice bill, which is so important, is now in conference, and apparently we can't get it out. I hope we can be more sensible about this and get that bill out of conference, bring it to the floor of the Senate and the House, and get it to the President for his signature.

There are other items we continue to struggle with, such as the issue of school construction.

I have spoken at great length about walking into the Cannon Ball School and seeing little Rosie Two Bears, a third grader, who says: Mr. Senator, are you going to build me a new school?

I said: No, I don't have the money to build you a new school, Rosie.

This is a school with 150 kids, one water fountain, two toilets, and closings of the school building which is not fit for classes, where sewer gas comes up and they have to evacuate the rooms. Rosie isn't getting the kind of education we want for her as an American.

When we say let's help rebuild, renovate, and construct some of America's schools to bring them back up to standard, we are told, no. You can't do that. That is not the Federal Government's job.

It is interesting. There was a piece in Newsweek by Jonathan Alter, a rather interesting columnist. He said about 4 or 5 years ago the Congress decided they were going to spend $8 billion to upgrade jails and prisons. The State and local governments absolutely spent the money for jails and prisons. The Federal Government can upgrade the jails and prisons but not the schools. Is it less important to bring schools up to standard than a jail or a prison somewhere?

If we can spend $8 billion to improve places to incarcerate criminals, we ought to be able to spend a few billion dollars to help kids go into a classroom door in a school that we as parents could be proud of. That ought to be done in this session of the Congress as well.

Judicial nominations, we want to get through. We don't have a committee in this Congress for lost and found. Almost everywhere else—hotels, airports, every other institution—when you lose something and ask where the lost and found is, they send you there. There is a lost and found over there. In Congress there is no place you can go to the lost and found. Maybe we need a committee on the lost and found. When these policy issues leave here, you never hear from them again.

I hope that in the coming days Republicans and Democrats together can decide that there are certain common elements to an agenda that will strengthen this country and make this a better place in which to live. I don't believe that we have a circumstance where one side of the political aisle is all right, and the other side all wrong. That is not the case. We have good men and women serving in this Chamber on both sides of the political aisle. But it remains a frustration that in some areas where we have passed legislation, it gets sent to a conference somewhere never to be seen again because a small minority refuses to accept sensible judgments of the majority in both the House and the Senate.

I think that is the case with the Patients' Bill of Rights with respect to the vote in the House, and certainly is the case with juvenile justice and decisions in the Senate on things such as trigger locks and also closing the gun show loophole.

I hope we can find a way to address some of these important issues in the coming weeks and months.

I hope we can demonstrate to the American people that we care about education and health care, address the crime issue in a thoughtful way, get nominations through this Chamber, and appoint Federal judges to fill vacancies, which are things that represent part of the agenda that needs to be completed as soon as possible in the Senate.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, are we in a period of morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The leader is correct. Under the previous order, the leadership time has been reserved.

—

SENATE SCHEDULE

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I will talk a few minutes about the schedule for the week and then comment specifically on some of the issues we will be addressing during the schedule for Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday.

We have several important issues before the Senate to take up and hopefully complete action on. One of them is the question of our national energy policy. That will be brought to the Senate during the day on Tuesday with a vote on the gas tax issue.

Following that, we will be discussing the marriage penalty tax. This past Saturday, I had occasion to be in a store and one of the other customers asked me: Are we finally going to get rid of the unfair marriage penalty tax? I said we would try to and hoped to do it this week.

I went on about my business and the customer went on about his. The customer came back later and said: Do you think you actually will begin to eliminate the very unfair tax? I said: That is what we are trying to do.

Then he came back a third time and said: You are going to have a vote next week? I said: Yes, we are. He asked if he could get the names of those voting against getting rid of the unfair tax. I said: Yes, it will be in the RECORD. Call my office; we will be glad to get it to you.

That is what we hear in the real world, off of Capitol Hill. People say this is a real problem.

We have been talking about eliminating the marriage penalty tax for years. It is time we get it done. We will have that debate on Wednesday and, I presume, a vote Wednesday or Thursday to see exactly where the Senate is: Do we want to eliminate the marriage penalty tax or not? I think we should. I certainly will vote that way.

Before the week is out, we hope to take up a number of Executive Calendar nominations. We have a number of nominations that we should be able to clear. We will work with interested Senators and committees involved on both sides of the aisle to see if we can clear a number of these nominations.

Last and certainly not least is the fact we will also want to complete action on the conference on the budget. We completed action on the budget resolution of the Senate on Friday. I understand the conferees will be working together during the next 2 days, hopefully, to file the necessary report by Tuesday night. Then we will have the necessary debate, whatever time that might be. It could be up to as much as 10 hours. Then we will have a vote on that conference report Thursday evening or Friday morning.

That leads me to another point I want to be sure to make early in the week. As I have notified Senators in the past, during these weeks right before a recess—in this case the Easter recess—we will go home and be with our constituents and families. Senators should anticipate the possibility or even the likelihood of votes on Friday. If we can complete the work I have outlined by Thursday night then we will not be in session on Friday. But if for some reason we have not been able to complete at least the vote on the conference report on the budget, then we will be in session on Friday. We certainly hope to finish it by noon on Friday, but that will depend on how much time is needed and when the Senate wishes to get to a final vote.

I wanted to go over the schedule for the week so Senators know what to anticipate on Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, and the possibility even of Friday votes on the budget resolution conference report.

Now let me go back and talk about some of these issues, to try to make clear what I am trying to do by moving

these bills, and explain what the situation is with regard to the gas tax, for instance.

There have been those who said the Senate voted last week during the debate on the budget resolution on a sense of the Senate that basically the Senate would not temporarily suspend or in any way remove the gas tax.

The Federal gasoline tax is 4.3 cents a gallon. That was added back in 1993. But the total amount of the Federal tax is 18.4 cents a gallon. I remind my colleagues, that does not count the State taxes and in many cases local taxes on gasoline. Where I am from, we even have, in addition to the State and Federal taxes, what is known as the seawall tax.

That is quite curious because quite often we do not see anything happening on the seawall, but the tax is being collected and spent on general improvement of roads. Most people do not gripe because we have a developing area and we want to have good roads. I think that is a very important thing.

But, as a matter of fact, the total tax on gasoline in most States is as much as a quarter or a third or more of the total cost of a gallon of gasoline. So the taxes on gasoline are significant.

With regard to this vote last week, the so-called Byrd sense-of-the-Senate resolution said it is the sense of the Senate that the functional totals in this budget resolution do not assume the reduction of any Federal gasoline taxes on either a temporary or permanent basis. What we will be considering today and tomorrow morning in our gas tax bill is specifically designed to make certain that highway spending, and thus the functional totals, are not changed by our gas tax suspension.

Therefore, the spending assumptions in the budget resolution do not assume the reduction of any Federal gas taxes on either a temporary or permanent basis. The revenue levels in the budget resolution, however, do assume a temporary suspension of the 4.3-cent-a-gallon so-called Gore tax increase.

If the Byrd amendment had been drafted to read, ''it is the sense of the Senate that the functional totals and the revenue levels in this budget resolution do not assume . . .'' then it would have had a very different impact. So I am trying to clarify the difference in what some people thought the resolution did last week and what we are actually doing.

Under the budget resolution, there is no question we could have this debate and have this vote on gas tax because this is what it would do. It says we would temporarily suspend, just for the remainder of this year, 4.3 cents a gallon—I will come back to that in a moment—and, if gasoline prices go to $2 a gallon national average, then the entire 18.4 cents a gallon would be suspended in a gas tax holiday just to the end of the year.

So when people say, How much would this cost? The first answer is it would depend on whether or not gasoline reached the national average of $2 a gallon and when that would occur, when that would take effect.

The amendment language is drafted so this will not affect the highway trust fund. I want to emphasize that: It will not reduce the funds in the highway trust fund. It would hold harmless the highway trust fund. If there is this gas tax holiday, it would come out of the surplus.

I remind my colleagues, we do at this point have a $23 billion on-budget surplus now; that is, surplus in addition to what we have as a result of the FICA, Social Security tax. So there is a surplus there. While we would like to protect that surplus as much as possible and not use it, or see it used to pay down the national debt, this is what I think to be a reasonable way to use some of it, if gasoline prices should actually go up to $2 a gallon.

What I am saying is, there is no difference between what we are trying to do and what the Byrd sense-of-the-Senate resolution said. He was trying, I believe, to make sure it did not come out of the highway trust fund. As a matter of fact, this amendment is drafted in such a way it does not.

Let me remind my colleagues how we got to this additional 4.3-cent-a-gallon gas tax. It was added in 1993. In the Senate, it passed on a tie vote with the Vice President, Vice President GORE, breaking that tie. There was a big debate about whether or not we should be increasing the price of gasoline by raising this tax in the first place.

But there was an even more important, very telling point, and that was, in this case the gas tax would not go into the highway trust fund but it was going to go into the General Treasury to be used for any number of purposes by the Federal Government, not to build highways and bridges and to improve urban mass transportation and rail service or anything of that nature, just to go into the big, deep, dark hole of the Federal Treasury.

By the way, I think about $21 billion of gas tax revenue went into the General Treasury. But then in 1997 Congress changed that and said no, this is a gasoline tax and it should go, like other gasoline taxes, into the highway trust fund. So it started going into the highway trust fund.

With regard to what we are trying to do here, the elite Washington position is: Oh, what difference does 4.3 cents a gallon make? We can afford that.

Yes, maybe, if you live and work on Capitol Hill or for the Federal Government. But if you are out there in the real world, and you are a working family, and you are driving 100 miles a day round trip to get to an industrial job, or to get to where your employment is, while it still will not add up to a lot of money, when you are a blue-collar worker, when you are a union worker, working at a shipyard or International Paper mill, a few dollars more a week in the price of gasoline does make a difference. It comes right out of that family budget.

So it is typically what you get here in Washington, the elite attitude: Well, it will not make that much difference. But it is not only the individual who is paying those higher gas taxes, it also affects smaller business men and women. It affects barge operators on our rivers and inland lakes across America. It affects the truck driver who, by the way, if he is an independent driver—he owns his own rig, he drives not a few hundred miles a week, he drives many hundreds of miles a week up and down this country and back and forth across this country—it is hitting him or her very hard because he is paying this extra cost to run those trucks.

Or, if you are in a business that involves a lot of trucks, a lot of heavy equipment, such as road construction or sand and gravel work, you have seen the cost of doing business go up considerably. It is not a few dollars, it is not hundreds of dollars, it is thousands of dollars in cases such as that.

By the way, that comes right out of the bottom line because quite often you are carrying out a contract for which you have already submitted a bid, you have a price agreement, and now you see you are having to take this extra cost right out of getting this job done. So it is having a real impact.

The next argument against reducing the gasoline tax, or having a gas tax holiday, is that: Look, this is temporary. It was just a spike up in the price of gasoline. We did not see it coming. We were caught napping—according to the Secretary of Energy, Secretary Richardson—and the OPEC countries will open the spigot up a little bit and everything will be fine, prices will go back down.

Maybe they will. They have ticked down some in some areas, although I bought gasoline on Saturday and it cost $1.63 a gallon, and that was not the premium; premium was more than that. In some places it is more than that, in some places it is probably less than that. So maybe it will come down and maybe it will stay down, but I think maybe it might, as a matter of fact, tick back up because world demand is going to exceed supply. We are going to be drawing down reserves around the world. So I am concerned it could go back up, in addition to the fact it is still very high.

So this is an issue we should think about. We should be careful how we proceed. But we should have this debate. It is bigger than just gasoline price and the Federal gas tax, although, I repeat, to a lot of working people it has had an impact and it will continue to do so.

There is a broader question involved, and that is: What is our national energy plan? What are we going to do about the price of fuel, alternative fuels, conservation, environmental impact? All these questions are looming.

I do not think we have a true national energy plan for the future. Our dependence on foreign oil has gone

from 45 percent of our needs 10 years ago to around 55 or 56 percent now. I think it is going to go over 60.

What are we going to do? Are we comfortable with that? Are the American people comfortable with that? I do not think so.

In the early seventies, we had the higher prices. We had the gas lines. Nobody liked it. People really got mad. We put forth a lot of effort in Congress to develop a national energy plan and to make ourselves less dependent on oil. It has not worked. It has gone the other way.

We need to ask ourselves what we are going to do about this. What if the OPEC countries and other countries from whom we get our oil decide to cut the spigot down or cut it off? Economically, we would be in a real mess quickly.

We have the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, which is something we did in the aftermath of the last price increase and the long lines. We have SPR filled up so if we have a national emergency, we can use it for about a month.

Is that enough? Should we do more? What are we going to do in the broader sense? I view this current upward spike as another knock on the door, another tap on the shoulder: Hey, America, you have a problem. You are dependent on Libya and Qadhafi; you are dependent on Iraq for about 700,000 barrels of oil a day. Are you comfortable with that?

When I go home, I have people come up to me and say: Aren't these the same people we went to war for a few years ago? And now they are turning the spigot on and off, and the prices go way low or high. Is this what we want? I do not think so. It is very dangerous.

Then one may ask: What is going to be done? What can be done? We do need to look for more oil reserves of our own. We need to give incentives for our men and women, our independents, our wildcats, the small operators, and the big ones, to find more reserves, to make use of these oil wells that are capped right now. There are a few in my own State and certainly other places around the country. We ought to see if there are other places we can open up.

The Senate voted last week against an amendment that would have prevented using the reserves in ANWR in Alaska. I believe we can get at those oil reserves without causing environmental damage, and we should do that.

It is not just about more oil. The President said we should look at alternatives. I agree. What are the alternatives about which we are talking? One is natural gas. When I sit on my front porch in my hometown of Pascagoula, MS, looking off to the south and the east, I see a natural gas well. I believe natural gas is a good alternative. It is clean, and we can make a lot more use of it if we provide some incentives for making greater use of natural gas. We have tremendous reserves of natural gas. So much of it is in the ground; so much has been capped because it has not been worthwhile to get it out. That is an alternative that is environmentally safe, and we have lots of it. That is one option.

Also, in my part of the country we use coal to provide electricity to our people. It is cheap, and it also is clean-burning coal. Our companies have taken actions to deal with the emissions problems. Yet EPA today is putting genuine hard pressure on five companies in America, including Southern Company in our part of the United States, that will drive up the cost and will cause real problems using coal as their fuel supply in the future.

That is one alternative we ought to keep. We ought to find more oil; we ought to make use of natural gas; we ought to continue to find ways to burn coal with clean technology, with modern technology, but also that it is clean coal being burned.

The next thing is nuclear power. Nuclear power is clean. There is nuclear power already in Europe, China, and Japan. Yet we have been trying for years and have spent billions of dollars finding a repository for nuclear waste. The Senate passed a bill, I believe, two or three times, and the President is threatening to veto a very carefully thought out procedure of a repository for nuclear waste.

Sooner or later, if we cannot deal with that problem, our nuclear plants will be faced with the threat of shutting down. If we do not explore for more oil, if we do not make greater use of natural gas, if we put limits and make it difficult to use coal, if, as a matter of fact, we cannot use nuclear power because we cannot come up with a proper way with which to deal with nuclear waste disposal—talk about an environmental problem. Deciding how to deal with nuclear waste is the biggest environmental problem in America today. We have been batting that ball back and forth for 10 years or more, and we still have not resolved it.

If not oil, not natural gas, not coal, and not nuclear, what? Solar and wind? That will help some, but the statistics I have seen show that will provide a very small percentage of our needs. Ethanol—I have supported ethanol. I just do not believe wind and solar, ethanol, and alternative sources beyond the ones I have been talking about will solve this problem.

I hope, as a result of the debate today and tomorrow, we will admit that we do not have a national energy policy, that we are dependent on foreign oil and are going to be for the foreseeable future unless we sit down, think this through, and come up with some ideas on how to proceed.

I have urged the committees of jurisdiction—the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, the Foreign Relations Committee, and other committees—to have joint hearings or have hearings and ask questions about these long-term problems of how we are going to deal with these issues. I hope after we have this debate and votes tomorrow, we will have a broader, general energy package that will begin to address these long-term problems. I am concerned about it. I hope the Senate will step up to this issue and make a difference beyond what we have done in the past.

The second issue on which the Senate will be working this week is the marriage penalty tax. I believe most Americans have some idea by now of what it is. There have been different proposals on how to deal with it. Some of the arguments are: Yes, but if you are married, you get certain bonuses. I do not think that applies to what we are trying to deal with here.

The fact of the matter is, if you are a young couple or, as we realized last week, an older couple—couples married 25 years get hit with a marriage penalty tax, but for young couples it is particularly startling.

I found that to be the case with my own family. Our daughter got married last May. She has been hearing talk about the marriage penalty tax, so she decided to find out what that would mean for her. She and her husband both work. Together, they have a pretty good income, although they are certainly not wealthy, but they are in that middle bracket. She figured it would cost them about $500 more this year in taxes because they got married.

By the way, it is going to escalate over the next few years to about $1,400 a year. This is just basically wrong. We should encourage people to get married. We should not in any way discourage them by saying: Oh, by the way, if you do get married, you will pay more in taxes.

Some people will complain the package that came out of the Finance Committee is too big; that, as a matter of fact, not only did we deal with the low-income people by increasing what was in the House bill for the so-called earned-income tax credit, EITC, we also said we will double the 15-percent bracket and the 28-percent bracket because we do think if a marriage penalty tax is wrong, it should be wrong for everybody. It should not be wrong just for the entry-level, lower income people; it ought to be also unfair for the upper lower income bracket and the middle-income bracket; as a matter of fact, right across the board.

But we at least broadened its application to the middle bracket to make sure, if you have a young couple who are both working—whether they are in blue-color jobs or whether they are in entry-level professional jobs—they should have this penalty eliminated.

Senator MOYNIHAN of New York, and others, have an alternative proposal. I think it is worth considering. In fact, if we could afford it, I would like to have what we are doing and what Senator MOYNIHAN is proposing in terms of—I guess it is the income splitting option. But I think we ought to have that offered and debated.

I think we can come up with a way that we can have a full debate where

there could be amendments with regard to the marriage penalty legislation. I hope we can reach an agreement on how that would come up. Then on Wednesday and Thursday, we would debate the alternatives and we would have a vote. But it is long overdue.

I hope we can do as we did on the Social Security earnings limitation. We passed it unanimously in the Senate. A lot of people said: Oh, gee, that was so easy. Why didn't you do it before? We have been talking about it for 20 years. We couldn't get it done.

They said it cost too much or that senior citizens didn't really need it or it was a part of a package. But for some reason or another—for years and years—it did not happen. Finally, we isolated it, passed it clean, and passed it overwhelmingly.

The President had a big signing ceremony last week saying: Finally, we have eliminated the Social Security earnings test. Good. The main thing is our seniors who are between 65 and 69, who want to continue working without being penalized in their Social Security benefits, are going to have that opportunity.

But I think the same is true here. It is clear now we have isolated it. The marriage penalty tax is not connected to incentives for people to adopt children. It is not connected to the death tax or the estate tax. It is not connected to anything else. We are just going to have a debate about the marriage penalty tax. Senator HUTCHISON of Texas and Senator ASHCROFT of Missouri, and a number of other Senators on both sides, are going to say: We ought to do this. This is the way to do it.

But in the end, this is the point: We are going to see this week if the Senate is for eliminating the marriage penalty tax or not.

The guy in the store where I was shopping is going to have a list of the names of those who vote against it. I hope the Senate will step up to this and that we will begin the process of totally eliminating the marriage penalty tax.

Then, finally, on the budget resolution, I hope we can get a final agreement on the conference report and that we will pass it before the end of the week so we can go forward with our appropriations bills. That is a very important part of what we need to do this year; that is, pass the 13 appropriations bills for Agriculture, for defense, for the Interior, and for all the various Agencies and Departments of the Government, and more importantly for the American people.

We ought to do it earlier than usual. There is no reason why we should wait until June or July to do the appropriations bills. Let's get started in May. Let's move them earlier. That is where we can include things that we think should be done.

For instance, on the foreign relations bill, I think we should provide aid for Colombia to fight the narcoguerrillas and try to get control of that drug war there. I think we ought to do it, and do it on the foreign relations bill.

With regard to Kosovo and defense, the first bill that comes along, whether it is MilCon—military construction—or the defense bill, I hope we will add that additional funding. This budget resolution conference report will get all of that started.

Then I think important, once again, is, we should give credit to the Budget Committee and to what we are doing in the Congress as a result of this budget resolution. No. 1, for the third year in a row, we have the ability to have a balanced budget—3 years running now. Before that, we had not had one since 1969. Yet this year we have the ability to do that for a third time, and to protect every cent of the Social Security trust fund income. Every cent that comes in from FICA taxes will be preserved and set aside and will not be spent on other Federal Government spending programs.

I do not know exactly what that amount would be for the coming year, but it would be significant. I think maybe the figure is approximately $160 billion, or something close to that. But over a 10-year period, it will be $1 trillion. By not spending it, that is good for the program, it is good for technology, and we can pay down the national debt.

Over a 3-year period now, I understand we may have reduced the national debt by somewhere more than $300 billion. A lot of people never thought they would see the day come when we would actually begin to pay down the national debt.

If we stay on the path we are on, if we stay on the trajectory we now see with technology—and a lot has to happen; we have to have good fiscal responsibility, monetary policy, stable energy prices, right across the board—but if those things will stay within the ranges we are looking for, we could reduce completely the national debt by the year 2013 or 2015. That has not been done since Andrew Jackson was President of the United States. That is really an amazing thing.

If we can continue to keep in place policies by congressional actions, and by monetary policy, and by the administration, and see economic growth year after year of around 4.5 percent—and in recent years it has been more than that; but just 4.5 percent—it would have a tremendous impact on the economy and the explosion of revenue coming into the Social Security trust fund.

When we come to the point, over the next 2 or 3 years, where we are going to have fundamental reform of Social Security, to make sure it is preserved, protected, and, as a matter of fact, it is there for our children and our grandchildren in a way that will be meaningful to them, just that growth in the economy of 4.5 percent will give us the options we need to have a very strong program that will go not just into the year 2040 but go throughout this century.

I think these are very important issues. This is going to be an interesting week to have debate. When we complete that budget resolution, it will be a very positive action and will set the course for not only this year but well into the rest of this decade.

Mr. President, I have been looking forward to this opportunity to have this debate and have these votes this week. I look forward to that process as we go forward.

Thank you, Mr. President. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to restore the remaining, I believe, 15 minutes of the hour that was reserved on the Democratic side.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Without objection, it is so ordered.

—

GAS PRICES

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President I enjoyed listening to the majority leader. I have always worked well with him, although we have different perspectives and a different philosophy and opinion on some issues. I have worked with him both in the House of Representatives and here in the Senate. When I listen to him I am always reminded why I have always liked him personally. He is a good person. I appreciate his public service.

There are some things on the agenda, however, that we might not agree about. I want to comment about a couple of those issues, especially with respect to an agenda item this week dealing with the repeal of the 4.3-cent-a-gallon gas tax, which is set for a cloture vote tomorrow afternoon here in the Senate Chamber.

My expectation is that the cloture vote will fail. I am not certain of that, but that is my expectation. Just hearing some of the comments and some of the statements that have been made previously, I expect that cloture vote will fail, and I think justifiably so.

Let me describe why.

I think the price of fuel in this country is a pretty tough pill for the American people to swallow. What has happened is the price of gasoline has spiked up. It is not because the free market has caused that. It is because we have a cartel called the OPEC countries that are limiting production and increasing the international price for their product.

That is not the free market. That is monopoly pricing. They have the strength and, I guess, the opportunity to do that. What they have done is, of course, impose a significant new charge on American families, on family farmers, producers, manufacturers, drivers, and others.

There was no vote on that. That was something the OPEC countries did. We

didn't have a chance to discuss that or vote on it in the Congress.

The question I ask with respect to the repeal of the 4.3-cent gas tax—which is, after all, rather small in the scheme of what has happened to the price of gasoline—is who would get the benefit of that? Is there a guarantee of any kind that the American people would actually get the benefit of the gas tax reduction? The gasoline tax is not imposed at the pump. The gasoline tax is imposed up the line. There is no guarantee at all that if the Congress would repeal the 4.3-cent gasoline tax, that that savings wouldn't simply be blended into the profits of the large oil companies. There is no guarantee that the American driver is going to pull up to a gas pump and find that gasoline prices are 4.3 cents a gallon less.

The other question is, What is going to happen to make sure we continue the building of the transportation infrastructure, roads and bridges, the programs we have already approved in the highway program that are done with this money? I am told by some: This money will be made up from the general fund. Where from the general fund? Where do we get that money? How do we know that will be the case?

Someone once said you should never buy anything from somebody who is out of breath. There is a kind of breathless quality about bringing this bill to the floor of the Senate to repeal the 4.3-cent-a-gallon gas tax.

One of the reasons we heard Members stand up last week and ask some very tough questions about this is, most of them understand, this is kind of an immediate, quick reaction that hasn't been thought through very well. It will not necessarily provide any relief to drivers. There is no guarantee this 4.3-cent-a-gallon reduction is going to show up at the pumps.

Secondly, where is the money? Where are we going to make up the money? Which roads aren't we going to fix or which bridges are not going to be repaired? Those are questions that need answering this week. Because they cannot be answered, I think the cloture vote will fail.

I think this is a pretty good discussion we are having with respect to energy policy. The majority leader indicated this country doesn't have much of an energy policy. I don't quarrel with that. We haven't had much under any administration, as a matter of fact. We are far too dependent on foreign sources of energy. There is no question about that. But in many ways this is a helpful discussion because we have had the discussion in recent years about the globalization of our economy. How can one stand in the way of the global economy? We are told this economy is a global economy. Understand it, they say.

Well, where are people going to produce energy in this world? In a global economy, they will produce energy where it is least expensive to produce. You can bring up oil under the sands in the Persian Gulf for a fraction of the cost of bringing up oil in the United States. That is the global economy, I guess. That is a decision the global economy helps make.

The majority leader asked the question—I think a very important question—do we have a national policy with respect to energy and our desire to be somewhat independent of foreign sources? That is a good question not just for oil. It is a good question for steel and for a whole series of things we know are important to the American economy.

We have been told until this time there is nothing that is more important than globalization of our economy; if steel moves and is produced elsewhere, so be it. Do the people who say that feel the same way about oil? Because that is where we are. The oil we consume is produced elsewhere. We now discover that when a cartel manipulates artificially the price of oil by restricting supply, Americans get overcharged. That is part of a monopoly in the global economy that we do not control.

We need to do a lot of things. This administration is proposing something I hope the majority leader and others will support in the area of domestic renewable energy. They are proposing significant new initiatives in wind energy, which I think make a lot of sense. We have new technology on wind-generation devices that is remarkable. If we put some in this Chamber on the right days, we could electrify New York.

In my State, North Dakota, I grew up walking outdoors in the morning with the wind and the breeze. If you take a map and evaluate what is the Saudi Arabia of wind energy, it is North Dakota, and a lot of other northern border States are right behind. Some will say, listening to me speak, they would have known we ranked high on wind energy. But seriously, we have an opportunity, with new technology, to capture wind energy in many parts of this country and extend our energy supply.

The same is true with biomass. The same is true with geothermal, and natural gas, which the majority leader suggested. Absolutely, we have wonderful new discoveries in natural gas and deep well finds. We are doing a lot of that.

We do need to pay attention to the development of oil and the development of coal, which are important in this country. We also need to get behind the proposals coming from the Department of Energy and this President's budget that call for the development of renewable energy resources and what is called green power—environmentally friendly sources of power. I mentioned one: wind energy. We need to fully fund these initiatives.

I hope no one comes to the floor later and says, ''We really care about our energy supply,'' if before that time they voted against these initiatives to extend our energy supply by investing in renewable energy sources. We need to do that.

This, in many ways, is a wonderful discussion. What does the global economy mean? Does it mean we don't have to worry about dependence on anything? We are now discovering it means we have to worry about dependence with respect to oil. What about steel? What about a range of other economic activities without which a country such as ours will not long remain a world economic power? This is a great discussion to have. It is right on point and right on time.

Yes, it is about oil and gas, but it is about much more than that. When we have this vote on cloture on the 4.3-cent gasoline tax repeal, I hope it will be preceded by a rather lengthy discussion of a whole range of these issues. I appreciate the majority leader raising them today.

I don't intend to support cloture. As I said, there is kind of a breathless quality of coming to the floor with a 4.3-cent gas tax repeal that consumers will probably never see, even if we take the 4.3 cents off. I expect it is going into other pockets long before it gets to the consumer. If it gets done, dye the dollars green and then look around for green pockets someplace. You won't find green at the gas pumps. You will find it somewhere upstream. Some bigger enterprise will pocket that money.

—

MARRIAGE TAX PENALTY

Mr. DORGAN. There is no disagreement in the Senate about the marriage tax penalty, that it ought not exist. We should change it. There are several different proposals to change it. We ought to come together with respect to one of those proposals.

I will describe one approach to address the marriage tax penalty. I am going to be introducing a piece of legislation at some point in the days ahead with my colleagues, Senator JUDD GREGG, a Republican, and Senator DICK DURBIN, a Democrat, and perhaps others, that would dramatically change the income tax system in this country. This approach would eliminate for a large number of Americans the marriage tax penalty. I have been working on this a couple of years and appreciate the work of Senator GREGG and others.

Over 30 countries that have an income tax system allow people to comply with their income tax without having to file a tax return. How do they do it? They just manipulate their W–4 that is filed with the employer to provide a little more information, and their actual withholding becomes their exact tax liability—no questions. That is your liability, no return filed, no searching for records, no long line at the post office on April 15.

Our country can do that. Our country can do it in a way that will allow 70 million Americans to comply with their income tax responsibilities on April 15 without having to file an income tax return. How do we do it? You

take the W–4 form when you sign in with your employer and you say: I have four children. I own a home—check that box. Check about three or four boxes. From that, you provide opportunities for the deduction for, on average, a mortgage interest deduction, and a couple of other things. A table is then provided by the Internal Revenue Service that sets forth the exact amount of taxes that the employer will withhold and send the IRS, and that is the end of the transaction. You are not going to be hassled or forced to search for receipts; you are not going to wait in a long line at the post office to get your income tax return postmarked by April 15.

Now, in doing that, this plan will also eliminate the marriage tax penalty. But the plan only applies to people making $50,000 a year or less in wages, if they are single, or $100,000 a year or less, if they are married filing jointly. If they have less than $2,500 in other income such as interest, dividends or capital gains if they are single, or $5,000 or less in such other income if they are married and filed jointly, they are eligible to check the box that says, yes, I want to use the Fair and Simple Shortcut Tax plan, the FASST plan, which means I don't have to file a tax return. My withholding will be adjusted at my place of work, and the withholding will be sent to the IRS and there is no tax return.

Simple, yes. It is the only plan I know of that discusses simplicity. Everybody who talks about simplifying the tax program, in most cases, ends up proposing things that will make it horribly complicated. This will simplify it—but not for everybody.

Some people have unusual income characteristics, with four different jobs, and investments, and capital gains of $20,000 or $40,000 a year. It won't work for them. For the majority of the American people whose only income is their wage at work and they have a de minimis amount of other income in capital gains or interest—$5,000 a year if they are married and filing jointly—all that other income will be tax free. So that is the incentive for savings and investment; that is the right incentive. All of the wage income—after several major deductions—up to $50,000 single and $100,000 married filing jointly—will be taxed at the single lowest rate. This plan extends the bottom rate and provides a de minimis amount of income tax free and you don't have to file a tax return anymore.

That makes a lot of sense to me and a fellow named Bill Gale at the Brookings Institution, who has done a lot of work on this issue of return-free filing. We are going to introduce legislation, which has been underway for a year and a half, I hope within the next week. As I indicated, Senator JUDD GREGG of New Hampshire has agreed to cosponsor, and Senator DURBIN and, I hope, others, so we can begin discussing real simplification for tens of millions of Americans who always do the right thing. They always file a tax return, they always fill it out correctly, and they believe as an American it is their responsibility because we do things, as a country, to provide for a common defense, to build roads and schools, and to provide for a whole series of things. They understand their obligation to pay for the cost of a civilized society, to pay for the cost of democracy. But they ought to be able to do it in a way that is far simpler than the current system, and that is what we intend to accomplish with this legislation.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. COLLINS). Under the previous order, the Senator from Alaska is recognized.

—

THE FEDERAL FUELS TAX HOLIDAY OF THE YEAR 2000

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Madam President, I am very pleased today to join with the majority leader, Senator LOTT, Senator CRAIG, Senator KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON, and a number of Senators on a very important piece of legislation that is before this body, entitled ''The Federal Fuels Tax Holiday of the Year 2000.''

This legislation is necessary because it will put a brake on the ever-rising gasoline prices that American families face every day. Unlike the airlines, the American family can't pass on the increased price in gasoline. Recently, the truckers came to Washington to express their concerns about the gas tax.

Energy and the cost of energy affects all of us in our lives in varying ways. So the idea of putting the brake on the ever-increasing gasoline prices that American families pay each day is very important.

It is my hope that we invoke cloture tomorrow to ensure that the American motorist and workers get a break.

Our legislation provides a tax holiday for all Americans, from the gas tax, that Democrats, with Vice President GORE casting the deciding vote, adopted in 1993. That 30 percent gas tax hike was the centerpiece of one of the largest tax increases in American history and we believe with gas prices approaching $2 a gallon in some parts of the country, the American motorist should not have to continue paying the Gore tax.

I don't know if all my colleagues on the other side would agree with that nomenclature, but I think it is appropriate since the Vice President broke the tie which added a 30-percent gas hike.

In addition to temporarily ending the Clinton/Gore gas tax, our legislation guarantees that if the failed Clinton/Gore energy policies result in the price of gasoline rising over $2 a gallon, all fuel taxes will be lifted until the end of the year.

That means the American motorist will be relieved of the 18.4-cent-per-gallon gas tax. The trucking industry will not have to pay the 24.4-cent-per-gallon diesel tax. Barge operators will be relieved of the 4.4-cent-per-gallon inland waterway tax, and commercial and noncommercial aircraft operators will be relieved of the aviation tax.

It is certainly my hope that average gasoline prices do not rise above $2. But it is clear to me that $2 gasoline is well within the probability of becoming a reality because despite the administration's claims of victory about last week's OPEC meeting, Americans should not expect much, if any, of a price decline at the gas pump. Why? Let's look at it.

OPEC's decision to increase production by 1.7 million barrels per day is not, in my opinion, even a hollow victory for the Administration's, which lobbied for a minimum increase of 2.5 million barrels. The reality is that there isn't a real 1.7-million-barrel increase by OPEC.

Why do I say that? Let's look at the arithmetic.

OPEC agreed last year to 23 million barrels as their quota of production. They cheated by an additional 1.2 barrels, moving it up to 24.2. As a consequence, the difference between 1.2 and what they said we got as an increase of 1.7 is only 500,000 barrels of real increase. OPEC makes up 15.8 percent of American imports. As a result, we will be lucky to see another 78,000 barrels of oil in our market.

Will 78,000 barrels make a dent in gasoline prices? Not likely. Consider that motorists in the Washington, D.C. metropolitan area use more than 121,000 barrels of oil in a single day.

With no relief in sight for the American motorist, we believe that the Gore fuel tax should be temporarily lifted. That would save American motorists about 4.4 barrels over the next 8 months.

If gasoline goes above $2, our bill suspends all fuel taxes resulting in a $19 billion saving to American motorists, truckers, barge operators, and airlines at the same time that fuel prices are near an all-time high. I believe the Government should suspend those taxes and ease the financial burden OPEC has placed on the American motorist and the industries that rely on fuel to move goods throughout this country.

I know some are concerned, if we suspend these taxes, that the highway trust fund, which finances roads, bridges, and mass transit, could be in danger. Again, I would like to put that fear to rest.

Our legislation ensures that the Highway Trust Fund will not lose a single penny during this tax holiday. We require that all monies that would have gone into the fund had the taxes not been suspended be replaced by other Federal revenue. That could come from the on-budget surplus, as I have indicated, or from what I would like to see, which is a reduction of wasteful Federal spending.

I can assure the American motorist that highway construction projects

this year and next year will be unaffected by the tax holiday that we are proposing. And when the trust fund is fully restored, all projects scheduled for beyond 2002 will be completed.

Some of the colleagues believe it is a mistake to establish a precedent wherein general revenues are used to finance highway construction. Ordinarily, I might agree with them, but not in this case.

All of my colleagues should remember that when the Clinton/Gore 4.3-cent gasoline tax was adopted in 1993, not a single penny of that tax was dedicated to highway or bridge construction. All the money was earmarked for Federal spending.

As I stated earlier, it was not until the Republicans adopted the 1997 highway bill that we shifted the 4.3-cent-per-gallon tax back to the highway trust fund.

Further, as I have indicated, Americans have paid $42 billion since the Gore tax went into effect. Of that $42 billion, $28 billion was spent not on highways but on general government and went into the general fund.

Let me repeat that. Of the $42 billion Americans paid under the GORE tax, $28 billion was spent not on highways but on general government.

I believe under these circumstances that it is perfectly reasonable for general revenues to be used to repay the trust fund money that should have been spent on highways.

The question before the Senate today is very simple. Do Senators want to give American motorists a break at the gas pump when gas prices are at near record highs?

I think it is important for everybody to understand that we are the elected representatives of the people. What is their choice? Do the people want to have relief from the gas tax? Is that their priority?

We have polling information that I will submit for the RECORD that indicates overwhelming support for relief at the gas pump. I think the polling clearly shows that the American public, when offered an opportunity to reduce taxes, would much rather take it and run.

A Gallup Poll released last week found that although Americans think high prices are only temporary, they believe several things should be done to reduce taxes.

Eighty percent of the American people—I hope my colleagues and staff are listening and will take notes—favor lowering gas taxes. Seventy-four percent—nearly three out of every four Americans—think that a temporary reduction of the gas tax is a worthy solution. That is three out of four.

Think about that. Seventy-four percent of Americans think a temporary reduction in the gas tax is a worthy solution.

Think about where we are and what the administration is telling us.

First of all, since I have been speaking about policies of the administration and the position of our Vice President, I want to refer to an article that appeared on October 23, 1999, in the State Times Morning Advocate at Baton Rouge, LA. The Vice President says he would be more antidrilling than other Presidents. More anti-drilling? Let me read the quote.

''I will take the most sweeping steps in our history to protect our oceans and coastal waters from offshore oil drilling,'' he said in a press release. ''I will make sure that there will be no new oil leasing off the Keys of California and Florida, and then I will go much further. I will do everything in my power to make sure that there is no new drilling off these sensitive areas, even in areas leased by previous administrations.''

He would cancel contracts and leases out there that were made by previous administrations.

(Mr. CRAIG assumed the Chair.)

Mr. MURKOWSKI. He further states: Existing leases and what oil and natural gas companies could do with them already are the objects of long-running legal disputes.

He says he would cancel leases in areas already leased by previous administrations.

These are existing leases; where is the sanctity of a contractual commitment? I believe if Florida and California don't want OCS activities off their coast, that is fine; that should prevail if that is what people want. In Louisiana, Texas, Mississippi, Alabama, and my State of Alaska, where we produce roughly 22 percent of the total crude oil produced in the United States, these States should go ahead because they want this. They recognize the alternative is not very pleasant—and that is to import more oil.

I leave Members with the very ambiguous reference this administration has given, suggesting things will get better. There is a certain psychology in reassuring citizens that the price will come down. However, in reality, the consumption is up, production is down, we are 56-percent dependent on imports, and the forecast is we will be 65 percent in the year 2015 or thereabouts. These are hardly reassuring notes, taken verbatim from this administration, to suggest things will get better.

In conclusion, from the CBS ''Early Show'' on March 29, 2000, from Secretary Richards, the Secretary was being questioned on his view of whether we could likely see some relief. He states as follows: This means for the American consumer, gasoline prices will gradually and steadily decline, according to the Energy Information Administration and my Department, by as much as 11 cents by the end of September or the end of summer.

That is quite a while. What do we do in the meantime?

Then he says: The bottom line is, I am just quoting our investigators and our official people who are saying 11 cents by the end of summer, possibly 15, 16 cents by the end of the year.

That is an indefinite forecast, in my opinion.

I appeal to the Chair to recognize that we can't believe the Secretary that the price is coming down. Every Member should support this legislation because it will keep the pressure on the administration to ensure it stays below $2 and this tax holiday won't be a reality. It will give the American consumer a safety net. Think about that.

The administration says: Don't worry, prices are on the decline. OK, if prices are on the decline—which I don't believe they are in the short term or the long term, but we will see who is right or wrong—we go ahead and pass the elimination of the 18.4-cent-gallon Federal tax, suspend it for the balance of the year, if the price goes to $2 a gallon for regular. That is a balance that puts the administration on notice to practice what they preach. If they preach the prices are coming down, this will never happen anyway. We are giving the American consumer a safety net. That safety net is real and it says if the price goes up to $2 the 18.4 comes off. I think that is a fair balance.

I will show this chart one more time. I find it outrageous. Who do we look to for imports? We look to Saddam Hussein and Iraq: Last year 300,000; now it is 700,000 barrels a day.

Where does the money go? It is going to Saddam Hussein. We fought a war over there—remember—in 1991. We lost the lives of 147 U.S. men and women. We fought a war to keep Saddam out of Kuwait. What did Saddam do when he lost the war?

Talk about environmental degradation. This is a picture of Kuwait with the oil fields on fire. We see the fires in the background. Here is an American with the firefighters helping put that fire out. That is the kind of guy we are dealing with to depend on imports. We had 23 soldiers taken prisoner over there. It has cost the American taxpayer $10 billion since the war in 1991 to keep Saddam Hussein fenced in enforcing the no-fly zones. Within the last week, we did two bombing runs in Iraq because he was in violation of the no-fly zone, and we had antiaircraft action.

Isn't it incredible? We talk about foreign policy or energy policy of this administration, and we are feeding Saddam Hussein millions and millions of dollars so he can take that cash-flow and pay his Republican Guards who keep him alive. He doesn't funnel that into his economic system for the benefit of his people. He is in cahoots with the North Koreans, developing missile technology and our bombing airplanes are carrying his fuel. How inconsistent, how ironic. Talk about a full circle. We are importing 700,000 barrels a day, we are bombing him, we are using his oil that we refine to fill up our airplanes.

I may be reaching a little bit, but this is reality. We are importing 700,000 barrels a day.

It is my understanding this matter will come up tomorrow and we will

have a number of Senators active in the debate on the merits of the basic presentation.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURKOWSKI). Without objection, it is so ordered.

—

ENERGY CRISIS

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, for the last number of minutes I have listened with great interest to the comments of my good friend from Alaska describing the energy crisis in which our Nation now finds itself. I use the word ''crisis'' with some reservation because my guess is most Americans don't think we are in a crisis. They have good jobs, they probably got raises this year, they feel their jobs are secure, they have plenty of spendable income, and while they may be paying 30 or 40 cents or even 50 cents a gallon more for gas this year than last year, at least the gas is still there and the pump does not say ''no fuel available,'' they don't sense a crisis.

I traveled home to my State of Idaho this weekend. I drove in out to Dulles Airport. I got on a Boeing 777 that burns tens of thousands of gallons of fuel in the course of a day and I paid $70 or $80 more for each one of my tickets because of the cost of jet fuel. As I traveled across the country I found the airports full, of Americans and foreign travelers. Yet no sense of urgency or crisis did they appear to feel.

When I got home to my home State of Idaho and began to travel across the northern end of the State, I saw that spring is breaking out very quickly in the marvelous wheat belt of northern Idaho that spreads into Washington and Oregon over to Pendleton and Wala Wala. It is a highly productive area that oftentimes yields 100 to 110 bushels of wheat per acre annually without benefit of irrigation.

What was out on those rolling wheat fields this weekend? Large 4-wheel-drive tractors, oftentimes pulling 40- and 50-foot spreads of harrows and springtooths, beginning to till the soil, all of them with a 250- or 400-horse diesel engine under the hood of that tractor, burning hundreds of gallons of diesel fuel each day.

This year those farmers will be paying another 50 or 60 cents a gallon for that fuel. Yet this is just the beginning of the growing season in our Nation. We are now tilling and planting. We will spend the summer cultivating and spraying to protect our crops from weeds and insects. Then in the fall, huge combines will roll out on the fields, once again driven by diesel fuel—a source of energy that has historically been so abundant in our country and so relatively inexpensive.

Today, a river conservation group announced that some rivers in our country are endangered because they have been dammed. In the past America has placed large dams across some rivers and put large turbines in the dams to generate electricity. In a relatively cavalier way, this group said that my river, my Snake River of Idaho, is the most endangered. Why? Because of dams. They want the dams removed. Yet those dams produce hundreds of thousands of kilowatts a year to light the cities of Portland and Seattle, Boise and many other cities and towns. And somehow, all in the name of the environment, they cavalierly suggest we start taking down relatively modern structures that produce large amounts of inexpensive electricity without burning fossil fuels.

The reason I draw these verbal pictures today is that no one senses a crisis. This administration, for the last 8 years, has not proposed a single policy initiative that would produce 1 gallon more domestic crude oil for our Nation. In fact, the Clinton/Gore administration has done quite the opposite. They, through punitive environmental policies, have suggested continually that we close more and more federal land to any further oil and gas exploration and production. They have even proposed to take down some of the hydro dams I have talked about, once again all in the name of the environment.

Now, the Clinton/Gore administration has an energy policy of sorts. They have talked a lot about solar and biomass which is not a bad idea as long as we don't kid ourselves into believing they will solve all of our problems. They have also talked about developing more powerful wind energy technology to produce more power—not a bad idea either.

But the myth of that kind of technology is that to replace the dams on the lower Snake River with photovoltaic cells or windmills, the entire State of Idaho would have to be covered with solar cells just to offset the difference. My guess is there would be a Vice President who would reject such an idea because the result would be unsightly. It would destroy the vistas that are so beautiful in my State right now. It would be uncomely to the American environmental eye. And I would agree with him.

But I would not agree with this Vice President, when he stands and says that he will not tolerate drilling offshore California, offshore Florida, offshore our East coast, or in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. The Clinton/Gore administration has an energy policy of sorts and the Vice President's desire to take down dams, prevent new oil and gas exploration, and instead cover my State of Idaho, or Arizona, or California, with solar cells and wind farms is its hallmark.

The reason I mention these frustrations I have, and I think some Americans share, is that for a good long while now we have not had a consistent energy policy for our country that is a combination of all these things: Research for new technology, conservation so we use less and gain more from it, while at the same time producing as much of our own fossil fuel resources as possible.

In just a decade or so, we have increased our electrical generation by some 200 percent by the use of coal, but we have reduced the sulfur oxide emissions from coal during that same time by over 20 percent. Through technology, we are using more fossil fuels more efficiently and more cleanly and more of our electricity is generated with such fuels. That is the way you do it. You do not take those kinds of sources off line; you say those are the sources that can generate the abundance of power that drives our industries and heats and cools our homes.

So let's be wiser and smarter with our technology than just saying to a certain political interest, I am with you, we will just take that all out of production and off line, because it does not fit somebody's environmental agenda.

Among all the things the rivers conservation group said today, about taking dams out on the Snake River, there is something they did not say. They did not say the removal of those dams would destroy the barge traffic on the Snake-Columbia River system. All of the grain and timber and paper and coal that now travels the river in barges would have to move in 18-wheel trucks over the highways of the Pacific Northwest. Tens of thousands more trucks would have to be employed to haul the freight and replace the slack water transportation system that would be destroyed were the dams removed.

Is that an environmentally sound thing to do, to employ thousands and thousands more trucks, burning hundreds of gallons of diesel fuel a day? I think not. But, of course, that is not a headline. That does not make the kind of press they thought they could make by their release today, all in the name of the environment, all in the name of saving fish.

We will probably debate, on this floor in the next decade, the removal of dams, whether in my State or somewhere else, as it relates to energy policy and protection of the environment and valuable fish. I hope at that time the American people can be given all the facts. I think, when given all the facts and when allowed to view all the alternatives of technology and retrofitting dams, Americans will understand that abundant, inexpensive hydro power energy, can be had along with a clean environment and strong salmon runs.

They will also understand the extent to which farmers and ranchers need abundant, relatively inexpensive supplies of energy to produce the food and fiber our Nation needs. Those commodities were being planted in the soils of north Idaho this weekend by the large

4-wheel-drive diesel tractors pulling 50-foot spreads of equipment I talked about at the beginning of my statement. They had to use energy to accomplish it.

I will also discuss legislation, with which we will deal in the near future, to alleviate some of the concerns about energy policy in the short term and the cost to the consumer while Congress struggles to develop a long-term policy to increase energy production in our country.

I do support legislation that will give us a temporary Federal tax holiday from energy taxes of the kind thrust upon this country by the Clinton-Gore administration several years ago when they argued it was necessary to tax fuel consumption to reduce the deficit structure and the debt structure of our country.

I did not support the tax then, and several years later I was one of those who changed the tax from going into the general fund to reduce the deficit to going into the trust funds of transportation, because up until this President came to town, we had never taxed the American people at the gas pump to fund the general fund expenditures of our Government. We had taxed them only to put it in the transportation trust funds that build the roads, bridges, and infrastructure all of us expect and enjoy and the infrastructure on which our economy runs—goods and services that traffic across America on a daily basis.

One way to give some short-term relief to the American consumer, as these energy prices have gone up, is to reduce for a short term the 4.3-cent-a-gallon gas tax; take it off the pump; take it away from the consumer and allow that tax to stay in the consumer's pocket. The reason is, what does it mean with the current runup in fuel prices? Matt Lauer said the other day on the ''Today'' show: The energy crisis may be over in the short term. Meaning the Secretary had been to the Middle East, he begged and cajoled the producers in the Middle East to turn the valve on a little bit. Then as the spokesperson for energy policy in this country, the Secretary announced to the American people that gas prices were going to come down some maybe. The ''some maybe'' is that maybe they will come down a little bit, but they are still going to be 40 to 50 cents a gallon higher than they were a year ago. There is some belief in the marketplace, depending on whom you study and whom you believe and who has the right information, that the supply the OPEC nations promised may not be as large as promised and, therefore, by late summer we could see an average of $2 prices across this country.

We are going to have to wait and watch for that one. None of us know what the price of gas will be in July or August, but it is going to be a lot higher than it was a year ago. It will, in many ways, determine how the American consumer utilizes his or her free time this year as they think about a vacation, whether it is in the family car, the van, or the SUV, or whether it is booking airline tickets to travel across this country. In all instances, the cost of that leisure time Americans so enjoy will be substantially more expensive than it was a year ago.

I am talking about leisure time. I am not talking about the weekly commute, the daily commute. I am not talking about the goods and services that traffic on America's trucks across our Nation on a daily basis or the food we buy at the local supermarket, all having been transported by trucks that are paying substantially more for fuel.

How much more are truckers now paying and how much will they have to pass through to the consumer as these prices go up?

Diesel fuel costs exceeded $2.10 a gallon in the Northeast this spring. That is a doubling of cost in about a year. The average nationwide was about $1.50 a gallon. To the driver of an 18-wheeler freight truck that traffics America's highways hauling our goods and services, it will mean an additional $150 to $200 to fill his or her tank on a daily basis or a 24-hour transportation period. If they are to stay alive as a business, they have to pass that cost directly through to the consumer: a little here on food prices; a little there on the cost of a piece of carpet; a little somewhere else on any of the goods and services that ultimately the American consumer buys.

Of course, that is the same cost the American farmer is experiencing when he or she cannot pass it on, because they cannot set the price of the commodity they will be selling this fall by an extra 10 cents or 15 cents a hundredweight to offset the cost of the diesel fuel and all of the petrochemicals they will use this year in the production of America's food sources.

To the consumer—that is you and me—who is commuting to work or considering a family vacation, another 60, 70, or 80 cents a gallon could well mean another $10.50 a tankful every time we pull into the service station. Did they put that in the family budget in January? Did they really plan to pay $300 or $400 more this year, including their trips and all of their other expenses? I do not think so. I do not think anyone considered that. Yet that is what one ought to have considered if they have a true and honest budget.

That is why, when recently polled, the American people are beginning to figure out that maybe a 4.3-cent-a-gallon tax reduction for the short term is a good idea to offset at least some of these new costs in energy. Eighty percent of them said the Congress of the United States ought to reduce that tax, at least for the short term, to help compensate for this runup in energy prices we have seen.

I am talking about short-term policy. It does not produce a gallon more of domestic crude oil. It does not in any way provide the reliable sources our country has grown to expect over time in a nation that has experienced relatively inexpensive energy.

Many of our conservation and environmental friends are saying we ought to be paying as much as Europe pays or as much as the rest of the world pays. That is another $1, $2 a gallon, in some instances, and, therefore, we would rely less upon our vehicles and change our lifestyles. Some day we might have to do that, but all of those costs would have to be spread across an economy, and the general cost of living in this country will go up dramatically.

Mr. President, you and I, as consumers in this economy, will have to make choices about how we spend our disposable income and how we spend our income for goods and services. We will have to live a different lifestyle than the one we currently have, if our attitude is only to drive up the cost of energy instead of finding conservation sources and alternative sources and maintaining at least a substantial level of production of crude oil from our own domestic sources.

Last week, this Senate, by 1 vote, recognized the importance of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge as a potential producer of 16 billion barrels of crude oil, production that will be done in a fragile area of our country but can be done in an environmentally sound way based on new technologies.

We listen to a Department of Energy that says energy dependence on foreign sources will go up to 65 percent by the year 2010 if we continue the same policy, so says Secretary of Energy Bill Richardson. What he did not say is that to be 65-percent dependent upon foreign sources will require an estimated 12,000 more huge oil tanker dockings each year in the United States. Will that be done safely? In most instances, it will. Will there be a risk with thousands and thousands of more of these supertankers on our open oceans? Will there be some kind of environmental problem? You bet there will. In fact, that is the weak link in the whole process. We have a Vice President who says no drilling offshore because of environmental fragility, and yet by saying that, he is advocating thousands of more supertankers on the open ocean.

Go back and look at the record over the last decade. We have not had environmental problems with offshore drilling. But every so often, one of these big tankers runs ashore and spills crude into very fragile environmental areas.

So, Mr. Vice President, get honest with the American people. Look at a total package of energy policy that produces onshore in safe environmental ways, and that looks at some of the alternatives you are proposing for wind and solar. I do not deny that any of those has certain value.

I suggest that our energy basket, as a nation, be full of all kinds of alternatives but at the same time recognize the base: the conventional forms of energy that drives our agriculture, that

drives our industry, and that provides us with the kind of lifestyle Americans expect, and ought to expect, from a free, powerful nation such as ours.

Let me close with these thoughts because we do not often talk about national security. We talk about ourselves, our personal security, our family's security, our food security. Those are the things I have been talking about for the last 10 or 15 minutes. Those are the things that come to our minds immediately when we think we have to spend more of our income on them. Is the food going to be there? Can we live the lifestyle we have had if energy reasonably available?

Here is what Commerce Secretary Daley recently reported to our President. In all honesty, this report was on the President's desk, but he wasn't saying anything about it until Senator FRANK MURKOWSKI, the chairman of the Senate Energy Committee, stood up and said: Mr. President, you have a report on your desk. You ought to talk about it a little bit. You ought to tell the American people what your own Commerce Secretary is telling you.

The President wrote to the Secretary that he concurred with the Secretary's findings and that current policies should aid in dealing with our dependence on imported oil. Secretary Daley said in his report that ''. . . imports of crude oil threaten to impair the national security of this country.''

What does the Secretary mean? He means we are not as stable as we were, as strong as we were. We are dependent upon foreign sources for a lot of our energy. We did not send Secretary Richardson to Houston to talk to the oil producers of Texas or to Anchorage to talk to the oil producers of Alaska. We sent him to the most unstable political area in the world, the Middle East. We begged the sheiks, the producers: Please, please, give us just a little oil. We fought a war for you. We saved you. We saved your palaces. We saved your airplanes and your lifestyles and your limousines. Oh, it cost us 140 American lives, but we saved you. So would you please give us a little oil? Because you are really cramping our lifestyle. What you are doing may damage our economy and put hundreds of thousands of Americans out of work.

I do not think Mr. Richardson said it quite like that, but that is what he, in essence, was saying. He was admitting that we are vulnerable. That is why Secretary Daley told the President we are becoming more dependent on foreign sources, our national security is at risk.

What did the President say? He said: I accept your recommendation that existing policies to enhance conservation and limit dependency on foreign oil ought to be continued. But not one energy proposal has come forth from this administration, except the current budget which has large increases in solar cell and wind technology budgets and hardly any increases for nuclear or hydro technology, hardly any increase in clean coal technology research that could help the large, coal-fired, electrical-energy-producing plants of our Nation.

The President was warned this year by the Secretary of Commerce. In 1995, the President was also warned by the Secretary of Commerce that ''. . . The Nation's growing reliance on imports of crude oil and refined petroleum products threatens the Nation's security because they increase U.S. vulnerability to oil supply interruption.'' That was in 1995.

In late 1998, the OPEC nations were scratching their heads. They weren't making any mont with oil prices at $10-a-barrel. So, t decided to reduce production and drive up prices.

They did just that. We saw crude oil prices, in less than a year, go from $10 a barrel to $34 a barrel. That is why I am on the floor today. That is why House Members and Senate Members have been talking about energy policy in the last several months.

We have known it was coming. We have warned the administration for years. Six months ago, our colleagues from the Northeast warned of a runup in home heating fuel prices and what that would do to their constituents. But has this administration done anything about it? No, not anything of consequence.

The Vice President has been outspoken about no new offshore drilling.

He has been outspoken about needing higher taxes for fossil fuels so we would become less reliant upon the internal combustion engine. But nowhere has he suggested increased domestic oil and gas production.

We will debate this week, and I hope we will pass, a temporary Federal tax holiday that will allow the American consumer just a little relief in a time when our Nation's energy policy has failed the American consume. At the same time Congress will look at both short-term and long-term policy in an attempt to create more stability in price and supply.

This is an important issue. We will hear a great deal more about it in days to come if prices at the pump average $2 a gallon at the height of the summer driving season.

When I began these comments, I talked about an energy crisis. The scenario I tried to describe over the last several minutes is that there is, in fact, a crisis going on in our country. It is relatively quiet at the moment. But it is a crisis. We aren't producing enough oil and gas. The White House has no will to build an effective energy policy and will not tell the American people truth about its failures in this regard. We need to find ways to increase oil and gas production, to deal boldly with our neighbors in the Middle East on matters of their physical security and our energy security. The administration has not been very firm with our allies. We are there providing security today, yet we have to beg for our energy.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROBERTS). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. AKAKA. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. COLLINS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

—

IN SUPPORT OF THE DECENNIAL CENSUS

Mr. AKAKA. Madam President, during last week's consideration of S. Con. Res. 101, the congressional budget resolution, the Senate by voice vote agreed to a modified amendment (amendment 3028) offered by the Senator from New Hampshire (Senator SMITH) that:

> Assume(s) that no American will be prosecuted, fined or in anyway harassed by the Federal government or its agents for failure to respond to any census questions which refer to an individual's race, national origin, living conditions, personal habits or mental and/or physical condition, but that all Americans are encouraged to send in their census forms.

There are serious consequences for state, local, and Federal Government when people are missed by the census. There are approximately 1,327 federal domestic assistance programs that use population information in some way. The breadth of the programs affected that touch families and businesses throughout the nation clearly spells out the need to ensure that all Americans are counted. The questions asked by the census represent a balance between the needs of our nation's communities and the need to keep the time and effort required to complete the form to a minimum. Federal and state funds for schools, employment services, housing assistance, road construction, day care facilities, hospitals, emergency services, programs for seniors, and much more are distributed based on census figures.

The percentage of people undercounted in Hawaii—1.9 percent—was higher than the national average, and the largest component of the undercount by race was projected to be Asians and Pacific Islanders. I was so concerned that Hawaii would once more have a higher than average undercount that on March 14, 2000, I held a forum in Hawaii on the Census 2000. At that forum, I urge Native Hawaiians and other Pacific Islanders to take advantage of the 2000 Census as an opportunity to be accurately represented in data and statistics that will impact our lives for the next 10 years. During the forum, which was attended by Congressman ENI FALEOMAVAEGA from American Samoa, Hawaii's Lieutenant Governor Mazie Hirono, representatives from the Census Bureau, U.S. Department of Commerce, U.S. Department of Interior, and various Native Hawaiian and Other

Pacific Islander organizations, I strongly urged everyone to answer their questionnaires.

The Senate agreed to the Smith amendment, as modified, on April 7, 2000. However, if there is no objection, I am submitting to the RECORD a statement by Census Director Kenneth Prewitt, regarding the Sense of the Senate amendment, Number 3028 to the concurrent resolution, S. Con. Res. 101:

The Census Bureau is required by law to collect a complete response from every resident in America to both the census short and long forms. Today's sense of the Senate amendment would undermine the quality of information from both forms. Census 2000 is not designed by law as a pick and choose exercise. Serious degradation of census information will negatively affect economic policy-making, public sector expenditures and private sector investment for a decade.

The census procedures require enumerators in the non-response follow up phase to make six attempts to collect information. Congress would have to advise the Census Bureau whether six attempts (or even a single attempt) would constitute harassment.

Kenneth Prewitt,
Director, U.S. Census Bureau,
April 7, 2000.

Madam President, I suggest the absence after quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

TRIBUTE TO MATHEMATICS EDUCATION MONTH

• Mr. GRAMS. Madam President, Galileo understood the importance of mathematics when he said, ''Mathematics is the alphabet with which God has created the universe.'' I proudly rise today in recognition of Mathematics Education Month. Additionally, I take this opportunity to applaud the tireless efforts of our nation's math teachers.

The importance of a strong mathematical education is indisputable. Our math skills prove invaluable on a daily basis. Without them we could not perform simple tasks such as buying groceries, following a recipe, or balancing our checkbooks, much less plan for our retirement or buy a home. Here in Congress, mathematical skills are essential to comprehending the incredibly complex issues of Social Security reform, taxes, and the federal budget process.

My home state of Minnesota boasts some of the best math educators in the country, dedicated men and women who have inspired a lifetime of learning in countless students. This has been proven time and again by Minnesota's status as a national leader in ACT and SAT math scores. Nevertheless, we should continue to make improvements and not be satisfied with our success.

One organization in my state deserves special accolades for its ongoing efforts to initiate those improvements. The Minnesota Council of Teachers of Mathematics is dedicated to the constant betterment of mathematical education at the elementary, secondary, and college levels. The Council's advocacy results in an ongoing effort to raise the bar for better education. I commend its members for their devotion to creating an awareness and interest in mathematics among young people.

As classrooms across America labor over long division, tangents and derivatives this month, it is my hope that students, parents, and teachers alike will reflect on the significance of mathematics in our society and join me in celebrating Mathematics Education Month.•

NATIONAL LIBRARY WEEK

• Mr. SARBANES. Madam President, this week from April 9–15 we are celebrating the 42nd anniversary of ''National Library Week.'' As a strong and vigorous supporter of Federal initiatives to strengthen and protect libraries, I am pleased to take this opportunity to draw my colleagues' attention to this important occasion and to take a few moments to reflect on the significance of libraries to our nation.

When the free public library came into its own in this country in the 19th century, it was, from the beginning, a unique institution because of its commitment to the same principle of free and open exchange of ideas as the Constitution itself. Libraries have always been an integral part of all that our country embodies: freedom of information, an educated citizenry, and an open and enlightened society. They are the only public agencies in which the services rendered are intended for, and available to, every segment of our society.

It has been my longstanding view that libraries play an indispensable role in our communities. From modest beginnings in the mid-19th century, today's libraries provide well-stocked reference centers and wide-ranging loan services based on a system of branches, often further supplemented by travelling libraries serving outlying districts. Libraries promote the reading of books among adults, adolescents, and children and provide the access and resources to allow citizens to obtain reliable information on a vast array of topics.

Libraries gain even further significance in this age of rapid technological advancement where they are called upon to provide not only books and periodicals, but many other valuable resources as well. In today's society, libraries provide audio-visual materials, computer services, internet access terminals, facilities for community lectures and performances, tapes, records, videocassettes, and works of art for exhibit and loan to the public. In addition, special facilities libraries provide services for older Americans, people with disabilities, and hospitalized citizens.

Of course, libraries are not merely passive repositories of materials. They are engines of learning—the place where a spark is often struck for disadvantaged citizens who for whatever reason have not had exposure to the vast stores of knowledge available. I have the greatest respect for those individuals who are members of the library community and work so hard to ensure that our citizens and communities continue to enjoy the tremendous rewards available through our library system.

As we celebrate National Library Week, it should be noted that the Library of Congress will be 200 years old on April 24, 2000. The Library of Congress represents the oldest federal cultural institution in America. As we approach this birthday celebration, we should recognize that all libraries represent the cornerstone of knowledge in our local communities.

My own State of Maryland has 24 public library systems providing a full range of library services to all Maryland citizens and a long tradition of open and unrestricted sharing of resources. This policy has been enhanced by the State Library Network which provides interlibrary loans to the State's public, academic, special libraries and school library media centers. The Network receives strong support from the State Library Resource Center at the Enoch Pratt Free Library, the Regional Library Resource Centers in Western, Southern, and Eastern Shore counties, and a Statewide database of holdings totalling 178 libraries.

The State Library Resource Center alone gives Marylanders free access to approximately 2 million books and bound magazines, over 1 million U.S. Government documents, 600,000 documents in microform, 11,000 periodicals, 90,000 maps, 20,000 Maryland State documents, and over 19,000 videos and films.

The result of this unique joint State-County resource sharing is an extraordinary level of library services available to the citizens of Maryland. Marylanders have responded to this outstanding service by borrowing more public library materials per person than citizens of almost any other State, with 67 percent of the State's population registered as library patrons.

I have had a close working relationship with members of the Maryland Library Association and others involved in the library community throughout the State, and I am very pleased to join with them and citizens throughout the nation in this week's celebration of ''National Library Week.'' I look forward to a continued close association

with those who enable libraries to provide the unique and vital services available to all Americans.●

—

MR. DONALD T. STORCK HONORED AS LUTHERAN LAYMAN OF THE YEAR 2000

● Mr. ABRAHAM. Madam President, I rise today to recognize Mr. Donald T. Storck, who on Tuesday, April 11, 2000, will be honored by the Lutheran Luncheon Club of Metropolitan Detroit as its Lutheran Layman of the Year 2000. This is the 46th year the Luncheon Club has named a Layman of the Year, and I cannot imagine that any have been more deserving than Mr. Storck. For over thirty-five years, he has displayed a dedication to both his community and his church that are representative of an incredible desire to help others.

Mr. Storck was born in raised in Saint Louis, Missouri. He began working for General Motors in their St. Louis Chevrolet Plant in 1957. In 1964, after graduating from Washington University, he was transferred to the G.M. Building in Detroit, where he worked as an engineer. He and his wife, Ethel Steinmann, settled down in Royal Oak, Michigan, and they have lived there, and been members of the St. Paul Lutheran Church, ever since.

In his thirty-six years in Royal Oak, Mr. Storck has contributed to the community in many ways. Before recycling had become popular, he was part of a paper drive activity that raised over $60,000 for building projects. He has been very active in supporting the Boy Scouts of America, involving himself in a program at the G.M. Willow Run Transmission Plant. He sits on the Board of Directors of the Royal Oak Penguins, a youth swimming club. As a volunteer for Focus: HOPE, he has spent one Saturday per month delivering food to elderly and shut-in individuals. He has worked on many Habitat for Humanity projects, is a teacher of an after-school elementary woodworking class for 1st and 2nd grade youth at the Huntington Woods Community Center, and a regular donor of blood and blood platelets.

His devotion to the religious community has been equally impressive. He currently serves on the Board of Elders and the Board of Trustees of St. Paul Lutheran Church, and sings in the Men's Chorus and Chancel Choir. This is in addition to serving as chief chef of the men's breakfast, a tradition which he founded. He is the current president of the Lutheran Choralaires, a popular male chorus which performs regularly throughout the metropolitan Detroit area. He has been a member of the Lutheran Laymen's League Retreat Committee, and volunteers time at the group's annual retreat. He has also been very active in the Lutheran Luncheon Club, serving as its president in 1984–85, its secretary from 1986–1995, and has sat on the Board of Directors for the last five years.

Recently, he has donated much of his time to helping Grace Lutheran Church in Durham, North Carolina. This ministry provides for the transport of children to and from Belaruse and places these children with host families while they receive needed surgical and medical care at the Duke University Hospital. Mr. Storck discovered the ministry when he was at the Duke University Hospital visiting his youngest grandchild, Mollie, who died at the age of two after a battle with leukemia. At a time when Mr. Storck's faith was put to the test, it never wavered; he remained committed to the church and to helping others in the name of God.

Madam President, I applaud Mr. Storck on his many contributions to both his church and his community. He is truly a role model, and I applaud the Lutheran Luncheon Club for taking the opportunity to recognize him as such. On behalf of the entire United States Senate, I congratulate Mr. Donald R. Storck on being named the 46th Lutheran Layman of the Year.●

—

EXPANDING ACCESS TO COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTERS

● Mr. HOLLINGS. Madam President, it has been over 30 years since I set off on my hunger tour of South Carolina, where I observed first-hand the shocking condition of health care and nutritional habits in rural parts of my state. The good news is, we have come a long way since then. The bad news is, there is still much work to be done. Like the ''hunger myopia'' I described in my book ''The Case Against Hunger,'' we suffer today from a sort of ''health care myopia,'' a condition in which a booming economy and low unemployment rates mask a reality—that many Americans eke out a living in society's margins, and most of them lack health insurance. Ironically, as the stock market soars, so do the numbers of uninsured in our country, at a rate of more than 100,000 each month; 53 million Americans are expected to be uninsured by 2007.

The health care debate swirls around us, reaching fever pitch in Congress, where I have faith that we will soon reach an agreement on expanding coverage and other important issues. However, I see a need to immediately address the health care concerns of these left-behind and sometimes forgotten citizens. They cannot and should not have to wait for Congress to hammer out health care reform in order to receive the medical care so many of us take for granted. That's why I sponsored, along with Senator BOND, a sense-of-the-Senate amendment to double the funding for health centers over the next five years. The Bond-Hollings Resolution to Expand Access to Community Health Centers (REACH) recommends that we start the process with a $150 million increase in FY 2001. Let me emphasize that this measure is a cost-saving investment, not an increase in spending.

While ideas about health care have changed dramatically, community health centers have remained steadfast in their mission, quietly serving their communities and doing a tremendous job. Last year, community health centers served 11 million Americans in decrepit inner-city neighborhoods as well as remote rural areas, 4.5 million of which were uninsured. It's no wonder these centers have won across-the-board, bipartisan support. They have a proven track record of providing no-nonsense, preventive and primary medical services at rock-bottom costs. They're the value retailers of the health care industry, if you will, treating a patient at a cost of less than $1.00 per day, or about $350 annually.

Not only are these centers providing care at low costs, but they are saving precious health care dollars. An increased investment in health centers will mean fewer uninsured patients are forced to make costly emergency room visits to receive basic care and fewer will utilize hospitals' specialty and inpatient care resources. As a consequence, a major financial burden is lifted from traditional hospitals and government and private health plans. Every federal grant dollar invested in health centers saves $7 for Medicare, Medicaid and private insurance: $6 from lower use of specialty and inpatient care and $1 from reduced emergency room visits.

The value of community health centers can be measured in two other significant ways. First of all, the centers' focus on wellness and prevention, services largely unavailable to uninsured people, will lead to savings in treatment down the road. And secondly, health centers foster growth and development in their communities, shoring up the very people they serve. They generate over $14 billion in annual economic activity in some of the nation's most economically depressed areas, employing 50,000 people and training thousands of health professionals and volunteers.

It should also be noted that community health centers are just that—community-based. They are not cookie cutter programs spun from the federal government wheel, but area-specific, locally-managed centers tailored to the unique needs of a community. They are governed by consumer boards composed of patients who utilize the center's services, as well as local business, civic and community leaders. In fact, it is stipulated that center clients make up at least 51 percent of board membership. This set-up not only ensures accountability to the local community and taxpayers, but keeps a constant check on each center's effectiveness in addressing community needs.

In South Carolina, community health centers have a long history of meeting the care requirements of the areas they serve. The Beaufort-Jasper Comprehensive Health Center in Ridgeland, the Franklin C. Fetter Family Health Center in Charleston, and Family Health

Centers, Inc. in Orangeburg were among the first community health centers established in the nation. The Beaufort-Jasper Center was very innovative for its day, in the late 1960s, tackling not only health care needs, but related needs for clean water, indoor toilets and other sanitary services. Today, the number of South Carolina health centers has grown to 15. They currently provide more than 167,000 people, 10 percent of which are uninsured, with a wide range of primary car services. Yet despite the success story, a need to throw a wider net is obvious. Of the 3.8 million South Carolinians, nearly 600,000 have no form of health insurance. That means roughly 15% of the state population is uninsured. Another 600,000 residents are ''underinsured,'' meaning that they do not receive comprehensive health care coverage from their insurance plans and must pay out-of-pocket for a number of specialty services, procedures, tests and medications.

South Carolina's statistics are mirrored nationwide. The swelling ranks of the uninsured are outgrowing our present network of community health centers. Adopting this sense of the Senate amendment will ensure the reach of community health centers expands to meet increasing demand. It is our responsibility to continue providing our neediest citizens with a basic health care safety net. What better way to do that than by building on a program with a record of positive, fiscally responsible results? Everyone can benefit and take pride in such a worthwhile investment.●

—

THE NEED TO SUPPORT THE U.S.T.T.I.

● Mr. INOUYE. Madam President, I rise today to call attention to a recent New York Times article, ''India's Unwired Villages Mired in the Distant Past.'' It is because of the struggles developing nations face, as illustrated in the article, that I support the United States Telecommunications Training Institute (USTTI) and their work to increase access to telecommunications.

The USTTI is a nonprofit joint venture connecting the public and private sectors, providing tuition-free communications and broadcast training to professionals from around the world. USTTI is geared toward meeting the common training needs of the women and men who are bringing modern communications to the developing world.

The development of the telecommunications industry may be seen as a solution to economic troubles in developing nations. The New York Times article I referred to earlier states, ''. . . the wonders of telecommunications technology—distance learning, telemedicine, the Internet—offer a way out of the 'old India','' where illiteracy, disease, and poverty punctuate the countryside. This scenario is not isolated to India, but may be applied to many developing nations throughout the world. In each instance, a big part of the solution is the deployment of modern telecommunications technology.

The USTTI has been working to bring modern telecommunication services to the developing world for 18 years. The USTTI has offered 935 tuition-free courses and has graduated 5,574 men and women who are now helping to make modern telecommunications a reality in their 161 respective countries. The program participants are government officials responsible for developing and implementing telecommunications policies in their countries.

By allowing developing countries to capitalize fully on the increased educational opportunities provided through the USTTI, countries prosper economically and connect themselves to the modern world.

Madam President, I ask that the full text of the New York Times article be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 19, 2000]

INDIA'S UNWIRED VILLAGES MIRED IN THE DISTANT PAST

(By Celia W. Dugger)

HYDERABAD, INDIA, MARCH 15.—Cyber Towers rises from the campus of a software technology park here, a sleek Internet-connected symbol of the new India that is feverishly courting foreign investment, selling its wares in the global marketplace and creating wealth at an astonishing rate.

But less than 50 miles away, in the poverty-stricken village of Sheri Ram Reddy Guda, the old India is alive and unwell. Illiteracy, sickness and hunger are the villagers' constant companions. Women and children work in the fields for less than 50 cents a day. The sole telephone—an antique contraption of batteries and antennae—almost never works.

Like most of the villagers, Muhammad Hussain, an unlettered field hand in a ragged loin cloth, has never seen a computer, but offered that he did once watch an office worker at a typewriter. ''I saw the fingers moving, but I did not know what was being written,'' he said.

The chasm between India's educated elite and its impoverished multitudes worries economists, politicians and some software entrepreneurs.

Because of the extraordinary success of Indian engineers in Silicon Valley and the Indian software industry's sales to American companies, India and the United States have forged strong economic ties in high technology. President Clinton will acknowledge those links next Friday with a visit to Hitec City, where Microsoft, Oracle and Metamor are ensconced in the air conditioned comfort of Cyber Towers.

But during his five-day whirlwind tour of five Indian cities, the president will spend little time in the villages, where almost three-quarters of this country's billion people still live and struggle for the basic necessities.

At a time when India's software industry is creating a glamorous digerati and driving a dizzying escalation in stock values on the Bombay exchange, the boom has stirred a debate about the country's social and economic priorities, as well as the potential of high technology to transform the lives of the poor.

Some, like Chandrababu Naidu, the chief minister of the southern state of Andhra Pradesh, whose capital is this bustling city, have an almost messianic faith in technology. Though fewer than one-half of 1 percent of Indian households now have Internet access compared with more than a third in America, the optimists believe that technology is coming that will make connecting to the New cheap enough for a broader spectrum of Indians to afford.

''If a television in a school is connected to the Internet, you can hold literacy classes in the evenings,'' said Randeep Sudan, who oversees information technology for Mr. Naidu. ''You can deliver the best of content to the worst of schools. Imagine the potential to revolutionize the educational process.''

But others worry that the boom may be distracting the country from its chronic problems and fear that the last decade's more rapid economic growth—spawned by India's loosening of restrictions on trade and investment—is leaving the poor, and the poorer states, further behind, even as the size of India's middle class has doubled.

This is still a country where half the women and a quarter of the men cannot read or write; where more than half the children 4 and under are stunted by malnutrition; where one-third of the population, or more than 300 million people, live in absolute poverty, unable to afford enough to eat; where more than 30 million children 6 to 10 are not in school.

K.R. Narayanan, India's first president from an untouchable caste, sounded this alarm in a recent speech.

''We have one of the world's largest reservoirs of technical personnel, but also the world's largest number of illiterates,'' he said, ''the world's largest middle class, but also the largest number of people below the poverty line, and the largest number of children suffering from malnutrition. Our giant factories rise from out of squalor. Our satellites shoot up from the midst of hovels of the poor.''

Even those who believe that the importance of the $5 billion software industry is overblown acknowledge its contributions. It has generated 280,000 jobs for the educated and highly skilled. Those workers, in turn, are creating demand for housing, refrigerators and other goods that help the economy grow.

And there is potential for greater growth. A study by McKinsey & Company, the management consulting firm, forecasts that India's software industry could earn $87 billion and employ 2.2 million people before the decade is done.

The success of the industry has also stirred optimism about India's ability to compete in a global economy. It has offered capitalist, free market models in a country where government still plays a central role and has hastened the tendency of the country's best and brightest young people to choose careers in business rather than the civil service.

''Every country needs a major success story to lift the psyche and to be seen as a powerhouse in something,'' said Krishna G. Palepu, a Harvard Business School professor who is bullish on the industry. ''This is India's chance. Suddenly, there's a sense of self-confidence and visibility internationally.''

But there are also limitations on what high technology can do to increase the productivity of the entire Indian economy, at least for now. The industry itself still generates only about 1 percent of India's gross domestic product and about 1 percent of worldwide software exports.

The country desperately needs to attend to the fundamentals, most economists say, and some state leaders like Mr. Naidu concur. It must invest more in primary education and

health care, build a working system of roads and power grids, reduce subsidies for power and fertilizer that go mostly to the better-off and generate higher rates of growth in agriculture and industry, which employ 8 in 10 Indians.

India has lagged behind China, for instance, in educating its children and increasing its exports of textiles, shoes and toys—industries that employ huge numbers of less educated workers in China. By law, India has required those industries to remain small, typically employing fewer than 100 people per workplace—putting them at a tremendous disadvantage with China, where such factories employ thousands.

In the garment trade, India and China started out in 1980 with about the same level of exports, but by 1996, India was selling $4.6 billion of its goods abroad, compared with China's $25 billion.

The Indian government is in dire need of revenues to tackle its daunting ills, but so far the software industry is contributing relatively little to the country's public coffers.

Income from software exports is generally exempted from the 38.5 percent corporate income tax. And unlike companies in other industries, high technology companies do not have to pay the 40 percent to 60 percent customs duties on computers and other technology items they import to operate their businesses.

''The software industry is making gobs and gobs of profits,'' said Anil Garg, an Indian and a Silicon Valley entrepreneur who is setting up an office for Aristasoft, the new company he helped found, in Cyber Towers. ''And yet there is this huge debate about whether it should pay taxes. I don't understand. Having taxes is a good problem. The roads here are broken, for God's sake. The schools are so bad. We have been the privileged class for so long. It's time for us to pay back.''

The software technology park of Hitec City and the village of Sheri Ram Reddy Guda are separated by only a short distance, yet seem to come from different centuries, and to stand at opposite poles, emblems of the new and the old India.

Hitec City is a temple to modernity, with a soaring atrium, gargling fountains, an on-site A.T.M., basement car parking and Internet connections for all. The government has created an island where everything works. There are three separate power systems, ensuring that the lights will never go out. And the businesses do not need decent roads; they can deliver their products via satellite links or fiber-optic cables.

Sheri Ram Reddy Guda, population 400, seems ancient by comparison. No one here owns a car or even a scooter. The ox cart is still the primary means of transportation and word of mouth the main grapevine. There is no health clinic, no cable television. Raggedy children who should be in school play in the dirt with toys made from twisted wire.

The village is connected to the main blacktop highway by a narrow, mile-and-a-half-long dirt road, deeply gouged with ruts, that is nearly impassable in the rainy season.

Most of the villages are from the formerly untouchable castes now known as Dalits, and they are grateful to Mr. Naidu's government for building 23 houses for them. But they say they desperately need a better road, reliable electricity and jobs.

The village gets only about eight hours of power a day, and that is often of such low voltage that it does not operate the irrigation pumps. When rain is scare, as it is now, the fields lie parched and work is scarce.

''Chandrababu has not given us the current,'' said an old man, Baswapuram Yelleah, referring to the chief minister and waving his handmade hatchet as he gestured angrily with his hands. ''Our eyes are filled with tears when we see our fields.''

Yarrea Balamani is a widowed mother of five children, 7 to 18. She and her older children do farm work but lately there have been no more than 10 days of work in a month. ''If there was some industry around, we could get work every day,'' she said. ''That would be better for us. It's a very difficult life we are living.''●

SANDIA LABORATORY INTERNATIONAL ARMS CONTROL CONFERENCE

● Mr. BINGAMAN. Madam President, this week marks the tenth anniversary of the International Arms Control Conference hosted by Sandia National Laboratory in Albuquerque, New Mexico. I extend my congratulations to Dr. Paul Robinson, Director of Sandia Laboratory for his support for this unique international conference that draws hundreds of technical and policy experts from all over the world each year.

It is particularly important at this time in history to recognize this Conference here in the Senate. The conclusion of the Cold War has offered the United States and the nations of the world an historic opportunity to increase security in the international system through seeking cooperative measures that would establish international standards of behavior useful for improving global security. When the Senate voted to ratify the Chemical Weapons Convention in 1997, I am pleased to say, this nation acted in a committed and positive way to capitalize on the opportunity we have been afforded.

Events in the past two years, however, have brought America to a crossroads with respect to the future of arms control. The Senate recently voted to reject the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, a treaty signed by 155 countries, that would have established an international standard permanently banning the testing of nuclear weapons in order to combat the spread of nuclear weapons. I deeply regret that vote by the Senate, Mr. President, and am committed to find a way to achieve the goal for which that treaty was negotiated.

Meanwhile, the Russian Duma continues its on again off again consideration of the START II Treaty to reduce the number of strategic weapons in our respective arsenals of nuclear weapons. To date, they have taken no action. Each time a vote in the Duma approaches, an event occurs that postpones its consideration of this important treaty that would reduce the nuclear threat between Russia and the United States and, indeed, to the world as a whole.

Many Russian officials have observed that no further progress in reducing nuclear arsenals is possible if the United States chooses to abrogate the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty which restricts the ability of the United States and Russia to deploy national missile defense systems. Many experts and public officials in the U.S., however, have concluded that the missile threat from rogue governments is sufficiently real that the U.S. should move forward on deploying a missile defense regardless of its impact on strategic relations between Russia and the United States. The President, however, in signing the National Missile Defense Act, indicated that before deciding to deploy a national missile defense system, he would assess the potential impact of such a decision on arms control regimes that support our national security. The nation awaits a decision that could occur this summer.

While this critical decision lies ahead, U.S. negotiators have been meeting with their Russian counterparts to explore a potential agreement that could permit the U.S. to modify the ABM Treaty in a way that would not threaten the strategic balance between the two countries. The outcome of those negotiations is far from certain. The issues that are involved are complex, and extend beyond the dyadic relations between the United States and Russia. Other nuclear powers, notably China, are watching those negotiations very closely to determine appropriate policy directions regarding their own nuclear strategy and arsenal.

As the U.S. and Russia examine the thorny, complex issues involving the relationship between offensive and defensive strategic arms, and nations of the world consider the Senate's vote against the CTBT, the world nevertheless remains committed to preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons through the Treaty on the Nonproliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). That Treaty, ratified by 187 countries, recently celebrated its 30th anniversary. In 1995, the states parties to that treaty voted to extend its provisions indefinitely. Later this month, the Sixth Nonproliferation Treaty Review Conference will take place in New York. Given the events in South Asia during the past year, and the vote on CTBT in the Senate this winter, the Review Conference will be a very important convocation at which all states parties, including the U.S., will be called on to reaffirm their commitment to the provisions of the NPT.

Given these current conditions in the international environment, it is indeed timely and vital that efforts such as the International Arms Control Conference hosted by Sandia Laboratory take place. The meetings and dialogues that occur at this Conference have provided important understanding among the international community on major arms control issues and I am confident will continue to do so as long as the world seeks to improve security through cooperation.

I salute Sandia, and in particular, Dr. Jim Brown, who founded the Conference ten years ago and has faithfully served as its organizer and driving force during the past decade. If the nations of the world will be able to build upon cooperative understandings

reached through arms control agreements, it will be because of the efforts of people such as Dr. Brown, who has devoted a career toward that goal. I extend my best wishes to conference participants and urge them to work hard to build a safer tomorrow for all of us.●

ALLAN LAW

● Mr. WELLSTONE. Madam President, I rise to talk about a truly extraordinary Minnesotan.

Allan Law has been doing extraordinary work in Minnesota for a very long time. For more than 30 years he was a public school teacher—which merits mention in its own right.

But his work did not stop at the end of the school day. He also is the founder of Minneapolis Recreation Development, Inc., a non-profit organization, which has been providing constructive recreational activities for our urban youth. This after-school and weekend program was developed more than 30 years ago and has been reaching yearly, on average, 400 of our hardest to reach young people.

During that period, Allan has spent untold hours meeting the needs of our inner-city youth. Day-in, day-out Allan Law wakes up and works to make the Twin Cities a better place and the young people living there stronger and healthier. He provides us with a model of what an individual, committed to improving a community, can do.

Allan is an inspiration who has been inspiring people for more than a generation. It is my hope and prayer that he will continue his good work for another 30 years.

I rise, as schools begin adjourning for the year, to pay tribute to Allan and his incredible work in making Minneapolis a better place—one young person at a time.●

NORTH EAST WISCONSIN FAIR HOUSING COUNCIL

● Mr. KOHL. Madam President, I rise to recognize the contribution of the North East Wisconsin Fair Housing Council, which provides fair housing enforcement services in the Fox Valley in Northeastern Wisconsin. I applaud the North East Wisconsin Fair Housing Council's fight to end housing discrimination. It is not only wrong, intolerable and unjust, it's illegal. While we would like to think that housing discrimination is a thing of the past, it still happens. And while we would like to think that in this day and age, equal housing opportunities are available to everyone, too many people are still shut out of the right to live in a home of their choosing. The more frequently citizens are reminded of their rights, the more likely they are to seek justice.

The North East Wisconsin Fair Housing Council's greatest accomplishment has been an ongoing enforcement program. As of March 1, there have been 906 fair housing complaints filed with the North East Wisconsin Fair Housing Council. Every year since 1992 there has been a major pattern and practice study conducted by the North East Wisconsin Fair Housing Council. Through national competition, the North East Wisconsin Fair Housing Council has been the primary contractor on three Fair Housing Initiative Program grants.

The North East Wisconsin Fair Housing Council has been at the forefront of innovative ways to combat illegal housing discrimination. In 1997 the North East Wisconsin Fair Housing Council received a Fair Housing Initiative Program Grant which provided the financial resources to increase attention to complaints from four targeted populations: Hmong, Native Americans, Hispanics and persons with disabilities. The North East Wisconsin Fair Housing Council developed an Enforcement Network Program with eight advocacy agencies representing those groups. The goals were to develop better communication with the agencies so they would understand how fair housing issues impacted their agencies and clients. Relationships with the agencies were enhanced and more efficient services were provided to the clients.

Fair Housing is a right for all Americans, and I commend the North East Wisconsin Fair Housing Council for their efforts.●

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. MURKOWSKI, from the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, without amendment:

H.R. 3090. A bill to amend the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act to restore certain lands to the Elim Native Corporation, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 106–258).

By Mr. THOMPSON, from the Committee on Governmental Affairs, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute:

S. 1993. A bill to reform Government information security by strengthening information security practices throughout the Federal Government (Rept. No. 106–259).

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 183

At the request of Mr. INOUYE, the name of the Senator from Maine (Ms. SNOWE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 183, a bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize certain disabled former prisoners-of-war to use Department of Defense commissary and exchange stores.

S. 664

At the request of Mr. BREAUX, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mrs. LINCOLN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 664, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit against income tax to individuals who rehabilitate historic homes or who are the first purchasers of rehabilitated historic homes for use as a principal residence.

S. 708

At the request of Mr. DEWINE, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 708, a bill to improve the administrative efficiency and effectiveness of the Nation's abuse and neglect courts and the quality and availability of training for judges, attorneys, and volunteers working in such courts, and for other purposes consistent with the Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997.

S. 821

At the request of Mr. LAUTENBERG, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SPECTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 821, a bill to provide for the collection of data on traffic stops.

S. 1487

At the request of Mr. AKAKA, the name of the Senator from Connecticut (Mr. DODD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1487, a bill to provide for excellence in economic education, and for other purposes.

S. 2018

At the request of Mrs. HUTCHISON, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SPECTER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2018, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to revise the update factor used in making payments to PPS hospitals under the Medicare Program.

S. 2021

At the request of Mr. BROWNBACK, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2021, a bill to prohibit high school and college sports gambling in all States including States where such gambling was permitted prior to 1991.

S. 2181

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the name of the Senator from New York (Mr. MOYNIHAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2181, a bill to amend the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act to provide full funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund, and to provide dedicated funding for other conservation programs, including coastal stewardship, wildlife habitat protection, State and local park and open space preservation, historic preservation, forestry conservation programs, and youth conservation corps; and for other purposes.

S. 2255

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. ABRAHAM) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2255, a bill to amend the Internet Tax Freedom Act to extend the moratorium through calendar year 2006.

S. 2271

At the request of Mr. DEWINE, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2271, a bill to amend the Social Security Act to improve the quality and availability of training for judges, attorneys, and volunteers working in the Nation's abuse and neglect courts, and for other purposes

consistent with the Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997.

S. 2272

At the request of Mr. DEWINE, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2272, a bill to improve the administrative efficiency and effectiveness of the Nation's abuse and neglect courts and for other purposes consistent with the Adoption and Safe Families Act of 1997.

S. 2299

At the request of Mr. L. CHAFEE, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2299, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to continue State Medicaid disproportionate share hospital (DSH) allotments for fiscal year 2001 at the levels for fiscal year 2000.

S. 2308

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2308, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to assure preservation of safety net hospitals through maintenance of the Medicaid disproportionate share hospital program.

S. 2323

At the request of Mr. MCCONNELL, the names of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN), the Senator from Texas (Mr. GRAMM), the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. DASCHLE), and the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SESSIONS) were added as cosponsors of S. 2323, a bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to clarify the treatment of stock options under the Act.

S. 2365

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 2365, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to eliminate the 15 percent reduction in payment rates under the prospective payment system for home health services.

S. CON. RES. 98

At the request of Mr. DEWINE, the name of the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. JOHNSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 98, a concurrent resolution urging compliance with the Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction.

AMENDMENT NO. 3018

At the request of Mr. BOND, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of amendment No. 3018 proposed to S. Con. Res. 101, an original concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal years 2001 through 2005 and revising the budgetary levels for fiscal year 2000.

AMENDMENTS SUBMITTED

LEGISLATION INSTITUTING A FEDERAL FUELS TAX HOLIDAY

GRAHAM AMENDMENT NO. 3083

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. GRAHAM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2285) instituting a Federal fuels tax holiday; as follows:

At the end add the following:

SEC. ___. DELAY IN EFFECTIVE DATE.

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

(1) The social security program is the foundation upon which millions of Americans rely for income during retirement or in the event of disability.

(2) For nearly two-thirds of seniors living alone, social security comprises 50 percent or more of their total income.

(3) The medicare program provides essential medical care for tens of millions of older and disabled Americans.

(4) During the 35-year history of the program, medicare has helped lift elderly Americans out of poverty and has improved and extended their lives.

(5) According to the 2000 annual report of the Board of Trustees of the social security trust funds—

(A) beginning in 2016, payroll tax revenue will fall short of the amount needed to pay current benefits, necessitating the use of interest earned on trust fund assets and then the eventual redemption of those assets; and

(B) assets of the combined retirement and disability trust funds will be exhausted in 2037.

(6) According to the 2000 annual report of the Board of Trustees of the social security trust funds, assets in the medicare health insurance trust fund will be exhausted in 2023.

(7) The Congressional Budget Office has prepared 3 estimates of the non-social security surplus for the next 10 years which range in size from $838,000,000,000 to $1,918,000,000,000.

(8) The presence of non-social security surpluses present Congress with the opportunity to address the long-term funding shortfall facing the social security and medicare programs.

(b) DELAY IN EFFECTIVE DATE.—Notwithstanding any other provision of, or amendment made by, this Act, no such provision or amendment shall take effect until legislation has been enacted that extends the solvency of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund under section 201 of the Social Security Act through 2075 and the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund under part A of title XVIII of such Act through 2025.

LOTT AMENDMENTS NOS. 3084–3085

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. LOTT submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill, S. 2285, supra; as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 3084

Strike all after the first word and insert:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Federal Fuels Tax Holiday Act of 2000''.

SEC. 2. TEMPORARY REDUCTION IN FUEL TAXES ON GASOLINE, DIESEL FUEL, KEROSENE, AVIATION FUEL, AND SPECIAL FUELS, BY 4.3 CENTS, OR TO ZERO.

(a) TEMPORARY REDUCTION IN FUEL TAXES.—During the applicable period, each rate of tax referred to in subsection (b)—

(1) shall be reduced by 4.3 cents per gallon, and

(2) if at any time during the applicable period the national average price of unleaded regular gasoline is at least $2.00 per gallon (as determined on a weekly basis by the Secretary of Energy), shall be suspended beginning on the date which is 7 days after the announcement described in subsection (d) and for the remainder of the applicable period, subject to subsection (e).

(b) RATES OF TAX.—The rates of tax referred to in this subsection are the rates of tax otherwise applicable under—

(1) paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 4041(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to special fuels),

(2) subsection (m) of section 4041 of such Code (relating to certain alcohol fuels),

(3)(A) in the case of the reduction under subsection (a)(1), subparagraph (C) of section 4042(b)(1) of such Code (relating to tax on fuel used in commercial transportation on inland waterways), and

(B) in the case of the suspension under subsection (a)(2), subparagraphs (A) and (C) of such section 4042(b)(1),

(4) clauses (i), (ii), and (iii) of section 4081(a)(2)(A) of such Code (relating to gasoline, diesel fuel, and kerosene),

(5) paragraph (1) of section 4091(b) of such Code (relating to aviation fuel), and

(6) paragraph (2) of section 4092(b) of such Code (relating to fuel used in commercial aviation).

(c) SPECIAL REDUCTION RULES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Paragraph (1) of subsection (a) shall be applied by substituting for ''4.3 cents''—

(A) ''3.2 cents'' in the case of fuel described in section 4041(a)(2)(B)(ii) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to liquefied petroleum),

(B) ''2.8 cents'' in the case of fuel described in section 4041(a)(2)(B)(iii) of such Code (relating to liquefied natural gas),

(C) ''48.54 cents'' in the case of fuel described in section 4041(a)(3)(A) of such Code (relating to compressed natural gas), and

(D) ''2.15 cents'' in the case of fuel described in section 4041(m)(1)(A)(ii)(I) of such Code (relating to certain alcohol fuel).

(2) CONFORMING RULES.—

(A) In the case of a reduction under subsection (a)(1)—

(i) section 4081(c) of such Code shall be applied without regard to paragraph (6) thereof,

(ii) section 4091(c) of such Code shall be applied without regard to paragraph (4) thereof,

(iii) section 6421(f)(2) of such Code shall be applied by disregarding ''and, in the case'' and all that follows,

(iv) section 6421(f)(3) of such Code shall be applied without regard to subparagraph (B) thereof,

(v) section 6427(l)(3) of such Code shall be applied without regard to subparagraph (B) thereof, and

(vi) section 6427(l)(4) of such Code shall be applied without regard to subparagraph (B) thereof.

(B) In the case of a suspension under subsection (a)(2)—

(i) section 40(e)(1) of such Code shall be applied without regard to subparagraph (B) thereof,

(ii) section 4041(d)(1) of such Code shall be applied by disregarding ''if tax is imposed by

subsection (a)(1) or (2) on such sale or use'', and

(iii) section 6427(b) of such Code shall be applied without regard to paragraph (2) thereof.

(d) ANNOUNCEMENT BY SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.—Within 2 days of the determination by the Secretary of Energy described in subsection (a)(2), the Secretary of the Treasury shall announce the suspension described in such subsection or the modification described in subsection (e).

(e) PROTECTING SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUNDS.—If upon the determination described in subsection (a)(2), the Secretary of the Treasury, after consultation with the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, and based on the most recent available estimate of the Federal on-budget surplus for fiscal years 2000 and 2001, determines that the suspension described in subsection (a)(2) when added to the reduction described in subsection (a)(1) would result in an aggregate reduction in revenues to the Treasury exceeding such surplus during the remainder of the applicable period, the Secretary shall modify such suspension such that each rate of tax referred to in subsection (b) is reduced in a pro rata manner and such aggregate reduction does not exceed such surplus.

(f) MAINTENANCE OF TRUST FUNDS DEPOSITS.—On April 16, 2000, and, if necessary, on the date described in subsection (a)(2), the Secretary of the Treasury shall determine the amount any Federal trust fund would have received in gross receipts during the applicable period had this section not been enacted. Such amount shall be appropriated and transferred from the general fund to the applicable trust fund in the manner in which such gross receipts would have been transferred by the Secretary of the Treasury and such amount shall be treated as taxes received in the Treasury under the applicable section of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 described in subsection (b).

(g) APPLICABLE PERIOD.—For purposes of this section, the term ''applicable period'' means the period beginning after April 15, 2000, and ending before January 1, 2001.

SEC. 3. FLOOR STOCKS CREDIT.

(a) IN GENERAL.—If—

(1) before a tax reduction date, a tax referred to in section 2(b) has been imposed on any liquid, and

(2) on such date such liquid is held by a dealer and has not been used and is intended for sale,

there shall be credited (without interest) to the person who paid such tax (hereafter in this section referred to as the ''taxpayer''), against the taxpayer's subsequent semimonthly deposit of such tax, an amount equal to the excess of the tax paid by the taxpayer over the amount of such tax which would be imposed on such liquid had the taxable event occurred on the tax reduction date.

(b) CERTIFICATION NECESSARY TO FILE CLAIM FOR CREDIT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In any case where liquid is held by a dealer (other than the taxpayer) on the tax reduction date, no credit amount with respect to such liquid shall be allowed to the taxpayer under subsection (a) unless the taxpayer files with the Secretary—

(A) a certification that the taxpayer has given a credit to such dealer with respect to such liquid against the dealer's first purchase of liquid from the taxpayer subsequent to the tax reduction date, and

(B) a certification by such dealer that such dealer has given a credit to a succeeding dealer (if any) with respect to such liquid against the succeeding dealer's first purchase of liquid from such dealer subsequent to the tax reduction date.

(2) REASONABLENESS OF CLAIMS CERTIFIED.—Any certification made under paragraph (1) shall include an additional certification that the claim for credit was reasonable based on the taxpayer's or dealer's past business relationship with the succeeding dealer.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

(1) the terms ''dealer'' and ''held by a dealer'' have the respective meanings given to such terms by section 6412 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; except that the term ''dealer'' includes a position holder, and

(2) the term ''tax reduction date'' means April 16, 2000, or the date described in section 2(a)(2).

(d) CERTAIN RULES TO APPLY.—Rules similar to the rules of subsections (b) and (c) of section 6412 of such Code shall apply for purposes of this section.

SEC. 4. FLOOR STOCKS TAX.

(a) IMPOSITION OF TAX.—In the case of any liquid on which a tax referred to in section 2(b) would have been imposed during the applicable period but for the enactment of this Act, and which is held on the floor stocks tax date by any person, there is hereby imposed a floor stocks tax in an amount equal to the excess of—

(1) the tax referred to in section 2(b) which would be imposed on such liquid had the taxable event occurred on the floor stocks tax date, over

(2) the amount of such tax previously paid (if any) with respect to such liquid.

(b) LIABILITY FOR TAX AND METHOD OF PAYMENT.—

(1) LIABILITY FOR TAX.—A person holding a liquid on the floor stocks tax date to which the tax imposed by subsection (a) applies shall be liable for such tax.

(2) METHOD OF PAYMENT.—The tax imposed by subsection (a) shall be paid in such manner as the Secretary shall prescribe.

(3) TIME FOR PAYMENT.—The tax imposed by subsection (a) shall be paid on or before the date which is 45 days after the floor stocks tax date.

(c) DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

(1) HELD BY A PERSON.—A liquid shall be considered as ''held by a person'' if title thereto has passed to such person (whether or not delivery to the person has been made).

(2) FLOOR STOCKS TAX DATE.—The term ''floor stocks tax date'' means January 1, 2001.

(3) APPLICABLE PERIOD.—The term ''applicable period'' means the period beginning after April 15, 2000, and ending before January 1, 2001.

(4) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Treasury or the Secretary's delegate.

(d) EXCEPTION FOR EXEMPT USES.—The tax imposed by subsection (a) shall not apply to any liquid held by any person exclusively for any use to the extent a credit or refund of the tax referred to in section 2(b) is allowable for such use.

(e) EXCEPTION FOR FUEL HELD IN VEHICLE TANK.—No tax shall be imposed by subsection (a) on any liquid held in the tank of a motor vehicle, motorboat, vessel, or aircraft.

(f) EXCEPTION FOR CERTAIN AMOUNTS OF FUEL.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—No tax shall be imposed by subsection (a) on any liquid held on the floor stocks tax date by any person if the aggregate amount of such liquid held by such person on such date does not exceed 2,000 gallons. The preceding sentence shall apply only if such person submits to the Secretary (at the time and in the manner required by the Secretary) such information as the Secretary shall require for purposes of this paragraph.

(2) EXEMPT FUEL.—For purposes of paragraph (1), there shall not be taken into account any liquid held by any person which is exempt from the tax imposed by subsection (a) by reason of subsection (d) or (e).

(3) CONTROLLED GROUPS.—For purposes of this subsection—

(A) CORPORATIONS.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—All persons treated as a controlled group shall be treated as 1 person.

(ii) CONTROLLED GROUP.—The term ''controlled group'' has the meaning given to such term by subsection (a) of section 1563 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986; except that for such purposes the phrase ''more than 50 percent'' shall be substituted for the phrase ''at least 80 percent'' each place it appears in such subsection.

(B) NONINCORPORATED PERSONS UNDER COMMON CONTROL.—Under regulations prescribed by the Secretary, principles similar to the principles of subparagraph (A) shall apply to a group of persons under common control if 1 or more of such persons is not a corporation.

(g) OTHER LAW APPLICABLE.—All provisions of law, including penalties, applicable with respect to the taxes imposed by chapter 31 or 32 of such Code shall, insofar as applicable and not inconsistent with the provisions of this section, apply with respect to the floor stock taxes imposed by subsection (a) to the same extent as if such taxes were imposed by such chapter.

SEC. 5. BENEFITS OF TAX REDUCTION SHOULD BE PASSED ON TO CONSUMERS.

(a) PASSTHROUGH TO CONSUMERS.—

(1) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that—

(A) consumers immediately receive the benefit of the reduction in taxes under this Act, and

(B) transportation motor fuels producers and other dealers take such actions as necessary to reduce transportation motor fuels prices to reflect such reduction, including immediate credits to customer accounts representing tax refunds allowed as credits against excise tax deposit payments under the floor stocks refund provisions of this Act.

(2) STUDY.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Comptroller General of the United States shall conduct a study of the reduction of taxes under this Act to determine whether there has been a passthrough of such reduction.

(B) REPORT.—Not later than September 30, 2000, the Comptroller General of the United States shall report to the Committee on Finance of the Senate and the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives the results of the study conducted under subparagraph (A).

AMENDMENT NO. 3085

On page 2, strike lines 7 and 8.

BURNS AMENDMENT NO. 3086

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. BURNS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill, S. 2285, supra; as follows:

Strike all after the first word, and insert:

SEC. 2. REPEAL OF 4.3-CENT AVIATION FUEL EXCISE TAXES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 4091(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to rate of tax) is amended by striking ''21.8 cents'' and inserting ''17.5 cents''.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 4091(b)(3)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

''(A) The rate of tax specified in paragraph (1) shall be zero after September 30, 2007.''.

(2) Section 4091(c)(1) of such Code is amended—

(A) by striking ''13.4 cents'' both places it appears and inserting ''9.1 cents'', and

(B) by striking ''14 cents'' and inserting ''9.7 cents''.

(3) Section 4091(c) of such Code is amended by striking paragraph (4) and by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (4).

(4) Section 4092(b)(2) of such Code is amended by inserting ''and before the date of the enactment of the ___ Act,'' after ''1995,''.

(5) Section 4081(a)(2)(A)(ii) of such Code is amended by striking ''19.3 cents'' and inserting ''15 cents''.

(6) Section 4081(d)(2) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

''(2) AVIATION GASOLINE.—The rate of tax specified in subsection (a)(2)(A)(ii) shall be zero after September 30, 2007.''.

(7) Section 4041(c)(3) of such Code is amended to read as follows:

''(3) TERMINATION.—The rate of the taxes imposed by paragraph (1) shall be zero after September 30, 2007.''.

(8) Section 6421(f)(2)(B) of such Code is amended by striking ''financing rate'' and all that follows and inserting ''financing rate.''.

(9) Section 6427(l)(4)(B) of such Code is amended by inserting ''and before the date of the enactment of the ___ Act,'' after ''1995,''.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act.

TORRICELLI AMENDMENT NO. 3087

(Ordered to lie on the table.)

Mr. TORRICELLI submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill, S. 2285, supra; as follows:

At the end add the following:

SEC. ___. MODIFICATIONS TO DISASTER CASUALTY LOSS DEDUCTION.

(a) LOWER ADJUSTED GROSS INCOME THRESHOLD.—Paragraph (2) of section 165(h) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to treatment of casualty gains and losses) is amended—

(1) by striking subparagraph (A) and inserting the following:

''(A) IN GENERAL.—If the personal casualty losses for any taxable year exceed the personal casualty gains for such taxable year, such losses shall be allowed for the taxable year only to the extent of the sum of—

''(i) the amount of the personal casualty gains for the taxable year, plus

''(ii) so much of such excess attributable to losses described in subsection (i) as exceeds 5 percent of the adjusted gross income of the individual (determined without regard to any deduction allowable under subsection (c)(3))'', plus

''(iii) so much of such excess attributable to losses not described in subsection (i) as exceeds 10 percent of the adjusted gross income of the individual.

For purposes of this subparagraph, personal casualty losses attributable to losses not described in subsection (i) shall be considered before such losses attributable to losses described in subsection (i).'', and

(2) by striking ''10 PERCENT'' in the heading and inserting ''PERCENTAGE''.

(b) ABOVE-THE-LINE DEDUCTION.—Section 62(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (defining adjusted gross income) is amended by inserting after paragraph (17) the following:

''(18) CERTAIN DISASTER LOSSES.—The deduction allowed by section 165(c)(3) to the extent attributable to losses described in section 165(i).''

(c) ELECTION TO TAKE DISASTER LOSS DEDUCTION FOR PRECEDING OR SUCCEEDING 2 YEARS.—Paragraph (1) of section 165(i) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to disaster losses) is amended—

(1) by inserting ''or succeeding'' after ''preceding'', and

(2) by inserting ''OR SUCCEEDING'' after ''PRECEDING'' in the heading.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to losses sustained in taxable years beginning after December 31, 1998.

NOTICE OF HEARING

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the Subcommittee on Forests and Public Land Management of the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

The hearing will take place on Wednesday, April 26, 2000, at 2:30 p.m. in room SD–366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, D.C.

The purpose of this hearing is to receive testimony on S. 2273, to establish the Black Rock Desert-High Rock Canyon Emigrant Trails National Conservation Area, and for other purposes; and S. 2048 and H.R. 3605, to establish the San Rafael Western Legacy District in the State of Utah, and for other purposes.

Those who wish to submit written statement should write to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, D.C. 20510. For further information, please call Mike Menge or Bill Eby at (202) 224–6170.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Special Committee on Aging be authorized to meet on April 10, 2000, from 1 p.m.–4 p.m. in Dirksen 106 for the purpose of conducting a hearing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

FISCAL YEAR 2001 BUDGET—H. CON. RES. 290

On April 7, 2000, the Senate amended and passed H. Con. Res. 290, as follows:

Resolved, That the resolution from the House of Representatives (H. Con. Res. 290) entitled ''Concurrent resolution establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2001, revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2000, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2002 through 2005.'', do pass with the following amendment:

Strike out all after the resolving clause and insert:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001.

(a) DECLARATION.—Congress determines and declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2001 including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2002, 2003, 2004, and 2005 as authorized by section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and the revised budgetary levels for fiscal year 2000 as authorized by section 304 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this concurrent resolution is as follows:

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2001.

TITLE I—LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.
Sec. 102. Social Security.
Sec. 103. Major functional categories.
Sec. 104. Reconciliation of revenue reductions in the Senate.
Sec. 105. Appropriate levels for Function 920.
Sec. 106. Further appropriate levels for Function 920.

TITLE II—BUDGETARY RESTRAINTS AND RULEMAKING

Sec. 201. Congressional lock box for Social Security surpluses.
Sec. 202. Reserve fund for prescription drugs.
Sec. 203. Reserve fund for stabilization of payments to counties in support of education.
Sec. 204. Reserve fund for agriculture.
Sec. 205. Tax reduction reserve fund in the Senate.
Sec. 206. Mechanism for additional debt reduction.
Sec. 207. Emergency designation point of order in the Senate.
Sec. 208. Reserve fund pending increase of fiscal year 2001 discretionary spending limits.
Sec. 209. Congressional firewall for defense and nondefense spending.
Sec. 210. Mechanisms for strengthening budgetary integrity.
Sec. 211. Prohibition on use of Federal Reserve surpluses.
Sec. 212. Reaffirming the prohibition on the use of revenue offsets for discretionary spending.
Sec. 213. Application and effect of changes in allocations and aggregates.
Sec. 214. Reserve fund to foster the health of children with disabilities and the employment and independence of their families.
Sec. 215. Exercise of rulemaking powers.
Sec. 216. Reserve fund for military retiree health care.
Sec. 217. Reserve fund for early learning and parent support programs.

TITLE III—SENSE OF THE SENATE PROVISIONS

Sec. 301. Sense of the Senate on controlling and eliminating the growing international problem of tuberculosis.
Sec. 302. Sense of the Senate on increased funding for the Child Care and Development Block Grant.
Sec. 303. Sense of the Senate on tax relief for college tuition paid and for interest paid on student loans.
Sec. 304. Sense of the Senate on increased funding for the National Institutes of Health.
Sec. 305. Sense of the Senate supporting funding levels in Educational Opportunities Act.
Sec. 306. Sense of the Senate on additional budgetary resources.
Sec. 307. Sense of the Senate on regarding the inadequacy of the payments for skilled nursing care.
Sec. 308. Sense of the Senate on the CARA programs.
Sec. 309. Sense of the Senate on veterans' medical care.
Sec. 310. Sense of the Senate on Impact Aid.
Sec. 311. Sense of the Senate on funding for increased acreage under the Conservation Reserve Program and the Wetlands Reserve Program.

Sec. 312. Sense of the Senate on tax simplification.
Sec. 313. Sense of the Senate on antitrust enforcement by the Department of Justice and Federal Trade Commission regarding agriculture mergers and anticompetitive activity.
Sec. 314. Sense of the Senate regarding fair markets for American farmers.
Sec. 315. Sense of the Senate on women and Social Security reform.
Sec. 316. Protection of battered women and children.
Sec. 317. Use of False Claims Act in combatting medicare fraud.
Sec. 318. Sense of the Senate regarding the National Guard.
Sec. 319. Sense of the Senate regarding military readiness.
Sec. 320. Sense of the Senate on compensation for the Chinese Embassy bombing in Belgrade.
Sec. 321. Sense of the Senate supporting funding of digital opportunity initiatives.
Sec. 322. Sense of the Senate regarding immunization funding.
Sec. 323. Sense of the Senate regarding tax credits for small businesses providing health insurance to low-income employees.
Sec. 324. Sense of the Senate on funding for criminal justice.
Sec. 325. Sense of the Senate regarding the Pell Grant.
Sec. 326. Sense of the Senate regarding comprehensive public education reform.
Sec. 327. Sense of the Senate on providing adequate funding for United States international leadership.
Sec. 328. Sense of the Senate concerning the HIV/AIDS crisis.
Sec. 329. Sense of the Senate regarding tribal colleges.
Sec. 330. Sense of the Senate to provide relief from the marriage penalty.
Sec. 331. Sense of the Senate on the continued use of Federal fuel taxes for the construction and rehabilitation of our Nation's highways, bridges, and transit systems.
Sec. 332. Sense of the Senate on the internal combustion engine.
Sec. 333. Sense of the Senate regarding the establishment of a national background check system for long-term care workers.
Sec. 334. Sense of the Senate concerning the price of prescription drugs in the United States.
Sec. 335. Sense of the Senate against Federal funding of smoke shops.
Sec. 336. Sense of the Senate regarding the need to reduce gun violence in America.
Sec. 337. Sense of the Senate supporting additional funding for fiscal year 2001 for medical care for our Nation's veterans.
Sec. 338. Sense of the Senate regarding medical care for veterans.
Sec. 339. Sense of the Senate concerning investment of Social Security trust funds.
Sec. 340. Sense of the Senate concerning digital opportunity.
Sec. 341. Sense of the Senate on medicare prescription drugs.
Sec. 342. Sense of the senate concerning funding for new education programs.
Sec. 343. Sense of the Senate regarding enforcement of Federal firearms laws.
Sec. 344. Sense of the Senate regarding the census.
Sec. 345. Sense of the Senate that any increase in the minimum wage should be accompanied by tax relief for small businesses.
Sec. 346. Sense of the Senate concerning the minimum wage.
Sec. 347. Sense of Congress regarding funding for the participation of members of the uniformed services in the Thrift Savings Plan.
Sec. 348. Sense of the Senate concerning protecting the Social Security trust funds.
Sec. 349. Sense of the Senate concerning regulation of tobacco products.
Sec. 350. Sense of the Senate regarding after school programs.
Sec. 351. Sense of Senate regarding cash balance pension plan conversions.
Sec. 352. Sense of the Senate concerning uninsured and low-income individuals in medically underserved communities.
Sec. 353. Sense of the Senate concerning fiscal year 2001 funding for the United States Coast Guard.

TITLE I—LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are the revised levels for fiscal year 2000 and the appropriate levels for the fiscal years 2001 through 2005:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution—

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $1,464,604,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,501,903,341,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,547,229,399,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,599,474,925,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,655,748,225,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,721,310,999,999.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: −$877,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: −$12,911,658,996.
Fiscal year 2002: −$24,157,600,996.
Fiscal year 2003: −$30,048,074,996.
Fiscal year 2004: −$36,894,774,996
Fiscal year 2005: −$42,790,999,997.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $1,467,259,500,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,478,583,890,003.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,503,416,000,003.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,614,843,200,003.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,670,986,800,003.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,731,182,000,003.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution and the revised fiscal year 2000 resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $1,441,461,500,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $1,451,702,341,003.
Fiscal year 2002: $1,470,727,399,003.
Fiscal year 2003: $1,590,481,125,003.
Fiscal year 2004: $1,644,813,025,003.
Fiscal year 2005: $1,706,375,000,003.

(4) DEFICITS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $23,147,500,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $53,473,000,001.
Fiscal year 2002: $76,577,000,001.
Fiscal year 2003: $9,076,200,001.
Fiscal year 2004: $10,975,800,001.
Fiscal year 2005: $14,958,000,001.

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $5,625,962,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $5,667,144,000,001.
Fiscal year 2002: $5,681,983,000,001.
Fiscal year 2003: $5,768,762,000,001.
Fiscal year 2004: $5,849,465,000,001.
Fiscal year 2005: $5,923,674,000,001.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of the debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $3,455,362,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $3,248,659,000,001.
Fiscal year 2002: $2,995,663,000,001.
Fiscal year 2003: $2,802,939,000,001.
Fiscal year 2004: $2,594,260,000,001.
Fiscal year 2005: $2,364,124,000,001.

SEC. 102. SOCIAL SECURITY.

(a) SOCIAL SECURITY REVENUES.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the amounts of revenues of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $479,648,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $501,533,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $524,854,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $547,179,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $569,907,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $597,326,000,000.

(b) SOCIAL SECURITY OUTLAYS.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the amounts of outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000: $322,545,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001: $331,869,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002: $339,068,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003: $347,733,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004: $357,737,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005: $368,976,000,000.

(c) SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—In the Senate, the amounts of new budget authority and budget outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund for administrative expenses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $3,160,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,187,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $3,429,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,378,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $3,471,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,438,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $3,505,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,473,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $3,541,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,507,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $3,576,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,543,000,000.

SEC. 103. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority, budget outlays, new direct loan obligations, and new primary loan guarantee commitments for fiscal year 2000 (as revised) and fiscal years 2001 through 2005 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $291,585,500,000.
(B) Outlays, $288,114,500,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $309,843,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $296,074,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $309,091,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $302,278,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $315,489,200,000.
(B) Outlays, $309,366,200,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $323,193,800,000.
(B) Outlays, $317,463,800,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $331,534,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $327,950,000,000.
(2) International Affairs (150):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $21,967,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,019,000,000.

Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $20,139,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,625,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $20,868,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,932,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $21,420,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,573,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $21,907,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,741,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $22,645,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,892,000,000.
(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $19,267,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,418,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $19,703,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,245,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $19,877,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,593,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $19,806,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,515,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $20,069,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,655,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $20,337,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,900,000,000.
(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $1,081,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$607,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $1,475,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $172,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, −$264,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$1,366,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $1,202,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$43,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $1,238,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$124,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $1,210,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$85,000,000.
(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $24,487,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,245,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $24,936,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,905,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $25,023,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,045,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $25,019,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,203,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $25,066,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,065,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $25,059,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,876,000,000.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $35,257,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,916,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $20,894,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,779,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $18,950,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,235,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $17,965,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,366,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $17,354,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $15,910,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $16,092,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,593,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $7,594,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,141,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $6,117,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,977,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $8,608,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,864,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $9,356,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,677,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $13,413,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,391,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $13,368,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,331,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $54,352,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,656,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $59,247,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,822,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $57,536,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $53,486,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $59,101,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $55,516,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $59,135,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $56,138,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $59,174,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $56,418,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $11,336,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,725,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $9,271,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $10,438,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $8,822,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,878,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $8,665,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,823,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $8,657,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,290,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $8,744,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,904,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $57,688,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $61,904,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $75,600,000,001.
(B) Outlays, $68,772,000,001.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $76,377,000,001.
(B) Outlays, $73,182,000,001.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $77,280,000,001.
(B) Outlays, $76,065,000,001.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $78,406,000,001.
(B) Outlays, $77,412,000,001.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $79,794,000,001.
(B) Outlays, $78,690,000,001.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $159,224,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $153,473,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $170,815,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $167,436,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $178,911,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $177,766,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $190,951,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $190,300,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $205,181,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $204,835,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $221,484,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $220,329,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $199,601,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $199,507,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $218,751,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $219,005,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $228,635,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $228,604,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $249,762,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $249,520,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $265,318,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $265,546,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $288,730,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $288,681,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $238,891,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $248,071,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $253,236,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $255,424,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $264,844,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $267,252,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $274,789,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $278,452,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $284,929,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $288,367,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $297,669,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $301,202,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $11,532,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,533,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $9,728,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,727,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $11,572,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $11,572,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $12,271,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,271,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $13,020,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,020,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $13,841,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,841,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $46,010,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,130,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $48,568,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,071,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $49,323,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,189,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $51,338,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $51,010,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $52,619,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,340,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $56,017,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $55,692,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $27,370,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,013,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $28,210,890,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,345,341,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $28,520,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,782,399,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $29,157,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $29,191,925,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $31,283,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,021,225,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $32,124,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,863,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $13,670,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,727,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $14,427,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $14,291,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $13,605,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,883,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $13,578,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,768,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $13,570,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,882,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $13,595,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,604,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, $284,491,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $284,493,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, $286,920,000,001.
(B) Outlays, $286,920,000,001.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, $285,291,000,001.
(B) Outlays, $285,290,000,001.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $279,465,000,001.
(B) Outlays, $279,465,000,001.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $275,502,000,001.
(B) Outlays, $275,502,000,001.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $270,951,000,001.
(B) Outlays, $270,951,000,001.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, −$3,829,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$11,702,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, −$62,031,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$50,131,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, −$59,729,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$71,311,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, −$790,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, −$6,770,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, −$6,072,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2000:
(A) New budget authority, −$34,315,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$34,315,000,000.
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, −$38,366,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$38,366,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, −$41,943,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$41,943,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, −$41,270,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$41,270,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, −$38,374,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$38,374,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, −$40,686,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$40,686,000,000.

SEC. 104. RECONCILIATION OF REVENUE REDUCTIONS IN THE SENATE.

Not later than September 22, 2000, the Senate Committee on Finance shall report to the Senate a reconciliation bill proposing changes in laws within its jurisdiction necessary to reduce revenues by not more than $12,911,658,999 in fiscal year 2001 and $146,803,109,999 for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005.

SEC. 105. APPROPRIATE LEVELS FOR FUNCTION 920.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution the appropriate levels for function 920 are as follows:
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, −$60,431,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$48,461,000,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, −$60,229,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$71,796,000,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, −$500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$5,287,000,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, −$500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$7,268,000,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, −$500,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$6,570,000,000.

SEC. 106. FURTHER APPROPRIATE LEVELS FOR FUNCTION 920.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, the appropriate levels for function 920 are as follows:
Fiscal year 2001:
(A) New budget authority, −$60,214,890,000.
(B) Outlays, −$48,152,341,000.
Fiscal year 2002:
(A) New budget authority, −$59,729,000,000.
(B) Outlays, −$71,395,399,000.
Fiscal year 2003:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, −$858,925,000.
Fiscal year 2004:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, −$6,779,225,000.
Fiscal year 2005:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, −$6,072,000,000.

TITLE II—BUDGETARY RESTRAINTS AND RULEMAKING

SEC. 201. CONGRESSIONAL LOCK BOX FOR SOCIAL SECURITY SURPLUSES.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) under the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, the Social Security trust funds are off-budget for purposes of the President's budget submission and the concurrent resolution on the budget;

(2) the Social Security trust funds have been running surpluses for 18 years;

(3) these surpluses have been used to implicitly finance the general operations of the Federal Government;

(4) in fiscal year 2001, the Social Security surplus will reach $166,000,000,000;

(5) in fiscal year 1999, the Federal budget was balanced without using Social Security;

(6) the only way to ensure that Social Security surpluses are not diverted for other purposes is to balance the budget exclusive of such surpluses; and

(7) Congress and the President should take such steps as are necessary to ensure that future budgets continue to be balanced excluding the surpluses generated by the Social Security trust funds.

(b) POINT OF ORDER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any revision to this concurrent resolution, or any other concurrent resolution on the budget, or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that sets forth a deficit for any fiscal year.

(2) DEFICIT LEVELS.—For purposes of this subsection, a deficit shall be the level (if any) set forth in the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget for that fiscal year pursuant to section 301(a)(3) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(c) BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.—For purposes of this section, the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for a fiscal year shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives or the Senate, as applicable.

(d) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (b) shall not apply if—

(1) the most recent of the Department of Commerce's advance, preliminary, or final reports of actual real economic growth indicate that the rate of real economic growth for each of the most recently reported quarter and the immediately preceding quarter is less than 1 percent; or

(2) a declaration of war is in effect.

(e) SOCIAL SECURITY LOOK-BACK.—If in any fiscal year the Social Security surplus is used to finance general operations of the Federal Government, an amount equal to the amount used shall be deducted from the available amount of discretionary spending for the following fiscal year for purposes of any concurrent resolution on the budget.

(f) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (b) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required in the Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

SEC. 202. RESERVE FUND FOR PRESCRIPTION DRUGS.

(a) ALLOCATION.—In the Senate, spending aggregates and other appropriate budgetary levels and limits may be adjusted and allocations may be revised for legislation reported by the Committee on Finance to provide a prescription drug benefit for fiscal years 2001, 2002, and 2003, provided that this legislation will not reduce the on-budget surplus by more than $20,000,000,000 total during these 3 fiscal years, and provided that the enactment of this legislation will not cause an on-budget deficit in any of these 3 fiscal years.

(b) EXCEPTION.—The adjustments provided in subsection (a) shall be made for a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment that is offered (in the Senate), that provides coverage for prescription drugs, if the Senate Committee on Finance has not reported such legislation on or before September 1, 2000.

(c) ADJUSTMENT.—If legislation is reported by the Senate Committee on Finance that extends the solvency of the Medicare Hospital Insurance Trust Fund without the use of transfers of new subsidies from the general fund, without decreasing beneficiaries' access to health care, and excluding the cost of extending and modifying the prescription drug benefit crafted pursuant to section (a) or (b), then the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget may change committee allocations and spending aggregates by no more than $20,000,000,000 total for fiscal years 2004 and 2005 to fund the prescription drug benefit if such legislation will not cause an on-budget deficit in either of these 2 fiscal years.

(d) BUDGETARY ENFORCEMENT.—The revision of allocations and aggregates made under this section shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

SEC. 203. RESERVE FUND FOR STABILIZATION OF PAYMENTS TO COUNTIES IN SUPPORT OF EDUCATION.

(a) ADJUSTMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Whenever the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate reports a bill, or an amendment thereto is offered, or a conference report thereon is submitted, that provides additional resources for counties and complies with paragraph (2), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may increase the allocation of budget authority and outlays to that committee by the amount of budget authority (and the outlays resulting therefrom) provided by that legislation for such purpose in accordance with subsection (b).

(2) CONDITION.—Legislation complies with this paragraph if it provides for the stabilization of receipt-based payments to counties that support school and road systems and also provides that a portion of those payments would be dedicated toward local investments in Federal lands within the counties.

(b) LIMITATIONS.—The adjustments to the allocations required by subsection (a) shall not exceed $200,000,000 in budget authority (and the outlays resulting therefrom) for fiscal year 2001 and shall not exceed $1,100,000,000 in budget authority (and the outlays resulting therefrom) for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005.

SEC. 204. RESERVE FUND FOR AGRICULTURE.

(a) ADJUSTMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—If the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry of the Senate reports a bill on or before June 29, 2000, or an amendment thereto is offered, or a conference report thereon is submitted that provides assistance for producers of program crops and specialty crops, and enhancements for agriculture conservation programs that complies with paragraph (2), the appropriate chairman of the Committee on the Budget may increase the allocation of budget authority and outlays to that committee by the amount of budget authority (and the outlays resulting therefrom) provided by that legislation for such purpose in accordance with subsection (b).

(2) CONDITIONS.—Legislation complies with this paragraph if it does not cause a net increase in budget authority and outlays of greater than $1,640,000,000 for fiscal year 2001.

(b) LIMITATIONS.—The adjustments to the allocations required by subsection (a) shall not exceed $5,500,000,000 in budget authority and outlays for fiscal year 2000, and $3,000,000,000 in budget authority (and the outlays resulting therefrom) for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005.

SEC. 205. TAX REDUCTION RESERVE FUND IN THE SENATE.

In the Senate, the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may reduce the spending and revenue aggregates and may revise committee allocations for legislation that reduces revenues if such legislation will not increase the deficit or decrease the surplus for—

(1) fiscal year 2001; or

(2) the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005.

SEC. 206. MECHANISM FOR ADDITIONAL DEBT REDUCTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—If any of the legislation described in subsection (b) does not become law on or before October 1, 2000, then the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate shall adjust the levels in this concurrent resolution as provided in subsection (c).

(b) LEGISLATION.—The adjustment required by subsection (a) shall be made with respect to—

(1) the reconciliation legislation required by section 104; or

(2) the Medicare legislation provided for in section 202.

(c) ADJUSTMENTS TO BE MADE.—The adjustment required in subsection (a) shall be—

(1) with respect to the legislation required by section 104, to decrease the balance displayed on the Senate's pay-as-you-go scorecard and increase the revenue aggregate by the amount set forth in section 104 (as adjusted, if adjusted, pursuant to section 205) and to decrease the level of debt held by the public as set forth in section 101(6) by that same amount; or

(2) with respect to the legislation provided for in section 202, to decrease the balance displayed on the Senate's pay-as-you-go scorecard by the amount set forth in section 202 and to decrease the level of debt held by the public as set forth in section 101(6) by that same amount and make the corresponding adjustments to the revenue and spending aggregates and allocations (as adjusted by section 202).

SEC. 207. EMERGENCY DESIGNATION POINT OF ORDER IN THE SENATE.

(a) DESIGNATIONS.—

(1) GUIDANCE.—In making a designation of a provision of legislation as an emergency requirement under section 251(b)(2)(A) or 252(e) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the committee report and any statement of managers accompanying that legislation shall analyze whether a proposed emergency requirement meets all the criteria in paragraph (2).

(2) CRITERIA.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The criteria to be considered in determining whether a proposed expenditure or tax change is an emergency requirement are—

(i) necessary, essential, or vital (not merely useful or beneficial);

(ii) sudden, quickly coming into being, and not building up over time;

(iii) an urgent, pressing, and compelling need requiring immediate action;

(iv) subject to subparagraph (B), unforeseen, unpredictable, and unanticipated; and

(v) not permanent, temporary in nature.

(B) UNFORESEEN.—An emergency that is part of an aggregate level of anticipated emergencies, particularly when normally estimated in advance, is not unforeseen.

(3) JUSTIFICATION FOR FAILURE TO MEET CRITERIA.—If the proposed emergency requirement does not meet all the criteria set forth in paragraph (2), the committee report or the statement of managers, as the case may be, shall provide a written justification of why the requirement should be accorded emergency status.

(b) POINT OF ORDER.—When the Senate is considering a bill, resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report, a point of order may be made by a Senator against an emergency designation in that measure and if the Presiding Officer sustains that point of order, that provision making such a designation shall be stricken from the measure and may not be offered as an amendment from the floor.

(c) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required in the Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

(d) DEFINITION OF AN EMERGENCY REQUIREMENT.—A provision shall be considered an emergency designation if it designates any item an emergency requirement pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A) or 252(e) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(e) FORM OF THE POINT OF ORDER.—A point of order under this section may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(f) CONFERENCE REPORTS.—If a point of order is sustained under this section against a conference report the report shall be disposed of as provided in section 313(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(g) EXCEPTION FOR DEFENSE SPENDING.—Subsection (b) shall not apply against an emergency designation for a provision making discretionary appropriations in the defense category.

SEC. 208. RESERVE FUND PENDING INCREASE OF FISCAL YEAR 2001 DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.

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

(1) The functional totals with respect to discretionary spending set forth in this concurrent resolution, if implemented, would result in legislation which exceeds the limit on discretionary spending for fiscal year 2001 set out in section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985. Nonetheless, the allocation pursuant to section 302 of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 to the Committee on Appropriations is in compliance with current law spending limits.

(2) Consequently unless and until the discretionary spending limit for fiscal year 2001 is increased, aggregate appropriations which exceed the current law limits would still be out of order in the Senate and subject to a supermajority vote.

(3) The functional totals contained in this concurrent resolution envision a level of discretionary spending for fiscal year 2001 as follows:

(A) For the discretionary category: $602,179,000,000 in new budget authority and $593,926,000,000 in outlays.

(B) For the highway category: $26,920,000,000 in outlays.

(C) For the mass transit category: $4,639,000,000 in outlays.

(4) To facilitate the Senate completing its legislative responsibilities for the 106th Congress in a timely fashion, it is imperative that the Senate consider legislation which increases the discretionary spending limit for fiscal year 2001 as soon as possible.

(b) ADJUSTMENT TO ALLOCATIONS.—Whenever a bill or joint resolution becomes law that increases the discretionary spending limit for fiscal year 2001 set out in section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the appropriate chairman of the Committee on the Budget shall increase the allocation called for in section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the appropriate Committee on Appropriations.

(c) LIMITATION ON ADJUSTMENT.—An adjustment made pursuant to subsection (b) shall not result in an allocation under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 that exceeds the total budget authority and outlays set forth in subsection (a)(3).

SEC. 209. CONGRESSIONAL FIREWALL FOR DEFENSE AND NONDEFENSE SPENDING.

(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, for fiscal year 2001 the term ''discretionary spending limit'' means—

(1) for the defense category, $310,819,000,000 in new budget authority and $297,050,000,000 in outlays; and

(2) for the nondefense category, $291,360,000,000 in new budget authority and $329,183,000,000 in outlays.

(b) POINT OF ORDER IN THE SENATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—After the adjustment to the section 302(a) allocation to the Appropriations Committee is made pursuant to section 207 and except as provided in paragraph (2), it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that exceeds any discretionary spending limit set forth in this section.

(2) EXCEPTION.—This subsection shall not apply if a declaration of war by Congress is in effect.

(c) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—This section may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required in the Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

SEC. 210. MECHANISMS FOR STRENGTHENING BUDGETARY INTEGRITY.

(a) DEFINITION.—For purposes of this section, the term ''budget year'' means with respect to a

session of Congress, the fiscal year of the Government that starts on October 1 of the calendar year in which that session begins.

(b) POINT OF ORDER WITH RESPECT TO ADVANCED APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, resolution, amendment, motion or conference report that—

(A) provides an appropriation of new budget authority for any fiscal year after the budget year that is in excess of the amounts provided in paragraph (2); and

(B) provides an appropriation of new budget authority for any fiscal year subsequent to the year after the budget year.

(2) LIMITATION ON AMOUNTS.—The total amount, provided in appropriations legislation for the budget year, of appropriations for the subsequent fiscal year shall not exceed $23,000,000,000.

(c) POINT OF ORDER WITH RESPECT TO DELAYED OBLIGATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that contains an appropriation of new budget authority for any fiscal year which does not become available upon enactment of such legislation or on the first day of that fiscal year (whichever is later).

(2) EXCEPTION.—Paragraph (1) shall not apply with respect to appropriations in the defense category; nor shall it apply to appropriations reoccurring or customary or for the following programs: Provided, That such appropriation is not delayed beyond the specified date and does not exceed the specified amount:

(A) DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR.—Operation of Indian Programs School Operation Costs (Bureau of Indian Affairs Funded Schools and Other Education Programs): July 1 not to exceed $401,000,000.

(B) DEPARTMENT OF LABOR.—

(i) Training and Employment Service: July 1 not to exceed $1,650,000,000.

(ii) State Unemployment Insurance: July 1 not to exceed $902,000,000.

(C) DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION.—

(i) Education Reform: July 1 not to exceed $512,000,000.

(ii) Education for the Disadvantaged: July 1 not to exceed $2,462,000,000.

(iii) School Improvement Program: July 1 not to exceed $975,000,000.

(iv) Special Education: July 1 not to exceed $2,048,000,000.

(v) Vocational Education: July 1 not to exceed $858,000,000.

(D) DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION.—Grants to the National Railroad Passenger Corporation: September 30 not to exceed $343,000,000.

(E) DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—Medical Care (equipment-land-structures): August 1 not to exceed $900,000,000.

(F) ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY.—Hazardous Substance Superfund: September 1 not to exceed $100,000,000.

(d) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsections (b) and (c) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required in the Senate to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under this section.

(e) FORM OF THE POINT OF ORDER.—A point of order under this section may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974.

(f) CONFERENCE REPORTS.—If a point of order is sustained under this section against a conference report, the report shall be disposed of as provided in section 313(d) of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974.

(g) PRECATORY AMENDMENTS.—For purposes of interpreting section 305(b)(2) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, an amendment is not germane if it contains only precatory language.

(h) SUNSET.—Except for subsection (g), this section shall expire effective October 1, 2002.

SEC. 211. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FEDERAL RESERVE SURPLUSES.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to ensure that transfers from nonbudgetary governmental entities such as the Federal Reserve banks shall not be used to offset increased on-budget spending when such transfers produce no real budgetary or economic effects.

(b) BUDGETARY RULE.—For purposes of points of order under this resolution and the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, provisions contained in any bill, resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that affects any surplus funds of the Federal Reserve banks shall not be scored with respect to the level of budget authority, outlays, or revenues contained in such legislation.

SEC. 212. REAFFIRMING THE PROHIBITION ON THE USE OF REVENUE OFFSETS FOR DISCRETIONARY SPENDING.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to reaffirm Congress' belief that the discretionary spending limits should be adhered to and not circumvented by increasing taxes.

(b) RESTATEMENT OF BUDGETARY RULE.—For purposes of points of order under this resolution and the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974, provisions contained in an appropriations bill (or an amendment thereto or a conference report thereon) resulting in increased revenues shall continue not to be scored with respect to the level of budget authority or outlays contained in such legislation.

SEC. 213. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) APPLICATION.—Any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this concurrent resolution for any measure shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations and aggregates contained in this concurrent resolution.

SEC. 214. RESERVE FUND TO FOSTER THE HEALTH OF CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES AND THE EMPLOYMENT AND INDEPENDENCE OF THEIR FAMILIES.

(a) ADJUSTMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Whenever the Committee on Finance of the Senate reports a bill, or an amendment thereto is offered, or a conference report thereon is submitted, that facilitates children with disabilities receiving needed health care at home and complies with paragraph (2), the chairman of the Committee on the Budget may increase the spending aggregate and allocation of budget authority and outlays to that committee by the amount of budget authority (and the outlays resulting therefrom) provided by that legislation for such purpose in accordance with subsection (b).

(2) CONDITION.—Legislation complies with this paragraph if it finances health programs designed to allow children with disabilities to access the health services they need to remain at home with their families while allowing their families to become or remain employed.

(b) LIMITATIONS.—The adjustments to the spending aggregates and allocations required by subsection (a) shall not exceed $50,000,000 in budget authority (and the outlays resulting therefrom) for fiscal year 2001 and shall not exceed $300,000,000 in budget authority (and the outlays resulting therefrom) for the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005.

SEC. 215. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

Congress adopts the provisions of this title—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate and the House of Representatives, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, or of that House to which they specifically apply, and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change those rules (so far as they relate to that House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of that House.

SEC. 216. RESERVE FUND FOR MILITARY RETIREE HEALTH CARE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the Senate, aggregates, allocations, functional totals, and other budgetary levels and limits may be revised for Department of Defense authorization legislation reported by the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate to fund improvements to health care programs for military retirees and their dependents in order to fulfill the promises made to them: Provided, That the enactment of that legislation will not cause an on-budget deficit for—

(1) fiscal year 2001; or

(2) the period of fiscal years 2001 through 2005.

(b) REVISED LEVELS.—Upon the consideration of legislation pursuant to subsection (a), the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may file with the Senate appropriately revised allocations under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and revised functional levels and aggregates to carry out this section. These revised allocations, functional levels, and aggregates shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as allocations, functional levels, and aggregates contained in this resolution.

SEC. 217. RESERVE FUND FOR EARLY LEARNING AND PARENT SUPPORT PROGRAMS.

(a) ADJUSTMENT.—When the Committee on Education and Workforce of the House of Representatives or the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate reports a bill, an amendment is offered in the House of Representatives or the Senate, or a conference report is filed that improves opportunities at the local level for early learning, brain development, and school readiness for young children from birth to age 6 and offers support programs for such families, particularly those with special needs such as mental health issues and behavioral disorders, the relevant chairman of the Committee on the Budget may increase the allocation aggregates, functions, totals, and other budgetary totals in the resolution by the amount of budget authority (and the outlays resulting therefrom) provided by the legislation for such purpose in accordance with subsection (b) if the legislation does not cause an on-budget deficit.

(b) LIMITATIONS.—The adjustments to the aggregates and totals pursuant to subsection (a) shall not exceed $8,500,000,000 on-budget authority (and the outlays resulting therefrom) for the period fiscal year 2001 through 2005.

TITLE III—SENSE OF THE SENATE PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON CONTROLLING AND ELIMINATING THE GROWING INTERNATIONAL PROBLEM OF TUBERCULOSIS.

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

(1) According to the World Health Organization—

(A) nearly 2,000,000 people worldwide die each year of tuberculosis-related illnesses;

(B) one-third of the world's total population is infected with tuberculosis; and

(C) tuberculosis is the world's leading killer of women between 15- and 44-years old and is a leading cause of children becoming orphans.

(2) Because of the ease of transmission of tuberculosis, its international persistence and growth pose a direct public health threat to

those nations that had previously largely controlled the disease. This is complicated in the United States by the growth of the homeless population, the rate of incarceration, international travel, immigration, and HIV/AIDS.

(3) With nearly 40 percent of the tuberculosis cases in the United States attributable to foreign-born persons, tuberculosis will never be eliminated in the United States until it is controlled abroad.

(4) The means exist to control tuberculosis through screening, diagnosis, treatment, patient compliance, monitoring, and ongoing review of outcomes.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assumes that additional resources should be provided to fund international tuberculosis control efforts at $60,000,000 in fiscal year 2001, consistent with authorizing legislation approved by the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate.

SEC. 302. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON INCREASED FUNDING FOR THE CHILD CARE AND DEVELOPMENT BLOCK GRANT.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) in 1998, 33.2 percent of women in the labor force have children under 14;

(2) in 1998, 65.2 percent of women with children younger than age 6, and 78.4 percent of women with children ages 6 through 17 were in the labor force, and 41.6 percent of women with children younger than 3 were employed full-time;

(3) 1,920,000 couples both working and with children under 18 had family incomes of under $30,000 (10.3 percent);

(4)(A) in 1998, 11,700,000 children out of 21,300,000 (55.1 percent) under the age of 5 have employed mothers;

(B) 18.4 percent of children under 6 are cared for by their fathers at home;

(C) another 5.5 percent (562,000) are looked after by their mother either at home or away from home; and

(D) in other words, less than a quarter (23.9 percent) of these children are taken care of by 1 parent;

(5) a 1997 General Accounting Office study found that the increased work participation requirement of the welfare reform law will cause the need for child care to exceed the known supply;

(6) a 1995 study by the Urban Institute of child care prices in 6 cities found that the average cost of daycare for a 2-year-old in a child care center ranged from $3,100 to $8,100;

(7) for an entry-level worker, the family's child care costs at the average price of care for an infant in a child care center would be at least 50 percent of family income in 5 of the 6 cities examined;

(8) a large number of low- and middle-income families sacrifice a second full-time income so that a parent may be at home with the child;

(9) the average income of 2-parent families with a single income (a family with children, wife does not work) is $13,566 less than the average income of 2-parent families with 2 incomes;

(10) a recent National Institute for Child Health and Development study found that the greatest factor in the development of a young child is ''what is happening at home and in families''; and

(11) increased tax relief directed at making child care more affordable, and increased funding for the Child Care and Development Block Grant, would take significant steps toward bringing quality child care within the reach of many parents, and would increase the options available to parents in deciding how best to care for their children.

(b) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution and legislation enacted pursuant to this resolution assume—

(1) that tax relief should be directed to parents who are struggling to afford quality child care, including those who wish to stay home to care for a child, and should be included in any tax cut package; and

(2) a total of $4,567,000,000 in funding for the Child Care and Development Block Grant in fiscal year 2001.

SEC. 303. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON TAX RELIEF FOR COLLEGE TUITION PAID AND FOR INTEREST PAID ON STUDENT LOANS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) in our increasingly competitive global economy, the attainment of a higher education is critical to the economic success of an individual, as evidenced by the fact that, in 1975, college graduates earned an average of 57 percent more than those who just finished high school, compared to 76 percent more today;

(2) the cost of attaining a higher education has outpaced both inflation and median family incomes;

(3) specifically, over the past 20 years, the cost of college tuition has quadrupled (growing faster than any consumer item, including health care and nearly twice as fast as inflation) and 8 times as fast as median household incomes;

(4) despite recent increases passed by Congress, the value of the maximum Pell Grant has declined 23 percent since 1975 in inflation-adjusted terms, forcing more students to rely on student loans to finance the cost of a higher education;

(5) from 1992 to 1998, the demand for student loans soared 82 percent and the average student loan increased 367 percent;

(6) according to the Department of Education, there is approximately $150,000,000,000 in outstanding student loan debt, and students borrowed more during the 1990's than during the 1960's, 1970's, and 1980's combined; and

(7) in Congress, proposals have been made to address the rising cost of tuition and mounting student debt, including a bipartisan proposal to provide a deduction for tuition paid and a credit for interest paid on student loans.

(b) SENSE OF SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution and legislation enacted pursuant to this resolution assume that any tax cut package reported by the Finance Committee and passed by Congress during the fiscal year 2001 budget reconciliation process include tax relief for college tuition paid and for interest paid on student loans.

SEC. 304. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON INCREASED FUNDING FOR THE NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) the National Institutes of Health is the Nation's foremost research center;

(2) the Nation's commitment to and investment in biomedical research has resulted in better health and an improved quality of life for all Americans;

(3) continued biomedical research funding must be ensured so that medical doctors and scientists have the security to commit to conducting long-term research studies;

(4) funding for the National Institutes of Health should continue to increase in order to prevent the cessation of biomedical research studies and the loss of medical doctors and research scientists to private research organizations; and

(5) the National Institutes of Health conducts research protocols without proprietary interests, thereby ensuring that the best health care is researched and made available to the Nation.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume increased funding in function 550 (Health) for the National Institutes of Health of $2,700,000,000, reflecting the commitment made in the fiscal year 1998 Senate Budget Resolution to double the National Institute of Health budget by 2003.

SEC. 305. SENSE OF THE SENATE SUPPORTING FUNDING LEVELS IN EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES ACT.

It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that of the amounts provided for elementary and secondary education within the Budget Function 500 of this resolution for fiscal years 2001 through 2005, such funds shall be appropriated in proportion to and in accordance with the levels authorized in the Educational Opportunities Act, S. 2.

SEC. 306. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON ADDITIONAL BUDGETARY RESOURCES.

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

(1) In its review of government operations, the General Accounting Office noted that it was unable to determine the extent of improper government payments, due to the poor quality of agency accounting practices. In particular, the General Accounting Office cited the Government's inability to—

(A) ''properly account for and report billions of dollars of property, equipment, materials, and supplies and certain stewardship assets''; and

(B) ''properly prepare the Federal Government's financial statements, including balancing the statements, accounting for billions of dollars of transactions between governmental entities, and properly and consistently compiling the information in the financial statements.''.

(2) Private economic forecasters are currently more optimistic than the Congressional Budget Office (CBO). Blue Chip expects 2000 real GDP growth of 4.1 percent, whereas the Congressional Budget Office expects 3.3 percent growth. From 1999 through 2005, Blue Chip expects real GDP to grow more than 0.3 percentage points faster per year than the Congressional Budget Office does. Using budgetary rules of thumb, this latter difference translates into more than $150,000,000,000 over the 5-year budget window.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels contained in this resolution assume that—

(1) there are billions of dollars in wasted expenditures in the Federal Government that should be eliminated; and

(2) higher projected budget surpluses arising from reductions in government waste and stronger revenue inflows could be used in the future for additional tax relief or debt reduction.

SEC. 307. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON REGARDING THE INADEQUACY OF THE PAYMENTS FOR SKILLED NURSING CARE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) Congress confronted and addressed the funding crisis for medicare beneficiaries requiring skilled nursing care through the Balanced Budget Refinement Act of 1999;

(2) Congress recognized the need to address the inadequacy of the prospective payment system for certain levels of care, as well as the need to end arbitrary limits on rehabilitative therapies. Congress restored $2,700,000,000 to reduce access threats to skilled care for medicare beneficiaries; and

(3) Currently, more than 1,600 skilled nursing facilities caring for more than 175,000 frail and elderly Americans have filed for bankruptcy protection.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that—

(1) the Administration should identify areas where they have the authority to make changes to improve quality, including analyzing and fixing the labor component of the skilled nursing facility market basket update factor; and

(2) while Congress deliberates funding structural medicare reform and the addition of a prescription drug benefit, it must maintain the continued viability of the current skilled nursing benefit. Therefore, the committees of jurisdiction should ensure that medicare beneficiaries requiring skilled nursing care have access to that care and that those providers have the resources to meet the expectation for high quality care.

SEC. 308. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON THE CARA PROGRAMS.

It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that, if the Congress and

the President so choose, the following programs can be fully funded as discretionary programs in fiscal year 2001, including—

(1) the Land and Water Conservation Fund programs;

(2) the Federal aid to Wildlife Fund;

(3) the Urban Parks and Recreation Recovery Grants;

(4) the National Historic Preservation Fund;

(5) the Payment in Lieu of Taxes; and

(6) the North American Wetlands Conservation Act.

SEC. 309. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON VETERANS' MEDICAL CARE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) this budget addresses concerns about veterans' medical care;

(2) we successfully increased the appropriation for veterans' medical care by $1,700,000,000 last year, although the President had proposed no increase in funding in his budget; and

(3) this year's budget proposes to increase the veterans' medical care appropriation by $1,400,000,000, the level of funding in the President's budget.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume an increase of $1,400,000,000 in veterans' medical care appropriations in fiscal year 2001.

SEC. 310. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON IMPACT AID.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) the Impact Aid, as created by Congress in 1950, fulfills a Federal obligation to local educational agencies impacted by a Federal presence;

(2) the Impact Aid provides funds to these local educational agencies to help them meet the basic educational needs of all their children, particularly the needs of transient military dependent students, Native American children, and students from low-income housing projects; and

(3) the Impact Aid is funded at a level less than what is required to fully fund ''all'' federally connected local educational agencies.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that the Impact Aid Program strive to reach the goal that all local educational agencies eligible for Impact Aid receive at a minimum, 40 percent of their maximum payment under sections 8002 and 8003.

SEC. 311. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON FUNDING FOR INCREASED ACREAGE UNDER THE CONSERVATION RESERVE PROGRAM AND THE WETLANDS RESERVE PROGRAM.

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

(1) The Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) and the Wetlands Reserve Program (WRP) have been successful, voluntary, incentive-based endeavors that over the last decade and a half have turned millions of acres of marginal cropland into reserves that protect wildlife in the United States, provide meaningful income to farmers and ranchers (especially in periods of collapsed commodity prices), and combat soil and water erosion. CRP and WRP also provide increased opportunities for hunting, fishing, and other recreational activities.

(2) CRP provides landowners with technical and financial assistance, including annual rental payments, in exchange for removing environmentally sensitive farmland from production and implementing conservation practices. Currently, CRP includes around 31,300,000 acres in the United States.

(3) Similarly, WRP offers technical and financial assistance to landowners who select to restore wetlands. Currently, WRP includes 785,000 acres nationwide.

(4) Furthermore, bipartisan legislation has been introduced in the 106th Congress to increase the acreage permitted under both CRP and WRP. The Administration also supports raising the acreage limitations in both programs.

(5) Unfortunately, both CRP and WRP may soon become victims of their own success and their respective statutory acreage limitations unless Congress acts. Given the popularity and demand for these conservation programs, the statutory acreage limitations will likely exhaust resources available to producers who want to participate in CRP or WRP. As currently authorized, CRP has an enrollment cap of 36,400,000 acres and WRP is limited at 975,000 acres. As of October 1, 1999, enrollment in CRP stood at approximately 31,300,000 acres and enrollment in WRP at just over 785,000 acres.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that Congress and the Administration should take steps to raise the acreage limits of the CRP and WRP in order to make these programs available to aid the preservation and conservation of sensitive natural soil and water resources without negatively effecting rural communities. Further, such actions should help improve farm income for agricultural producers and restore prosperity and growth to rural sectors of the United States.

SEC. 312. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON TAX SIMPLIFICATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the tax code has become increasingly complex, undermining confidence in the system, and often undermining the principles of simplicity, efficiency, and equity;

(2) some have estimated that the resources required to keep records and file returns already cost American families an additional 10 percent to 20 percent over what they actually pay in income taxes; and

(3) if it is to enact a greatly simplified tax code, Congress should have a thorough understanding of the problem as well as specific proposals to consider.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that the Joint Committee on Taxation shall develop a report and alternative proposals on tax simplification by the end of the year, and the Department of the Treasury is requested to develop a report and alternative proposals on tax simplification by the end of the year.

SEC. 313. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON ANTITRUST ENFORCEMENT BY THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE AND FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION REGARDING AGRICULTURE MERGERS AND ANTICOMPETITIVE ACTIVITY.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds that—

(1) the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice is charged with the civil and criminal enforcement of the antitrust laws, including the review of corporate mergers likely to reduce competition in particular markets, with a goal of protecting the competitive process;

(2) the Bureau of Competition of the Federal Trade Commission is also charged with enforcement of the antitrust laws, including the review of corporate mergers likely to reduce competition;

(3) the Antitrust Division and the Bureau of Competition are also responsible for the prosecution of companies and individuals who engage in anti-competitive behavior and unfair trade practices;

(4) the number of merger filings under the Hart-Scott-Rodino Antitrust Improvements Act of 1976, which the Department of Justice, in conjunction with the Federal Trade Commission, is required to review, has increased significantly in fiscal years 1998 and 1999;

(5) large agri-businesses have constituted part of this trend in mergers and acquisitions;

(6) farmers and small agricultural producers are experiencing one of the worst periods of economic downturn in years;

(7) farmers currently get less than a quarter of every retail food dollar, down from nearly half of every retail food dollar in 1952;

(8) the top 4 beef packers presently control 80 percent of the market, the top 4 pork producers control 57 percent of the market, and the largest sheep processors and poultry processors control 73 percent and 55 percent of the market, respectively;

(9) the 4 largest grain processing companies presently account for approximately 62 percent of the Nation's flour milling, and the 4 largest firms control approximately 75 percent of the wet corn milling and soybean crushing industry;

(10) farmers and small, independent producers are concerned about the substantial increase in concentration in the agriculture industry and significantly diminished opportunities in the marketplace; and

(11) farmers and small, independent producers are also concerned about possible anticompetitive behavior and unfair business practices in the agriculture industry.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that—

(1) the Antitrust Division and the Bureau of Competition will have adequate resources to enable them to meet their statutory requirements, including those related to reviewing increasingly numerous and complex mergers and investigating and prosecuting anticompetitive business activity; and

(2) these departments will—

(A) dedicate considerable resources to matters and transactions dealing with agri-business antitrust and competition; and

(B) ensure that all vertical and horizontal mergers implicating agriculture and all complaints regarding possible anticompetitive business practices in the agriculture industry will receive extraordinary scrutiny.

SEC. 314. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING FAIR MARKETS FOR AMERICAN FARMERS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) United States agricultural producers are the most efficient and competitive in the world;

(2) United States agricultural producers are at a competitive disadvantage in the world market because the European Union outspends the United States (on a dollar/acre basis) by a ratio of 10:1 on domestic support and by a ratio of 60:1 on export subsidies;

(3) the support the European Union gives their producers results in more prosperous rural communities in Europe than in the United States;

(4) the European Union blocked consensus at the World Trade Organization ministerial meeting in Seattle because Europe does not want to surrender its current advantage in world markets;

(5) despite the competitiveness of American farmers, the European advantage has led to a declining United States share of the world market for agricultural products;

(6) the United States Department of Agriculture reports that United States export growth has lagged behind that of our major competitors, resulting in a loss of United States market share, from 24 percent in 1981 to its current level of 18 percent;

(7) the United States Department of Agriculture also reports that United States market share of global agricultural trade has eroded steadily over the past 2 decades, which could culminate in the United States losing out to the European Union as the world's top agricultural exporter sometime in 2000;

(8) prices of agricultural commodities in the United States are at 50-year lows in real terms, creating a serious economic crisis in rural America; and

(9) fundamental fairness requires that the playing field be leveled so that United States farmers are no longer at a competitive disadvantage.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that—

(1) the United States should take steps to increase support for American farmers in order to level the playing field for United States agricultural producers and increase the leverage of the

United States in World Trade Organization negotiations on agriculture as long as such support is not trade distorting, and does not otherwise exceed or impair existing Uruguay Round obligations; and

(2) such actions should improve United States farm income and restore the prosperity of rural communities.

SEC. 315. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON WOMEN AND SOCIAL SECURITY REFORM.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) without Social Security benefits, the elderly poverty rate among women would have been 52.2 percent, and among widows would have been 60.6 percent;

(2) women tend to live longer and tend to have lower lifetime earnings than men do;

(3) during their working years, women earn an average of 70 cents for every dollar men earn; and

(4) women spend an average of 11.5 years out of their careers to care for their families, and are more likely to work part-time than full-time.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that—

(1) women face unique obstacles in ensuring retirement security and survivor and disability stability;

(2) Social Security plays an essential role in guaranteeing inflation-protected financial stability for women throughout their old age;

(3) the Congress and the Administration should act, as part of Social Security reform, to ensure that widows and other poor elderly women receive more adequate benefits that reduce their poverty rates and that women, under whatever approach is taken to reform Social Security, should receive no lesser a share of overall federally funded retirement benefits than they receive today; and

(4) the sacrifice that women make to care for their family should be recognized during reform of Social Security and that women should not be penalized by taking an average of 11.5 years out of their careers to care for their family.

SEC. 316. PROTECTION OF BATTERED WOMEN AND CHILDREN.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) Each year an estimated 1,000,000 women suffer nonfatal violence by an intimate partner.

(2) Nearly 1 out of 3 adult women can expect to experience at least 1 physical assault by a partner during adulthood.

(3) Domestic violence is statistically consistent across racial and ethnic lines. It does not discriminate based on race or economic status.

(4) The chance of being victimized by an intimate partner is 10 times greater for a woman than a man.

(5) Past and current victims of domestic violence are over-represented in the welfare population. It is estimated that at least 60 percent of current welfare beneficiaries have experienced some form of domestic violence.

(6) Abused women who do seek employment face barriers as a result of domestic violence. Welfare studies show that 15 to 50 percent of abused women report interference from their partner with education, training, or employment.

(7) The programs established by the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 have empowered communities to address the threat caused by domestic violence.

(8) Since 1995, Congress has appropriated close to $1,800,000,000 to fund programs established by the Violence Against Women Act of 1994, including the STOP program, shelters for battered women and children, the domestic violence hotline, and Centers for Disease Control and Prevention injury control programs.

(9) The programs established by the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 have been and continue to comprise a successful national strategy for addressing the needs of battered women and the public health threat caused by this violence.

(10) The Supreme Court could act during this session to overturn a major protection and course of action provided for in the Violence Against Women Act of 1994. In United States v. Morrison/Brzonkala, the Supreme Court will address the issue of the constitutionality of the Federal civil rights remedy under the Violence Against Women Act of 1994, and may overturn congressional intent to elevate violence against women to a category protected under Federal civil rights law.

(11) The actions taken by the courts and the failure to reauthorize the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 has generated a great deal of concern in communities nationwide.

(12) Funding for the programs established by the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 is the only lifeline for battered women and Congress has a moral obligation to continue funding and to strengthen key components of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994.

(13) Congress and the Administration should work to ensure the continued funding of programs established by the Violence Against Women Act of 1994.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that, in light of the pending litigation challenging the constitutionality of the Federal civil rights remedy in the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 and the lack of action on legislation reauthorizing and strengthening the provisions of that Act—

(1) Congress, through reauthorization of the programs established by the Violence Against Women Act of 1994, should work to eliminate economic barriers that trap women and children in violent homes and relationships; and

(2) full funding for the programs established by the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 will be provided from the Violent Crime Reduction Fund.

SEC. 317. USE OF FALSE CLAIMS ACT IN COMBATTING MEDICARE FRAUD.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) the solvency of the medicare trust funds is of vital importance to the well-being of the Nation's seniors and other vulnerable people in need of quality health care;

(2) fraud against the medicare trust funds is a major problem resulting in the depletion of the trust funds; and

(3) chapter 37 of title 31, United States Code (commonly referred to as the False Claims Act) and the qui tam provisions of that chapter are vital tools in combatting fraud against the medicare program.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that chapter 37 of title 31, United States Code (commonly referred to as the False Claims Act) and the qui tam provisions of that chapter are essential tools in combatting medicare fraud and should not be weakened in any way.

SEC. 318. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE NATIONAL GUARD.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) the Army National Guard relies heavily upon thousands of full-time employees, Military Technicians and Active Guard/Reserves, to ensure unit readiness throughout the Army National Guard;

(2) these employees perform vital day-to-day functions, ranging from equipment maintenance to leadership and staff roles, that allow the drill weekends and annual active duty training of the traditional Guardsmen to be dedicated to preparation for the National Guard's warfighting and peacetime missions;

(3) when the ability to provide sufficient Active Guard/Reserves and Technicians end strength is reduced, unit readiness, as well as quality of life for soldiers and families is degraded;

(4) the Army National Guard, with agreement from the Department of Defense, requires a minimum essential requirement of 23,500 Active Guard/Reserves and 25,500 Technicians; and

(5) the fiscal year 2001 budget request for the Army National Guard provides resources sufficient for approximately 22,430 Active Guard/Reserves and 23,957 Technicians, end strength shortfalls of 1,052 and 1,543, respectively.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.— It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in the resolution assume that the Department of Defense will give priority to funding the Active Guard/Reserves and Military Technicians at levels authorized by Congress in the fiscal year 2000 Department of Defense authorization bill.

SEC. 319. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING MILITARY READINESS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) the Secretary of the Air Force stated that the United States Air Force's top unfunded readiness priority for fiscal year 2000 was its aircraft spares and repair parts account and top Air Force officers have said that getting more spares is a top priority to improve readiness rates;

(2) the Chief of Naval Operations stated that the aircraft spares and repair parts account for a top readiness priority important to the long-term health of the Navy;

(3) the General Accounting Office's study of personnel retention problems in the armed services cited shortages of spares and repair parts as a major reason why people are leaving the services;

(4) the fiscal year 2001 budget request decreases the Air Force's spares and repair parts account by 13 percent from fiscal year 2000 expected levels; and

(5) the fiscal year 2001 budget request decreases the Navy's spares and repair parts account by 6 percent from the fiscal year 2000 expected levels.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the functional totals in the budget resolution assume that Congress will protect the Department of Defense's readiness accounts, including spares and repair parts, and operations and maintenance, and use the requested levels as the minimum baseline for fiscal year 2001 authorization and appropriations.

SEC. 320. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON COMPENSATION FOR THE CHINESE EMBASSY BOMBING IN BELGRADE.

It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume funds designated to compensate the People's Republic of China for the damage inadvertently done to their embassy in Belgrade by NATO forces in May 1999, should not be appropriated from the international affairs budget.

SEC. 321. SENSE OF THE SENATE SUPPORTING FUNDING OF DIGITAL OPPORTUNITY INITIATIVES.

(a) The Senate finds that—

(1) computers, the Internet, and information networks are not luxury items but basic tools largely responsible for driving the current economic expansions;

(2) information technology utility relies on software applications and online content;

(3) access to computers and the Internet and the ability to use this technology effectively is becoming increasingly important for full participation in America's economic, political, and social life; and

(4) unequal access to technology and high-tech skills by income, educational level, race, and geography could deepen and reinforce the divisions that exist within American society.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that the Committees on Appropriations and Finance should support efforts that address the digital divide, including tax incentives and funding to—

(1) broaden access to information technologies;

(2) provide workers and teachers with information technology training;

(3) promote innovative online content and software applications that will improve commerce, education, and quality of life; and

(4) help provide information and communications technology to underserved communities.

SEC. 322. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING IMMUNIZATION FUNDING.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) vaccines protect children and adults against serious and potentially fatal diseases;

(2) society saves up to $24 in medical and societal costs for every dollar spent on vaccines;

(3) every day, 11,000 babies are born—4,000,000 each year—and each child needs up to 19 doses of vaccine by age 2;

(4) approximately 1,000,000 2-year-olds have not received all of the recommended vaccine doses;

(5) the immunization program under section 317(j)(1) under the Public Health Service Act, administered by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, provides grants to States and localities for critical activities including immunization registries, outbreak control, provider education, outreach efforts, and linkages with other public health and welfare services;

(6) Federal grants to States and localities for these activities have declined from $271,000,000 in 1995 to $139,000,000 in 2000;

(7) because of these funding reductions States are struggling to maintain immunization rates and have implemented severe cuts to immunization delivery activities;

(8) even with significant gains in national immunization rates, underimmunized children still exist and there are a number of subpopulations where coverage rates remain low and are actually declining;

(9) rates in many of the Nation's urban areas, including Chicago and Houston, are unacceptably low; and

(10) these pockets of need create pools of susceptible children and increase the risk of dangerous disease outbreaks.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in the resolution assume that Congress should enact legislation that provides $214,000,000 in funding for immunization grants under section 317 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 247b) for infrastructure and delivery activities, including targeted support for immunization project areas with low or declining immunization rates or who have subpopulations with special needs.

SEC. 323. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING TAX CREDITS FOR SMALL BUSINESSES PROVIDING HEALTH INSURANCE TO LOW-INCOME EMPLOYEES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) 25,000,000 workers in the United States were uninsured in 1997 and more than two-thirds of the uninsured workers earn less than $20,000 annually, according to a Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation report;

(2) the percentage of employees of small businesses who have employer-sponsored health insurance coverage decreased from 52 percent in 1996 to 47 percent in 1998; for the smallest employers, those with 3 to 9 workers, the percentage of employees covered by employer-sponsored health insurance fell from 36 percent in 1996 to 31 percent in 1998;

(3) between 1996 and 1998, health premiums for small businesses increased 5.2 percent; premiums increased by 8 percent for the smallest employers, the highest increase among all small businesses;

(4) monthly family coverage for workers at firms with 3 to 9 employees cost $520 in 1998, compared to $462 for family coverage for workers at large firms; and

(5) only 39 percent of small businesses with a significant percentage of low-income employees offer employer-provided health insurance and such companies are half as likely to offer health benefits to such employees as are companies that have only a small percentage of low-income employees.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that Congress should enact legislation that allows small businesses to claim a tax credit when they provide health insurance to low-income employees.

SEC. 324. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON FUNDING FOR CRIMINAL JUSTICE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) our success in the fight against crime and improvements in the administration of justice are the result of a bipartisan effort; and

(2) since 1993 the Congress and the President have increased justice funding by 92 percent, and a strong commitment to law enforcement and the administration of justice remains appropriate.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that funds to improve the justice system will be available as follows:

(1) $665,000,000 for the expanded support of direct Federal enforcement, adjudicative, and correctional-detention activities.

(2) $50,000,000 in additional funds to combat terrorism, including cyber crime.

(3) $41,000,000 in additional funds for construction costs for the Federal Bureau of Prisons and the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center.

(4) $200,000,000 in support of Customs and Immigration and Nationalization Service port of entry officers for the development and implementation of the ACE computer system designed to meet critical trade and border security needs.

(5) Funding is available for the continuation of such programs as: the Byrne Grant Program, Violence Against Women, Juvenile Accountability Block Grants, First Responder Training, Local Law Enforcement Block Grants, Weed and Seed, Violent Offender Incarceration and Truth in Sentencing, State Criminal Alien Assistance Program, Drug Courts, Residential Substance Abuse Treatment, Crime Identification Technologies, Bulletproof Vests, Counterterrorism, Interagency Law Enforcement Coordination.

SEC. 325. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE PELL GRANT.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) public investment in higher education yields a return of several dollars for each dollar invested;

(2) higher education promotes economic opportunity for individuals; for example recipients of bachelor's degrees earn an average of 75 percent per year more than those with high school diplomas and experience half as much unemployment as high school graduates;

(3) access to a college education has become a hallmark of American society, and is vital to upholding our belief in equality of opportunity;

(4) for a generation, the Federal Pell Grant has served as an established and effective means of providing access to higher education;

(5) over the past decade, Pell Grant has failed to keep up with inflation. Over the past 25 years, the value of the average Pell Grant has decreased by 23 percent—it is now worth only 77 percent of what Pell Grants were worth in 1975;

(6) grant aid as a portion of student aid has fallen significantly over the past 5 years. Grant aid used to comprise 55 percent of total aid awarded and loans comprised just over 40 percent. Now that trend has been reversed so that loans comprise nearly 60 percent of total aid awarded and grants only comprise 40 percent of total aid awarded;

(7) the percentage of freshmen attending public and private 4-year institutions from families whose income is below the national median has fallen since 1981.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that within the discretionary allocation provided to the Committee on Appropriations, the funding for the maximum Pell Grant award should be at or above the level requested by the President.

SEC. 326. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING COMPREHENSIVE PUBLIC EDUCATION REFORM.

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

(1) Recent scientific evidence demonstrates that enhancing children's physical, social, emotional, and intellectual development before the age of 6 results in tremendous benefits throughout life.

(2) Successful schools are led by well-trained, highly qualified principals, but many principals do not get the training in management skills that the principals need to ensure their school provides an excellent education for every child.

(3) Good teachers are a crucial catalyst to quality education, but 1 in 4 new teachers do not meet State certification requirements; each year more than 50,000 underprepared teachers enter the classroom; and 12 percent of new teachers have had no teacher training at all.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that the Federal Government should support State and local educational agencies engaged in comprehensive reform of their public education system and that any public education reform should include at least the following principles:

(1) Every child should begin school ready to learn.

(2) Training and development for principals and teachers should be a priority.

SEC. 327. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON PROVIDING ADEQUATE FUNDING FOR UNITED STATES INTERNATIONAL LEADERSHIP.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) United States international leadership is essential to maintaining security and peace for all Americans;

(2) such leadership depends on effective diplomacy as well as a strong military;

(3) effective diplomacy requires adequate resources both for operations and security of United States embassies and for international programs;

(4) in addition to building peace, prosperity, and democracy around the world, programs in the International Affairs (150) budget serve United States interests by ensuring better jobs and a higher standard of living, promoting the health of our citizens and preserving our natural environment, and protecting the rights and safety of those who travel or do business overseas;

(5) real spending for International Affairs has declined more than 40 percent since the mid-1980's, at the same time that major new challenges and opportunities have arisen from the disintegration of the Soviet Union and the worldwide trends toward democracy and free markets;

(6) current ceilings on discretionary spending will impose severe additional cuts in funding for International Affairs;

(7) improved security for United States diplomatic missions and personnel will place further strain on the International Affairs budget absent significant additional resources;

(8) the United States cannot reduce efforts to safeguard nuclear materials in the former Soviet States or shortchange initiatives aimed at maintaining stability on the Korean peninsula, where 37,000 United States forces are deployed. We cannot reduce support for peace in the Middle East or in Northern Ireland or in the Balkans. We cannot stop fighting terror or simply surrender to the spread of HIV/AIDS. We must continue to support all of these things, which are difficult to achieve without adequate and realistic funding levels; and

(9) the President's request for funds for fiscal year 2001 would adequately finance our International Affairs programs without detracting from our defense and domestic needs. It would help keep America prosperous and secure. It would enable us to leverage the contributions of allies and friends on behalf of democracy and peace. It would allow us to protect the interests of Americans who travel, study, or do business overseas. It would do all these things and more for about 1 penny of every dollar the Federal Government spends.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that additional budgetary resources should be identified for function 150 to enable successful United States international leadership.

SEC. 328. SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING THE HIV/AIDS CRISIS.

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

(1) More than 16,000,000 people have been killed by Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome (AIDS) since the epidemic began.

(2) 14,000,000 Africans have died as a result of the AIDS epidemic. Eighty-four percent of the worldwide deaths from AIDS have occurred in sub-Saharan Africa.

(3) Each day, AIDS kills 5,500 Africans, and infects 11,000 more.

(4) By the end of 2000, 10,400,000 children in sub-Saharan Africa will have lost one or both parents, to AIDS.

(5) Over 85 percent of the world's HIV-positive children live in Africa.

(6) Fewer than 5 percent of those living with AIDS in Africa have access to even the most basic care.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the functional totals underlying this resolution on the budget assume that Congress has recognized the catastrophic effects of the HIV/AIDS epidemic, particularly in sub-Saharan Africa, and seeks to maximize the effectiveness of the United States' efforts to combat the disease through any necessary authorization or appropriations;

(2) Congress should strengthen ongoing programs which address education and prevention, testing, the care of AIDS orphans, and improving home and community-based care options for those living with AIDS; and

(3) Congress should seek additional or new tools to combat the epidemic, including initiatives to encourage vaccine development and programs aimed at preventing mother-to-child transmission of the disease.

SEC. 329. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING TRIBAL COLLEGES.

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

(1) More than 26,500 students from 250 tribes nationwide attend tribal colleges. The colleges serve students of all ages, many of whom are moving from welfare to work. The vast majority of tribal college students are first-generation college students.

(2) While annual appropriations for tribal colleges have increased modestly in recent years, core operation funding levels are still about half of the $6,000 per Indian student level authorized by the Tribally Controlled College or University Act.

(3) Although tribal colleges received a $3,000,000 increase in funding in fiscal year 2000, because of rising student populations and other factors, these institutions may face an actual per-student decrease in funding over fiscal year 1999.

(4) Per-student funding for tribal colleges is roughly half the amount given to mainstream community colleges.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that—

(1) the Senate recognizes the funding difficulties faced by tribal colleges and assumes that priority consideration will be provided to them through funding for the Tribally Controlled College and University Act, the 1994 Land Grant Institutions, and title III of the Higher Education Act; and

(2) such priority consideration reflects Congress' intent to continue work toward current statutory Federal funding goals for the tribal colleges.

SEC. 330. SENSE OF THE SENATE TO PROVIDE RELIEF FROM THE MARRIAGE PENALTY.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) marriage is the foundation of the American society and a key institution for preserving our values;

(2) the tax code should not penalize those who choose to marry;

(3) a report to the Treasury Department's Office of Tax Analysis estimates that in 1999, 48 percent of married couples will pay a marriage penalty under the present tax system;

(4) the Congressional Budget Office found that the average penalty amounts to $1,400 a year.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the level in this budget resolution assume that the Congress shall—

(1) pass marriage penalty tax relief legislation that begins a phasedown of this penalty in 2001;

(2) consider such legislation prior to April 15, 2000.

SEC. 331. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON THE CONTINUED USE OF FEDERAL FUEL TAXES FOR THE CONSTRUCTION AND REHABILITATION OF OUR NATION'S HIGHWAYS, BRIDGES, AND TRANSIT SYSTEMS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) current law, as stipulated in the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century (TEA–21), requires all Federal gasoline taxes be deposited into the Highway Trust Fund;

(2) current law, as stipulated in TEA–21, guarantees that all such deposits to the Highway Trust Fund are spent in full on the construction and rehabilitation of our Nation's highways, bridges, and transit systems;

(3) the funding guarantees contained in TEA–21 are essential to the ability of the Nation's Governors, highway commissioners, and transit providers to address the growing backlog of critical transportation investments in order to stem the deterioration of our road and transit systems, improve the safety of our highways, and reduce the growth of congestion that is choking off economic growth in communities across the Nation;

(4) any effort to reduce the Federal gasoline tax or de-link the relationship between highway user fees and highway spending pose a great danger to the integrity of the Highway Trust Fund and the ability of the States to invest adequately in our transportation infrastructure; and

(5) proposals to reduce the Federal gasoline tax threaten to endanger the spending levels guaranteed in TEA–21 while providing no guarantee that consumers will experience any reduction in price at the gas pump.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the functional totals in this budget resolution do not assume the reduction of any Federal gasoline taxes on either a temporary or permanent basis.

SEC. 332. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON THE INTERNAL COMBUSTION ENGINE.

It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that the Senate will not, on behalf of Vice President Al Gore, increase gasoline and diesel fuel taxes by $1.50 per gallon effective July 1, 2000, and by an additional $1.50 per gallon effective fiscal year 2005, as part of ''a coordinated global program to accomplish the strategic goal of completely eliminating the internal combustion engine over, say, a twenty-five year period'' since ''their cumulative impact on the global environment is posing a mortal threat to the security of every nation that is more deadly than that of any military enemy we are ever again likely to confront''.

SEC. 333. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A NATIONAL BACKGROUND CHECK SYSTEM FOR LONG-TERM CARE WORKERS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) The impending retirement of the baby boom generation will greatly increase the demand and need for quality long-term care and it is incumbent on Congress and the President to ensure that medicare and medicaid patients are protected from abuse, neglect, and mistreatment.

(2) Although the majority of long-term care facilities do an excellent job in caring for elderly and disabled patients, incidents of abuse and neglect and mistreatment do occur at an unacceptable rate and are not limited to nursing homes alone.

(3) Current Federal and State safeguards are inadequate because there is little or no information sharing between States about known abusers and no common State procedures for tracking abusers from State to State and facility to facility.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the assumptions underlying the functional totals in this concurrent resolution on the budget assume that a national registry of abusive long-term care workers should be established by building upon existing infrastructures at the Federal and State levels that would enable long-term care providers who participate in the medicare and medicaid programs to conduct background checks on prospective employees.

SEC. 334. SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING THE PRICE OF PRESCRIPTION DRUGS IN THE UNITED STATES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) Today, two-thirds of senior citizens in the United States have access to prescription drugs through health insurance coverage.

(2) However, it is difficult for many Americans, including senior citizens, to afford the prescription drugs that they need to stay healthy.

(3) Many senior citizens in the United States leave the country and go to Canada or Mexico to buy prescription drugs that are developed, manufactured, and approved in the United States in order to buy such drugs at lower prices than such drugs are sold for in the United States.

(4) According to the General Accounting Office, a consumer in the United States pays on average ⅓ more for a prescription drug than a consumer pays for the same drug in another country.

(5) The United States has made a strong commitment to supporting the research and development of new drugs through taxpayer-supported funding of the National Institutes of Health, through the research and development tax credit, and through other means.

(6) The development of new drugs is important because the use of such drugs enables people to live longer and lead healthier, more productive lives.

(7) Citizens of other countries should pay a portion of the research and development costs for new drugs, or their fair share of such costs, rather than just reap the benefits of such drugs.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the budgetary levels in this resolution assume that the cost disparity between identical prescription drugs sold in the United States, Canada, and Mexico should be reduced or eliminated.

SEC. 335. SENSE OF THE SENATE AGAINST FEDERAL FUNDING OF SMOKE SHOPS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) Smoking begun by children during their teen years and even earlier turns the lives of far too many Americans into nightmares decades later, plagued by disease and premature death.

(2) The Federal Government should leave a legacy of more healthy Americans and fewer victims of tobacco-related illness.

(3) Efforts by the Federal Government should seek to protect young people from the dangers of smoking.

(4) Discount tobacco stores, sometimes known as smoke shops, operate to sell high volumes of cigarettes and other tobacco products, often at significantly reduced prices, with each tobacco outlet often selling millions of discount cigarettes each year.

(5) Studies by the Surgeon General and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention demonstrate that children are particularly susceptible to price differentials in cigarettes, such as those available through smoke shop discounts.

(6) The Department of Housing and Urban Development is using Federal funds for grants to construct not less than 6 smoke shops or facilities that contain a smoke shop.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the budget levels in this resolution assume that no Federal funds may be used by the Department of Housing and Urban Development to provide any grant or other assistance to construct, operate, or otherwise benefit a smoke shop or other tobacco outlet.

SEC. 336. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE NEED TO REDUCE GUN VIOLENCE IN AMERICA.

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

(1) On average, 12 children die from gun fire everyday in America.

(2) On May 20, 1999, the Senate passed the Violent and Repeat Offender Accountability and Rehabilitation Act, by a vote of 73 to 25, in part, to stem gun-related violence in the United States.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in function 750 of this resolution assume that Congress should—

(1) pass the conference report to accompany H.R. 1501, the Violent and Repeat Juvenile Offender Accountability and Rehabilitation Act, including Senate-passed provisions, with the purpose of limiting access to firearms by juveniles, convicted felons, and other persons prohibited by law from purchasing or possessing firearms; and

(2) consider H.R. 1501 not later than April 20, 2000.

SEC. 337. SENSE OF THE SENATE SUPPORTING ADDITIONAL FUNDING FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001 FOR MEDICAL CARE FOR OUR NATION'S VETERANS.

(a) It is the sense of the Senate that the provisions in this resolution assume that if the Congressional Budget Office determines there is an on-budget surplus for fiscal year 2001, $500,000,000 of that surplus will be restored to the programs cut in this amendment.

(b) It is the sense of the Senate that the assumptions underlying this budget resolution assume that none of these offsets will come from defense or veterans, and to the extent possible should come from administrative functions.

SEC. 338. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING MEDICAL CARE FOR VETERANS.

It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the provisions of this resolution assume that if the Congressional Budget Office determines there is an on-budget surplus for fiscal year 2001, $450,000,000 of that surplus will be restored to the programs cut by this amendment; and

(2) the assumptions underlying this resolution assume that none of the offsets made by this amendment will come from defense or veterans and should, to the extent possible, come from administrative functions.

SEC. 339. SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING INVESTMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUNDS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) Government investment of the Social Security trust funds in the stock market is a gamble Congress should be unwilling to make on behalf of the millions who receive and depend on Social Security to meet their retirement needs;

(2) in 1999, the Senate voted 99–0 to oppose Government investment of the Social Security trust funds in private financial markets;

(3) in addition to the unanimous opposition of the United States Senate, Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan and Securities and Exchange Commissioner Arthur Levitt also oppose the idea; and

(4) despite this opposition, and despite the dangers inherent in having the Government invest Social Security trust funds in private financial markets, President Clinton has once again suggested, on page 37 of the Administration's proposed fiscal year 2001 Federal budget, that the Government invest part of the Social Security trust funds in corporate equities.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the assumptions underlying the functional totals in this resolution assume that the Federal Government should not directly invest contributions made to the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund established under section 201 of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 401), or any interest derived from those contributions, in private financial markets.

SEC. 340. SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING DIGITAL OPPORTUNITY.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) A digital divide exists in America. Low-income, urban and rural families are less likely to have access to the Internet and computers. African American and Hispanic families are only 2/5 as likely to have Internet access as white families. Access by Native Americans to the Internet and to computers is statistically negligible.

(2) Regardless of income level, Americans living in rural areas lag behind in Internet access. Individuals with lower incomes who live in rural areas are half as likely to have Internet access as individuals who live in urban areas.

(3) The digital divide for the poorest Americans has grown by 29 percent since 1997.

(4) Access to computers and the Internet and the ability to use this technology effectively is becoming increasingly important for full participation in America's economic, political and social life.

(5) Unequal access to technology and high-tech skills by income, educational level, race and geography could deepen and reinforce the divisions that exist within American society.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the functional totals underlying this resolution on the budget assume that—

(1) to ensure that all children are computer literate by the time they finish the eighth grade, regardless of race, ethnicity, gender, income, geography or disability, to broaden access to information technologies, to provide workers, teachers and students with information technology training, and to promote innovative online content and software applications that will improve commerce, education and quality of life, initiatives that increase digital opportunity should be provided for as follows:

(A) $200,000,000 in tax incentives should be provided to encourage private sector donation of high-quality computers, sponsorship of community technology centers, training, technical services and computer repair;

(B) $450,000,000 should be provided for teacher training;

(C) $150,000,000 for new teacher training;

(D) $400,000,000 should be provided for school technology and school libraries;

(E) $20,000,000 should be provided to place computers and trained personnel in Boys & Girls Clubs;

(F) $25,000,000 should be provided to create an E-Corps within Americorps;

(G) $100,000,000 should be provided to create 1,000 Community Technology Centers in low-income urban and rural communities;

(H) $50,000,000 should be provided for public/private partnerships to expand home access to computers and the Internet for low-income families;

(I) $45,000,000 should be provided to promote innovative applications of information and communications technology for underserved communities;

(J) $10,000,000 should be provided to prepare Native Americans for careers in Information Technology and other technical fields; and

(2) all Americans should have access to broadband telecommunications capability as soon as possible and as such, initiatives that increase broadband deployment should be funded, including $25,000,000 to accelerate private sector deployment of broadband and networks in underserved urban and rural communities.

SEC. 341. SENSE OF THE SENATE ON MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUGS.

It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this budget resolution assume that among its reform options, Congress should explore a medicare prescription drug proposal that—

(1) is voluntary;

(2) increases access for all medicare beneficiaries;

(3) is designed to provide meaningful protection and bargaining power for medicare beneficiaries in obtaining prescription drugs;

(4) is affordable for all medicare beneficiaries and for the medicare program;

(5) is administered using private sector entities and competitive purchasing techniques;

(6) is consistent with broader medicare reform;

(7) preserves and protects the financial integrity of the medicare trust funds;

(8) does not increase medicare beneficiary premiums; and

(9) provides a prescription drug benefit as soon as possible.

SEC. 342. SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING FUNDING FOR NEW EDUCATION PROGRAMS.

It is the sense of the Senate that the budgetary levels in this resolution assume that Congress' first priority should be to fully fund the programs described under part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1411 et seq.) at the originally promised level of 40 percent before Federal funds are appropriated for new education programs.

SEC. 343. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING ENFORCEMENT OF FEDERAL FIREARMS LAWS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) The Clinton Administration has failed to adequately enforce Federal firearms laws. Between 1992 and 1998, Triggerlock gun prosecutions—prosecutions of defendants who use a firearm in the commission of a felony—dropped nearly 50 percent, from 7,045 to approximately 3,800.

(2) The decline in Federal firearms prosecutions was not due to a lack of adequate resources. During the period when Federal firearms prosecutions decreased nearly 50 percent, the overall budget of the Department of Justice increased 54 percent.

(3) It is a Federal crime to possess a firearm on school grounds under section 922(q) of title 18, United States Code. The Clinton Department of Justice prosecuted only 8 cases under this provision of law during 1998, even though more than 6,000 students brought firearms to school that year. The Clinton Administration prosecuted only 5 such cases during 1997.

(4) It is a Federal crime to transfer a firearm to a juvenile under section 922(x) of title 18, United States Code. The Clinton Department of Justice prosecuted only 6 cases under this provision of law during 1998 and only 5 during 1997.

(5) It is a Federal crime to transfer or possess a semiautomatic assault weapon under section 922(v) of title 18, United States Code. The Clinton Department of Justice prosecuted only 4 cases under this provision of law during 1998 and only 4 during 1997.

(6) It is a Federal crime for any person ''who has been adjudicated as a mental defective or who has been committed to a mental institution'' to possess or purchase a firearm under section 922(g) of title 18, United States Code. Despite this Federal law, mental health adjudications are not placed on the national instant criminal background system established under section 103(b) of the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act (18 U.S.C. 922 note).

(7) It is a Federal crime for any person knowingly to make any false statement in the attempted purchase of a firearm under section

922(a)(6) of title 18, United States Code. It is also a Federal crime for convicted felons to possess or purchase a firearm under section 922(g) of title 18, United States Code.

(8) More than 500,000 convicted felons and other prohibited purchasers have been prevented from buying firearms from licensed dealers since the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act was enacted. When these felons attempted to purchase a firearm, they violated section 922(a)(6) of title 18, United States Code, by making a false statement under oath that they were not disqualified from purchasing a firearm. Nonetheless, of the more than 500,000 violations, only approximately 200 of the felons have been referred to the Department of Justice for prosecution.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the assumptions underlying the functional totals in this concurrent resolution on the budget assume that Federal funds will be used for an effective law enforcement strategy requiring a commitment to enforcing existing Federal firearms laws by—

(1) designating not less than 1 Assistant United States Attorney in each district to prosecute Federal firearms violations and thereby expand Project Exile nationally;

(2) upgrading the national instant criminal background system established under section 103(b) of the Brady Handgun Violence Prevention Act (18 U.S.C. 922 note) by encouraging States to place mental health adjudications on that system and by improving the overall speed and efficiency of that system; and

(3) providing incentive grants to States to encourage States to impose mandatory minimum sentences for firearm offenses based on section 924(c) of title 18, United States Code, and to prosecute those offenses in State court.

SEC. 344. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING THE CENSUS.

It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution and legislation enacted pursuant to this resolution assume that no American will be prosecuted, fined or in anyway harassed by the Federal Government or its agents for failure to respond to any census questions which refer to an individual's race, national origin, living conditions, personal habits or mental and/or physical condition, but that all Americans are encouraged to send in their census forms.

SEC. 345. SENSE OF THE SENATE THAT ANY INCREASE IN THE MINIMUM WAGE SHOULD BE ACCOMPANIED BY TAX RELIEF FOR SMALL BUSINESSES.

It is the sense of the Senate that the functional totals underlying this resolution on the budget assume that the minimum wage should be increased as provided for in amendment number 2547, the Domenici and others amendment to S. 625, the Bankruptcy Reform legislation.

SEC. 346. SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING THE MINIMUM WAGE.

It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that Congress should enact legislation to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 201 et seq.) to increase the Federal minimum wage by $1.00 over 1 year with a $0.50 increase effective May 2, 2000 and another $0.50 increase effective on May 2, 2001.

SEC. 347. SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING FUNDING FOR THE PARTICIPATION OF MEMBERS OF THE UNIFORMED SERVICES IN THE THRIFT SAVINGS PLAN.

It is the sense of Congress that the levels of funding for the defense category in this resolution—

(1) assume that members of the Armed Forces are to be authorized to participate in the Thrift Savings Plan; and

(2) provide the $980,000,000 necessary to offset the reduced tax revenue resulting from that participation through fiscal year 2009.

SEC. 348. SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING PROTECTING THE SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUNDS.

It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that the Congress shall pass legislation which provides for sequestration to reduce Federal spending by the amount necessary to ensure that, in any fiscal year, the Social Security surpluses are used only for the payment of Social Security benefits, retirement security, Social Security reform, or to reduce the Federal debt held by the public.

SEC. 349. SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING REGULATION OF TOBACCO PRODUCTS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) Cigarette smoking and tobacco use is the single most preventable cause of death and disability in the United States.

(2) Cigarette smoking and tobacco use cause approximately 400,000 deaths each year in the United States.

(3) Health care costs associated with treating tobacco-related diseases are $80,000,000,000 per year, and almost half of such costs are paid for by taxpayer-financed government health care programs.

(4) In spite of the well established dangers of cigarette smoking and tobacco use, there is no Federal agency that has authority to regulate the manufacture, sale, distribution, and use of tobacco products.

(5) Major tobacco companies spend over $5,600,000,000 each year ($15,000,000 each day) to promote the use of tobacco products.

(6) Ninety percent of adult smokers first started smoking before the age of 18.

(7) Each day 3,000 children become regular smokers and ⅓ of such children will die of diseases associated with the use of tobacco products.

(8) The Food and Drug Administration regulates the manufacture, sale, distribution, and use of nicotine-containing products used as substitutes for cigarette smoking and tobacco use and should be granted the authority to regulate tobacco products.

(9) Congress should restrict youth access to tobacco products and ensure that tobacco products meet minimum safety standards.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the budgetary levels in this resolution assume that—

(1) the Food and Drug Administration is the most qualified Federal agency to regulate tobacco products; and

(2) Congress should enact legislation in the year 2000 that grants the Food and Drug Administration the authority to regulate tobacco products.

SEC. 350. SENSE OF THE SENATE REGARDING AFTER SCHOOL PROGRAMS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) The demand for after school education is very high, with more than 1,000,000 students waiting to get into such programs.

(2) After school programs improve educational achievement and have widespread support, with over 90 percent of the American people supporting such programs.

(3) 450 of the Nation's leading police chiefs, sheriffs, and prosecutors, along with the presidents of the Fraternal Order of Police, and the International Union of Police Associations, support government funding of after school programs.

(4) Many of our Nation's governors endorse increasing the number of after school programs through a Federal and State partnership.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that this resolution assumes that the President's level of funding for after school programs in fiscal year 2001 will be provided, which will accommodate the current need for after school programs.

SEC. 351. SENSE OF SENATE REGARDING CASH BALANCE PENSION PLAN CONVERSIONS.

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

(1) Defined benefit pension plans are guaranteed by the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation and provide a lifetime benefit for a beneficiary and spouse.

(2) Defined benefit pension plans provide meaningful retirement benefits to rank and file workers, since such plans are generally funded by employer contributions.

(3) Employers should be encouraged to establish and maintain defined benefit pension plans.

(4) An increasing number of major employers have been converting their traditional defined benefit plans to ''cash balance'' or other hybrid defined benefit plans.

(5) Under current law, employers are not required to provide plan participants with meaningful disclosure of the impact of converting a traditional defined benefit plan to a ''cash balance'' or other hybrid formula.

(6) For a number of years after a conversion, the cash balance or other hybrid benefit formula may result in a period of ''wear away'' during which older and longer service participants earn no additional benefits.

(7) Federal law should continue to prohibit pension plan participants from being discriminated against on the basis of age in the provision of pension benefits.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the levels in this resolution assume that pension plan participants whose plans are changed to cause older or longer service workers to earn less retirement income, including conversions to ''cash balance plans,'' should receive additional protection than what is currently provided, and Congress should act this year to address this important issue. In particular, at a minimum—

(1) all pension plan participants should receive adequate, accurate, and timely notice of any change to a plan that will cause participants to earn less retirement income in the future; and

(2) pension plans that are changed to a cash balance or other hybrid formula should not be permitted to ''wear away'' participants' benefits in such a manner that older and longer service participants earn no additional pension benefits for a period of time after the change.

SEC. 352. SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING UNINSURED AND LOW-INCOME INDIVIDUALS IN MEDICALLY UNDERSERVED COMMUNITIES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate finds that—

(1) the uninsured population in the United States continues to grow at over 100,000 individuals per month, and is estimated to reach over 53,000,000 people by 2007;

(2) the growth in the uninsured population continues despite public and private efforts to increase health insurance coverage;

(3) nearly 80 percent of the uninsured population are members of working families who cannot afford health insurance or cannot access employer-provided health insurance plans;

(4) minority populations, rural residents, and single-parent families represent a disproportionate number of the uninsured population;

(5) the problem of health care access for the uninsured population is compounded in many urban and rural communities by a lack of providers who are available to serve both insured and uninsured populations;

(6) community, migrant, homeless, and public housing health centers have proven uniquely qualified to address the lack of adequate health care services for uninsured populations, serving over 4,500,000 uninsured patients in 1999, including over 1,000,000 new uninsured patients who have sought care from such centers in the last 3 years;

(7) health centers care for nearly 7,000,000 minorities, nearly 600,000 farmworkers, and more than 500,000 homeless individuals each year;

(8) health centers provide cost-effective comprehensive primary and preventive care to uninsured individuals for less than $1.00 per day, or $350 annually, and help to reduce the inappropriate use of costly emergency rooms and inpatient hospital care;

(9) current resources only allow health centers to serve 10 percent of the Nation's 44,000,000 uninsured individuals;

(10) past investments to increase health center access have resulted in better health, an improved quality of life for all Americans, and a reduction in national health care expenditures; and

(11) Congress can act now to increase access to health care services for uninsured and low-income people together with or in advance of health care coverage proposals by expanding the availability of services at community, migrant, homeless, and public housing health centers.

(b) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that the functional totals underlying this resolution on the budget assume that—

(1) appropriations for consolidated health centers under section 330 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254b) should be increased by 100 percent over the next 5 fiscal years in order to double the number of individuals who receive health care services at community, migrant, homeless, and public housing health centers; and

(2) appropriations for consolidated health centers should be increased by $150,000,000 in fiscal year 2001 over the amount appropriated for such centers in fiscal year 2000.

SEC. 353. SENSE OF THE SENATE CONCERNING FISCAL YEAR 2001 FUNDING FOR THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Senate makes the following findings:

(1) The United States Coast Guard in 1999 saved approximately 3,800 lives in providing the essential service of maritime safety.

(2) The United States Coast Guard in 1999 prevented 111,689 pounds of cocaine and 28,872 pounds of marijuana from entering the United States in providing the essential service of maritime security.

(3) The United States Coast Guard in 1999 boarded more than 14,000 fishing vessels to check for compliance with safety and environmental laws in providing the essential service of the protection of natural resources.

(4) The United States Coast Guard in 1999 ensured the safe passage of nearly 1,000,000 commercial vessel transits through congested harbors with vessel traffic services in providing the essential service of maritime mobility.

(5) The United States Coast Guard in 1999 sent international training teams to help more than 50 countries develop their maritime services in providing the essential service national defense.

(6) Each year, the United States Coast Guard ensures the safe passage of more than 200,000,000 tons of cargo cross the Great Lakes including iron ore, coal, and limestone. Shipping on the Great Lakes faces a unique challenge because the shipping season begins and ends in ice anywhere from 3 to 15 feet thick. The ice-breaking vessel MACKINAW has allowed commerce to continue under these conditions. However, the productive life of the MACKINAW is nearing an end. The Coast Guard has committed to keeping the vessel in service until 2006 when a replacement vessel is projected to be in service, but to meet that deadline, funds must be provided for the Coast Guard in fiscal year 2001 to provide for the procurement of a multipurpose-design heavy icebreaker.

(7) Without adequate funding, the United States Coast Guard would have to radically reduce the level of service it provides to the American public.

(b) ADJUSTMENT IN BUDGET LEVELS.—

(1) INCREASE IN FUNDING FOR TRANSPORTATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, the amounts specified in section 103(8) of this resolution for budget authority and outlays for Transportation (budget function 400) for fiscal year 2001 shall be increased as follows:

(A) The amount of budget authority for that fiscal year, by $300,000,000.

(B) The amount of outlays for that fiscal year, by $300,000,000.

(2) OFFSETTING DECREASE IN FUNDING FOR ALLOWANCES.—Notwithstanding any other provision of this resolution, the amounts specified in section 103(19) of this resolution for budget authority and outlays for Allowances (budget function 920) for fiscal year 2001 shall be decreased as follows:

(A) The amount of budget authority for that fiscal year, by $300,000,000.

(B) The amount of outlays for that fiscal year, by $300,000,000.

(c) SENSE OF THE SENATE.—It is the sense of the Senate that—

(1) the provisions of this resolution, as modified by subsection (b), should provide additional budget authority and outlay authority for the United States Coast Guard for fiscal year 2001 such that the amount of such authority in fiscal year 2001 exceeds the amount of such authority for fiscal year 2000 by $300,000,000; and

(2) any level of such authority in fiscal year 2001 below the level described in paragraph (1) would require the Coast Guard to—

(A) close numerous stations and utilize remaining assets only for emergency situations;

(B) reduce the number of personnel of an already streamlined workforce;

(C) curtail its capacity to carry out emergency search and rescue; and

(D) reduce operations in a manner that would have a detrimental impact on the sustainability of valuable fish stocks in the North Atlantic and Pacific Northwest and its capacity to stem the flow of illicit drugs and illegal immigration into the United States.

—

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES—H. CON. RES. 290

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to the previous order, the Chair appoints on behalf of the Senate the following conferees for the budget resolution: Mr. DOMENICI, Mr. GRASSLEY, Mr. BOND, Mr. GORTON, Mr. LAUTENBERG, Mr. CONRAD, and Mr. WYDEN.

—

ORDERS FOR TUESDAY, APRIL 11, 2000

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until the hour of 10 a.m. on Tuesday, April 11. I further ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday, immediately following the prayer, the Journal of the proceedings be approved to date, the morning hour be deemed to have expired, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and the Senate then be in a period for morning business until 12:30 p.m. with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 5 minutes each, with the following exceptions: Senator MURKOWSKI or his designee, for 75 minutes, and Senator DASCHLE or his designee, for 75 minutes.

I further ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess from the hours of 12:30 p.m. to 2:15 p.m. for the weekly policy conferences.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

—

PROGRAM

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, for the information of all Senators, the Senate will convene at 10 a.m. and be in a period for morning business until 12:30 p.m. A number of Senators have indicated they would like to speak prior to the cloture vote on the gas tax repeal legislation. Therefore, there will be up to 2½ hours for that debate.

Following the policy luncheons, there will be an additional 10 minutes of debate, to be followed by the vote on invoking cloture on S. 2285, the Federal Fuels Tax Holiday.

I now ask unanimous consent that Senators have until 2:20 p.m. on Tuesday in order to file timely second-degree amendments to S. 2285.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. NICKLES. In addition, it was my hope that today we could have reached agreement for the consideration of the marriage tax penalty. That is not possible today; however, I still hope that we will be able to begin consideration of that measure during tomorrow's session. I will continue to work toward that result. If an agreement is not reached on Tuesday, it may be necessary to begin the process to move that bill forward.

I thank all of my colleagues for their cooperation.

—

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. NICKLES. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in adjournment under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 3:50 p.m., adjourned until Tuesday, April 11, 2000, at 10 a.m.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

DON'T USE SHORTAGE TO PROMOTE ANWR, COAST DEVELOPMENT

HON. GEORGE MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 10, 2000

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the recent rise in energy prices should serve as a wake-up call for the Republican leadership in Congress. From legislative obstruction that prevents improved auto fuel efficiency to gutting the budgets for energy conservation and efficiency programs, the Republicans in Congress have set the American people up to be exploited by OPEC.

Now, as the predicted crisis hits, the Republicans offer solutions that are as bankrupt and empty as their legislative record over the past five years:

Republicans vote for opening the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to oil and gas development.

The Republican Whip declares that ''the cleanest thing you could do is to drill [for oil] off the coast of California and Florida,'' repealing the moratoria on offshore oil drilling.

Republicans want to repeal the gas taxes that are paying for urgently needed transportation improvements throughout America.

These are the same leaders who have repeatedly advocated the abolition of the Department of Energy and promoted the export to Asia of domestic oil from Alaska, all the while slashing programs designed to make America less dependent on foreign fuels.

As the Nation prepares for the celebration of Earth Day, these vigorously anti-environmental initiatives by the Republican leadership are extraordinarily ill-timed. But that should not come as a great surprise from a party whose third-ranking leader in the House of Representatives has been quoted as likening the Environmental Protection Agency to the Gestapo.

There is no easy or instant solution to make us more energy independent. Thanks to the budget cuts embraced by the Republican leadership, we have lost years of critical research and development in energy conservation and efficiency programs that were requested by the Clinton administration.

Instead of anti-environmental Republican policies, we should be working together to make the daily activities of Americans more energy-friendly. Who wouldn't want to drive a more fuel efficient car, live in a home that is better insulated, or have utilities which use less water and electricity? These kinds of measures can save much more oil than would ever be produced from the Arctic Refuge and without environmental destruction.

The Republican strategy is to trade energy efficiency for environmental catastrophe. That is not a sane national energy policy. That is a choice the American people should not have to make, and it is a choice they rightly reject.

HONORING MATTHEW NEMERSON FOR OUTSTANDING SERVICE TO THE COMMUNITY

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 10, 2000

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join the many that have gathered to pay tribute to one of our community's leading advocates, Matthew Nemerson. A dear friend and colleague, Matthew has had a tremendous impact on the city of New Haven.

As president of the Greater New Haven Chamber of Commerce, Matthew has taken the lead in the revitalization efforts for the city of New Haven. Representing New Haven and 14 surrounding municipalities, the chamber is the primary voice for businesses throughout the region. With an unequaled understanding of the needs of business leaders, Matthew has led the effort to include the concerns of local businesses in city revitalization efforts—actively ensuring the creation of a strong and viable economic climate for the region. It has been an honor and privilege to work with Matthew on the many issues facing our region. His profound dedication to the advancement of southern Connecticut has been an inspiration.

Matthew's commitment to Greater New Haven extends beyond the chamber. His participation in numerous organizations throughout the region serves as an example to us all. His efforts on behalf of the Greater New Haven Urban League, the Greater New Haven United Way, the Greater New Haven Preservation Trust, the Greater New Haven Arts Council, the New Haven Scholarship Fund, and the Connecticut Anti-Defamation League have benefitted countless families across the State of Connecticut. Matthew also serves as a gubernatorial appointee to the Connecticut Port Authority and the Connecticut Employment and Training Commission and a mayoral appointee to the New Haven Coliseum Authority New Haven Development Corporation. Through his outstanding record of service, he has demonstrated a unique commitment to addressing the myriad of issues that face some of our most vulnerable citizens. All of us in the New Haven area have benefited from his work.

For nearly 13 years, Matthew has led the Chamber of Commerce and the Greater New Haven community with an unparalleled spirit that has truly enriched the lives of many. I am proud to join with his wife, Marian, his two children, Elana and Joy, family, friends and colleagues to extend my best wishes as Matthew begins a new chapter in his career. Mere words cannot express our gratitude for all that he has achieved on behalf of our community—we will certainly miss him.

A TRIBUTE IN HONOR OF BARBARA HOWELL, BREAD FOR THE WORLD'S DIRECTOR OF GOVERNMENT RELATIONS

HON. TONY P. HALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 10, 2000

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, today I honor Barbara Howell, on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of her service to Bread for the World, a nonpartisan Christian citizens' movement against hunger. Barbara Howell has dedicated her career to fighting for the needs of hungry and low-income people.

In April 1975, Barbara opened Bread for the World's first Washington, DC office—just across the street, on the fifth floor of the Methodist Building on Maryland Avenue. Since then, she has been instrumental in guiding Bread for the World's efforts to develop and support public policies to benefit low-income and hungry people in the United States and overseas. Barbara has provided expert testimony to Congress numerous times and has met with U.S. Presidents from President Carter to President Clinton. Due in large part to her leadership and advocacy, in 1995, the U.S. government implemented a groundbreaking measure to collect and report data on hunger and food insecurity in the United States annually.

Perhaps because of the deep love Barbara holds for her own daughters, Leah and Marya, Barbara has been a tireless advocate for the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC). Barbara's work in support of the WIC program has helped ensure its steady availability to more and more low-income women and their children—even during periods of time when a number of programs assisting low-income people were under attack. In 1999, the National Association of WIC Directors honored Barbara for her longstanding leadership by giving her their WIC Advocacy Award.

Barbara is a woman of deep faith in God. She holds a master's degree in religious education from Union Theological Seminary. She has served her church as an elder and has chaired its missions council. Earlier in her career Barbara worked as a Methodist chaplain, serving three universities over a seven year period.

Barbara Howell has devoted her life to bringing justice to the most vulnerable people in our world. Barbara and her husband Leon spent four years as free-lance journalists in southeast Asia, writing about economic, development assistance, and church-related issues. For the past 25 years, she has been a determined leader on behalf of effective federal policy for low-income people in the United States and overseas. She has attended three United Nations Women's Conferences—in Copenhagen in 1980, Nairobi in 1985, and Beijing in 1995.

Barbara is a rare individual, and deserves our heart-felt thanks for dedicating her life to

serving others. I invite you and our colleagues to join me in thanking Barbara Howell for her distinguished commitment to making our nation's public policy more just for all people.

TRIBUTE TO DOLORES HUERTA

HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 10, 2000

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, today I pay a heartfelt tribute to Dolores Huerta, pre-eminent American labor leader and social activist, on the occasion of her 70th birthday, which we celebrate today.

Dolores Fernandez Huerta was born April 10, 1930, in Dawson, New Mexico. The mother of 11 children, the grandmother of 14, and the great-grandmother of four, she is a hero to farmworkers, to the Latino community, to women, to the labor movement and to me.

I have known and worked with Dolores for many years, and I can say that this is a person whose brilliance, incomparable leadership ability and sheer energy would have propelled her to prominence no matter what field she might have chosen for her life's work. How very fortunate for the farmworkers of this nation—and for all of us—that she chose La Causa, the cause of justice for farmworkers.

I say all of us because our nation is diminished when some among us, those who do the hard work of harvesting the food we eat, are deprived of decent wages and working conditions. She organized and co-founded the United Farm Workers of America with Cesar Chavez in 1965 in the belief that in the union there is the strength to achieve economic and civil rights for farmworkers.

In the 35 years since then, she has fired the souls and minds of poor farmworkers who, thanks to her, can imagine and achieve better lives for themselves and their children. She is a wellspring of ideas and a brilliant strategist—I can personally attest to that—but she has also physically put herself on the line for her fellow workers and has been subjected to life-threatening injury for it.

It has been my great personal fortune to be able to count Dolores Huerta as a colleague and a friend. Dolores, for the inspiration that you provide by your selfless devotion to improving the lives of farmworkers, for the breakthroughs you have achieved and the goals you continue to set for all of us, and for your example of a life spent in service to others, we thank you and wish you a joyous birthday and many happy returns.

AMERICAN HOMEOWNERSHIP AND ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 2000

SPEECH OF

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 2000

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1776) to expand homeownership in the United States:

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, a livable community is one where our families are safe, healthy, and economically secure. A community without housing options to meet the needs of its residents is not livable. Clearly, action is needed since many throughout our country cannot afford to live in the places in which they work. I am pleased to rise in support of the American Homeownership and Economic Opportunity Act because it creates more housing options and will make our communities better places to live.

This bill contains several employer-assisted housing opportunities. These are important tools for bringing the benefits of homeownership to the citizens who serve us every day. I want to highlight a couple of outstanding programs in my city of Portland, efforts that H.R. 1776 reinforces.

Police At Home is a mortgage loan incentive program to help police officers purchase and live in homes in neighborhoods with higher crime rates. This program gives police officers a personal stake in their communities. It was created in 1995 through a partnership with our Mayor's Office, the Portland Police Bureau, the Rotary Club of Albina, and five lending institutions. Many of the neighborhoods that have attracted officers under this program have seen a decrease in crime. This is an excellent example of the kind of partnerships that are a cornerstone of community policing.

The City of Portland's Hometown Home Loan program offers an array of benefits to city employees who are purchasing or refinancing a house within the city limits. A joint program of the City, Fannie Mae, and Continental Savings Bank, it is open to all benefits-eligible employees of the City of Portland. It was developed to help City employees become homeowners, as well as to encourage employees to live in the city where they work.

Another important item contained in this bill is $275 million for the Housing Opportunities for People with AIDS (HOPWA) program. Portland's effective use of HOPWA dollars is a national model. It offers diverse housing stock including transitional housing for people who are homeless and living with AIDS. It also provides permanent housing for people living with HIV/AIDS at sites such as the Rose Wood Apartments that includes 36 units of rehabilitated affordable rental housing and has received HUD's Blue Ribbon Award for Best practice. Nathaniel's Way is providing housing for HOPWA-eligible families with children. Supported residential care is provided at such places as Swan House and Care House. People served by HOPWA funds receive not only housing but also a variety of social services: legal assistance, health services, mental health counseling and drug and alcohol intervention.

But the need is greater than ever before. Death rates are declining and so more and more people are living with the epidemic. In the Portland region, the unmet need is at least 1000 units of permanent housing. The funding in this bill will help to address that need.

This legislation represents efforts by the housing industry and the government to promote best practices and assure money is targeted to providing more housing. I'm pleased to vote yes.

AMERICAN HOMEOWNERSHIP AND ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 2000

SPEECH OF

HON. BENJAMIN L. CARDIN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 6, 2000

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1776) to expand homeownership in the United States:

Mr. CARDIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of HR 1776 however, I speak to you today to encourage deliberate caution with concern to FHA and HUD legislation.

Homeownership is a critical building block of strong families and healthy communities. It has helped many households accumulate wealth, and a home owned free of mortgage debt is considered an important part of retirement security.

While the current homeownership rate is at a record high of 66.8%, the purchase of a first home remains difficult or out of reach for many young people and low to moderate income families, particularly single-parent households and minorities.

As the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development said on March 30th: ''The economic boom which has produced the highest homeownership rate in history has a downside and that is predatory lending.'' Unfortunately, we are now just learning the full meaning of that statement.

FHA has in some areas, inadvertently fueled a downward spiral created by purchasing homes, selling to buyers with limited resources or readiness for ownership, allowing foreclosure and leaving boarded up houses sitting and pulling a community even further into despair. While HUD has made a credible start, there is much more that this Congress must do to ensure that these issues are addressed.

WE MUST REPAIR FHA/HUD LENDING PROGRAMS

Baltimore has the highest number of FHA foreclosures per capita in the nation. Baltimore has become one of the worst manifestations in the country of predatory lending.

HUD, responding to complaints that federal housing policies have resulted in tremendous damage to Baltimore neighborhoods, told city nonprofit agencies last week that it would be willing to halt Federal Housing Administrations (FHA) foreclosures in some of Baltimore's hardest hit neighborhoods for eight weeks to have a task force study what is happening.

I agree that we must find out what is happening and I propose that there must be the formation of a federally led task force that would find a solution to flipping, predatory lending and FHA disposal of houses the agency acquires through foreclosures.

WE MUST DEAL WITH PREDATORY LENDING PRACTICES AND INSTITUTIONS

Just five years ago there were 1,900 loans that went into foreclosure for the entire year of 1995. In the first 3 months of this year 1,700 loans in Baltimore City have gone into foreclosure.

Some say that HUD has fueled these problems. The agency has relaxed its control over the issuance of mortgages insured by one of its agencies, the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) allowing lenders to make questionable loans that often end up in foreclosure.

HUD must have better oversight to make sure that the would-be home buyer is ready as well as the appraisal process needs to be closely monitored. HUD contracts out for the appraisal process which has led to unrealistically high appraisals, which then creates bad loans given by these ''lenders of last resort.'' As you can see this process continues on a vicious downward spiral.

The buyers of these home loans often are single mothers with low-wage jobs who end up defaulting on the mortgages. In cases where FHA insures the loans, the agency pays off the lender and takes title to the house.

Once HUD pays off the lender and acquires title to a property after foreclosure, the house often sits vacant for months—depreciating the value not just of that property but of the neighborhood. HUD then sells the house on an ''as-is'' basis. Often they are in poor shape and unattractive to potential homeowners. Which, as a result leads to yet another phenomenon—they frequently are sold to unscrupulous speculators who quickly ''flip'' them for a huge markup—sometimes marking the homes up to 100% of what they were originally purchased for.

WE MUST REPAIR THE DAMAGE TO THESE NEIGHBORHOODS

I hope that a HUD Task Force on Predatory Lending will find solutions to this problem.

However, we now must also identify, fund and implement programs to repair the damage done to these communities and hold the speculators accountable for their illegal actions. HUD, local governments, and non profit housing organizations must begin working together now!

HONORING DR. GERALD AND MARILYN FISHBONE FOR OUTSTANDING COMMUNITY SERVICE

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 10, 2000

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, each year the Juvenile Diabetes Foundation International of Greater New Haven Chapter presents an individual or individuals with the ''Living and Giving Award,'' recognizing outstanding contributions to diabetes research and education. It gives me great pleasure to rise today to honor two of New Haven's outstanding citizens, my good friends Gerald and Marilyn Fishbone, this year's recipients of this prestigious award. The Fishbones have been leading advocates in the fight against diabetes for twenty-five years and I cannot think of a more appropriate way for the people of New Haven to express our thanks and appreciation.

Diabetes is the leading cause of new adult blindness, kidney failure, and premature death. The volunteer efforts of the Juvenile Diabetes Foundation to fund research is an essential part of our national effort to find a cure. It is the dedication and commitment of people like Gerry and Marilyn that has fueled the national movement to eliminate this devastating disease. With unparalleled motivation and spirit, they have built an impressive record of service to this organization. They are truly an inspiration to us all.

They are both founding members of the Greater New Haven Chapter of the Juvenile Diabetes Foundation, and have both devoted extraordinary time and energy to this critical endeavor. Gerry is past chairman of the JDF International Board of Directors and continues to serve on the board of chancellors. As the chair of the editorial committee, he oversees the publication of the organization's magazine, COUNTDOWN, which carries the latest news of research and progress across the country.

Marilyn was president of the Greater New Haven Chapter of JDF for 7 years and has been a board member since the organization's inception 25 years ago. Testifying before the State Senate, she helped to establish two Centers for Children with Diabetes—bringing statewide awareness of the need for continued funding for research and education. Marilyn is the former director of fundraising for the Greater New haven Chapter of JDF. Under her direction the chapter raised more dollars per capita than any other chapter across the nation—truly one of her greatest achievements. Drawing on her own personal experiences with the disease, Marilyn counsels patients and their families, extending a comforting hand as they face the challenges of the disease. Through their work, Gerry and Marilyn have been instrumental in the development and success of the Juvenile Diabetes Foundation.

It is rare to find individuals with the same spirit of giving as we have found in Gerry and Marilyn. Their hard work has enriched the organization—making a real difference in the lives of countless children and families. I am proud to join their children, Scott and Lisa, the Juvenile Diabetes Foundation of Greater New Haven, friends and supporters, as Gerry and Marilyn are presented with the ''Living and Giving Award.'' Words cannot express our gratitude for their many contributions.

RELEASING FOUR KURDISH MEMBERS OF PARLIAMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF TURKEY

HON. JOHN EDWARD PORTER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 10, 2000

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I am supporting a resolution introduced today calling for the immediate release from prison of four Kurdish members of the Parliament of the Republic of Turkey. I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) for sponsoring this resolution of which I am a proud co-sponsor.

Currently, four Turkish parliamentarians of the now banned Kurdish based Democracy Party [DEP], Leyla Zana, Hatip Dicle, Orhan Dogan, and Selim Sadak, are serving prison sentences simply because they are Kurds. Leyla Zana, the first Kurdish woman ever elected to the Turkish Parliament, was chosen to represent the city of Diyarbakir by an overwhelming majority in October in 1991. In 1993, she travel to the United States to speak to officials about human rights abuses against the Kurdish minority in Turkey and to testify before the Congressional Human Rights Caucus. She was arrested on March 2, 1994 in the Parliament building and subsequently prosecuted for a so-called ''separatist speech.'' Ever since then Ms. Zana, along with Hatip Dicle, Orhan Dogan, and Selim Sadak have been jailed for the simple act of specaking out for their people—the Kurds—the very people by whom they were elected.

Turkey is a country which claims to be a democracy and is continuously taking steps to be accepted as a western partner, as seen with its current European Union candidacy. However, its recent actions do not show any concrete effort to abide by international human rights standards. In the last week, it has been reported that the Turkish military has been massing troops and tanks along the Iraqi border in an apparent pending offense against the Kurds. Equally as disturbing is the re-arrest of Turkey's most prominent human rights figure, Akin Birdal, for a speech he made in 1996 calling for a peaceful resolution to the conflict between the Turkish state and the Kurdish Workers' Party [PKK].

If Turkey wants to be treated as an equal partner with the west, it is time for it to treat all of its citizens with equal rights and a general respect for human rights. The time has come for Turkey to allow the Kurdish people the right to speak their language and practice their culture. Releasing these parliamentarians would show Turkey and the world that Turkey is ready to respect the human rights of all its citizens and that it is on the right path to be accepted by the international community.

We must not continue to ignore or apologize for Turkey's outrageous behavior. Six years is far too long for these parliamentarians to be in jail, for speaking out for rights which are guaranteed under the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights. We must speak out strongly against these attacks and unfair acts and demand that Turkey end this lawless assault.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. BOB CLEMENT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 10, 2000

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall vote No. 105, I was unavoidably detained on official business. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye.''

RECOGNIZING THE STATE CHAMPION MINNECHAUG REGIONAL HIGH SCHOOL GIRLS' BASKETBALL TEAM

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 10, 2000

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize and congratulate the 1999–2000 Minnechaug Regional High School girls' basketball team. On March 18, 2000, the Falcons captured their third Massachusetts Division I state championship in the past four years at the Worcester Centrum, defeating Brockton High School by a score of 68–61 in a memorable final contest.

The final contest was not an easy one for the Falcons. Minnechaug trailed by as many as 14 points in the first half, and took its first lead in the contest with only 1:32 remaining. The comeback was led by senior Melissa Kowalski, who scored 22 of her 28 points during the final 10 minutes of the game.

Kowalski's efforts, along with the play of seniors Maureen Leahy and Christal Murphy accounted for all of Minnechaug's 42 second half points.

A final win in the state championship, as if not impressive enough, capped off a perfect season of 25 wins and no losses for the Falcons. The final game was a battle of the undefeated as Brockton also headed into the final contest with a record of 24 wins and no losses. Minnechaug arrived at the final games as the Western Massachusetts champions for the fourth straight year.

Under the leadership and direction of Coach Dave Yelle, Minnechaug has dominated their competition from around the state. Over the past four seasons, the Falcons have compiled an outstanding total of 91 wins, including 18 wins in the postseason. Defense had been their greatest strength, holding opponents to an average of 32 points for the two playoff contests before the final.

Mr. Speaker, allow me to recognize the Minnechaug Regional High School girls' basketball team. The seniors are Melissa Kowalski, Christal Murphy, Abigail Lipinski and Maureen Leahy. Underclasswomen include Christina Conway, Cheri Murphy, Laura Mulcahy, Erica Bacon, Katie Clark, Sara McCarthy, Marybeth Maziarz and Julie Sullivan. The team is coached by Dave Yelle, and he is assisted by Pete Kowalski, Jason Fenlason and Elizabeth Ouellette. The Falcons are managed by Amy Gregorius, Tom Loper and Meghan Mitchell and the team trainer is Jason Patterson.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud and honored to extend my congratulations to the 1999–2000 Minnechaug Regional High School girls' basketball team. Their consistent record of dominance and excellence is certainly worthy of the attention of this Chamber. I wish Coach Yelle and the state champion Falcons the best of luck in defending their title next season.

IN SUPPORT OF H. CON. RES. 282 AND H. CON. RES. 228

HON. CAROLYN McCARTHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 10, 2000

Mrs. McCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, today I am supporting H. Con. Res. 282, The GI As Person of the Century Act, and H. Con. Res. 228, Honor Vietnam-era Armed Forces Act. These important bills recognize the sacrifices endured by our men and women who fought to protect the freedom we cherish.

Throughout our distinguished history, we have been blessed with the courage and determination of brave Americans who were willing to preserve democratic beliefs with their lives. From the gas-filled trenches of World War I to the flaming deserts of the Gulf War, our veterans wrote much of the history that transformed the United States from a young and naive country into a world leader and global superpower. It's a history lesson that makes you proud to be an American and respect those who fought for the freedoms we cherish.

Each regional conflict the United States entered there was always one consistent factors—a brave American in the trenches fighting to stop aggression. These brave men and women defended the most basic of the beliefs on which our Nation was created—that freedom is worth putting our lives in harms way to preserve. We owe them a great deal of gratitude and respect.

That is why I support legislation that designated the ''American GI'' as the ''Person of the Century''. We honor them because it was their blood, their resolution, and their love of country that became infectious and spread from one generation to another.

Lastly, we should never forget those brave men and women who never returned home from fighting to protect what our flag symbolizes. Many were either captured or killed. In Vietnam there are still over 2,000 soldiers classified either Prisoners of War or Missing in Action. The anguish they suffer, as well as their families, is indescribable.

The Honor Vietnam-era Armed Forces Act recognizes the service and sacrifices by members of the Armed Forces and federal civilian employees who, during the Vietnam era, served proudly to protect those in need. This measure also honors the sacrifices and hardships endured by the families of individuals who lost their lives or remain unaccounted during this tumultuous era.

Vietnam veterans, like their fallen brethren before them, exemplify a spirit of nationality and patriotism that continues to thrive today.

Veterans are the unsung heros who define our American heritage. They are ordinary citizens who answered their call to duty and fought for something they believed in. They remember the places they were stationed, their training, and they certainly remember their days in combat. It is an experience the rest of us can only read about and marvel at. Although we can never adequately express our thanks to those who could not return to us, we remember them by supporting the legislation before us today.

IN HONOR OF THE SIMON WIESENTHAL CENTER LIBRARY AND ARCHIVES

HON. HENRY A. WAXMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 10, 2000

Mr. WAXMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to recognize the Simon Wiesenthal Center—Museum of Tolerance Library and Archives, an extraordinary institution in the 29th District of California, which I represent, that is dedicated to teaching the importance of Holocaust remembrance and the defense of human rights. The Library and Archives is being honored this week in conjunction with National Library Week; chosen by the Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS) as one of four libraries, nationwide, to receive the first annual National Award for Library Services.

The Simon Wiesenthal Center Library and Archives' broad collections document the Holocaust in Nazi Germany and the many other tragic genocides of the 20th century. The library holdings of over 30,000 books and periodicals document antisemitism, racism, and related issues, and are available to researchers, media, students and the public. The archives, containing an extensive array of original documents, manuscripts, personal narratives, diaries, artifacts, photographs, magazines, newspaper, maps, and original artwork, have evolved into a primary research depository for materials dealing with the Holocaust and the pre-World War II Jewish experience.

In partnership with the Simon Wiesenthal Center Museum of Tolerance, the Library and Archives maintains a number of excellent education programs to fulfill its mission of teaching the dangers of bigotry and the importance of tolerance. In addition to answering over 500 inquiries a week, hosts numerous visiting authors, scholars and civic leaders to bring its message to the community. The Library and Archives also sponsors a dynamic ''Contact a Survivor'' program of direct, electronic, eyewitness discussions between Holocaust survivors and students.

The IMLS award is a tribute to the power of libraries to reach families and communities across America and around the world, and the Simon Wiesenthal Center Library and Archives is a deserving recipient. Under the leadership of Adaire Klein, it continues to make a tremendous contribution to preserving the lessons of the Holocaust and the legacy of its victims for future generations. We owe the Simon Wiesenthal Center, Ms. Klein and her staff a debt of gratitude for this distinguished record of accomplishment. I thank them for the devoted service and extend my best wishes for the future.

CONGRATULATIONS AND GOOD LUCK TO SHEREKA WRIGHT

HON. CHET EDWARDS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 10, 2000

Mr. EDWARDS. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate a great high school student and basketball player from my Texas congressional district—Shereka Wright—on her selection as the 1999–2000 Gatorade National High School Girls Basketball Champion. Shereka was chosen for this honor out of the 454,000 high school girls basketball players across the country. Past winners of this award include Emmitt Smith, Lisa Leslie, Chris Webber, Peyton Manning, Tim Couch, Kobe Bryant, and Alex Rodriguez.

Shereka Wright will graduate from Copperas Cove High School in Copperas Cove, Texas, next month after four tremendous years as a basketball player. Her long list of achievements already rivals many professional basketball players.

Just this season, Shereka has averaged 25 points, 10 rebounds, four assists, three steals, and two blocks per game. Over the course of her career, she has scored over 3,000 points. That feat places her in the top-25 scorers of all-time. She has been selected as the Most Valuable Player of the Nike Tournament of Champions in California twice. She has also been named to the Conference AAAAA 1st Team All-State in Texas for four consecutive years.

Shereka's commitment to success off the court is equally impressive. she truly is a student athlete and has maintained a 3.6 grade point average. She has also volunteered her time working with the Youth Teen Summit and summer youth basketball camps.

Shereka will attend Purdue University in the fall. I feel certain she will continue to be an

outstanding player, student, and leader for many years to come.

I ask Members to join me and offer our heartfelt congratulations on a job well done and best wishes for continued success, to a student and athlete—Shereka Wright.

COMMENDING CHASITY SNYDER

HON. MICHAEL G. OXLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 10, 2000

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, today I commend the courageous acts of Chasity Snyder, a heroine from Lima, OH. Her extraordinary act of bravery can serve as an inspiration to us all.

[From People Magazine, March 27, 2000]

SMALL MARVEL

Afloat on her Yellow Jacket, Chas Snyder, 11, saves a pair of canoeists in peril.

It was one of those delightfully warm days that can fool the winter-weary into thinking the worst is over. So in Lima, Ohio, homemaker Cherie Snyder took her daughter Chasity, 11, down to the reservoir on March 6 to see if they could hook a few fish. Meanwhile, James H. Moore Sr., 36, a delivery driver, and Aaron Schafer, 22, a roofer, had already launched Moore's newly patched canoe on a test run. But the two men were about 25 yards from shore when the canoe started to roll. They jumped—without life jackets—into water so frigid that swimming was nearly impossible. Spotting the men struggling, Snyder, 30, waded in to try to save them, but quickly retreated because of the cold.

That's when Chas sprang into action. ''I said, 'Chas, no!'' recalls her mother. But Chas shouted, ''Mom, I have to! I've got to do something!'' and then shed her yellow winter jacket and leaped in. Using the jacket as a flotation device she paddled out to Moore, who had slipped below the surface, and dragged him to where he could touch bottom. ''I had floaties when I was little,'' says Chas, and explains that the jacket looked similar. Chas then helped Lynn Wallace, 41, who was on an afternoon walk, rescue Schafer. ''If that little girl hadn't been there,'' Moore says of Chas, ''I would be in the funeral home.''

Back home after the rescue, Chas, who lives with Cherie and her four siblings, says she never doubted she could help the men: ''My guardian angel and God gave me courage and told me I could do it and nothing would happen to me.''

HONORING THE HAMMOND CARPENTER'S UNION LOCAL 599

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 10, 2000

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, it is my distinct honor to congratulate some of the most dedicated and skilled workers in Northwest Indiana. On April 8, 2000, in a salute to their workers' durability and longevity, the Hammond Carpenter's Union Local 599 recognized their members for 25 years or more of dedicated service. They were recognized during a pin ceremony banquet to be held on Saturday at the Carpenter's Union Hall in Hammond, Indiana. These individuals, in addition to the other Local 599 members who have served Northwest Indiana so diligently for such a long period of time, are a testament to the prototypical American worker: loyal, dedicated, and hardworking.

The Carpenter's Local 599, which received its charter in 1899, honored members for their years of devoted service. The members honored for 55 years of service include: John Giba, Sylvester Reising and Tensey Roberts. The members honored for 50 years of service include: Robert J. Busch, Robert Herhold, Earnest Latta, Kenneth Ogden and Oliver J. Vogeler. The members honored for 45 years of service include: Louis B. Biedron, Lafayette M. Bundren, William J. Burgess, Guy Casey, William C. Dowdy, Elmer F. Lucas, Raymond Lukowski and John Sills. The members honored for 40 years of service include: John M. Davich, Robert Dimichelle, C. J. Krupinski, Ethard McIlroy, Richard Meyers, John E. Shoup, William Simmons, Joseph M. Staes and Robert Washington. The members honored for 35 years of service include: John R. Billings, Kenneth E. Clayton, James McCready, Harold Neil, Elmer C. Phelps, Jr., Paul V. Reppa, Dale R. Robert, Harold Sills and Richard C. Thiel. The members honored for 30 years of service include: Robert E. Chorba, Glen E. Flaherty, Jr., Uwe H. Grantz, James Liming, Sr. and Paul W. Steinhauer. The members honored for 25 years of service include: Denny L. Crouse, Thomas A. Dorsey, John P. Hindahl, Donald King, Joseph Lippie and Richard A. Polus.

As Orville Dewey said, ''Labor is man's greatest function. He is nothing, he can be nothing, he can achieve nothing, he can fulfill nothing, without working.'' The men and women of Local 599, in addition to all of the local unions in Northwest Indiana, form the backbone of our economy and community. Without their blood, sweat, and tears, Indiana's First Congressional District would not be a place of which to be proud, it would not be the place I love, nor would it be my home.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and my distinguished colleagues join me in congratulating these dedicated, honorable, and outstanding members of the Hammond Carpenter's Union Local 599, in addition to all the hardworking union men and women in America. The men and women of Local 599 are a fine representation of America's union men and women; I am proud to represent such dedicated men and women in Congress. Their hard labor and dauntless courage are the achievement and fulfillment of the American dream.

INTRODUCTION OF BILL TO REDUCE TEMPORARILY THE DUTY ON FIPRONIL TECHNICAL

HON. WILLIAM J. JEFFERSON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, April 10, 2000

Mr. JEFFERSON. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation to reduce the ad valorem duty on the active ingredient used in a product known as fipronil technical, an insecticide registered for use on dozens of crops, in the animal health industry to control fleas and ticks, and most importantly in urban pest control to stop the spread of destructive termites.

As many of my colleagues know, the entire Gulf Coast is under attack by Formosan termites. The invasion is costing homeowners, businesses and local governments hundreds of millions annually. Biologists have traced these insatiable termites to twelve states. In my district—New Orleans—Formosan termites have caused more damage than tornadoes, hurricanes and floods combined. Experts trace the migration of these voracious termites to the continental United States back to the return of World War II cargo ships from the Far East to ports throughout the country. Since then, the Formosan termite has increased beyond control, infesting trees, homes and other buildings. Traditional forms of pesticides do not work on this termite and while efforts are underway to develop a termiticide that will eradicate the Formosan pests, we must also consider new products.

We have been working with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and with manufacturers of pest control products to bring new products to the market to help us in our efforts to stop these destructive insects. A new product, fipronil, was officially registered for use by the EPA just last September and is being introduced into the market this month. This new product is applied to the perimeter of buildings and within three months the termites have died. The chemical is a non-repellent so the insects carry it to the nest and contaminate it before the other termites can detect it. Other products take much longer to produce results and are more labor intensive.

Fipronil has no domestic producer which would be disadvantaged by the tariff reduction and other termiticides do not work in the same way that fipronil does. Fipronil has also been approved for use in treating trees. We are losing our old historic trees in New Orleans at an alarming rate to the Formosan termites. This product gives us hope that we will be able to stop this attack.

My bill allows the makers of this product to bring the active ingredient into the United States at a reduced tariff rate. The product is finished, packaged and used in the U.S. creating jobs in both the manufacturing side as well as the pest control industry.

I look forward to working with my colleagues to advance this proposal.

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, April 11, 2000 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

APRIL 12

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2001 for the Corporation for National and Community Service, Community Development Financial Institutions, and Chemical Safety and Hazardous Investigation Board.

SD–138

Indian Affairs

To hold oversight hearings on the report of the Academy for Public Administration on Bureau of Indian Affairs management reform.

SR–485

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings on S. 2255, to amend the Internet Tax Freedom Act to extend the moratorium through calendar year 2006.

SR–253

Judiciary

Administrative Oversight and the Courts Subcommittee

To resume oversight hearings on the handling of the investigation of Peter Lee.

SH–216

Rules and Administration

To resume hearings on campaign finance reform proposals, focusing on compelled political speech.

SR–301

Joint Economic Committee

To hold hearings to examine reform of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank.

311 Cannon Building

10 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

Securities Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on multistate insurance agent licensing reforms and the creation of the National Association of Registered Agents and Brokers.

SD–538

Foreign Relations

European Affairs Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine issues dealing with the Russian presidential elections.

SD–419

Governmental Affairs

To hold hearings to examine the Wassenaar arrangement and the future of multilateral export control.

SD–342

Appropriations

Defense Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2001 for the Department of Defense, focusing on missile defense programs.

SD–192

11 a.m.

Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

Business meeting to consider S. 2311, to revise and extend the Ryan White CARE Act programs under title XXVI of the Public Health Service Act, to improve access to health care and the quality of health care under such programs, and to provide for the development of increased capacity to provide health care and related support services to individuals and families with HIV disease; the proposed Organ Procurement and Transplantation Network Act Amendments of 2000; the nomination of Mel Carnahan, of Missouri, to be a Member of the Board of Trustees of the Harry S Truman Scholarship Foundation; the nomination of Edward B. Montgomery, of Maryland, to be Deputy Secretary of Labor; the nomination of Marc Racicot, of Montana, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for National and Community Service; the nomination of Alan D. Solomont, of Massachusetts, to be a Member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for National and Community Service; the nomination of Scott O. Wright, of Missouri, to be a Member of the Board of Trustees of the Harry S Truman Scholarship Foundation for the remainder of the term expiring December 10, 2003; and the nomination of Nathan O. Hatch, of Indiana, to be a Member of the National Council on the Humanities for the term expiring January 26, 2006.

SD–430

2 p.m.

Foreign Relations

International Economic Policy, Export and Trade Promotion Subcommittee

To hold hearings on the status of infrastructure projects for Caspian Sea energy resources.

SD–419

2:30 p.m.

Energy and Natural Resources

Water and Power Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings to examine federal actions affecting hydropower operations on the Columbia River system.

SD–366

APRIL 13

9:15 a.m.

Environment and Public Works

Business meeting to consider the nomination of Edward McGaffigan, Jr., of Virginia, to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission; S. 522, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to improve the quality of beaches and coastal recreation water; H.R. 999, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to improve the quality of coastal recreation waters; S. 2370, to designate the Federal Building located at 500 Pearl Street in New York City, New York, as the ''Daniel Patrick Moynihan United States Courthouse''; H.R. 2412, to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 1300 South Harrison Street in Fort Wayne, Indiana, as the ''E. Ross Adair Federal Building and United States Courthouse''; and S. 2297, to reauthorize the Water Resources Research Act of 1984.

SD–406

9:30 a.m.

Appropriations

VA, HUD, and Independent Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2001 for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

SD–138

Energy and Natural Resources

To resume hearings on S. 282, to provide that no electric utility shall be required to enter into a new contract or obligation to purchase or to sell electricity or capacity under section 210 of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978; S. 516, to benefit consumers by promoting competition in the electric power industry; S. 1047, to provide for a more competitive electric power industry; S. 1284, to amend the Federal Power Act to ensure that no State may establish, maintain, or enforce on behalf of any electric utility an exclusive right to sell electric energy or otherwise unduly discriminate against any consumer who seeks to purchase electric energy in interstate commerce from any supplier; S. 1273, to amend the Federal Power Act, to facilitate the transition to more competitive and efficient electric power markets; S. 1369, to enhance the benefits of the national electric system by encouraging and supporting State programs for renewable energy sources, universal electric service, affordable electric service, and energy conservation and efficiency; S. 2071, to benefit electricity consumers by promoting the reliability of the bulk-power system; and S. 2098, to facilitate the transition to more competitive and efficient electric power markets, and to ensure electric reliability.

SH–216

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.

SR–253

Judiciary

Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.

SD–226

10 a.m.

Appropriations

Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Subcommittee

To hold hearings to examine the National Reading Panel report.

SD–124

Armed Services

To hold hearings to examine the Department of Defense anthrax vaccine immunization program.

SR–222

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings on the structure of securities markets.

SD–106

Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions

To hold hearings to examine issues dealing with protecting pension assets.

SD–430

2 p.m.
Judiciary
Immigration Subcommittee
To hold hearings on the proposed Mother Teresa Religious Worker Act.
SD–226

2:30 p.m.
Appropriations
Treasury and General Government Subcommittee
To hold hearings to examine certain Internal Revenue Service reform issues.
SD–192

Energy and Natural Resources
Forests and Public Land Management Subcommittee
To hold oversight hearings on the United States Forest Service's proposed revisions to the regulations governing National Forest Planning.
SD–366

Foreign Relations
Business meeting to consider pending calendar business.
SD–419

Commerce, Science, and Transportation
To hold hearings on S. 1361, to amend the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977 to provide for an expanded Federal program of hazard mitigation, relief, and insurance against the risk of catastrophic natural disasters, such as hurricanes, earthquakes, and volcanic eruptions.
SR–253

APRIL 25

2:30 p.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Water and Power Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 2239, to authorize the Bureau of Reclamation to provide cost sharing for the endangered fish recovery implementation programs for the Upper Colorado River and San Juan River basins.
SD–366

APRIL 26

10 a.m.
Appropriations
Defense Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2001 for the Department of Defense.
SD–192

Armed Services
Readiness and Management Support Subcommittee
To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing fund for fiscal year 2001 for the Department of Defense and the Future Years Defense Program, focusing on acquisition reform efforts, the acquisition workforce, logistics contracting and inventory management practices, and the Defense Industrial Base.
SR–222

2:30 p.m.
Energy and Natural Resources
Forests and Public Land Management Subcommittee
To hold hearings on S. 2273, to establish the Black Rock Desert-High Rock Canyon Emigrant Trails National Conservation Area; and S. 2048, to establish the San Rafael Western Legacy District in the State of Utah.
SD–366

APRIL 27

9:30 a.m.
Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry
To hold hearings on pending legislation on agriculture concentration of ownership and competitive issues.
SR–328A

SEPTEMBER 26

9:30 a.m.
Veterans' Affairs
To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs on the Legislative recommendation of the American Legion.
345 Cannon Building

POSTPONEMENTS

APRIL 12

10 a.m.
Environment and Public Works
To hold hearings on the disposal of low activity radioactive waste.
SD–406

APRIL 19

9:30 a.m.
Indian Affairs
Business meeting to consider pending calendar business; to be followed by hearings on S. 611, to provide for administrative procedures to extend Federal recognition to certain Indian groups.
SR–485

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S2449–S2481

Measures Reported: Reports were made as follows:

H.R. 3090, to amend the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act to restore certain lands to the Elim Native Corporation. (S. Rept. No. 106–258)

S. 1993, to reform Government information security by strengthening information security practices throughout the Federal Government, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. (S. Rept. No. 106–259) **Page S2465**

Congressional Budget Resolution—Conferees: The Chair appointed the following conferees on the part of the Senate to H. Con. Res. 290, Congressional Budget Resolution: Senators Domenici, Grassley, Bond, Gorton, Lautenberg, Conrad, and Wyden. **Page S2481**

Gas Tax Repeal—Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for the filing of second degree amendments to S. 2285, instituting a Federal fuels tax holiday, on Tuesday, April 11, 2000. **Page S2481**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S2465–66**

Amendments Submitted: **Pages S2466–68**

Notices of Hearings: **Page S2468**

Authority for Committees: **Page S2468**

Additional Statements: **Pages S2461–65**

Text of H. Con. Res. 290, as Previously Agreed To: **Pages S2468–81**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 12 noon, and adjourned at 3:50 p.m., until 10:00 a.m., on Tuesday, April 11, 2000. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S2481.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

FUNERAL AND BURIAL CONSUMER PROTECTION

Special Committee on Aging: Committee held hearings to examine issues facing consumers when preplanning, arranging and conducting funeral and burial activities, focusing on educating consumers about funeral-related industries, exposing bad practices, and exploring the extent of consumer satisfaction, receiving testimony from Toni Moore, Paradise Memorial Park Cemetery Memorial Fund, Santa Fe Springs, California; Cheryl L. Lankford, Lankford Funeral Home, DeLand, Florida; Father Henry Wasielewski, Catholic Diocese of Phoenix, Tempe, Arizona, on behalf of the Interfaith Funeral Information Committee; Lamar Hankins, FAMSA-Funeral Consumers Alliance, Inc., San Marcos, Texas; Robert Shreve, American Association of Retired Persons, Washington, DC; Danell D. Pepson, Leesburg, Virginia; Darryl J. Roberts, Scottsdale, Arizona; and Irwin Karp, an incarcerated witness, via video teleconferencing.

Hearings continue tomorrow.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Bills Introduced: 7 public bills, H.R. 4220–4226; and 4 resolutions, H.J. Res. 95–97 and H. Res. 467, were introduced. **Page H2012**

Reports Filed: Reports were filed today as follows:

H.R. 852, to require the Department of Agriculture to establish an electronic filing and retrieval system to enable the public to file all required paperwork electronically with the Department and to have access to public information on farm programs, quarterly trade, economic, and production reports,

and other similar information, amended (H. Rept. 106–565);

H.R. 4163, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide for increased fairness to taxpayers, amended (H. Rept. 106–566); and

H.R. 3439, to prohibit the Federal Communications Commission from establishing rules authorizing the operation of new, low power FM radio stations, amended (H. Rept. 106–567). **Page H2012**

Speaker Pro Tempore: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he designated Representative Wicker to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H1961**

Guest Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the guest Chaplain, Rev. Dr. Ronald Christian. **Page H1961**

Recess: The House recessed at 12:31 p.m. and reconvened at 2:00 p.m. **Page H1961**

Suspensions: The House agreed to suspend the rules and pass the following measures:

Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run through the Capitol Grounds: H. Con. Res. 280, authorizing the 2000 District of Columbia Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run to be run through the Capitol Grounds; **Pages H1962–63**

Use of the Capitol Grounds for the Soap Box Derby: H. Con. Res. 277, amended, authorizing the use of the Capitol grounds for the Greater Washington Soap Box Derby; **Pages H1963–65**

5th Anniversary of the Oklahoma City Bombing: H. Res. 448, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives in continued sympathy for the victims of the Oklahoma City bombing on the occasion of the 5th anniversary of the bombing; **Pages H1965–66**

Honoring the American GI as the Person of the Century: H. Con. Res. 282, amended, declaring the ''Person of the Century'' for the 20th century to have been the American G.I. (agreed to by a yea and nay vote of 397 yeas to 1 nay, Roll No. 111); **Pages H1966–70, H1984–85**

Honoring Vietnam Era Veterans and Their Families: H. Con. Res. 228, honoring the members of the Armed Forces and Federal civilian employees who served the Nation during the Vietnam era and the families of those individuals who lost their lives or remain unaccounted for or were injured during that era in Southeast Asia or elsewhere in the world in defense of United States national security interests (agreed to by a yea and nay vote of 399 yeas with none voting ''nay'', Roll No. 112); and **Pages H1970–73, H1985–86**

Freedom to E-File Act: S. 777, amended, to require the Department of Agriculture to establish an electronic filing and retrieval system to enable the public to file all required paperwork electronically with the Department and to have access to public information on farm programs, quarterly trade, economic, and production reports, and other similar information (passed by a yea and nay vote of 397 yeas to 1 nay, Roll No. 113). Agreed to amend the title. **Pages H1973–75, H1986**

Recess: The House recessed at 3:30 p.m. and reconvened at 5:03 p.m. **Page H1975**

Motion to Instruct Conferees: Representative Rangel announced his intention to offer a motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 1501 , to provide grants to ensure increased accountability for juvenile offenders, to insist that the conference meet and report a substitute that includes enforcement of gun safety laws and safety measures that prevent felons, fugitives, and stalkers from obtaining firearms and children from getting access to guns. **Page H1975**

Budget Resolution: The House disagreed to the Senate amendment to H. Con. Res. 290, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2001, revising the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2000, and setting forth appropriate budgetary levels for each of fiscal years 2002 through 2005, and agreed to a conference. **Page H1975**

Rejected the Spratt motion to instruct conferees to insist that the tax cuts and reconciliation legislation implementing tax cuts be reported no earlier than September 22, 2000, thereby allowing time to enact legislation establishing a universal prescription drug benefit, consistent with section 202 of the Senate amendment and provisions in section 10 of the concurrent resolution; and to recede to the lower tax cuts in the Senate amendment, by a yea and nay vote of 198 yeas to 210 nays, Roll No. 114. **Pages H1975–84 H1986–87**

Appointed as conferees: Chairman Kasich, and Representatives Chambliss, Shays, Spratt, and Holt.

Senate Messages: Messages received from the Senate today appear on pages H1961 and H1975.

Referral: S.J. Res. 43 was referred to the Committee on International Relations. **Page H2010**

Quorum Calls—Votes: Four yea and nay votes developed during the proceedings of the House today and appear on pages H1984–85, H1985–86, H1986, and H1987. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 12:30 p.m. and adjourned at 9:25 p.m.

Committee Meetings

OVERSIGHT—INS: COMMISSIONER REPORTS

Committee on Government Reform: Subcommittee on Government Management, Information, and Technology held a hearing on ''Oversight of the Internal Revenue Service: The Commissioner Reports''. Testimony was heard from the following officials of the IRS, Department of the Treasury: Charles O. Rossotti, Commissioner; and W. Val Oveson, National Taxpayer Advocate; Margaret Wrightson, Associate Director, Tax Policy and Administration Issues, GAO; and public witnesses.

NEW PUBLIC LAWS

(For last listing of Public Laws, see DAILY DIGEST, *p. D335)*

H.R. 5, to amend title II of the Social Security Act to eliminate the earnings test for individuals who have attained retirement age. Signed April 7, 2000. (P.L. 106–182)

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR TUESDAY, APRIL 11, 2000

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Special Committee on Aging: to continue hearings to examine funerals and burials, focusing on protecting consumers from bad practices, 10 a.m., SD–106.

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: to hold hearings on the nomination of Christopher A. McLean, of Nebraska, to be Administrator, Rural Utilities Service, Department of Agriculture; to be followed by hearings to examine the Methyl Tertiary Butyl Ether (MTBE) crisis and the future of renewable fuels, 9:30 a.m., SR–328A.

Committee on Appropriations: Subcommittee on Energy and Water Development, to hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2001 for the Department of Energy, 9 a.m., SD–124.

Subcommittee on Interior, to hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2001 for the Department of Energy, 9:30 a.m., SD–138.

Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, to hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 2001 for foreign health assistance, 10 a.m., SD–192.

Committee on Armed Services: to hold hearings on the nominations of Bernard Daniel Rostker, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness; Gregory Robert Dahlberg, of Virginia, to be Under Secretary of the Army; and Madelyn R. Creedon, of Indiana, to be Deputy Administrator for Defense Programs, National Nuclear Security Administration, 9:30 a.m., SR–222.

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: to hold hearings to examine the effects of permanent, normalized trade relations with China on the U.S. economy, 9:30 a.m., SR–253.

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: to hold hearings on S. 282, to provide that no electric utility shall be required to enter into a new contract or obligation to purchase or to sell electricity or capacity under section 210 of the Public Utility Regulatory Policies Act of 1978; S. 516, to benefit consumers by promoting competition in the electric power industry; S. 1047, to provide for a more competitive electric power industry; S. 1284, to amend the Federal Power Act to ensure that no State may establish, maintain, or enforce on behalf of any electric utility an exclusive right to sell electric energy or otherwise unduly discriminate against any consumer who seeks to purchase electric energy in interstate commerce from any supplier; S. 1273, to amend the Federal Power Act, to facilitate the transition to more competitive and efficient electric power markets; S. 1369, to enhance the benefits of the national electric system by encouraging and supporting State programs for renewable energy sources, universal electric service, affordable electric service, and energy conservation and efficiency; S. 2071, to benefit electricity consumers by promoting the reliability of the bulk-power system; and S. 2098, to facilitate the transition to more competitive and efficient electric power markets, and to ensure electric reliability, 10 a.m., SH–216.

Committee on Foreign Relations: to hold hearings on the nomination of Carey Cavanaugh, of Florida, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Counselor, for the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service as Special Negotiator for Nagorno-Karabakh and New Independent States Regional Conflicts; the nomination of Christopher Robert Hill, of Rhode Island, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to the Republic of Poland; and the nomination of Thomas G. Weston, of Michigan, a Career Member of the Senior Foreign Service, Class of Minister-Counselor, for the rank of Ambassador during his tenure of service as Special Coordinator for Cyprus, 9 a.m., SD–419.

Full Committee, to hold hearings on United States policy towards China, focusing on permanent normal trade status, 2:30 p.m., SD–106.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Subcommittee on Children and Families, to hold hearings to examine early childhood programs for low-income families, 9:30 a.m., SD–430.

House

Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Commerce, Justice, State and Judiciary, on U.N. Peacekeeping, 10 a.m., H–309 Capitol.

Subcommittee on Foreign Operations, Export Financing and Related Programs, on AID Administrator, 2 p.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Interior, on Native American issues, 10 a.m., B–308 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, on Members of Congress, 10 a.m., and 2 p.m., 2358 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government, on U.S. Mint, 10 a.m., 2359 Rayburn.

Committee on Banking and Financial Services, hearing on the recommendations of the President's Working Group on Financial Markets concerning Financial Contract Netting, Hedge Fund Disclosure, and Over-the-Counter Derivatives, 10 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Commerce, Subcommittee on Telecommunications, Trade, and Consumer Protection, oversight hearing on the status of deployment of broadband technologies, 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Education and the Workforce, to continue mark up of H.R. 4141, Education Opportunities To Protect and Invest In Our Nation's Students (Education OPTIONS) Act; and to mark up the following bills: H.R. 4055, IDEA Full Funding Act of 2000; and H.R. 3629, to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to improve the program for American Indian Tribal Colleges and Universities under part A of title III, 2 p.m., 2175 Rayburn.

Committee on International Relations, hearing on Recent Developments in Kosovo and Related Issues, 3 p.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on the Judiciary, Subcommittee on Commercial and Administrative Law, oversight hearing on the limit on regulatory powers under the Bankruptcy Code, 2 p.m., 2237 Rayburn.

Committee on Resources, Subcommittee on Forests and Forest Health, oversight hearing on Integration of Eco-region Assessments in Forest Service Plans, 2 p.m., 1334 Longworth.

Committee on Rules, to consider the following: H.J. Res. 94, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States with respect to tax limitations; a resolution providing for consideration of motions to suspend the Rules; H.R. 2328, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Act to reauthorize the Clean Lakes Programs; and H.R. 3039, Chesapeake Bay Restoration Act of 1999, 1 p.m., H–313 Capitol.

Committee on Science, Subcommittee on Space and Aeronautics, hearing on NASA's Fiscal Year 2001 Budget Request: Aero-Space Technology Enterprise, 2 p.m., 2318 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, Subcommittee on Government Programs and Oversight, oversight hearing to examine the federal government's use of e-commerce to facilitate procurement in comparison to the private sector, 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, to consider the following: Corps of Engineers Survey Resolutions; H.R. 673, Florida Keys Water Quality Improvements Act of 1999; H.R. 855, Long Island Sound Preservation and Protection Act; H.R. 1106, Alternative Water Sources Act of 1999; H.R. 1237, to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to permit grants for the national estuary program to be used for the development and implementation of a comprehensive conservation and management plan, to reauthorize appropriations to carry out the program; H.R. 2957, Lake Pontchartrain Basin Protection Act of 1999 and H.R. 3313, Long Island Sound Restoration Act; 11(b) Public Buildings Resolutions; H.R. 1405, to designate the Federal building located at 143 West Liberty Street, Medina, Ohio, as the "Donald J. Pease Federal Building"; H.R. 1571, to designate the Federal building under construction at 600 State Street in New Haven, Connecticut, as the "Merrill S. Parks, Jr., Federal Building"; H.R. 1729, to designate the Federal facility located at 1301 Emmet Street in Charlottesville, Virginia, as the "Pamela B. Gwin Hall"; H.R. 1901, to designate the United States border station located in Pharr, Texas, as the "Kika de la Garza United States Border Station"; and other pending business, 2 p.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Aviation, hearing on Issues Arising out of the Egypt Air Crash, 9:30 a.m., 2167 Rayburn.

Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings, Hazardous Materials and Pipeline Transportation, hearing on GSA's Fiscal Year 2001 Capital Investment Program, 3 p.m., 2253 Rayburn.

Committee on Ways and Means, hearing on fundamental tax reform, 10 a.m., 1100 Longworth.

Subcommittee on Social Security, hearing on efforts to inform the public about Social Security, 3 p.m., B–318 Rayburn.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

10 a.m., Tuesday, April 11

Senate Chamber

Program for Tuesday: Recognition of two Senators for speeches, and the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond 12:30 p.m.).

Also at approximately 2:25 p.m., Senate will vote on the motion to close further debate on S. 2285, Gas Tax Repeal.

(Senate will recess from 12:30 p.m. until 2:15 p.m., for their respective party conferences.)

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9:30 a.m., Tuesday, April 11

House Chamber

Program for Tuesday: Consideration of Suspensions:

1. H. Res. 465, Dissemination of Statistics on the Number of Abandoned Babies;
2. H.R. 4051, Project Exile: The Safe Streets and Neighborhoods Act;
3. H.R. 1658, Civil Assets Forfeiture Reform Act;
4. H.R. 3767, Visa Waiver Permanent Program Act;
5. S. Con. Res. 71, Establishment of Miami, Florida as the permanent location for the Free Trade Area of the Americas Secretariat;
6. H.R. 4163, Taxpayer Bill of Rights;
7. H. Res. 467, Clinton/Gore Tax Hikes;
8. H.R. 4067, Business Checking Modernization Act. Motion to instruct conferees on H.R. 1501.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Berman, Howard L., Calif., E520
Blumenauer, Earl, Ore., E520
Cardin, Benjamin L., Md., E520
Clement, Bob, Tenn., E521
DeLauro, Rosa L., Conn., E519, E521
Edwards, Chet, Tex., E522
Hall, Tony P., Ohio, E519
Jefferson, William J., La., E523
McCarthy, Carolyn, N.Y., E522
Miller, George, Calif., E519
Neal, Richard E., Mass., E521
Oxley, Michael G., Ohio, E523
John Edward Porter, Ill., E521
Visclosky, Peter J., Ind., E523
Waxman, Henry A., Calif., E522

Congressional Record The public proceedings of each House of Congress, as reported by the Official Reporters thereof, are printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed at one time. ¶Public access to the Congressional Record is available online through *GPO Access,* a service of the Government Printing Office, free of charge to the user. The online database is updated each day the Congressional Record is published. The database includes both text and graphics from the beginning of the 103d Congress, 2d session (January 1994) forward. It is available on the Wide Area Information Server (WAIS) through the Internet and via asynchronous dial-in. Internet users can access the database by using the World Wide Web; the Superintendent of Documents home page address is http://www.access.gpo.gov/su_docs, by using local WAIS client software or by telnet to swais.access.gpo.gov, then login as guest (no password required). Dial-in users should use communications software and modem to call (202) 512–1661; type swais, then login as guest (no password required). For general information about *GPO Access,* contact the *GPO Access* User Support Team by sending Internet e-mail to gpoaccess@gpo.gov, or a fax to (202) 512–1262; or by calling Toll Free 1–888–293–6498 or (202) 512–1530 between 7 a.m. and 5:30 p.m. Eastern time, Monday through Friday, except for Federal holidays. ¶The Congressional Record paper and 24x microfiche will be furnished by mail to subscribers, free of postage, at the following prices: paper edition, $179.00 for six months, $357.00 per year, or purchased for $3.00 per issue, payable in advance; microfiche edition, $141.00 per year, or purchased for $1.50 per issue payable in advance. The semimonthly Congressional Record Index may be purchased for the same per issue prices. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 371954, Pittsburgh, PA 15250–7954, or phone orders to (202) 512–1800, or fax to (202) 512–2250. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily Congressional Record is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the Congressional Record.