United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 146 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 2, 2000 No. 143

House of Representatives

The House met at 6 p.m.

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

This evening as we gather, Lord God, we remember all those who gave us life. We remember those who enrich the life of this Nation with love and dedication, generosity and compassion. We recall the Members of this House and the dear members of family and friendship who have gone the way of all life on Earth.

May those who have preceded us in the ways of faith be rewarded for their just deeds and the lively peace and joy they brought to this world.

As we reflect upon those whose memory moves us this evening, especially those who have died during the 106th Congress, we seek the consolation You alone can give and the insight born of faith.

Renewed in the bonds that unite us forever, grant us wisdom in the midst of present difficulties and the bright promise of a just reward on that day when all come to rejoice in You who live now and forever. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. NORWOOD 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.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.J. Res. 123 and that I may

NOTICE—OCTOBER 23, 2000

A final issue of the Congressional Record for the 106th Congress, 2d Session, will be published on November 29, 2000, in order to permit Members to revise and extend their remarks.

All material for insertion must be signed by the Member and delivered to the respective offices of the Official Reporters of Debates (Room HT–60 or S–123 of the Capitol), Monday through Friday, between the hours of 10:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. through November 28. The final issue will be dated November 29, 2000, and will be delivered on Friday, December 1, 2000.

None of the material printed in the final issue of the Congressional Record may contain subject matter, or relate to any event that occurred after the sine die date.

Senators' statements should also be submitted electronically, either on a disk to accompany the signed statement, or by e-mail to the Official Reporters of Debates at ''Records@Reporters''.

Members of the House of Representatives' statements may also be submitted electronically by e-mail, to accompany the signed statement, and formatted according to the instructions for the Extensions of Remarks template at http://clerkhouse.house.gov. The Official Reporters will transmit to GPO the template formatted electronic file only after receipt of, and authentication with, the hard copy, signed manuscript. Deliver statements to the Official Reporters in Room HT–60.

Members of Congress desiring to purchase reprints of material submitted for inclusion in the Congressional Record may do so by contacting the Congressional Printing Management Division, at the Government Printing Office, on 512–0224, between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. daily.

By order of the Joint Committee on Printing.

WILLIAM M. THOMAS, *Chairman.*

Printed on recycled paper.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

MAKING FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2001

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 662, I call up the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 123) making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The text of House Joint Resolution 123 is as follows:

H.J. RES. 123

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Public Law 106–275, is further amended by striking the date specified in section 106(c) and inserting ''November 3, 2000''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 662, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume merely to point out that this is a 1-day continuing resolution. In addition to having this resolution before the House, after the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) makes his opening statement, I will be asking unanimous consent to consider an amendment that I have at the desk.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose there is virtually no reason for anyone to say anything, given what the reality is around here. But I would, nonetheless, like to make a few observations about why we are going through this surreal exercise this week, this evening, tomorrow and for God knows how long.

We were told at the beginning of the year by the majority party leadership that they were going to restore regular order to the House. Then this House proceeded to pass a phony budget resolution and a series of phony appropriation bills which pretended to fit within that budget resolution.

It did that, not because of any fault of any of the majority members of the Committee on Appropriations; we did it because they, in fact, had no choice but to proceed under that phony budget resolution.

The result is that, for 10 months, this House pretended to the public that it was going to spend about $40 billion less than virtually everyone in this House on both sides of the aisle knew we would in the end wind up spending.

The purpose of passing those fraudulently shrunken appropriation bills was to open up enough room in that phony budget so that the majority leadership could pretend that there was enough room in that budget for the huge tax cuts which they then proceeded to pass, the majority of benefits which went to those in our society who make $300,000 a year or more.

The leadership of the majority preached bipartisanship; but in fact, they blocked bipartisan majorities from passing the Patients' Bill of Rights. They held the minimum wage hostage to tax benefits that were nine times as large as the benefits afforded to workers under those minimum wage increases. They even refused to reform the so-called Freedom to Farm Act, which is the single biggest failure of farm policy in this country since the days of Ezra Taft Benson, and that is going some.

Lastly, the leadership of the majority party blocked a bipartisan conference on the Labor, Health and Education bill that would have taken us a long way toward reducing class size, strengthening teacher training, providing larger Pell Grants for struggling middle-income families trying to send their kids to college, providing us some 5,000 additional after-school learning centers for kids so that they do not have to go home at night to an empty house because both parents are working outside the home.

Since that bill was blown up, it has been apparently the goal of the majority party leadership to leave without ever bringing to a vote that bipartisan conference report.

Apparently the majority caucus is split. I am told by a number of you that, if this bill goes into a lame-duck session, that there are a good number of our friends on the majority side who would like to scale back significantly the size of those education and other increases in that Labor-Health-Education bill.

In my judgment as someone who has served here for over 30 years, the chaotic results of the policy pursued by the leadership left us at the end of the fiscal year with only two of the 13 appropriation bills that were supposed to be passed actually being finished by the House and the Senate. The House passed all 13 of its appropriation bills, but the Senate did not.

So we were left with only two of those 13 bills. We were left with only two of those 13 bills passed. Both bills that were passed had been signed by the President. So none of the delays associated with the other 11 bills were in any way the responsibility of the White House.

Now, the majority leadership wants to go home. We all want to go home.

I will say to the gentleman interrupting that no one in this House has worked harder than I have. I will compare my record to yours anytime.

I think I have the floor, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair requests that various conversations going around the Chamber will be removed to the cloakroom.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for obtaining order, and I thank most Members of the House for their courtesy.

What I was about to say is that the majority leadership would like us to go home, and we would all like to go home, but there is apparently a significant difference between the wishes of the majority leadership in the Senate and the majority leadership here.

I honestly believe that you want us in the minority to give you cover for your failure to produce on the whole range of legislative items by voting to get Congress out of town before we have all done our duty. I think that duty includes passing the Patients' Bill of Rights, passing a bill that provides prescription drugs under Medicare, passing a bill that provides the minimum wage increase for the least among us.

So now we are caught in what one reporter today called this Potemkin charade. It is being pretended that there is work being done here because, apparently, what the majority leadership wants to do is to keep the lights on even though the House is empty and keep the lights on to pretend that there is activity in the kitchen, when in fact there is not. The stove is off. The oven is empty. The oven is cold.

No major legislation, save perhaps one water project bill is in the works. What an unhappy, pitiful end to this session.

I want to say to my friends on the majority side of the aisle, I like and respect virtually every single one of you. Some of you I do not know as well as others. But when I think of the people I have known in my life, there is no more decent person than the gentleman sitting in the front row here, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HOUGHTON), or the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) or the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) or the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. NORWOOD) or a number of others of you. The gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. PETRI) I saw sitting here; we have been friends for years. I cherish some of the friendships that I have had with people on both sides of the aisle.

1815

But what I despise is what this kind of chaotic governance in this House has done to this institution and to the legislative process. And most of all what I despise is what this House has failed to do to represent and help the people we are supposed to be representing. When I see what this institution has failed to do, that is when I am truly saddened and appalled.

I do not make this statement out of any sense of personal dislike for any one of you. But sometimes parties or institutions do things collectively which they would never do individually, and I believe this year that has happened in this place. And that is why

this Congress, in my sad judgment, regardless of the meaningless votes that will occur the next 2 days, because this session is over any way you slice it, we just have an inability to admit it, so this Congress will go down as one of the lesser footnotes in history and it very richly deserves it.

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

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF FLORIDA

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment that I have placed at the desk be considered adopted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. YOUNG of Florida:

Insert before the period at the end the following:

, and by adding, at the end, the following new section:

''Sec. 120. Notwithstanding any other provision of this joint resolution, except section 107, $7,100,000 shall be available for obligation by the Administrator of General Services for expenses necessary to carry out the Presidential Transition Act of 1963 (3 U.S.C. 102 note).''

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think the purpose is self-evident, but I wonder if the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG) would be kind enough to take just 1 minute so that the Members understand what we are doing.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the amount of $7,100,000 was in the Treasury-Postal bill for the purpose of the transitioning to a new administration. $5.27 million was for the implementation of the transition of the new administration, the new President. $1.83 million was for the incumbent President to exit the White House and to exit the administration.

Since that bill was vetoed that money is not available. This amendment authorizes the same amount of money that was in the Treasury-Postal bill. It is important that we do this because the new administration has to begin work immediately after the election by preparing for the transition, interviewing potential appointments and staffers. There is travel involved. There is vetting of major appointments. This begins the day after election day, so it is important that we do this.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments. We certainly have no objection.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

The joint resolution is considered as having been read for amendment.

By order of the House today, the amendment is adopted.

Pursuant to House Resolution 662, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on passage of the joint resolution.

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

Mr. PETRI. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 310, nays 7, not voting 116, as follows:

[Roll No. 592]

YEAS—310

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Baca
Bachus
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Bartlett
Bass
Berkley
Biggert
Bilirakis
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Camp
Canady
Cannon
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth-Hage
Clyburn
Coble
Combest
Condit
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Cubin
Cunningham
Davis (FL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeGette
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Dixon
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Engel
English
Eshoo
Evans
Everett
Farr
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Fossella
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (TX)
Hastert
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kelly
Kildee
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaHood
Lampson
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Manzullo
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Minge
Mink
Moakley
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pombo
Porter
Portman
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reynolds
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Stearns
Strickland
Stump
Sununu
Sweeney
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Traficant
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NAYS—7

Berry
Capuano
DeFazio
Ford
LaFalce
Phelps
Stenholm

NOT VOTING—116

Ackerman
Allen
Baird
Barrett (WI)
Barton
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Bilbray
Bishop
Blumenauer
Boucher
Brown (FL)
Calvert
Campbell
Capps
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Coburn
Collins
Conyers
Costello
Crowley
Cummings
Danner
Davis (IL)
Delahunt
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dooley
Dunn
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Etheridge
Ewing
Fattah
Forbes
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gephardt
Goodling
Granger
Greenwood
Hall (OH)
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hefley
Hill (MT)
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hunter
Jones (OH)
Kasich
Kennedy
Kilpatrick
Klink
Lantos
Lazio
Maloney (NY)
McCollum
McIntosh
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Miller, George
Mollohan
Morella
Neal
Nethercutt
Oberstar
Ose
Owens
Payne
Pickett
Pitts
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Reyes
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Rush
Salmon
Scarborough
Schaffer
Shays
Smith (MI)
Smith (WA)
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stupak
Talent
Tancredo
Towns
Turner
Velazquez
Visclosky
Waters
Watts (OK)

Waxman	Weldon (FL)	Weygand
Weiner	Wexler	Wise

1845

Mr. WELLER and Mr. HALL of Texas changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, I was delayed en route. The plane just arrived. As a consequence I got in the House just a few minutes after the vote was closed. Had I been here, I would have voted in the affirmative.

Stated for:

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 592, had I been present, I would have voted ''yea'' in support of H.J. Res. 123.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on November 1, I was away from the House on personal business. Accordingly, I was unable to cast certain rollcall votes. If I were present, I would have voted the following:

''Yes'' on rollcall vote 586 on approving the Journal; ''yes'' on rollcall vote 587, H.J. Res. 122; ''no'' on rollcall vote 588; ''yes'' on rollcall vote 589; I would have voted ''yes'' on rollcall vote 590, H.R. 4577, a motion to instruct conferees; and I would have voted ''yes'' on rollcall vote 591, H.R. 4577.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, on October 19, I was away from the House on a personal matter, and I was unable to cast a rollcall vote. However, if I were present, I would have voted ''yes'' on rollcall vote 540, H.R. 4541, the motion to pass the Commodity Futures Modernization Act.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on October 30 I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall vote 583. In addition, yesterday due to pressing business back in my district, I missed rollcall vote 591. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes'' on rollcall vote 583 and 591.

DEMOCRATIC LEADER MISSES PRECEDING VOTE

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

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, we returned tonight once again to do the business of the people in an effort, even at this late date, to put people before politics. How sad it was to note in the rollcall vote that just preceded that our colleague from Missouri, the minority leader, the Democratic leader of this House, was absent. I hope there is no personal concern that took him home. In fact, we understand that he may be home campaigning in stark contrast to his public comments.

Mr. Speaker, tonight this is the situation that confronts us. Most of us are here working in Washington, D.C., working. But I would show you the Midwest, the great State of Missouri. Our friend, the Democratic leader, who said it was so important to stay here and do our work, it appears he is home campaigning, Mr. Speaker; and our friend, the President of the United States, is campaigning in California. Curiouser and curiouser the conduct of those in whom the public trust is placed.

THIS SESSION IS OVER

(Mr. PALLONE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I just want to take issue with the last speaker. It is very obvious that the Republican leadership has no intention of doing any more work here in the House of Representatives. There is barely a majority here to even vote on any measure. The Senate has already left. The other body has already left. To suggest in any way to the American people after having spent 2 years without passing a Patients' Bill of Rights, without passing a Medicare prescription drug benefit, without doing anything with regard to education initiatives that somehow this House or the other body are going to do some work over the next few days before the election is patently absurd.

Let us not kid the American people. This session is over. I am here and a lot of us are here, but we know very well that no work could possibly be done and the Republicans have failed to accomplish anything for the American people. They might as well admit it rather than keeping on with this rhetoric this evening.

BIPARTISANSHIP

(Mr. THOMAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, one of the things that I think we ought not to try to do, I mean, I do not mind it if somebody wants to argue on one side of the issue or on the other side of the issue, but you really ought not to try to argue on both sides of the issue.

The gentleman from New Jersey just stood up and said we did not pass a Medicare prescription drug bill. Perhaps he ought to check C–SPAN. I just finished watching a press conference of his leader, Mr. GEPHARDT, and the Senate leader, Mr. DASCHLE. The gentleman from Missouri was reviewing the bipartisan legislation that the Democrats were instrumental in passing. Now, we were pleased that five Democrats joined with us, they were the difference in the majority, in passing a Medicare prescription drug measure off the floor of the House. But the gentleman from Missouri just took credit for that prescription drug measure passing the House, saying that is evidence of their bipartisan nature.

Come on. Figure it out. One side or the other. But do not be on both sides of your mouth.

A FAILED CONGRESS

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that we have spent 2 years here, 2 years; and the majority in this House that told us the trains were going to run on time, the train has crashed into the barrier here because they have not been able to have the trains run on time.

We did pass in this House a bipartisan bill for a Patients' Bill of Rights. We passed a bipartisan bill for campaign finance reform. We have bipartisan agreement on common sense gun safety legislation. We could have done something about a Medicare prescription drug benefit where all of our seniors were covered. The very fact of the matter is that the Republican leadership of this House is in the pocket of the special interests, refuses to pass any of this legislation, could not pass all of their appropriations bills, cannot get a budget off the ground, and do not know what to do to get out of here. They do not have a program; and if they had a program, they cannot get themselves organized to get it passed in this body. A failed Congress by any sense of the imagination.

WHO IS WORKING?

(Mr. BURTON of Indiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Let me see if I have got this straight. The Democrats are complaining because we have not gotten our work done, but we are supposed to work out a compromise with the President and the minority. We are here working; we are here in Washington working.

That is right here. The minority leader, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), is over here in Missouri; and the President is out in Beverly Hills, California, campaigning. Who do you think is trying to get their work done?

WHO IS HERE?

(Mr. RANGEL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to share with the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) that he better not start labeling people who are not on the floor. I am too civil to get involved in the so-called Republican leaders that are not with us this evening, and so I will not engage in that.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. I think they are here. Would you like for us to go get them for you?

Mr. RANGEL. I do not know whether I saw the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. WATTS) here. Did you see him here today? Because he did not vote.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. His father just died. That may not count. I do not know.

Mr. RANGEL. Is my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAZIO), here?

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Is he in leadership?

Mr. RANGEL. I thought he was part of the whip organization.

EVERGLADES NATIONAL PARK

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

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, earlier it was described that there is just one little water bill to pass in the Congress, so why waste our time. That was stated by the minority appropriations senior member. The little water project described is the Everglades funding, a national park that we all have responsibility for.

So I would suggest as Congress convenes tomorrow at 9 o'clock, we have a chance, a majority Congress by Republicans, to pass one of the most comprehensive environmental bills in probably my lifetime and my term in Congress. So I think coming back tomorrow is indeed appropriate. I hope some of the other Members show up for the vote because the most important vote they will get to cast this year involves a national park, not a Florida park, Everglades National Park.

I commend this Congress, our leaders, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SHAW), and others who have brought this bill to the floor, Senator SMITH from the Senate who has ushered that bill to our Chamber. And I am delighted and will be proud as a Floridian to cast that important vote tomorrow at 9 o'clock.

I urge my colleagues to return from campaigns and vote with us on the Everglades.

A DO-NOTHING CONGRESS

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

Mr. GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am glad we are going to vote on the WRDA bill tomorrow. Why did we not vote on it in September or July or June? This Congress has been a do-nothing Congress. I am amazed. I have the Governor of my State going around the country saying he is going to bring Democrats and Republicans together, he is going to bring us together. I just wish he would bring the Senate Republicans and the House Republicans together, because here we had an agreement to leave. I do not like to have lame-duck sessions. I want people who are elected and have to answer to the voters here. But now we are here to cast one vote, and tomorrow maybe one or two votes.

I wish Governor Bush would get the Senate Republicans and the House Republicans together before they want to talk to us Democrats, and maybe we can get something done for the American people.

FAMILY OPPORTUNITY ACT OF 2000

(Mr. SESSIONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, tonight I would like to give thanks to my colleagues for the continued work that we are having and making on the Family Opportunity Act of 2000, H.R. 4825. This Family Opportunity Act is important for families. It allows families to stay together when they may have a child that is born with a severe medical problem.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4825 also helps parents who have the opportunity to work without fearing the loss of Medicaid services for their disabled child instead of refusing jobs, pay raises and overtime.

1900

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4825 is bipartisan; it is bicameral, 139 House cosponsors and 77 Senate sponsors.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 4825 is a bill we are still working on. We will not give up on it until we leave, and I want those people who are working on this to know that I support their efforts and appreciate them very much.

LET US NOT PRETEND

(Mr. DEFAZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, here we are 2 nights after Halloween, more than a month after the budget is due, engaged in some sort of bizarre charade. Let us not pretend to be working on the budget agreement. Just do not pretend anymore. Agreement was reached, last weekend, and the Senate Republicans stood behind their negotiators. The Senate Democrats stood behind their negotiators. The House Democrats stood behind their negotiators. The President stood behind his negotiators. But the Republican leaders, at the last second, pulled the plug after the phones rang off the hook from the National Association of Manufacturers and the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, who objected to any possibility that at some future date even a President Bush, if he gets elected, might not have the guts to kill workplace health and safety reforms.

That is what is going on here, plain and simple. Let us not pretend. Do not pretend. The American people do not like lies.

WHERE IS OUR PRESIDENT?

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

Mrs. KELLY. Mr. Speaker, where is our President? While we are here working conducting necessary business, I understand our President is out campaigning. He is not in the Middle East solving problems. He is not working on North Korean peace, but he is out campaigning. Mr. President, the town of New Castle, the Village of Chappaqua, needs you here to work with us to help them. Because you chose to veto the Treasury Postal bill, the supervisor of the town I represent, the town where Chappaqua is, has indicated she may have to raise taxes, your taxes in Chappaqua, Mr. President, by 3.5 percent to cover the cost of the extra police protection for you.

The citizens of Chappaqua ought not to have to carry this burden because you chose to veto a bill. This burden, Mr. President, is just one example of where you have put politics over people. Mr. President, please stop campaigning. Come back to Washington and do your job.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). The Chair reminds all Members to address their remarks to the Chair only, not to the President or others.

LAME DUCK

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, shame on us for pursuing this bizarre charade of a session. The House is gone. We all know we are coming back for a lame duck session, and to criticize those like the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAZIO) who cannot be here, how dare you attack our friend from New York in that way. We instead should adjourn this House; and we should instead reconvene the week after the election, and hopefully then we will get a prescription drug benefit in Medicare; hopefully then we will raise the minimum wage; and hopefully then the Republican leadership will stand behind its negotiators so we can actually get something done in this House.

WE SHOULD BE PROUD OF WHAT THE CONGRESS HAS DONE

(Mr. ROYCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, this Congress has accomplished much, and I

think we should be proud of what the Congress has done. We said we wanted to preserve and protect Social Security and Medicare, and we have. We stopped the raid on Social Security that had been going on for decades, and we made the system stronger by passing legislation locking away 100 percent of the Social Security surplus for Social Security; not for any other spending programs.

Republicans said we would eliminate the deficit and pay down the debt, and we have. In fact, over just the past 3 years we have paid down $360 billion in debt. Over the next 5 years, our tax cuts will provide the average household almost $2,000 in tax relief, and this includes the $500 per child tax credit we enacted; and we are just getting started. Let us continue working on behalf of all Americans to protect and preserve Social Security; to provide tax relief; to pay off the Federal debt and to strengthen education.

HIGHER PRICES WILL NOT WASH

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

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, how much is enough indeed, Mr. Speaker? The Clinton-Gore administration keeps asking for more and more and more from the American people, more and more in the way of money for their liberal special interests; billions and billions of dollars, in fact. But as if that were not bad enough, the Clinton and Gore administration demand to take even more of America's freedoms. They take and they take and they take. Their big government philosophy crowds out room for our freedoms.

Let me just give one timely example from this past month. The Clinton and Gore administration want to take away our freedom to select washing machines, air conditioners, and heat pumps and to force us to pay hundreds of dollars more for products that we refuse to buy. They proposed that rule just last month on October 5, 2000, which would steal that much more of our liberty. How much is enough? When the big hand of the Federal Government opens the door to our homes and invites itself in, it is time to say enough is enough.

GOVERNMENT IN LIMBO

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, here we are in Washington and the situation is that we have passed 13 out of 13 appropriation bills, and we are trying to work with the President of the United States to finalize these bills. This is always the case. It has always been this way. Both sides always claim victory, but in truth Democrats and Republicans come together because the American people want something done, but now we are unable to do that. The first time in history the Congress cannot adjourn. And why can it not adjourn? Because the President, as I speak, is in California today campaigning. Now, if he was in the Middle East avoiding war, hey, I am with him all the way. If he was in North Korea, if he was in Haiti or something, we are with him all the way. He is in California. Congress is here in Washington, D.C. The Democrat leader, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), is home in St. Louis campaigning. Because of this, taxpayers have a government that is somewhat in limbo. When we get the new President, Mr. Bush, I hope he will bring both sides together because that is what we need.

WE WILL NOT GIVE IN

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

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, the question that everybody is trying to wrestle with is why are we still here?

Let me, first of all, say everyone is entitled to their own opinion. They are not entitled to their own facts. Let me just offer my opinion as to why we are still here. It really does come down to some fairly simple questions, and the first one is how much is enough? Now, the Committee on the Budget worked out with the Senate earlier this year a budget agreement that said we could legitimately meet the needs of the Federal Government for about $1.9 trillion. The President of the United States wants more, and no matter how much more we give him he keeps moving the bar. Even today we do not know how much the President really wants to spend, but it is not just about spending. The President thought that in our eagerness to get home and campaign that we would roll, we would roll over and he would get what he wanted on ergonomics, on blanket amnesty for illegal aliens.

Know what? He was wrong. I am so proud of the House of Representatives and our leadership because we said no. We are not going to give in to even more spending. We are not going to give in to blanket amnesty for illegal aliens, and we are not going to give in to a bad ergonomics policy that hurts small business.

FORKED TONGUE TALK

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

Mr. FARR of California. Mr. Speaker, I was not going to speak tonight but I cannot believe what I am hearing, this forked tongue talk. First we have the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FOLEY) saying we are going to come down here tomorrow and we are going to pass a bill and we have enough people to do that. And then he gets up and says nothing can happen in Washington because the President is moving around the country. Thank God the President is moving around the country. Thank God over 100 Members of Congress are not here tonight.

Know where they are? They are out where the American people want Members of Congress to be on the eve of an election. They want to be face-to-face with the people they are going to vote with.

1907

Thank God the President is moving around the country. This is a sham what is going on here. This is an attempt to try to keep some endangered species.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard word on the Republican side of the aisle that some of their Members are saying it is a lot safer for them to be here because they are running such tough races, and if they have to get out there and respond to the challenger's opposition, they could not make it, they are not going to get elected. What a sham.

The Republicans control this place, all the rules, all the committees, all the decisions, all the votes. The Republicans have the majority. They can get in here and out of here as fast as they want to. So just because the President is traveling around the country; as commander in chief he can travel all over the world and do American business. Thank God he is not in Washington, and we should not be in Washington, either.

EXTRAORDINARY HAPPENINGS ON THE HILL

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

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, it is extraordinary tonight to listen to this, because there are 73 Democrats missing. The Democrat leader is missing. It is a little hard to negotiate when they are not in town. Our leadership is here and we are here.

But more importantly for the American people to understand, for 30 years around this place, whenever they wanted to spend more money than they had, the Democrats would just take the money out of the Social Security fund and leave an IOU behind.

We changed that in this Congress. We changed that. We created the lockbox that safeguards Social Security and Medicare. We also put money into paying down debt. There has been $350 billion paid down in the last 3 years. We hope to pay down another $240 billion in this budget alone. That is why we are standing here ready to fight, because we want to pay down debt, not just grow the government. We want to do meaningful tax relief, not just add to the burden of working Americans.

Tomorrow, we are going to do something extraordinary for the State of

Florida and for the United States, and that is approve the Everglades legislation.

READY TO WORK

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

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Speaker, they have mentioned that there are so many people gone. I just want my constituents to know that I am still here. This is KAREN THURMAN from Florida, and I am ready right now to pass the Everglades bill. We were told last night before we left here that we would, in fact, have the Everglades bill on the floor tonight. I do not know why we have to wait until tomorrow to get this up. It could have been done; it would have been passed. It sounds to me like everybody stayed here because we think it is an important bill to get done. It is a national thing, and we want it done. But I do not know why we are waiting until tomorrow morning and not getting it done tonight.

So to my constituents, I want them to know, I am here, I am ready to work, and I am ready to save the Everglades.

STOP THE FINGERPOINTING

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I hope we can put an end to the fingerpointing. It is time for us to close down this part of the session of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, I want all of those that have been doing the fingerpointing, I want to ask, were there any meetings to work out the differences yesterday? Were there any meetings today? Have there been any meetings between the leadership of the House and the White House since 1:20 last Sunday night? Can anyone from the other side of the aisle tell me of a single invitation to meet and truly negotiate over the remaining items that the administration or Democrats from Congress refused to attend? If they can, take another 1 minute and say so. If not, let us quit the fingerpointing and realize we have to come back after the election and finish the work of this Congress. This is not doing any good, what we have heard tonight, not one bit of good. We are not doing anything. It is ridiculous. We could have voted on the Everglades yesterday. We could vote on it tonight. We do not have to come back tomorrow, but we will be here tomorrow.

1915

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. THORNBERRY). 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.

HONORING ROXCY O'NEAL BOLTON, SOUTH FLORIDA'S PIONEER FEMINIST

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, tonight I would like to honor Roxcy O'Neal Bolton, a pioneer feminist in my congressional district who has and continues to champion the rights of women by widening the gate to equality.

Born in Mississippi in 1926, Roxcy Bolton has always been a trailblazer. She is a persistent advocate who continues to serve as a powerful voice for women whose needs and pleas had not been heard.

Through her actions, Roxcy has always demonstrated her courage and her deep convictions. She showcased the problems facing women of her time, and continues to encourage women to take action and to extend the fight for equal rights.

In South Florida, Roxcy's fight for equality helped to facilitate change. In the workplace, Roxcy demanded equal respect, equal opportunity, and equal pay for men and women.

For example, in dining clubs, as was the custom of the time, working men had a special dining area. During business day lunch hours men were seated and served quickly, while women, working women with short lunch hours, had to wait in line, looking at empty seats in the men's section.

By writing letters, meeting with restaurant owners, and organizing women, Roxcy Bolton changed this policy, and soon the ''men only'' policy in South Florida became obsolete.

Roxcy was also a fighter on behalf of abused women. In 1972 she founded Women in Distress, the first women's rescue shelter in Florida to provide emergency housing, rescue services, and care to women who found themselves in situations of personal crisis.

During that time, no one talked about rape, much less did anything about alleviating the horrendous trauma that the victim undergoes. Brave crime victims who actually reported their rapes were often treated callously.

Roxcy, however, was not afraid to speak on behalf of these unfortunate women, and did so publicly, with a march against rape down Flagler street in downtown Miami. Approximately 100 women gathered to march with Roxcy to make the community take notice of their concerns, of their anguish, of their need. It was the first time that South Florida women had taken to the streets, and Roxcy knew that if women banded together, we were going to make a difference.

Shortly thereafter, Roxcy approached every local official and persuaded them that something had to be done about treating rape as the violent crime that it is. In 1972, her efforts resulted in the first rape treatment center in the country, located in my regional congressional district at Jackson Memorial Hospital in Miami. In 1993, this rape treatment center was correctly named after Roxcy Bolton.

Roxcy also organized Florida's first crime watch meeting to help curb crime against women. She has served on many boards and commissions, working for women's rights, and has been the recipient of numerous civic awards related to her work with women's rights. In 1992, she helped form the Women's Park, the first park in the United States dedicated to all women who have made contributions to our community.

To this day, Roxcy continues to be a champion for humankind. We cannot keep her down. She continues to persevere and to recognize women's role in history. She continues to fight for women's rights, human rights, social welfare issues, and to put an end to the sexual discrimination in employment and in education.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have Roxcy O'Neal Bolton in my congressional district, and I wish her many more successful years in the ongoing struggle for women's issues. I ask my colleagues to join me in saluting this Florida heroine for her remarkable dedication to women, and for making South Florida a better place in which to live.

We are a richer community for having hard-charging feminists like Roxcy O'Neal Bolton in our midst.

GOVERNOR GEORGE W. BUSH'S FALSE STATEMENTS ABOUT HIS TAX PLAN

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

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, we should not pretend that we are working here toward a final solution. We all know we are coming back after the election. The people who know this best are the Republican Senate leadership. They have all gone home, so why are we pretending we are going to cut a deal without the Senate leadership?

This country needs an election so that the people can tell us that we need more Federal investment in education, that we need a prescription drug benefit that is part of Medicare, and that we need an increase in the minimum wage.

I trust next Tuesday that message will be heard here in Washington loud and clear.

Mr. Speaker, one thing that could prevent us from hearing that message is a misconstruction of the Governor of Texas' tax plan, because there are two false statements that have been made by the Governor about his own plan. I trust that he has not made these statements deliberately, but simply because

he has not read and studied his own tax plan, and that these are innocent, though major, mistakes.

The first is that the Governor of Texas tells us that under his plan, every American who pays taxes will get tax relief. He has said this over a dozen times, and it is false a dozen times. In fact, under his tax plan, 15 million American families who pay Federal taxes will get not one penny of tax relief.

Of course, over $700 billion of tax relief over 10 years will go to the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans, but not one penny will go to 15 million American families who work every day, who pay taxes to the Federal government in the form of FICA taxes taken from their wages, and who work at the lowest-paying jobs in our society.

The second false statement made by the Governor in both the second and third debates was that his plan provided only $223 billion over 10 years of tax relief to the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans. He was off. It is really closer to $700 billion of tax relief, because in stating the degree of tax relief that he provides to the wealthiest 1 percent, he simply forgot that his plan involves the repeal of the estate tax, which will eventually cost this country $50 billion a year, or $500 billion over the 10 years that is our traditional measure of the effect of tax proposals.

That is why it is true that the Governor's tax plan will provide more to the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans than he proposes to provide to strengthen our military, improve our education, improve Medicare, and provide for our health care system, or improve our health care system, combined.

Mr. Speaker, I now want to address the need for school construction, which is also a tax issue, because the tradition in this country is that the Federal government provides help for those school districts that have old schools that have need for new schools because of growth, or that need schools with smaller classrooms to provide for smaller class sizes, and therefore need more classrooms.

The tradition is that we do that through the Tax Code by allowing school districts to issue tax-exempt bonds. We on the Democratic side have urged that $25 billion of urgently-needed capital be provided to these school districts, not in the form of tax-exempt bonds but in the form of tax credit bonds, which will be even better for the school districts because they will not have to pay even reduced interest, they will pay no interest at all. The Federal Government will pick up the tab.

In fact, though, the tax bill that left this House provided only half of the $25 billion of tax credit bonds that these school districts need. But that tax bill did address another problem. That problem appears to be that the subspecialist tax lawyers who specialize in tax-exempt bonds feel their job is too boring. I could not agree with them more.

I myself am a tax nerd of long standing, but even I, after many years of reading the tax regulations, had but one solace, and that is, at least my job was not as boring as those of my brethren who subspecialized in tax-exempt school bonds.

Now these bond counsel want something exciting, and they have persuaded this House to supposedly help school districts by changing the arbitrage rules so that school districts will be encouraged not to use school bond money to build schools, but to delay that for up to 4 years, and to take that money on an exciting trip to Wall Street. Mr. Speaker, school bonds should be used to build a school on Elm Street, not a skyscraper on Wall Street.

But the main component of the tax bill that this House passed designed to help school districts is one that does not provide them with tax credits, does not cut their interest costs, does not provide capital to build schools, but instead, encourages those school districts to gamble with the school bond money.

Mr. Speaker, that is how Orange County, California, went bankrupt. That is no help to school districts at all. We need to take back that bill and provide a full $25 billion of tax credit bonds so schools can be built around the country.

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY STANDARDS ON CLOTHES WASHERS ERODES FREE MARKETPLACE AND ELIMINATES CONSUMER CHOICE

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

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, over the last few years, the extreme green have colluded with appliance manufacturers, with the rubber stamp of the Department of Energy. This collusion, if left unchecked, will erode the free marketplace, and it would eliminate consumer choice.

I am talking about the DOE's recent decision to propose mandates for clothes washers. On October 5, the Department of Energy rolled out its latest tome of regulations on American household appliances. Their proposed mandate would require that consumers buy clothes washers that are available now but which consumers refuse as a rule to buy.

Those requirements mean only one thing, that the type of washing machine in tens of millions of American homes will soon become a thing of the past. It means that the reliable, affordable, effective washers to which we are all accustomed will have to be replaced.

The Department of Energy, the appliance manufacturers, and a handful of extreme special interest groups together wrote this new mandate. They left out a few people: the consumers and the taxpayers. In my opinion, the consumers and the taxpayers are the biggest stakeholders when it comes to home appliances. They are the ones who have to shell out their hard-earned money when their washer breaks down.

Unfortunately, it is the 81 million owners of washing machines in homes across the U.S. who were the only ones left out of this decision. The average American family is not yet even aware of the proposed mandate.

Mr. Speaker, how many working families do we know who come home after a long day at the office to sit down and read the tedious technical Federal Register every day? I can assure the Speaker, not very many. It is for exactly this reason I am raising this issue, to make the public aware of the flawed regulations coming out of the DOE.

Not only is the Federal government going to take away their choice in the marketplace, but to add insult to injury, it is going to force them to shoulder the inordinate additional cost of meeting the new mandate.

I do not know how many Members of Congress have been out shopping for a front-loading washing machine lately, but if they had, they would come in with a clear case of sticker shock. Many models meeting the proposed efficiency levels are well over $1,000; yes, I said over $1,000. Compare that to the typical top-loading machine that sells for around $400.

Even by the scantest DOE calculation, the consumer will have to part with at least $240 extra for washers that meet this new requirement. All told, that adds up to over $1,000 more per household. Again, those are the low estimates.

The administration's own analysis shows that millions of customers and consumers will never be able to recoup the higher prices. Low-income households, households with fewer occupants, such as senior citizens living alone who use washers less frequently, and those households in areas where energy costs will be disproportionately higher are the ones most affected. Those who can least afford it are unlikely to recover the additional cost that is required.

Then, after having to pay hundreds more at the appliance showroom, the proposal provides for the manufacturers to recoup millions of taxpayer dollars. Let us get this straight. That is right, the back-room deal includes $60 million per manufacturer in tax breaks, tax breaks for the manufacturers, not for the consumers.

Mr. Speaker, several points need to be made concerning these proposed regulations. First, the regulation would hurt working families by severely limiting what type of clothes washers, and it also includes air conditioning and heat pumps, can be purchased.

1930

It forces homeowners to buy products they have shown they do not like. Front loading machines make up less

than 10 percent of current washer sales. The special interest groups have even publicly stated that American consumers simply do not want this type of washer.

Let me quote for my colleagues what some of the appliance manufacturers have said, I am quoting, ''selling in the marketplace is easy if there's a standard in place. It's not a matter, necessarily, of consumer acceptance.''

Another executive from the appliance industry claims, and I am quoting, ''Federal standards provide the only meaningful route to appropriately higher energy efficiency for appliances.''

Here is where it gets downright sad. Taxpayer dollars are being spent for outlandish trumpeting public relations events the new mandates. The examples include tax dollars spent on a few country western music series to promote the regulations and also to give away free washing machines. Who do you suppose pays for those? Try the Department of Energy.

Back in May, May 23, the Department of Energy stated that the new regulations would be proposed in June of 2000. Finally, in October, DOE got around to publishing the proposal with a deadline for public comment only 60 days later. It would appear after months of bureaucratic delay, the Energy Department now appears in a rush to regulate. Secretary Bill Richardson said that the department is, I quote, ''on a rush to establish a legacy.''

The Department has done the absolute minimum it can do to allow the people's voice to be heard by setting the minimum comment period of 60 days. That is why I introduced legislation to extend the public comment period to 120 days.

I ask for consideration from all of my colleagues. I have over 20 cosponsors at the present time. Please, come on board, support a common sense bill.

Mr. Speaker, over the past few years, the ''Extreme Green'' have colluded with appliance manufacturers with the rubber stamp of the Department of Energy. This collusion, if left unchecked, will erode the free marketplace and eliminates consumer choice. I am talking about DOE's recent decision to propose mandates for clothes washers.

On October 5, the Department of Energy rolled out its latest tome of regulations on American household appliances. Their proposed mandate would require that consumers buy clothes washers that are available now, but which consumers refuse, as a rule, to buy. Well, those requirements mean only one thing—that the type of washing machine in tens of millions of American homes, will soon become a thing of the past. It means that the reliable, affordable, effective washers to which we are all accustomed, will have to be replaced.

The Department of Energy, the appliance manufacturers and a handful of ''extreme'' special interest groups together wrote the new mandate. They left out a few people—the consumers and the taxpayers. Well, in my opinion, the consumers and taxpayers are the biggest ''stakeholders'' when it comes to home appliances. They're the ones who have to shell out their hard-earned money when their washer breaks down. Unfortunately, it is the 81 million owners of washing machines in homes across the United States who were the only ones left out of this decision.

The average American family is not yet even aware of the proposed mandate. Mr. Speaker, how many working families do you know that come home after a long day at the office and sit down to read the tediously technical Federal Register every day? I can assure you—not many. It is for exactly this reason that I am raising this issue, Mr. Speaker, to make the public aware of the flawed regulations coming out of DOE.

Not only is the Federal Government going to take away their choice in the marketplace, but to add insult to injury, it is going to force them to shoulder the inordinate additional cost of meeting the new mandate. I don't know how many Members of Congress have been out shopping for a front-loading washing machine lately. But if they had, they would have come home with a clear case of sticker-shock. Many models meeting the proposed efficiency levels are well over $1,000. Yes, I said over $1,000 for a home washing machine. Compare that to the typical top-loading machine that sell for under $400. Even by the scantest DOE calculation, the consumer will have to part with at least $240 extra for washers that meet the new requirements. When it comes to the regulations on new air conditioners and heat pumps, the additional initial costs are estimated to be at least $274 and $486 respectively. All told that adds up to over a thousand more dollars per household. Again, those are the low estimates. The administration's own analyses show that millions of consumers will never be able to recoup the higher cost.

Low-income households, households with fewer occupants—such as senior citizens living alone—who use washers less frequently, and those households in areas where energy costs will be disproportionately harmed. Those who can least afford it are unlikely to ever recover the added additional cost.

Purchasing a new washer, air conditioner, or heat pump for one's home or apartment is not a trival matter. These appliances cost several hundred dollars and the purchase is typically required with little if any ability to plan for such a large expenditure. Now the administration is making such a purchase much more expensive and eliminating consumer choice in the process.

Then, after having to pay hundreds more at the appliance showroom, the proposal provides for the manufacturers to recoup millions of taxpayer dollars. That's right—back-room deal includes $60 million per manufacturer in tax breaks. Tax breaks for manufacturers—not the consumers. This new tax shelter for appliance manufacturers means that the U.S. taxpayer carries an even larger share of the Federal tax burden in addition to the higher appliance costs.

In crafting their backroom deal, the special interests—these so-called joint stakeholders—decided that U.S. consumers and taxpayers would gladly accept their decision. I for one, don't think they should. America was founded upon the fundamental principles of freedom. Freedom to choose our words, freedom to choose the type and location of where we work, and the freedom to make individual choices in a free an open marketplace. Government should not be in the business of regulation, for the sake of regulation. Too many Washington bureaucrats and lobbyists are spending too much of the taxpyaers money on needless regulations.

Mr. Speaker, several points need to be made concerning these proposed regulations. First, the regulation would hurt working Americans by severely limiting what type of clothes washers, air conditioning, and heat pumps can be purchased. It forces homeowners to buy products that they have shown that they don't like. Front loading machines make up less than 10 percent of current washer sales. They are available out there in the marketplace, the simple fact is that the consumer doesn't want to buy them. The special interest groups have even publicly stated that American consumers simply don't want this type of washer.

Let me quote for you what some of the appliance manufacturers have said. ''. . . selling it in the marketplace is easy if there's a standard in place. Its not a matter, necessary, of consumer acceptance.'' Another executive from the appliance industry claims, ''. . . Federal standards provide the only meaningful route to appropriated higher energy efficiency for appliances, because consumers have historically shown a disinclination to pay more for products that are more environmentally friends. That is true even when the total cost of owning and operating such products is less than that of current models.''

Now here is where it gets downright sad. Taxpayer dollars are being spent for outlandish public relations event trumpeting the new mandates. The examples include tax dollars spent on a free country/western music concert series to promote the regulations and also to give away free washing machines to the people in Bern, Kansas, and Reading, Massachusetts to promote the front-loading washers.

Mr. Speaker, back on May 23, 2000, the Department of Energy stated that the new regulations would be proposed in June 2000. Finally in October, DOE gets around to publishing the proposal with a deadline for public comment only 60 days later. It would appear that after months of bureaucratic delay, the Energy Department now appears in a rush to regulate. Secretary Bill Richardson has been stated that the Department is ''on a rush to establish a . . . legacy.''

The Department has done the absolute minimum it can to allow the people's voice to be heard by setting the minimum comment period of 60 days. Working Americans should not suffer as a result of gross bureaucratic delays and ineptitude. Americans should not have their input limited as a result of bureaucrats rushing through midnight regulations before the close of this administration. The Department has given Congress and the American people virtually no time to examine the new rules. The people deserve more time than the minimum to defend our rights.

That is why I have introduced legislation to extend this public comment period and to defend the people's right to fully participate in government and to retain some measure of control over own lives against an insatiable administration, seeking ever-greater powers over them.

My bill would extend the public comment period on the flawed regulatory proposals pertaining to clothes washers, air conditioners, and heat pumps. I am proud that a bipartisan

group of now over 20 esteemed colleagues have now joined me in my efforts.

Americans should be granted more than the absolute minimum 60 days allowed by law. The special interest groups had several years to craft this new mandate—the people need more than 2 months to respond. The special interest groups exploit the disparity to tread on the will of the people. This bill seeks to rectify that disparity and to protect the best interests of the people.

All the elements for a comment extension are present. Nearly all American families are directly and substantially affected, the inclinations and desires of the people are thwarted, the cost increase of the mandate is high—more than doubling costs in some cases, and a last minute rush for ''Midnight Regulation'' is being pursued by the administration.

Apart from the higher cost and reduced freedom of choice, the Administration has not been fair to consumers and taxpayers during the development of the standards. DOE is supposed to disclose potential standards and impact analyses in a public process. Instead it bases its regulatory decisions on proposals submitted by special interest groups meeting in backrooms. Persons and groups who normally would speak to—and defend—the interests of consumers and taxpayers, and who have in years past been invited to participate, have been excluded.

Congress must assure that consumers are protected against faulty administration regulations. A public comment period of 120 days is required, given that the public has been largely excluded from the entire rulemaking process. This additional time will allow a thorough review and evaluation and a proper determination that has the consumers best interests in mind. I urge all Members to join me and fight to stop the erosion of the free marketplace and to prevent the elimination of consumer choice.

THE WORK OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES IS NOT DONE

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, this is the latest a Congress has met, absent a national emergency like World War II before an election. Now the work is not done. We do not yet have a fiscal year 2001 budget and the fiscal year began on October 1, which means that many essential government functions have yet to receive regular funding.

In an effort to achieve that, furious negotiations took place over the weekend. In fact, at 1:20 in the morning, night, agreement was reached between the Republicans in the House and the Senate, and the Democrats in the House and the Senate, and the White House.

There has been much talk on the other side of the aisle about the fact that the President was not in the room. They are right, the President was not in the room. They had 210 items in disagreement. This was grinding work for legislators and staff, but the President did something that the Republican leadership did not do. The President empowered and sent his head of office of management and budget and gave him the authority to negotiate and said I will stand behind you. Go get the best deal you can get.

At 1:20 in the morning the people in the room decided they had the best deal they could get. Now, the next morning, the President stood behind his negotiator. The Republicans in the Senate stood behind their negotiator. The Democrats on the Senate stood behind their negotiator. The Democrats in the House stood behind their negotiator, but the whole agreement was blown up and Congress is still here because of one group, the Republican leadership.

When their negotiator came in who they had thought, he thought they had, empowered to negotiate for them, they said you did what? You did what? You reached an agreement on workplace health and safety? Do you not know that the people who are paying for our elections, paying for us to keep the House of Representatives and win the Presidency object to that. And the phone has been ringing off the hook. They already heard about it.

The National Association of Manufacturers called. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce called. By God we would not even want to have contingent, contingent workplace health and safety regulations, which is what the agreement was. Everybody says we do not know who the President is going to be, and what the Republicans negotiated was we will have new workplace health and safety regulations, but they will not go into effect until next June.

Apparently, the Republican leadership who is touting they are leading in the polls for the House and for the Presidency does not even trust their candidate for President not to sign these reasonable workplace health and safety regulations come next June, because they blew up the negotiations.

Since then they have pretended, by keeping us here, that we are negotiating. We are not negotiating. In fact, the Republican who last night, the leader who stood up to engage in the discourse with the Democrat side of the aisle, when he was asked where and when will the negotiators next meet, he said, we will get back to you on that. Well, guess what? They have not called. They have not called.

The Senate left town in disgust, Democrats and Republicans alike. We are still here, and they are pretending that they are being reasonable in negotiating, because they are trying through a stealth agenda to hide what they are going to do if they control everything next year, and that is something people need to think about is what if they control everything. Workplace health and safety increases out the window. Deal with global warming, very serious problem, no way. They do not believe in it.

How about the oil companies? The oil companies are gouging the heck out of the American people. I have introduced legislation here to deal with that problem. No, cannot deal with the oil companies. They are big contributors too.

We heard earlier about a Medicare prescription drug benefit. Well, that was pretty inaccurate, because actually what the so-called bipartisan agreement which had about a dozen Democrats on it, Blue Dogs, that passed here was not on Medicare. It was to set up a new, very expensive, privatized system of pharmaceutical coverage for seniors that provided actually nothing. Because the head of the Health Insurance Industry of America said, well, you know, we are really not interested. None of my companies are interested in offering a pharmaceutical benefit only.

Then the Republicans came up with a new plan, we will bribe you to do that. We will give subsidies to you. We will give you the subsidies. You get the subsidies, you take them, no matter what, if you say you will offer a plan, with no conditions on the plans they will offer, no conditions on deductibles, no conditions on who they would redline out and not cover, no conditions on patients' appeals or rights.

They said that is not enough, some of those drugs are pretty expensive. They said well, we do not want to get in the face of the pharmaceutical industry, then they give subsidies to the pharmaceutical industry also. This is a farce.

REFUTING STATEMENTS REGARDING LACK OF PROGRESS OF THE 106TH CONGRESS

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

Mr. FOLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am here in Washington, D.C. representing the constituents of the 16th district in Florida, and I have heard a lot of conversation tonight about the lack of progress of this Congress. I must refute those statements vehemently and personally.

I came to Congress in 1994 with a freshman class of the 104th Congress. What we inherited at that time was 40 years of Democratic leadership which brought us to record deficits, annual deficits, huge amount of monies owed, the U.S.Treasury or the taxpayers, $5.7 trillion of accumulated debt, a government that was spending money out of Social Security, Medicare and every other trust fund that they could find, and borrowing money out of Social Security in order to camouflage the real size of the deficit annually.

When we were elected, we were told that we could expect, if we allowed the President and the majority party at that time to continue their spending ways, we would be probably this year spending in excess of $200 billion or $300 billion over and above what came in in revenues.

Interestingly, 6 years later, as I am about to celebrate my sixth anniversary of being elected to this important

and fine office, we have a balanced budget. We have welfare reform. We have reduced capital gains, which has led to the largest expansion on Wall Street and more income made by Americans in the equity markets than in our history.

We have increased Medicare funding, and we have created a lockbox hopefully for Social Security. We have passed a marriage penalty elimination, but the President vetoed it. We passed estate tax relief, but the President vetoed it. We passed a repeal of a phone tax, but the President vetoed it.

Mr. Speaker, we have restored military funding that was cut by this administration year after year. The White House sent us budgets that were inadequate for our military, and the Republican majority had to step up and make certain that our men and women in uniform were not only properly funded, trained, but that the personnel support that they need, the transportation support that they needed would, in fact, be there in a time of crisis.

People say we are just sitting around doing nothing, I think when you have a fight over real issues, then it is worth staying. We can go back to the ways of yesterday and spend, spend, spend to our heart's content and not care about the voters, because after all it is all about Members of Congress. I have to get elected, so I have to bribe my constituents in order to make sure they vote for me. So they spend money just willy nilly out of the pockets.

It is not theirs to pay, it just comes in the form of borrowed notes; and we fund the government excessively. We are here today over a few very, very minor issues. Yes, it was stated the President is away. He is in California.

There are other Members of their side of the aisle away campaigning, because, after all, control of Congress is more important than doing the people's work, being in charge somehow around here is more important than accomplishment. I always heard from my parents put people before your politics, make certain you take care of those who cannot take care of themselves.

As a Member of Congress, I voted for Head Start and a number of programs that the minority side has asked for. But at the same time, I recognize we have to have some fiscal restraint.

The gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, bent over backwards to give the President and the White House and the minority side as much money as we possibly could find in order to make certain that their needs were met. But in the waning hours, it just was not enough, because it was more about shutting this place down, about causing gridlock, about trying to pretend that somehow nothing has been accomplished in this Congress.

Campaign finance reform, we passed in the House. Patients' bill of rights, we passed in this House. I mentioned the tax cuts previously, so there is a record of accomplishment. People do not raise their voices.

People do not need to belly ache and browbeat. People need to come together and solve the problems that face America. That is why we were elected. We were elected to make certain, yes, in a partisan sense as a Republican, to represent the core elements of what my party is all about. The gentleman from California (Mr. HORN), who will speak in a moment, and I veer off from time to time on our party for a number of issues, because we believe we have to represent our districts, mine in Florida, his in California. We care enough about our constituents to say we will do what is right, not what is political.

The last 48, 72 hours, I have heard nothing but bellyaching from the other side of the aisle that has made me nauseous. It is not about doing something for people. It is about winning an election. It is about trying to gain power for the shear sake of having power. It is about being called chairman. That is not what this process is about; that will be decided November 7, and God bless America, it will be decided by people who pay taxes, who vote in this country, who make a difference, and who send us the money we spend here.

Let us stop the acrimony. Let us stop the nonsense and let us stop the partisanship from that side of the aisle and recognize there has been a number of good accomplishments by the 106th Congress.

SETTING THE RECORD STRAIGHT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I think it is important this evening to be able to set the RECORD straight. I am glad that my colleagues were able to individually really focus us on why we are here. I am here; but, frankly, I will be in my district tomorrow, because the real solution to this problem presented itself on late Monday evening, Sunday night, Monday day of last week, when there was a real agreement that would have brought us to the conclusion of this session.

It is interesting that over the course of debate that we have heard this evening, we have heard someone talk about taxes in upstate New York, not relevant to the American people, dealing with bringing closure to the appropriations process and ensuring that the government can run.

We saw some Members of this House present a map to talk about where the President of the United States, the commander in chief is and other Members of this House, none of that relevant. It has nothing to do with the negotiations process. All of this is dilatory tactics led by the Republican majority to press their points.

One of the leaders of the Republican majority said we are not going to let them go home because they will spend the weekend demagoguing and talking about trying to take back the House when we know that they will not. Those are not words from Democrats, those are Republican words.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I would like us to resolve this. Let me tell you why. Rushing to the airport today to get back for one vote, of course, I thought the Everglades vote would be on the floor tonight, but unfortunately, it is not. I support it and would have looked forward to voting for it and will vote in the RECORD when I return, if I am so elected, that I would have supported it, but on rushing to the airport, I stopped by a senior citizen center and spoke to senior citizens. I am sorry I did not have more time, but, obviously, I had to get back to Washington for important deliberations of which I hoped that I would have been able to participate in and to secure a vote for the future of our great Nation.

I told those senior citizens that we were still trying to work on answering the question why health maintenance organizations, insurance companies, HMOs were closing up in cities and States across the Nation.

1945

I did not have much time to talk to those seniors, some of them with a number of ailments, some of them confused about why their HMOs closed. But on that very note, they applauded. They wished me well. They said, we know you have to get back to the airport.

That is what we are fighting for, a distinction between giving $34 billion to HMOs versus giving monies to hospitals in rural and urban centers to keep their doors open, and giving the $34 billion to HMOs with no accountability whatsoever.

What that means is that we can give them the money to recoup what they say are their losses; but the minute they receive their paycheck, they can immediately close up in Iowa City; Detroit, Michigan; Houston, Texas; New York, New York; Atlanta, Georgia, and leave seniors in a lurch. This is what this debate is about.

So the Republican majority can get up and talk all day about work, work, work. I will not be here. I will be in my district tomorrow, because there is no work. Frankly, I believe if we had work, we would have had the Labor-HHS bill, just as we have heard our colleagues say, the negotiators, negotiated the resolve of this bill.

They had an agreement on education funding. They had an agreement dealing with school construction. They had an agreement on Medicare. But, yet, the special interests took control. The U.S. Chamber of Commerce and others said we cannot deal with those workplace safety rules. Frankly, I also spoke to my constituents about that.

We use these large terms, ''workplace safety.'' Do my colleagues know what we are fighting about? How many of us have had the carpal tunnel syndrome,

where one cannot move the hand? One might be on the computer or word processing or playing the piano, but one may be able to continue to work.

But the factory workers who get this syndrome cannot continue to pluck the feathers off a chicken or put the machine parts together. They cannot continue their work.

The only thing we have asked for is that rules will be implemented after the next President is elected. They squashed it, stomped on it, and said no way. Millions of Americans suffer with this syndrome.

We have been fighting for 3 or 4 years to get these kind of workplace safety rules so that these people who are on this kind of income working in factories in America would have some kind of protection.

But we blew up the last bill, the Labor-HHS appropriations bill, primarily because of that issue. Then of course we have heard all the characterization of immigrants. We are trying to provide opportunity for access to legalization of immigrants who are already in this country working, paying taxes, owning homes, and having children going to school. This is not a blanket amnesty. This is where we messed up, Mr. Speaker.

So to set the record straight, some of us are going home to work. We are going to wait on the Republicans until they find out that we are really working for Americans and get the job done.

H.R. 5622: A NEW VERSION OF THE MEDICARE INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT ACT

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

Mr. HORN. Mr. Speaker, we all know that Medicare is a vital program for nearly 40 million seniors. But we also know serious management deficiencies continue to plague this program resulting in the waste or misspending of billions of dollars for Medicare.

Last year, the Medicare program made improper payments totaling an estimated $13.5 billion for claims that were, to quote our auditors in the General Accounting Office, ''that it was just not reasonable, not necessary and not appropriate.''

In report after report, the General Accounting Office and other government auditors have outlined and detailed the problems in Medicare's financial management, and they repeatedly have offered this key recommendation: Medicare must develop a fully integrated financial management system that is standardized with all of its contractors so that timely, accurate, and meaningful information can be developed to control this $300 billion-a-year program.

Mr. Speaker, in May of this year, I introduced legislation that I believe would move us toward that goal, the Health Care Advanced and Informational Infrastructure Act. A similar bill was introduced in the other body by Senator LUGAR. Both of us believed that enacting sound and effective controls on Medicare programs must be made a high priority.

On July 11, 2000, the Subcommittee on Government Management, Information and Technology, which I chair, held a hearing on that bill, and witnesses included representatives from the General Accounting Office, the Health Care Financing Administration that administers Medicare, and the Medicare health providers and those who provide and service the computer systems that currently process Medicare claims and payments. These witnesses pointed out significant concerns. We listened.

We have now introduced tonight a new bill and a new version H.R. 5622. That legislation will address the concerns that were raised at the hearing while retaining the intent of the original proposal.

Similar to H.R. 4401, the new bill is designed to force the creation of an advanced information infrastructure that will allow the Medicare program to instantly process the vast number of straightforward transactions that now clog the pipeline and drain scarce health care resources.

This bill is the result of an extensive bipartisan work with both majority and minority staff on our subcommittee and the full committee. In addition, we have consulted with the Health Care Financing Administration's chief information officer as well as the staff in the General Accounting Office to ensure that the provisions of the bill accomplish the worthy goals of the previous bill without inflicting unintended consequences.

This bill establishes a commission to work with the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the chief information officer of the Health Care Financing Administration. We want a modern integrated computer system. This system is to provide Medicare beneficiaries with an immediate point of service verification of insurance coverage and an understandable explanation of benefits.

In addition, the bill would simplify the process for health care providers by giving them immediate information about their patients' Medicare benefits and a detailed explanation of why a benefit has been denied.

Unlike H.R. 4401, this bill does not call for immediate payments to health care providers, which was a significant concern to the General Accounting Office and the Health Care Financing Administration. According to health care providers who testified at the July hearing, Medicare often pays claims more quickly than private insurance companies.

The new bill also eliminates a requirement that the advanced informational system include the Federal Employees Health Benefits Program. We need to look at that for modeling. It does, however, require that the new system be structured so that it might be expanded for use by other government health plans; if they choose to do so, that is. Indeed, if this system is designed and developed as the bill requires, others will surely want to use it.

In addition, the bill expands the commission to include representatives of health care providers, Medicare information technology suppliers, and Medicare beneficiaries.

This bill is careful to avoid mandates that would undermine privacy rights. The privacy is of paramount concern and must be safeguarded in the design of an advanced network of the financial management systems for Medicare.

When seniors walk into the doctor's office, they deserve to know immediately what their Medicare benefits are and what copayments are or deductibles they will have to pay. When they leave the office, they deserve to have a simple statement explaining what was done and what is owed.

The goal of this bill is to reduce and, where possible, to eliminate excessive paperwork currently required by the Medicare program. Greater efficiency will free doctors to spend more time treating patients.

Mr. Speaker, the legislation could save billions of dollars in needless Medicare paperwork and inefficiencies and put an end to the many time-consuming and confusing complications both for the doctors and for the patients.

Mr. Speaker, Medicare's financial management systems and their annual reports of billions misspent would then be something of the past.

Mr. Speaker, I include a copy of H.R. 5622 for the RECORD as follows:

H.R. 5622

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; PURPOSE.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Medicare Program Infrastructure Investment Act of 2000''.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this Act is to design a strategy for the implementation of an advanced informational infrastructure for the administration of parts A and B of the medicare program in coordination with the Administrator of the Health Care Financing Administration and the Chief Information Office of the Health Care Financing Administration.

SEC. 2. ESTABLISHMENT OF THE HEALTH CARE INFRASTRUCTURE COMMISSION.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established within the Department of Health and Human Services a Health Care Infrastructure Advisory Commission (in this section referred to as the ''Commission'').

(b) DUTIES.—The Commission shall carry out the following duties:

(1) In conjunction with the Administrator and Chief Information Officer of the Health Care Financing Administration, the Commission shall develop a strategy to create an advanced informational infrastructure for the administration of the medicare program

under parts A and B of title XVIII of the Social Security Act, including claims processing by medicare carriers and fiscal intermediaries and beneficiary information functions.

(2) 18 months after the date all of the members of the Commission are appointed under subsection (c)(2), the Commission shall submit to Congress (and publish in the Federal Register) an initial report that describes a strategic plan to implement an advanced information structure for parts A and B of the medicare program, including a cost estimate and schedule for the plan, that—

(A) complies with all existing Federal financial management and information technology laws;

(B) provides immediate, point-of-service information on covered items and services under the program to each beneficiary, provider of services, physician, and supplier;

(C) ensures that strict security measures are integral to and designed into the system that—

(i) protect the privacy of patients and the confidentiality of personally identifiable health insurance data used or maintained under the system in a manner consistent with privacy regulations promulgated by the Secretary under the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996;

(ii) guard system integrity in a manner consistent with security regulations promulgated by the Secretary under such Act; and

(iii) apply to any network service provider used in connection with the system;

(D) immediately notifies each provider of services, physician, or supplier of any incomplete or invalid claim, including—

(i) the identification of any missing information;

(ii) the identification of any coding errors; and

(iii) information detailing how the provider of services, physician, or supplier may develop a claim under such system;

(E) allows for proper completion and resubmission of each claim identified as incomplete or invalid under subparagraph (D);

(F) allows for immediate automatic processing of clean claims and subsequent payment in accordance with the provisions of sections 1816(c)(2)(B)(i) and 1842(c)(2)(B)(i) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395h(c)(2)(B)(i) and 1395u(c)(2)(B)(i)) so that a provider of services, physician, or supplier may immediately provide the beneficiary with a written explanation of medical benefits, including an explanation of costs and coverage to any beneficiary under parts A and B at the point of care;

(G) allows for electronic payment of claims to each provider of services, physician, and supplier, including payment through electronic funds transfer, for each claim for which payment is not made on a periodic interim payment basis under section 1815(e)(2) of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1395g(e)(2)) for items and services furnished under part A;

(H) complies with all applicable transactions standards adopted by the Secretary under the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996;

(I) provides for system specifications that are flexible, modular in nature, scalable, and performance-based; and

(J) is designed to be used, or easily adapted for use, in other health insurance programs administered by a department or agency of the United States.

(3) Not later than one year after the date the Commission submits the initial report under paragraph (2), the Commission shall submit to Congress (and shall publish in the Federal Register) a final report on the Secretary's progress in developing an advanced informational system.

(4) Each report required under this subsection—

(A) shall include those recommendations, findings, and conclusions of the Commission that receive the approval of at least a majority of the members of the Commission; and

(B) shall include dissenting or additional views of members of the Commission with respect to the subject matter of the report.

(c) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) COMPOSITION.—The Commission shall be composed of 13 voting members appointed in accordance with paragraph (2) and two ex officio voting members designated under paragraph (3).

(2) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, members of the Commission shall be appointed as follows:

(A) The Director of the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency shall appoint one member.

(B) The Director of the National Science Foundation shall appoint one member.

(C) The Director of the Office of Science and Technology Policy shall appoint one member.

(D) The Secretary shall appoint one member who represents each of the following:

(i) Physicians and other health care practitioners.

(ii) Hospitals.

(iii) Skilled nursing facilities.

(iv) Home health agencies.

(v) Suppliers of durable medical equipment.

(vi) Fiscal intermediaries and carriers.

(E) The Secretary shall appoint two members who represent information technology providers, one who represents medicare information technology providers and one who represent health industry information technology providers.

(F) The Secretary shall appoint two members who represent medicare beneficiaries.

(3) EX OFFICIO MEMBERS.—The following shall serve as ex officio members of the Commission:

(A) The Secretary, who shall be the chairperson of the Commission.

(B) The Chief Financial Officer of the Health Care Financing Administration.

(4) QUALIFICATIONS.—Each of the members appointed under paragraph (2) shall be knowledgeable in advanced information technology, financial management, or electronic billing procedures associated with health care benefit programs. One of the members appointed under paragraph (2)(F) shall have expertise in health information privacy.

(d) MEETINGS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Commission shall meet at the call of the chairperson, except that it shall meet—

(A) not less than four times each year; or

(B) on the written request of a majority of its members.

(2) QUORUM.—A majority of the members of the Commission shall constitute a quorum, but a lesser number of members may hold hearings.

(e) COMPENSATION.—Each member of the Commission who is a full-time officer or employee of the United States may not receive additional pay, allowances, or benefits by reason of their service on the Commission. Each member of the Commission shall receive travel expenses and per diem in lieu of subsistence in accordance with sections 5702 and 5703 of title 5, United States Code.

(f) STAFF.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The chairperson of the Commission may, without regard to the civil service laws and regulations, appoint an executive director and such other additional personnel as may be necessary to enable the Commission to perform its duties.

(2) COMPENSATION.—The chairperson of the Commission may fix the compensation of the executive director and other personnel without regard to the provisions of chapter 51 and subchapter III of chapter 53 of title 5, United States Code, relating to classification of positions and General Schedule pay rates, except that the rate of pay for the executive director and other personnel may not exceed the rate payable for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of such title.

(3) DETAIL OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES.—Upon request of the chairperson, the head of any Federal department or agency may detail to the Commission, without reimbursement, basis, any of the personnel of that department or agency to the Commission to assist it in carrying out its duties under this Act. Such detail shall be without interruption or loss of civil service status or privilege.

(g) PROCUREMENT OF TEMPORARY AND INTERMITTENT SERVICES.—The chairperson of the Commission may procure temporary and intermittent services under section 3109(b) of title 5, United States Code, at rates for individuals which do not exceed the daily equivalent of the annual rate of basic pay prescribed for level V of the Executive Schedule under section 5316 of such title.

(h) TERMINATION.—The Commission shall terminate on the date that is 60 days after the date the Commission submits to Congress the final report under subsection (b)(3).

(i) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There are authorized to be appropriated out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary for the Commission to carry out its duties under this section.

(2) AVAILABILITY.—Any sums appropriated under paragraph (1) shall remain available until the termination of the Commission under subsection (h).

(j) DEFINITIONS.—In this section:

(1) SECRETARY.—The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

(2) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term ''Administrator'' means the Administrator of the Health Care Financing Administration.

(k) APPLICABILITY OF FACA.—The provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall apply to the Commission.

SEC. 3. IMPLEMENTATION OF SYSTEM.

(a) ANNUAL REPORTS ON IMPLEMENTATION.—Not later than 6 months after the Commission publishes in the Federal Register the final report required under section 2(b)(3) and annually thereafter until the date of final implementation under subsection (b), the Secretary shall submit to Congress a report on the progress of the Health Care Financing Administration on implementing a modernized advanced, integrated informational infrastructure for the administration of parts A and B of the medicare program.

(b) FINAL IMPLEMENTATION.—Not later than 10 years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall fully implement a modernized advanced, integrated informational infrastructure for the administration of parts A and B of the medicare program.

SEC. 4. ADMINISTRATIVE SIMPLIFICATION.

Section 1173(a) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1320d–2(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

''(4) INTERACTIVE TRANSACTIONS.—If the Secretary adopts a batch standard for a transaction under paragraph (1) that involves a health care provider, not later than 24 months after the adoption of the batch standard, the Secretary shall also adopt an interactive standard that is compatible with the batch standard so that the provider may

immediately complete the transaction at the point of service.''.

CONGRESS STILL WORKING FOR BETTERMENT OF NATION

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

Mr. GILCHREST. Mr. Speaker, we are here Thursday evening, and we all know that we are going to be here tomorrow, Friday. What I would like to tell my colleagues, all of them on both sides of the aisle, is that we are here to continue the process of legislating.

Some of the things that we are trying to work out here, one, for example, is to provide health care prescription drugs for Americans that need that service and do not have it right now.

We are working to create a system where no legal immigrants are turned away from our shores. We are working to ensure worker safety and much-needed, in certain circumstances, compensation for those who are injured in a variety of ways.

We are working to build schools for those municipalities around the country that need new construction. We are working to enhance the economy by stimulating productivity in the private sector. Some of that is by a tax structure. Some of that is opening new markets overseas.

We are working here, Mr. Speaker, to find ways to make this great country energy independent. We are working here, specifically what we will do tomorrow is to ensure that the environment is clean and sustainable.

Now, how do we do all those things while we are here working? Well, it is pretty fundamental. We as Members of Congress, both the Democrats and Republicans, and the two Independents, we come here every day, we exchange information. There is a sense of tolerance for somebody else's opinion. Then we vote. If you get 218 votes, you have the majority. Our fundamental democratic process is based on the majority. So if we have 218 votes, then that bill is passed out of the House and goes over to the Senate.

We hear a lot about gridlock and partisan politics, both here on the House floor and in the media, certainly. Well, I am here to say that partisan politics is actually the strength of our system. That means each of us is allowed to come here and express our deeply felt convictions without fear of any retribution or retaliation.

When we stand here and disagree with the Democrats or Republicans disagree with Republicans, or Republicans disagree with the President, that is the strength of our Nation, which is the diversity of thought.

Now, one cannot express one's difference of opinion in Cuba. One cannot express one's difference of opinion in Iraq to Saddam Hussein because one would disappear and never be seen again. But here on the House floor, the fundamentals of democratic process is that every individual Member of Congress, whether one is the Speaker or a new freshman, has an opportunity to be a responsible advocate for what one believes. If one can talk to 218 Members, and they see one as credible and one has the right information, then one will get their vote, and one's bill will pass.

So the strength of our country is that we each have the availability to us, because of our Constitution, to express our heartfelt convictions.

There is one other thing that we need to do here on a regular basis, but especially now before this general election, is to tap the energy of the American people with all their diversity and their initiative and innovation. We need to inspire the American people to participate in the democratic process so that all of us collectively together can make the possibilities for this Nation and this world limitless.

PUTTING PEOPLE ABOVE POLITICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PITTS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. KINGSTON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, we are joined here tonight by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT). What we want to talk about is what we have tried to do in our individual careers, and we believe that this Congress has, and that is putting people above politics.

See, when we were elected in Arizona, in Minnesota, and, in my case, Georgia, we did not go out there and say I am going to be a Republican, and I am going to only be a Republican and I am going to only represent Republicans. We went out there to say the American people want a change. We are going to try to put people above politics. We are going to try to stick to that.

Do my colleagues know what, I have found that a lot of times in these negotiations, the Democrats have a lot of good things to offer. What we try to do is put the best of the Democratic ideas and the best of the Republican ideas forward for the best for the American people.

2000

That is one reason why we are still here in Washington after the Senate has already adjourned. It is one reason we are still here to fight for the things that we believe in. It would be a lot more convenient for us during this election time to be back home pounding the streets in our own districts, but there are some things that we need to fight for.

My wife, Libby, often reminds me that she does not mind driving the car pool alone and being alone at parties and taking care of the kids and sitting down at the dinner table and seeing my empty chair night after night if I am here to make a difference.

But if I am not making a difference and it is politics as usual, then it is time to go home. But so far we are here to put people before politics.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Georgia for yielding.

As he mentioned his beloved spouse, Ms. Libby, my thoughts turn to home and Ms. Mary and a conversation that my bride, Mary, and I had just last night.

This is a great honor to serve in the Congress of the United States. Evoking the memories of one who served at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue before coming here, John Quincy Adams, he was heard to say, ''There is no greater honor than serving in the people's house.''

And so, Mr. Speaker, I think back to my conversation last night with Mary when she said, honey, we would love to have you at home. The kids have spelling tests. There is a lot going on. But you and the other Members of Congress need to stay there and complete the work you were sent to do. And as is often the case, Mary provides good advice, the kind of common sense that comes from Main Street, America, that may be disrupted in the Beltway and with the pundits and with the dominant media culture always ready to play a game of gotcha, especially now, Mr. Speaker, when we look at the calendar and see what approaches.

Fast approaching is the first Tuesday following the first Monday, election day, where our constituents, where citizens across America will make a choice. Conventional wisdom, our friends in the fourth estate, indeed our friends on the other side of the aisle, albeit sotto voce, from the other side of the aisle, say, we need to be at home. But the fact is we are here and here we will remain to put people before politics, to complete our work, to understand there are legitimate differences between people of the two major parties and those independents who join us here.

Mr. Speaker, I also think, in a sense, being entrusted with this role is not unlike applying for a job. And I have yet to take a job application and find a place to fill out partisan identification. I never see a spot on the resume or on a job application which asks whether you are a Republican or a Democrat or an Independent.

So putting partisanship aside, I think it is important for every Member who can possibly be here to return to this Chamber. And that is why I noted with great dismay tonight, as we cast the vote to make sure our Government was funded for another day, our friend the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), who happens to be the leader of the Democratic party in this Chamber, chose to be out campaigning in Missouri.

Mr. Speaker, how sad it is also that the President of the United States, who a week ago informed the Senate majority leader that due to a fund-raiser in New York, he would be unavailable for consultation until after 1 o'clock in the morning, followed the next day by a round of golf and going in person to the final game of the World Series, he would be unavailable for consultation, now that same President of the United States finds himself not in the resplendent White House but instead 3,000 miles to the west in California out campaigning.

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, let us make this very clear. The President of the United States is not our campaigner in chief, he is the commander in chief. He is the Chief Executive. And we should expect nothing less of our President than his presence here in Washington to achieve a hard-won consensus and compromise.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, it is ironic, and I am not trying to give anyone a geography lesson, but it is interesting that here we are in Washington, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT) is in Washington, the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) is in Washington, 300-some-odd Members of Congress are in Washington, and I will point out 73 Democrats are not, but the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT) is in Missouri campaigning, the leader. Mr. Clinton is here in California in the district of the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN) politicking. Again, the rest of us, 300-some-odd people, have flown to Washington for negotiations to try to finish up; and yet they have decided to leave Washington. And you cannot get your work done. It takes two to dance, and you have to have two at a bargaining table as well. And you cannot bargain, you cannot negotiate when other people have walked out of negotiations.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT).

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I just want to first of all say I am really proud of what this Congress has done, and I am proud of what we are doing right now. And I do not know if most people understand what the reason is that we are still here in Washington on just a few nights before the general election, but I honestly believe that there were people down at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue that thought, well, if we just hold them hostage in Washington, eventually we will get the Members to say, we got to go home and campaign, we got a campaign going on, we got to get out of here, we got to get out of here; and the longer they held us hostage, the more that they could extract in terms of more spending, in terms of policy changes.

I am proud of the fact that we said no, no, we are not going to do that. We are more than willing to meet the President more than halfway. We are more than willing to relax the spending caps, which some of us do not think was a very good idea. But we do not think it is a very good idea to give blanket amnesty to over four million illegal aliens. We think that is a very bad idea. And I think most of our constituents believe that is a very bad idea.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to kind of underscore what we are talking about, four million people who sneaked into the United States illegally against laws, the President wants to give blanket citizenship to. When we say ''amnesty,'' we mean citizenship.

That is the size roughly of Montana, Delaware, Alaska, North Dakota, Wyoming, and Vermont. That is what we are talking about. And on just one stroke of the pen, the President wants to make them citizens.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman mentioned those States, Montana, Delaware, Alaska, North Dakota, Wyoming and Vermont. But he did not say combined, all of those States combined.

Now, I do not think there is anybody in INS who thinks this is a very good idea. I do not think there are many Americans who think that is a very good idea.

The other issue is ergonomics. Certainly we have got to make some allowances for people who have repetitive motion injuries. No question about that. But the policy that was being attempted to be foisted down our throats could have had devastating impacts on small businesses. And so, we are not eager to do that.

We are willing to negotiate. We are willing to meet the President more than halfway. The question is, is he? And so far we have not seen a whole lot of flexibility from the White House. Clearly what they are trying to do is hold us hostage. I am proud of the fact that our leadership said, no, we are not going to do that. We are not going to play that game anymore. We are not going to bust the spending caps the way we have in the past.

So I am glad that we are still here. I would rather be home. My wife would love to have me home. She was so lonely, she hates to fly, but last week she was willing to get on a plane and fly out here she said because she was starting to miss me, believe it or not. But I think the people's business is important, and I think we should not allow the poison of partisan politics right before an election to get us to accept a bad deal for the American people.

So I am proud that we are here. I am proud of what we have accomplished in the last 6 years. And hopefully we will have a chance to continue that kind of progress, whether it is balancing the budget, continuing to make certain that our welfare system encourages work and personal responsibility, a whole long list of things that we have missed over the last 6 years. We cannot turn our backs on that now.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, as we are joined by our friends on the left, and we welcome them in the spirit of consensus and compromise, I just thought about a comment our own President made in a press conference a few days ago when he said that this bipartisan Congress has accomplished so much. And I think about stopping the tax on earnings limits, what in essence was an unfair tax on senior citizens.

For the record, the gentleman could you put that statement in our CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman referenced this quote. And maybe while we are looking at it, ''We have accomplished so much in this session of Congress in a bipartisan fashion. It has been one of the most productive sessions.'' President Bill Clinton, October 30, 2000.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for reading that into the RECORD. I think it points out that the mantra that was heard heretofore, indeed the mantra that some of our friends on the left came back with tonight of a ''do nothing Congress,'' even our own President, who happens to be a member of the other party, said that this has been one of the most productive sessions.

I think that is something upon which we ought to agree. Certainly we moved in a bipartisan fashion with a prescription drug benefit for our seniors. We moved, as I mentioned earlier, to end the unfair, in essence, tax on Social Security in terms of an earnings limit for those seniors who continue to choose to work past the age of retirement. We have moved in many different areas in terms of educational flexibility, a bill that was backed by every one of the 50 Governors in our United States regardless of whether they are Democrat, Republicans, or Independents.

So we have had consensus, compromise and progress. And it is unfortunate that at this time, at this juncture, when agreement can be so close, and perhaps it is inevitable it is a function of the calendar, that there are those who are tempted either to play a game of gotcha or one-upmanship to say we want to work but instead turn home to campaign.

The President, who we hoped was here to finally work this out, chose to go overfly my State and go to California again to campaign. We respect the fact that people want to get the issues to the folks, but it seems to me they are putting the cart before the horse. Our most important job is to be true to the oath of office that we have taken to be here doing our work regardless of the date on the calendar.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) has joined us. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I would like to participate with my three colleagues tonight. We were talking a moment ago about being here and working, and I heard comments made about we are glad to be here and working.

I would agree with you if we were here working. But can anyone of the

three of you tell me any meeting that has occurred between the negotiators, the leadership since 1:20 Sunday night as far as work to do the things we need to do?

When you put the poster up a moment ago about four million illegal aliens, this Member would join you in opposing that. That is not what we are talking about, and you know it. But it can be negotiated back and this is what we could do. We could work out an agreement on that that I think all four of us would agree to. It could be done.

But my question is this: Can you name one meeting that has occurred since 1:20 Sunday night, or Monday morning actually, that has occurred that has actually been a working meeting that would provide for some hope of resolving some of these difficulties?

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Georgia will continue to yield, first of all, let me note a common bond of agreement, since we both represent border States, the concern about how we deal with the real question of uniting families but at the same time not rewarding those who intentionally break the law. I think we have a consensus there. So let me build from there. Because, Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to show the American people that there can be some common agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I do this not to be flippant, but perhaps my friend from Texas is more aware of the President's schedule. Can he tell me, was the President of the United States available for meetings past 1:20 a.m. Monday?

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would continue to yield, the President was available all day Friday, all day Saturday, all day Sunday, all day Monday, until 1 o'clock on Tuesday, and was available for a period of time on Wednesday.

At no time was there ever any request by the leadership of the House to negotiate on the questions of which you are talking about according to my information.

2015

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I respect the work the gentleman from Texas has done on the budget. Generally speaking, we agree on a lot more things than we disagree on. But on this whole issue of the budget, the four of us, I would suspect, in a matter of a few hours could probably work out the final details of this budget, language on what we are going to do to reunite families and still preserve the basic notion of our immigration policy. Even on ergonomics, I think we could probably work out language that would be satisfactory to the four of us. But that is not the real question. The real question is, would the President sign it? I think that is where we have the real problem. Because the President has basically played this game of chicken, believing that we would ultimately cave on very important policy questions. He was wrong. He miscalculated this year. Some of us said, no, there is a line beyond which we simply will not retreat.

I think we have spent too much money this year. I think you agree with me on that. I think we should have kept those spending caps. I think we can legitimately meet the needs of the Federal Government and all the people who depend upon it for $1.86 trillion. That is what our spending agreement was with the Senate. We have gone over those spending caps already. We can point fingers and say it was the Republicans in the Senate or it was the Republicans in the House or it was the administration or it was this guy or that guy. But we could reach that agreement between the four of us, and I suspect within a few hours we could have that agreement worked out. But I will also suspect the President would not sign that bill.

Mr. KINGSTON. Let me say, also, I am going to find out if our leaders balked at any meetings. I know in a negotiation dance there are a lot of nuances and people do sometimes do a little head fake this way and that way. It takes place in all negotiations. I do not know all of it, what has not gone on; but I know this, that we were here all last week, including Friday, including Saturday, including Sunday. We were not in session Monday, although I will say my mind is a little bit foggy right now if we were here Monday. I know we were here Tuesday. We were here Thursday.

Mr. OBEY. Would the gentleman like me to give him an instance?

Mr. KINGSTON. I will be glad to yield in a minute. Let me finish. The point is, we are here. The President is in California. If he wants to get an agreement, you got to be there. And he is not here. It distresses me. We had a Member here who ironically represents the town where Mrs. Clinton has bought a house, and they had something in the Treasury-Post Office bill that was vetoed by this President, then he left town. I do not know if that is part of the New York strategy or what. To me he needs to be here.

Mr. OBEY. The gentleman asked a question. Would the gentleman like an answer on that?

Mr. KINGSTON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. I would be happy to tell you that on three successive days, the majority negotiators on the appropriation bills in question made it quite clear that representatives from the White House were not welcome in those meetings until other items were first negotiated. And on the night that the agreement was put together, the representatives of the White House, and it was Mr. Lew from the budget office, Mr. Lew was specifically told that he was not welcome in those meetings until after 10 o'clock at night. The President is not a part of those negotiations. He has delegated Mr. Lew to represent him in all instances, and Mr. Lew was available at all times requested by your party. You know that as well as I do.

Mr. KINGSTON. Reclaiming my time, maybe the President ought to delegate the rest of the job on over to somebody else if he does not want to do it. I do not know one person in the United States of America who voted for Jack Lew.

Mr. OBEY. Who did your leadership delegate it to?

Mr. KINGSTON. If the President was in the Middle East or in North Korea avoiding war or in someplace like that.

Mr. OBEY. Who did your leadership delegate negotiating authority to?

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman will remember, keeping a little courtesy here, I have the floor. I will try to answer your question.

Mr. OBEY. Do you remember?

Mr. KINGSTON. Here is the point. The President of the United States does not come to these meetings. I came from the private sector.

Mr. OBEY. The President of the United States was specifically excluded from the meetings.

Mr. KINGSTON. I may be naive because I come from the private sector and I do not understand all of Washington and I do not know all the nuances of Washington, but it would appear to me that in the 11th hour of the closing sessions of the United States Congress that the President would lower himself to show up to the meetings and not send some unelected Jack Lew guy. Mr. Lew might be brilliant. In fact, maybe he should be President and maybe that would have been a better choice of a nominee. But the reality is the President was not there.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I just want to come back to this point. Does anybody in this House believe that if we had an up-and-down vote on blanket amnesty for over 4 million illegal aliens, does anybody here believe it would pass? So why are we talking about it in the conference? Where did this come from? I do not think it was our negotiators who said, What we ought to really do is give blanket immunity, blanket amnesty to 4 million illegal aliens. I understand that is one of the sticking points. Maybe I am misinformed. Maybe I do not know what is going on in those conference committees. But our negotiators come back and say, We don't want to do this but the White House is saying we've got to do that.

Mr. OBEY. If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman is misinformed. That item was not even in the Labor-H appropriations bill.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Where is it then? Who is talking about it?

Mr. OBEY. That is in the State-Justice-Commerce bill, and each side has recognized that bill is going nowhere. The only issue that had a chance of passing was the Labor-HHS appropriations bill.

Mr. KINGSTON. Reclaiming my time, there again if the President is so proud about giving citizenship to 4 million illegal aliens, why does he not come here and defend his position instead of having somebody do it for him?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Or bring it to the floor for a vote. That is all I am asking for.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I appreciate the efforts of my friends on the left and certainly the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations to offer his perspective tonight. Certainly he has been involved in a variety of talks dealing with spending and certainly offers his own testimony to his point of view and political philosophy time and again on this floor. We welcome that because it is legitimate to have differences.

The point I would make, and this goes back to our early days in the House. I remember one night when the President and First Lady very graciously welcomed new Members of Congress to the White House for a meeting. As you might expect, Mr. Speaker, and maybe my colleagues remember in their early days of Congress when they had a chance to go to the White House, it is a fairly important occasion. I remember that night, the First Lady started the meeting and the President joined us later because he had to break away from personal negotiations to try and end the baseball strike.

Mr. Speaker, we know baseball is our national pastime; indeed, my friend from Wisconsin and I have discussed baseball time and again, but that is a leisure pursuit. We can talk about the business of sports and how important that may be; but, Mr. Speaker, I think what we are saying tonight is if it was important enough for the President of the United States to insert himself into a negotiation about the baseball strike, if it is important enough for the President of the United States to attempt to take a leadership role in negotiations in the Middle East, if it is important enough for the President of the United States to make a phone call between two domestic partners dealing with the status of their relationship, certainly, Mr. Speaker, it is important enough for the President of the United States to return to Washington and come join us personally to try to achieve an agreement.

Mr. STENHOLM. If the gentleman will yield, precisely. A moment ago the gentleman from Arizona made a statement that he and I agree on. I think upon a proper reflection of the question of how many of those citizens, or noncitizens, illegals, that might need to be reunited with their family, we probably could agree, and it will be considerably less than 4 million. But both of us represent border States, both of us understand that there are certain things that need to be done in that, but not 4 million; and it was never a part of the Labor-HHS discussions. My point here is that reasonable people can work this out. This is what I am suggesting tonight.

Again I want to say to my friend from Arizona, the President was available, at the White House, at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue on Friday, on Saturday, on Sunday, on Monday, on Tuesday until 1 o'clock, again on Wednesday. At no time did the leadership of my House of Representatives ever make a request to meet with the President.

Mr. HAYWORTH. To your knowledge.

Mr. STENHOLM. That is what I say. When I come to the floor, and I appreciate the courtesies given to me, if I ever say anything that is untrue, I would like for somebody to come to the floor and correct me. Therefore, that is what I believe according to what I understand and if anybody can correct me, if you can correct me or if any one of the leadership can come in and say, What he is saying, the gentleman from Texas is all wet, come in and tell me. Otherwise, let us not keep pointing the finger of blame.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I would concur. There is no reason to point the finger of blame. I was simply saying to my friend from Texas, we may not be privy to all the discussions. We may not be privy to all the schedules. Indeed as we have seen with some of the other verbal gymnastics that have gone on in preceding days, while we have not had firsthand knowledge, there has been a very curious process that has continued here of, sadly, not the gentleman from Texas, but perhaps others saying one thing while they would do another. It is not an attack on my friend's integrity. We agree on a great deal here.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Let me just say, I feel a little like Will Rogers. He once said, ''All I know is what I read in the newspapers.'' All I know is I thought we had an agreement on the Treasury-Postal bill. I thought I read, now maybe he was misquoted, that the President was going to sign the bill. In this business we all know that our word is pretty important. I am not privy to the negotiations. I do not know what has been going on in those meetings exactly. But, as I say, all I know is what I read in the newspapers. And when I read that the President said, ''I'm going to sign that bill'' and then in the dead of night he vetoes it and you have Senators saying that is a declaration of war against the Congress, that is not the way to resolve these differences.

Here is my real point. Because I was in the State legislature for 12 years. I have been frustrated since I came here at the way we end these budget sessions, the way we end a session. Because in the legislature, we had Republican governors with Democratic legislatures and we had Democratic governors where the Republicans controlled half the legislature. But in both cases what we did at the end of the session is the governor brought in the legislative leaders, they sat down like real human beings, they sat down reasonably and said, Okay, guys, let's figure out how big is the pie going to be. That was the first question. You decided how much you were going to spend. We had to balance our budget, so that made it somewhat easier.

Once you knew how much you were going to spend, whether that was $14.3 billion or whatever the number was, it was relatively easy then to sit down and work out, well, how much goes to transportation, how much goes to education, how much goes to criminal services, how much goes to the various other departments, welfare and so forth.

We have never done that. The President has never brought, as far as I know, the legislative leaders in and said, Let's decide how much we are going to spend. Here is the problem. Because what happens is as soon as we think we have an agreement on how much we are going to spend on Treasury-Postal, first of all he vetoes it but then secondly he says, Wait a second. We've got to have more money over here; we've got to have more money over there. You cannot negotiate a moving target. In my opinion that is a terrible, terrible way to do the business of the people of the United States of America.

We ought to agree, first and foremost, we are only going to spend, and at this point I do not care what the number is, but we ought to all agree that all we are going to spend this year is $1.91 trillion or whatever that number is. Once we have that number and with just a little bit of leadership from somebody down at the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, that agreement could be made in a half an hour. Then we could all begin to work out how much we really need for Treasury-Postal, how much we really need for Energy and Water, how much ought to go for Health and Human Services, how much goes to education. All those other things are relatively easy once you decide how big the pie is. Maybe I am just crazy, because that is the way 50 States do it, and yet it cannot be done here at the Federal level.

Mr. STENHOLM. Here again, we keep talking about, the sign is up again, ''How much is enough?'' The majority party set a new set of caps at $645 billion when you attached it to the Foreign Operations bill. I did not vote for it because that is too much. But you did.

2030

You keep pointing the finger of blame. I am not here tonight to point the finger of blame. What I am trying to say is the $645 billion is set; and if in the final negotiations on all the appropriations, whatever the President makes us do, if we spend more than $645 billion, you know, all of us know, we will have to sequester and we will have to cut across the board in order to bring it back to $645 billion, unless the new Congress is like the past three Congresses, we do not live up to the budget rules.

We all understand that.

Mr. KINGSTON. Let me claim some time here and say these are some of the things in the President's budget: 2,300 new jobs at the Department of Agriculture; 2,800 at the IRS, like we all want that; almost 3,400 at the Department of Veterans Affairs, that might

be a good idea there, after years of this administration cutting it; 1,300 at the Department of Interior; 1,000 at the Department of Commerce; 2,700 at the Department of Transportation.

Some examples of the President new spending proposals, $15 million to increase food stamp spending for migrant children; $85 million for the Clean Air Partnership Act; $30 million for information immigration initiative; $4.25 million for the international environmental monitoring program; $15 million for money laundering strategy; $100 million for nongame wildlife grants to States; $30 million for the Delta Regional Authority; $100 million for the long-term Russian initiative. I do not know if that was alluding to a document of Mr. Chernomyrdin; but $10 million for the fishery vessel buyout; $5.5 million for the Global Disaster Information Network; $4.5 million for the Indian Country Tourism Development; $10 million for gun destruction. These were all in the President's budget proposal, which was dead on arrival. I do not think any of the Democrats even voted for it.

What concerns me in these back rooms when you have somebody negotiating from the White House is how many of these are sneaked back into the budget? That is where I get concerned.

The gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. I would like to simply state that, first of all, your leadership made clear at the beginning of the year that they had no intention of getting in a room with Bill Clinton because they said that when Newt Gingrich got in a room to negotiate with Bill Clinton that the President stole his socks, I think was the term of your majority whip.

With respect to some of the items you just mentioned, is the gentleman aware that the item in conference to add the funding for food stamps for the children of immigrants was offered by a Republican subcommittee chairman? The gentleman has questioned the expenditure for money laundering. Is the gentleman for illegal money laundering?

Mr. KINGSTON. Actually, I am a Republican. I do not know that much about money laundering, particularly foreign money.

Mr. OBEY. Well, Richard Nixon knew an awful lot about it, did he not?

Mr. KINGSTON. There must have been some students of Nixon who are alive and well today in Washington.

Mr. OBEY. Is the gentleman suggesting the President should not try to deal with the laundering of drug money?

Mr. KINGSTON. Here is not what I am suggesting. Here is what I am saying. The President's budget was full of all kinds of new spending initiatives and new fee proposals. Some of those may be very good. But I know this, that his budget was voted down on a bipartisan basis by this House of Representatives.

Mr. OBEY. No, it was not.

Mr. KINGSTON. What my concern is, is some of this back on the table. The gentleman, with his knowledge knows, how in conferences things do pop back on the table; some very good, some with lots of merit, but there are also things that do not have that much merit and need to be vetted a little, and that is my point.

Mr. OBEY. Would the gentleman yield further?

Mr. KINGSTON. Yes, and then let me yield to the other gentleman.

Mr. OBEY. What I find amusing is that the majority party insisted on raising the military budget by $20 billion above last year. They insisted on passing appropriation bills that had some $9 billion above the President's level for a variety of items, especially projects for Members in their districts, but then when it comes to education, which is where the final division lay, you were objecting in conference, or your representatives were, to our raising Pell grants to the amount that you yourself said you wanted them funded at in May. And your representatives were objecting to our raising funding for special education to the same level that you said on the floor you wanted it raised to in March of this year.

So we were simply trying to prevent hypocrisy from having a bad name.

Mr. KINGSTON. I appreciate the gentleman standing up for the Republican House Members in those conferences.

The gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. HAYWORTH. It begs a larger question. My friend from Wisconsin mentioned special education. Indeed, what we have done here in terms of funding, IDEA, has been to increase by some 100 percent the amounts of funds there. What we have also done under the leadership of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, was to fulfill a promise made when my friend was here much earlier. Almost a quarter century ago when I was still in high school, when this Congress went on record saying it would supply 40 percent of the total funding for that program, it took this Congress, the same Congress that balanced the budget, the same Congress that kept its hands out of the Social Security money, the same Congress that kept its hands out of the Medicare cookie jar, it took this Congress to achieve that promise.

So I appreciate my friend's point of view from his inside view of the Committee on Appropriations, but I think from time to time we need to step back and take a look at the big picture.

Mr. OBEY. If the gentleman would yield, he is misinformed on that.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I would yield to my friend from Minnesota.

Mr. OBEY. Would the gentleman yield on that question, because those numbers are wrong.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Let me pose another question. Then I would be happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr KINGSTON. The gentleman from Minnesota and then the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. The gentleman has taken some umbrage at us asking the question, how much is enough?

Mr. OBEY. I would be very happy to answer that question, if you would yield me some time.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Let me just complete my thought here. Our colleague from Texas was quite upset that we had raised the spending caps, and so am I. But as far as I can remember, the President has signed the Defense bill. He did not quarrel with that. So we really are left with this question. Perhaps the gentleman from Wisconsin can tell us how much would be enough? How much more spending do we have to agree to?

Mr. OBEY. If the gentleman would yield time so I can answer the question.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I would be happy to. What is the final number?

Mr. OBEY. Would the gentleman yield me some time so I can answer the question?

Mr. KINGSTON. Let me say this.

Mr. OBEY. I did not think the gentleman wanted a real answer.

Mr. KINGSTON. I am going to yield time. I do want to remind my friends that as somebody who does special orders, never have Republicans received so much time during the Democrat hour, just to say that for a little advertising. And in the spirit of Hershey, let me yield to the distinguished gentleman.

Mr. OBEY. I thank the gentleman. Let me point out with respect to IDEA, the fact is what was at stake in conference is whether or not we would be allowed to add an additional $300 million to the level that you appropriated in the House-passed bill. Your negotiators consistently resisted that until the last day when we finally obtained support for an additional $300 million above the House bill.

That means that we are still only funding 17 percent of the promise that the Congress made on IDEA when we should be under 40 percent under the authorization.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Would the gentleman yield? That is exactly the point.

Mr. OBEY. You do not want an answer, do you?

Mr. HAYWORTH. That is the point I made to my friend from Wisconsin, who for a time chaired the Committee on Appropriations. The fact is, the problem is, the promise was made nearly a quarter century ago. My friend from Wisconsin raises what should be considered a triumph, that after long and hard negotiating an agreement was reached. But the question was begged nearly a quarter century ago. Where was the funding then?

Mr. OBEY. I see. If the gentleman would yield, when you want to raise IDEA it is okay; but when we want to add money to special education, then it is not okay. Is that it?

Mr. HAYWORTH. If my friend would yield the time, this is precisely the point.

Mr. OBEY. I see.

Mr. HAYWORTH. This is precisely the point. I think my friend misunderstands the historical context because my friend had margins of votes in excess of 100 and could have, during the days when he controlled the purse, could have fully funded IDEA had he chosen to with other Members of the majority party then. That was then. This is now.

I think it is profound, Mr. Speaker, that we have moved to fund the program, and I champion the fact that my friend sat down to negotiate.

Mr. KINGSTON. Let me claim some time here because I really think this is a good dialogue; and I would say amongst those who are on the floor tonight, as long as we are talking we can move the ball further down the road and we can get somewhere with it.

I want to shift just slightly the focus, though. As I see the President's proposal to federalize school construction, one of the things that is disturbing to me, and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) somewhat agreed the other night, and I will let him restate whatever his position is, is the President's insistence, apparently a union payoff, to have Davis-Bacon part of local school construction, which means the cost of local school construction will be up 25 percent. And that item is on the table, as I understand it. And that is something disturbing to me because when I go back to Glynn County, Brantley County, Wayne County, Georgia, they do not want to know, hey, the good news is the Federal Government is going to have more money for school construction; the bad news is it is going to cost you 25 percent more, and you probably should have just done it without the Federal Government's help.

Could the gentleman from Wisconsin enlighten us where that is in the negotiation?

Mr. OBEY. I would be happy to, if the gentleman would let me respond, and I thank the gentleman for the time.

As the gentleman knows, there are two pieces to the school construction and school modernization proposals. In the bipartisan agreement, which your leadership blew up, in that bipartisan agreement, the construction modernization program was included in the bipartisan agreement.

The school construction item was not. The school construction item under that agreement was moved to the tax bill, and the argument was left to the tax bill and to whatever fate the tax bill would experience.

So in the package that your negotiators and I, representing the Democrats, agreed to, we have the school modernization program that was funded at a level of, I believe, $1.3 billion, and then 25 percent of the overall amount that originally had been aimed at school modernization was, at the insistence of the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING) and Republicans, provided for other programs. It could have been used for either technology or it could have been used for special education. That was a bipartisan agreement which we agreed upon, and your leadership then blew up.

Mr. KINGSTON. Let me say this: As I understand it, the reason why there was agreement on it is it was in exchange for other concessions which the White House was offering, and when the White House reneged on their part of the bargain then our House leadership said, okay, if that is the case then we are going to go back to square one.

Mr. OBEY. That is a totally false statement.

Mr. KINGSTON. That is what we understand from our leadership, and they have said that so far.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. If the gentleman would yield.

Mr. OBEY. As is often the case, the gentleman's understanding is faulty.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Let me just come back. I am trying to keep a running total here, and you said all we needed was an extra $300 million for IDEA above and beyond what we already spent.

Mr. OBEY. No, I believe we need $4 billion additional in IDEA.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. If I could just finish here, then you said but we also want another $1.3 billion for school construction. Is that all we are talking about?

Mr. OBEY. No.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Because I understood that we were about $8 billion apart. Now back in Minnesota and Wisconsin, $8 billion is a lot of money. There must have been more money somewhere else.

Mr. OBEY. I would be happy to give the gentleman the rest of the list if you would yield.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. If you could just give us the numbers. How far apart are we in the numbers?

Mr. OBEY. We were not apart on any number. Every number in the bill had been agreed to by the negotiators. There was no disagreements left on the numbers.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. They may have been agreed to by the negotiators, but ultimately you have to get 218 votes around this place. Some of us are a little upset about how much we have spent already, as the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) indicated already.

Mr. OBEY. You do not want to hear the answer, do you?

Mr. KINGSTON. Let me reclaim the time here. One of the problems that we are having here is that it does appear often that when questions are answered they go on into speeches, and if we could just answer the questions it would probably be a lot faster.

The gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I think we, Members of the House, members of the general public, need to understand how much is enough? I mean, at what point do you see, yeah, that is all we want to spend. Is it $645 billion? Is it $660 billion? Is it $700 billion? We never get a clear answer to that question.

Mr. OBEY. Would the gentleman yield so I can respond?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Yes.

Mr. KINGSTON. Yes.

Mr. OBEY. I repeat, there was not a single difference remaining on numbers.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. But I did not hear a number.

Mr. OBEY. We had an agreement.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. What is the number? How much?

Mr. OBEY. Of what? The number of what?

Mr. GUTKNECHT. How much you want to spend? That is the question we have been asking all week. How much is enough?

Mr. OBEY. I will be happy to answer.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Is it $670 billion? Is it $700 billion?

Mr. OBEY. You asked what the differences were on the table, and I told you there were no dollar differences.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. How long do we have to wait? Lord, Lord, how long will it be? When will they tell us how much is enough? We have already gone over the spending caps.

Mr. OBEY. The gentleman is debating himself.

2045

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I think this is indicative of the process. I appreciate the good-faith efforts of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations, who has served with distinction for going on 3 decades in this Chamber, but here is the quintessential difference. My friend from Minnesota is asking, what is the bottom line? My friend from Wisconsin wants to revisit a process which he knows full well also entails sitting down and achieving consensus, not only with those at the table, but also with those in the White House who earlier tonight he said could negotiate for the President, in lieu of the President, the same way it works here, where your side has a point of view, our side has a point of view, and we attempt to reach a consensus.

So I would again be interested to hear if there was, in fact, a number, rather than a process. What is the number? Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, how much is enough?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I would be happy to answer that, if the gentleman will yield. The gentleman asked me two different questions. I answered the first and the gentleman would not let me answer the second. Would the gentleman let me answer the second?

If the gentleman wanted to know what we were asking for on education, what we were asking is that we add $4.2 billion above the conference bill for education. That is what we were asking for. We were asking for additional funding for after-school centers, additional

funding for smaller class size, additional funding to correct the fact that one out of every 10 teachers is not certified to teach the subject that they are teaching, and additional funding to provide the largest increase in the Pell grants in the history of the program. And we had agreed, Republican and Democrat alike, on ever single one of those dollars. The Republican leadership blew it up, over a totally different issue not involving money at all.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, what was the issue?

Mr. OBEY. The gentleman knows very well what the issue was.

Mr. HAYWORTH. No, we do not.

Mr. OBEY. The issue was whether or not the Congress should be allowed to block the President's effort to institute protection for workers against repetitive motion injuries.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Georgia will yield, because that is something very different. The President of the United States came out and said that it was the special interests who stopped this, not a legitimate question of policy. I am glad my friend from Wisconsin brought up the fact, and we affirm tonight, that there was a legitimate difference in terms of protecting small business people, and employers, and claiming that somehow people are captive of the special interests. I yield back to my friend from Georgia.

Mr. OBEY. No, no.

Mr. KINGSTON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT).

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Again, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin is talking a policy issue, and we are trying to solve the appropriation bills.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues on the other side are not trying to solve anything tonight.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, whether it is illegal aliens or ergonomics, they are policy questions which I am not certain would pass.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, as I understand it, the House level of the Labor, Health and Human Services bill was about $106 billion, and the gentleman wants to add $4.2 billion.

Mr. OBEY. No, that is not correct.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, can the gentleman tell me what the number was?

Mr. OBEY. The number is $608.2, the House number.

Mr. KINGSTON. Okay. Plus, then it would be $108. But then what we are arguing about are the riders that the President wants to put on there.

Mr. OBEY. No, no, it was a Republican item. That was a Republican rider which the gentleman voted for.

Mr. KINGSTON. If the gentleman will yield.

Mr. OBEY. The President was opposing your rider.

Mr. KINGSTON. It is a rider, and the President is wanting to put the rider on the bill.

Mr. OBEY. And your leadership voted to blow it up.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Texas has been standing here politely, and I yield to him.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. If we can kind of get back to the basic thesis of the whole 1-hour tonight that the gentleman from Georgia has started. On the question of how much is enough that my colleagues keep asking, but they are not listening to what is being said by someone who is on the Committee on Appropriations. The $645 billion has been set as a cap. Any additional fussing about additional money is going to have to be resolved under the House rules, which I assume you all will support; I certainly will.

Now, when we start talking about ergonomics, let the record show, that was a rider added by your side of the aisle, which I supported. And let the record show that on school construction, I do agree that Davis-Bacon should not be applicable to local bond issues. But that was a rider that your side put on, not our side, but I happen to agree.

Immigration, we have already talked about that one. I think we can find a middle ground that will treat people of our country who are doing tremendous service to our country fairly by finding an agreement, and I think the gentleman from Arizona and I would agree on that. But the $4 million is an erroneous number and should not be coming out on the House floor.

The one area that I really disagree with the majority party on is in the area of hospitals, home health, nursing homes and other health care providers, the BBA fix. I happen to totally disagree with what your side has put together regarding how we are going to deal with a very serious problem facing our rural hospitals, which is my district, nursing homes; and I suspect we all agree to that. But you put together a package, your side put together a package, which you allowed no one on my side of the aisle to have any input into, and no one in the administration to have any input into, and you said, take it or leave it. Some of us said we think we can do better.

If there is one reservation that I have about us going home before completing this, it is in this area, because it is giving a tremendous amount of uncertainty; but we are not going to finish that, because the Senate has gone home. But that is one area in which, again, I think, I think that reasonable people on both sides, once we get away from this rhetoric, the blame game, and I am not here defending the President, or defending my leadership, or defending anybody else, except when I think they are right, and in this case, I think they are right.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, let me reclaim the time, because we are going down to the wire and the gentleman has made his point.

I want to point out that that bill was endorsed by the Rural Hospital Association and the American Hospital Association, and I believe the American Cancer Society. There was a whole list of associations who endorsed that.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, there is another important point. I appreciate my friend from Texas and his version of events, and I understand how he perceives this, but if I am not mistaken, the Subcommittee on Health of the Committee on Ways and Means offered that, and we can go back and check the vote, but I believe it was unanimous.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, it was the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. HAYWORTH. There actually is joint jurisdiction.

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, it was the Committee on Commerce, it was not the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. HAYWORTH. I stand corrected.

Well, then, the Commerce section of the jurisdiction was cosponsored in bipartisan fashion by the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Mrs. WILSON), and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. LUTHER), and there was bipartisan consensus bringing that out and bringing it to the floor.

Now, good people can disagree. My vantage point is, also representing rural hospitals, I took a look at that $31 billion package, realizing that the bulk of the funding goes to the hospitals; some $11 billion, Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues, that is not hay, that is real money, going to help people. My friend has a different point of view, but I do not see how we can turn our backs on that.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I just want to come back. Apparently we are very close to an agreement on how much is enough: $645 billion, is that right? The gentleman from Wisconsin, is that the final number, $645 billion?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman totally misses the point. The issue is not how much was going to be spent, it was where it was going to be spent and what the priorities were going to be. There was no disagreement on the total amount of funding.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, I do understand that, that there are differences in priorities. I understand that. I come from a different district than the gentleman from Wisconsin, and we all have different priorities, but we still have never gotten to the point as far as I am concerned of how much do we want to spend? What is the total number? Because then ultimately, reasonable people, and it happens in every State legislature, once they agree on how big the pie is, they can all sit down and decide how much is going to go to these various different programs.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, but the problem is, my Republican colleagues passed a budget resolution which pretended that they were going to spend $40 billion less than they knew they were going to spend.

Mr. GUTKNECHT. I guess we are not going to get an answer.

Mr. OBEY. That is the problem.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, how much is enough? $645 is the number. We can fuss about how we spend it, but $645 billion is the number. So let me remind everyone now when we are talking about numbers, when we started this year, the Republican budget said 627 was enough. The President said 637 was enough. The Republicans said that was too much. The Blue Dogs came in at 633 and said that is a reasonable compromise.

Well, where would we be tonight had the Republicans accepted our version and we would have been standing here tonight, and I suspect the gentleman from Wisconsin would have been agreeing with us on the 633, just like we are saying on the 645.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, if I can claim some time, having come from the State legislative ranks and now serving on the Committee on Appropriations, one of my big disappointments is that it seems that regardless of who is in charge, the budget is ignored; and I think we have to all hold the line on spending. I do not know why we ignore it year after year.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, again, I thank my friend from Texas for bringing up a point and for his unending advocacy of the position of the Blue Dog Democrats. We look forward to working at a conservative governing coalition with my friend, provided that those who decide who comes back to this institution see fit to return to us, and we look forward to that.

Yes, I think it begs a larger question of budget reform; but it still does not change the dynamic, which is even if we were to agree on a number, is there any guarantee that our President would likewise agree? And therein lies the problem: a continual moving target.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, the President does not sign the budget resolutions. The President has no authority under the law to sign budget resolutions.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Again, I thank my friend from Wisconsin who is a master of process. However, there is a larger question.

Mr. Speaker, I extended to the gentleman the courtesy of not interrupting his speech, and I would appreciate the chance to respond, and then if my friend from Georgia chooses to yield the gentleman time, he can do so accordingly.

Mr. Speaker, the American people want to know, can we come to an agreement. I think there are many different alternatives there, many different ways to get there. But I would hope that in the immediate days ahead, the President will return from the campaign trail, and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the Democratic leader, will return from the campaign trail, and that working together, we can find a way to put people before politics.

I have a great deal of respect for my friends on the other side of the aisle. There is not total agreement, but then again, that is the virtue, even with the challenge of serving in this institution; and I hope that we can put people before politics and people before process.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's courtesy, and I will be very brief.

Mr. KINGSTON. Let me say one thing about the courtesy. I appreciate you all mentioning that, but we are here, as my Democratic colleagues all are here, because we really do want to resolve this. We have philosophical differences, but I think everybody in this Chamber knows that the people want a product here. So I think we are all here because we want to do the right thing.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I totally agree. When we talk about process, for 16 years of my 22, I was in the majority party, and many on the Republican side blamed me as a Democrat for being part of the big spending problem. And I had to accept it, because we were in the majority.

My frustration with the Republican side, with the Republican leadership, not with my colleagues here tonight, but my frustration is, the Republicans continue to point the finger of blame at the minority side, and everyone that understands the process, understands that minorities cannot achieve that which the majority does not go along with.

Mr. Speaker, a little constitutional reminder: when the President is of the other party, the President has sufficient power, and the only way we can beat a President is with a two-thirds vote override. When we have a very small majority, it is important that we work to achieve some help on the other side.

My frustration is that at no time during the last 2 years has the Republican side ever attempted to work to override the President.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, we only have 2 minutes remaining. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. GUTKNECHT).

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, in summation, I think people of goodwill ought to be able to resolve this. I think the American people are really pretty tired of the partisan bickering. I have said from the beginning, it would seem to me that reasonable people could come up with a final number and then work out these differences.

I do not think they are that big, but apparently some people believe that they could gain some political advantage by holding the Congress hostage through the month of October, and that strategy has not worked. Now, maybe after the break, we can come back and get this thing resolved.

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH).

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Georgia, and I thank my friends from the other side of the aisle who have taken the time to come down and offer their insights, their perspectives. I think even as frustrating as it gets, I think we ought to give thanks that we bring to this Chamber honest opinions and convictions, deeply held; and in an imperfect world, we attempt to find some sort of consensus and compromise. I think it is worth noting, as my friend from Texas has pointed out time and again, we have exceeded in terms of spending; and as my friend from Minnesota points out, the target tends to change, and again the question is, how much is enough?

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the participants of this Special Order and thank everyone for trying to keep working on these things dark into the night. Maybe, if we can get a few of our colleagues back here with us, we could resolve this.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

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

H.J. Res. 123. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes.

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

S. Con. Res. 160. Concurrent resolution providing for a conditional adjournment or recess of the Senate and a conditional adjournment of the House of Representatives.

2100

ISSUES OF CONCERN TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE NOT ADDRESSED BY THE 106TH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PITTS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, earlier this evening I was concerned because I think the impression was being given by the Republican leadership and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that if we stayed here the next few days, that we were going to be able to accomplish something.

I think that was a false impression, because we all know that the other body has already gone home and passed a continuing resolution that brings the other body back I think on November 13 or 14. So as much as my House colleagues and the Republican leadership

here in the House may feel that they are accomplishing something by being here for the next few days prior to the election, the bottom line is that they cannot accomplish anything because the other body, the Senate, is simply not here.

So it is hard for me to understand why my colleagues on the Republican side are being critical because some Members of either party do not happen to be here, because we all know that absolutely nothing can be accomplished.

I have listened to the debate back and forth in the last hour or two, and I know that what we are trying to do, what my Republican colleagues were trying to do, certainly, was to suggest that there have been great accomplishments made in this Congress.

I have been very critical of the fact, particularly with regard to health care, that the issues that the American people really care about, the ones that affect their lives, whether it be Medicare prescription drugs, because they do not have access to prescription drugs or because they are not affordable, or the issue of HMO abuse and the need for reform of the HMO system, these types of issues have not been addressed.

Also, there is the issue of trying to deal with the uninsured. We have now 42 million Americans who do not have health insurance. That needs to be addressed. It is not being addressed.

Reference was made to the fact that the Democrats have been trying to pass a labor-health appropriations bill that would provide additional funding for local education, give money back to the school districts around the country so they can hire more teachers and reduce class size, give money back so they can modernize their schools, renovate school buildings that are falling apart, or build new schools where there is overcrowding.

That has been a major issue in one of these appropriation bills that is still outstanding, yet it has not been addressed by the Republican leadership.

There are so many issues like that. The larger issue of what we are going to do about social security and Medicare is important, because we know that in another 20 or 30 years the money is going to start to run out, and the question is whether or not we are going to have some kind of long-term plan to do that, to deal with that.

These are the issues that my constituents talk about when I go home. They are concerned about quality education, they are concerned about health care, they are concerned about retirement security with regard to social security. These issues have not been addressed.

There is absolutely no way those issues are going to be addressed in the next few days prior to the election, so to suggest somehow that they could be I think is just basically a hoax, if you will, on the American people. There is no basis to it whatsoever.

Several times my colleagues, myself and others, have made reference particularly to an editorial that was in the New York Times just this past Wednesday, November 1. I thought that pretty much summed it up. I am not going to read the whole editorial, but it is entitled ''An Ineffectual Congress.''

It says: ''The 106th Congress, with little to show for its 2 years of existence, has all but vanished from public discourse.'' What they mean by that is that nobody is really paying attention to what we do anymore. It is no wonder that certain numbers of our colleagues on both sides of the aisle have gone home prior to the election, because they know that there is nothing to be done here.

The editorial continues. It says: ''Nobody, least of all the presidential candidates, are talking about this particular Congress, and the reason is plain. On almost every matter of importance, gun control, Patients' Bill of Rights, energy deregulation, social security, Congress has done little or nothing, failing to produce a record worthy of either celebration or condemnation.''

I suppose it is the ultimate ridicule when the New York Times tells them that they have done neither anything good nor bad, they have done nothing at all.

''Nor has the Congress been able to complete even the most basic business, the appropriation bills that keep the government functioning. Three have been vetoed. Absent a burst of statesmanship in the next few days, it is possible that Congress will have to come back after election day to complete work on the Federal budget.''

The bottom line is, once the other body, the Senate, went home, that is a fait accompli. That is going to happen. There is absolutely no way that anything happens here. It is going to happen on November 13, in what we call a lame duck session. There is no way to avoid that anymore because the other body has left.

The editorial goes on to say: ''But if Congress has done a lousy job for the public at large, it is doing a fabulous job of feathering its own nest and rewarding commercial interests and favored constituencies with last-minute legislative surprises that neither the public nor most Members of Congress have digested.''

What we have been saying, a lot of the Democrats have been saying, the problem with the Republican leadership is not only have they not done the people's business to get the appropriations and budget through, not only have they not addressed the major issues, such as health care, but they are doing nothing. If they do anything, it is something that favors the special interests.

It is very sad. I have seen this happen with almost every major issue. If we talk about prescription drugs, I made the point earlier this evening, when we were having some dialogue during the 1-minute speeches, that this body never passed, the Republicans never passed, the Medicare prescription drug bill.

Mr. Speaker, my point is that what we have seen with the Republican leadership is that whatever they do is essentially favoring special interests.

When I was talking earlier this evening during the 1-minutes, one of my colleagues on the Republican side, I think the gentleman from California who is on the Committee on Ways and Means, he said, well, we passed a Medicare prescription drug bill. Well, it is not true, we did not pass a bill. The Republicans did not bring up a bill that would actually put a prescription benefit under Medicare.

What they did was passed a system which I call a voucher, where they essentially give some money to seniors and say, go out and try to find an HMO or some kind of insurance company that will cover your prescription drugs.

The bottom line is that the seniors cannot do that because it is outside of Medicare. There is not an insurance company that is going to give them that kind of policy for the amount of money that the Republicans are offering. They may end up in an HMO. We know about all the problems we have had with HMOs that have dropped seniors.

So they have not passed a Medicare prescription drug bill, a benefit under Medicare. The reason is because the pharmaceutical companies do not want that to happen. They do not want to have a benefit under Medicare. They want to see what they can do somehow to avoid Medicare covering prescription drugs.

So there are so many examples like this with the special interests. I see some of my colleagues are here, Mr. Speaker. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER).

Mr. TANNER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding to me. He is right about the prescription drug issue.

Let me just say this: The prescription drug issue cannot be resolved through an insurance-based model. I am in the insurance business at home, and was before I came here. Insurance is based on a spreading of risk.

To use an example, if an insurance company insures 100 homes against fire, the odds are only two of them or one of them are going to burn that year, so they use the premiums paid for the other 98 or 99 to pay the one that burned.

The problem with the Republican model is that they want to use the HMO model for a prescription drug benefit, and it will not work because every policyholder will also be a claimant, and there is no way that works under an insurance model.

The reason Medicare came into being was because senior citizens who are sick and old could not get insurance, health insurance, for any price in the private marketplace, and with good reason, they are old and sick. I will be old and sick some day, if I am not already. That will not work.

What we have to have if we are going to have a meaningful program is we have to have a Medicare derivative that is a part of Medicare to say to seniors, this is your prescription drug benefit, no matter where you live or what you do. Now, I want to thank the gentleman for having this special order tonight to let us have a chance to discuss this.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate what the gentleman said, because in fact, and I think the same person who represented the health insurance industry who addressed the Committee on Commerce that I am on went to the gentleman's Committee on Ways and Means hearing when the Republican prescription drug proposal came up, and he said, I forget his name, I think Kahn is his name, he said exactly that. He said the reason that this Republican proposal will not work is because the prescription drugs are a benefit, they are not something that is a risk, so everybody wants it. Everybody is going to sign up.

Everybody needs the prescription drugs, and no insurance company is going to insure something that everybody is going to take advantage of.

Mr. TANNER. No insurance company can survive when every policyholder is also a claimant. That is not hard to understand.

Mr. PALLONE. Exactly. That is why they said they would not do it.

In fact, they had the example we mentioned several times here on the floor where I think it was back in March of this year the State of Nevada passed on a State level a plan or proposal that was very similar to the Republican model that the gentleman mentioned, and for something like 6 months they could not get any insurance company to come in and even propose to sell the insurance.

I was told a couple of weeks ago they finally got one company that says that they might be able to do it, but I have to see over the next few weeks whether that happens or not. But for 6 months they could not find anybody to even consider it, for exactly the same reason, that it is a benefit that everybody is going to take advantage of.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY), who has been on our Health Care Task Force. He is one of the co-chairs for the whole 2 years, and has talked a lot about this.

Mr. BERRY. I thank my colleague from New Jersey, Mr. Speaker, and I thank him also for his leadership and the leadership of our other colleagues who have joined us here this evening, the distinguished gentlemen from Texas and Tennessee.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard much rhetoric, election-year rhetoric this evening, and for the last few weeks especially. There is plenty of effort to say, let us blame someone.

I have only been here almost 4 years, and it has been interesting to listen to this rhetoric, and interestingly enough, it is always the Democrats that cause the problem. Even when we were not in the White House, it was the Democrats. When we are not in charge of the Congress, it is the Democrats. It does not make any difference, even when we are not in the majority and when we are not in the White House, we still cause the problem. I find that a bit interesting.

The fact is, the question about how much is enough is answered by the majority party. That is the Republicans. Just a few weeks ago they raised the budget limits, the budget caps, one more time. I did not vote for it, I do not think anyone in this room voted for it, but they raised it. They are in the majority. That is their job.

As they asked that question, I also wonder, how much is enough, when they tried to give $11.5 to the insurance companies last week that there is absolutely no justification for. How much is enough? Maybe we should give these insurance companies, they think maybe $20 billion. How much is enough? That is enough money to provide a real nice prescription drug benefit for our seniors for a year.

They tried to give $15 billion to the bond arbitrage folks that do that job, instead of letting it go to the schools, like we had intended. How much is enough? How much money do we just give away when there is absolutely no indication that there is a need for that money?

So I wonder myself how much is enough. I think we have had enough. I think it is time for this Congress to face up to its obligations. I can tell the gentleman this for absolute certainty: In the district that I am fortunate to represent, and I was there this morning, I met with more senior citizens that still do not have a prescription drug benefit with their Medicare policy. They are still paying three times as much for their medicine as any other country in the world, and it is not right. It is not fair. It does not make any difference whether it is the Democrats or Republicans. It does not make any difference about how much is enough.

2115

We know that that is not fair. It is not right, and it is time we do something with it about it. This Congress is not here tonight dealing with that like they should be. We are listening to all of these silly questions. We are listening to this rhetoric, and it is time that this Congress dealt with that. Our Republican colleagues just a few minutes ago they said we passed a prescription drug benefit; that is just simply not true. They did not pass one. They voted on one in this House. They did not make it into law. They never intended to.

They did not help those seniors I just talked about. They still have the problem. We still have seniors in the district that I represent that do not know whether or not tonight they are going to have something to eat because they had to buy their medicines. That is not right. It is not right for our colleagues across the aisle to try to cloud the issue.

We had their Presidential candidate a few weeks ago in a debate. He loved to use the word fuzzy numbers. He kept talking about fuzzy numbers. Well, there is nothing fuzzy about a senior citizen that does not have the money to buy the medicine and buy their food. There is nothing fuzzy about that. There is nothing cute about it. There is nothing funny about it, and it is a shame that the Republicans have chosen to just ignore this issue, let it go on and on and hope it will go away somewhere.

We have real people that feel real pain, and it is not right. These are the people that worked hard, played by the rules, and we had assured them we were going to give them health care and Social Security when they retire and things will be all right if you do this. It is not right to let that continue to happen.

Mr. Speaker, I can tell my colleagues another thing for certain, we do not have a patients' bill of rights. They have done the same thing. We have people in the district that I represent tonight that do not know whether or not the insurance is going to pay for their health care or not, because some clerk said we can make more money for the company if we do not pay for it. The doctor and the patient still cannot make that decision, and it is not right.

It is time that we do something about it. My distinguished friend and colleague, the gentleman from West Texas (Mr. STENHOLM), mentioned earlier this evening the one thing we absolutely cannot do is allow this Congress to end until we deal with the Medicare reimbursement schedules for our hospitals, nursing homes and our home health care providers and some of our other Medicare providers.

We are about to tear and destroy the very fabric of rural health care in this country if we do not do something about this, and we should do it in the morning. We should come back to this floor and take care of that problem. It is not right. I know for certain that those things have not been dealt with appropriately by this Congress.

It does not make any difference whether it is Republicans or Democrats. We have real people feeling real pain and doing without the necessities of life and the richest country that has ever been in the history of the world and we have people over here asking silly questions like how much is enough.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to mention briefly what happened with the HMOs, this bill that was mentioned that came up last week.

In New Jersey, and I think nationwide, we know that only 15 percent of the seniors are in an HMO, only 15 percent of the Medicare recipients are in an HMO. In my district, and I am sure in many of my colleagues, I guess it

was July 1 or just prior thereto, a lot of the seniors who were signed up for the HMOs got a notice saying that by the end of the year they were going to be dropped.

They were very upset and they called my office and they wrote to me. A lot of them did not even know that they could go back to the traditional Medicare, which they can, but as my colleagues know, that traditional Medicare does not have a prescription drug benefit. So they were very upset with the fact that they were being dropped.

I, in response to that, actually introduced a bill that would give a higher reimbursement rate to the HMOs, but I also realized that just giving them more money was not going to be good enough, that we had to put some kind of accountability in there. And as my colleagues know, I have talked about and we have actually voted on it, although the Republicans voted against it, the idea that they would have to stay in the system, in the Medicare system, for 3 years if they have a higher reimbursement rate, and they could not reduce their benefits, they could not, you know, for example, decide they were not going to observe prescription drugs. Of course, Republicans opposed that.

What basically the Republican leadership did with this bill is to say we are going to give you all this extra money. The gentleman mentioned $11 billion, and that is about 40-some percent of the total that is going in this bill back to providers, between the hospitals, the nursing homes, the home health agencies, the HMOs. The HMOs get over 40 percent, yet they only represent 15 percent of the seniors.

They are dropping almost a million seniors now since they got involved in the Medicare program. It is just crazy. How do you do that? How do you do that? The answer is very simple, and that is because the HMOs are aligned with the Republican leadership, and they are opposing the HMO reform. They are opposing the Medicare prescription drug, and they basically take the money that they get and they use it to lobby and to work against candidates who support Medicare prescription drug benefit and HMO reform.

Mr. Speaker, I mean it is just so obvious how this special interest money is operating here. They just want to give more money to the HMO. I do not know how they get away with it. Hopefully they will not get away with it.

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) for yielding, and I want to pick up on the gentleman's comments and the comments of the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY) a moment ago in which he talked about his concern about us leaving town without dealing with the Medicare/Medicaid givebacks. That bothers me.

It bothers a lot of my constituents who are worried that this finger-pointing game that we are in and this impasse that we are in is going to end, that we are going to end up this year without dealing with their problem, and we are not.

I wished it were possible for to us do it tomorrow morning, but my purpose in being here for the third time today is to begin hopefully to stop the finger-pointing and begin to acknowledge the fact that we are not going to accomplish anything more of substance this year until the election, not this year, until the election. We say we are going to be working.

I am chuckling now and, I guess, permit me one little finger-pointing of my own, Mr. Speaker, tonight. There has been a lot of rhetoric that we are here to work, but the only person I see from the other side of the aisle that is here right now is the Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS). And I apologize for keeping the gentleman, and I apologize for keeping these staff here tonight if we are convincing that we are doing work to resolve this problem, because we are not.

The Senate has gone home. I am afraid that we are going to come here in the morning and we are going to start the finger-pointing all over again, and that is not going to resolve anything. The facts are this Congress has thus far failed in doing our work, and we have failed in dealing with our hospitals and our nursing homes. We have failed to resolve that. And as we heard the previous discourse, but when we had our friends from the other side here, and they were so kind to yield to us, we could find that there was a lot of room and agreement, but the leadership of the House and the White House, et cetera, have not been able to resolve it. That is what I am worried about.

I would hope that anyone that is concerned about us going home December the 31 without resolving the health care or the Medicare/Medicaid giveback, the BBA fix, that you would breathe easier, because we will not finish this year's work without dealing with that problem for sure. Perhaps, we can deal with some of the others.

I would hope we can deal with the pharmaceutical question. I would hope we can deal with the patients' bill of rights. I would hope that we can do a lot of other things, but if we have to prioritize, this is one that is of a high priority.

It is important, I think, for us to stop the finger-pointing. I think that is clear, and the people are going to separate that one come November the 7th. No matter how you color it, there has been a failure of leadership in the Congress of doing our work, and as I said a moment ago, I get a little bit testy when I hear it blamed on the minority.

As I said before, I have been here in the majority for 16 years, and I caught a lot of blame, because when we Democrats had control of the House, we were not perfect. But I get a little bit ticked now when I continue to get the blame for not getting our work done. For my friends on the other side of the aisle to continue to come in and to blame the President, because he made us increase spending to $645 billion, I remember so many times in which I have said when I was here with the Reagan administration and the Bush administration and, before that, the Carter Administration, Presidents do not spend money.

There is no possible way for a President to spend money that the Congress does not first appropriate. Now, it often depends on who is in charge and who is pointing the fingers who you were going to blame, but it matters not whether it was a Republican President or a Democratic President, you are still not going to spend money that the Congress does not first appropriate.

If you have a difference between the administration and the Congress, because they are in different parties, if you are going to beat the President, which it seems there has been a dedication, at least on some in the leadership on the other side of the aisle that they have got to beat the President, the only way you beat the President is by getting a two thirds vote. That is what the Constitution provides.

I have said over and over if you want to beat the President, you have to got to reach out to the other side.

My frustration on the one area that I am the most extremely concerned about is in the area of the balanced budget givebacks, if we should not accomplish our work, I will have 10 hospitals to 12 hospitals in my district close within the next 6 months. If we are not able to resolve that question, that is what will happen.

But what my friends in this body, particularly on the majority side, do not seem to understand, the same leader that was responsible for the most part for writing the Balanced Budget Agreement in 1997 that has caused the problem for Medicare and Medicaid is the same leader that has given us his version of how we fix it and said take it or leave it and we will not negotiate that any further.

Now, we have a bill, as my friend, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), has stated, we have a bill that has been reintroduced in which we will deal with some specifics. I think it is extremely important that we give a full hospital prospective payment system update for 2 years, not just for 1 year. Because we have so many of our hospitals today that are dealing with so much uncertainty. They are already in the red. They are facing difficulty of borrowing money, and all it seems that the majority wants to say is we are going to give you one more year and then we are going to start cutting you again.

How are you going to deal with that?

Our bill improves the formula for rural disproportionate share hospitals, a higher level of reimbursement for rural hospitals that serve low-income individuals of which, unfortunately, rural America is not sharing in the economic boom that the rest of America is sharing in, and, therefore, we on

this side believe that that should be acknowledged. The majority has said, thanks but no thanks; this is all we can do.

We provide for a 10 percent bonus for rural health agencies to compensate for the high cost of travel. The majority has said thanks but no thanks. We provide for a 2-year delay in the 15 percent cuts in payments for home health agencies. Again, the majority has said thanks but no thanks.

Interestingly, this might sound like that we are wanting to spend more money, but our bill actually spends less over 5-year and 10-year periods than the majority proposal does.

You would never believe that when you listen to the majority in here, and particularly the gentleman from California, who so eloquently talks about his version of it. I do not pretend for a moment that I am smarter than they are, but I do respectfully ask from time to time to at least consider the views of some on this side of the aisle and allow us to have some input.

The gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY), the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) have spent hours looking at the pharmaceutical benefit question. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) has looked at the education question over and over and over again. He has some different ideas.

What is wrong with allowing the minority to have some input? If you do, you might be surprised. You might be surprised and find out that if the President disagrees, then there might be 290 that would disagree with the President, but I do not think that that would happen.

Again, this ''how much is enough?'' I do not remember how many times we have to answer the question. We still bring out the silly chart. When you are in the majority, you run this place, or at least you try to. You set the cap at $645 billion, which is $12 billion more than I think it ought to be, and $8 billion more than the President thought it ought to be. And no matter how many times you say how much is enough, you are not going to change that fact.

Let me just say enough is enough. We have to find a way to wind this down. There is nothing else going to happen of a positive nature, other than perhaps we will pass the National Park bill tomorrow morning. From what I understand, we are going to spend some more money, you might have to increase the budget caps again, not with my vote.

We might do that tomorrow on the budget. I do not know. I hope I am wrong what I have been hearing about that. We ought not to have been here today. We ought not to have been here yesterday. Here again, the finger-pointing. I hope tomorrow that we can get through this without any more finger-pointing.

Let us let all the finger pointing stop tonight. I was reminded a long time ago, when you are pointing a finger, there are three pointing back at you.

2130

There are three pointing back at me tonight.

But I, again, will make this request, in case there is going to be a temptation of the other side to point the finger again in the morning regarding where the President is tonight and where the Minority Leader is tonight, where they are tomorrow. Were there any meetings to work out the differences yesterday? Were there any meetings last Friday, last Saturday, last Sunday, last Monday, last Tuesday up to 1 o'clock and even yesterday?

Were there any meetings requested by the other side of the aisle to my side of the aisle in which we said, thanks, but no thanks, we do not wish to negotiate? If there are, I would like for somebody to come in and correct me, and I will eat the humble pie. But I think the facts are there had not been.

It is all a rhetorical game. It is all political rhetoric that is designed to benefit somebody by November 7. Well, it does not solve many problems. What we should have been doing last Friday since we were here working and every time we say this, work, work, work, well, there is four of us here working tonight.

But we are immaterial at this point in time, because the Senate has gone home. The House, all 435 of us, could be here working, and nothing would come of it. So hopefully tonight will be the last time until November 8 that we start the finger pointing.

But I hope when we come back November 8 or 9 or whenever we come back in the lame duck session, that we will come back with a different attitude, whoever wins the majority. I hope there will be enough of us to say enough is enough, not on the spending level, but enough is enough with the finger pointing.

I certainly hope, and I assure those out there in each of our 50 States that are worried about whether we are going to get our Nation's business done by December 31, ''you ain't seen nothing yet'' as far as disruptions if we find we are unable to work out a satisfactory compromise that will deal with our nursing homes and our hospitals and our reimbursement rate. That one is a must.

I say this very respectfully and with a lot of assurance, there will be bipartisan agreement to that. This will not be a partisan issue after November 7. There are enough folks, Mr. Speaker, on the other side of the aisle that absolutely agree.

Our problem tonight is a leadership problem. It has been a strategy, and we will see next week whose strategy has worked and whose has not. But I hope tomorrow, and to those that say it has got to be bipartisan, let the record clearly show, if it takes a Democrat to say it is time for us to go home and come back in a lame duck session, Mr. Speaker, I am saying it right now. Nothing additional of a positive nature can be accomplished past tomorrow.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I just have to reiterate the same thing. I mean, the bottom line is that we are having these discussions about what should be or what legislation we would like to see pass, but there is absolutely no way that any of it can because the other body has left.

So probably the best thing to leave everyone with tonight is the notion and the understanding that all these suggestions about working or continuing the session over the next few days just do not make any sense because there is no way to get anything done as long as the other body has left.

I just wanted to say a couple of things now. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) brought up this whole issue of the balanced budget amendment givebacks or however we are describing it, the problem, with the balanced budget agreement, that we still have a problem with our hospitals, our nursing homes, because the reimbursement level is not high enough, and the effort that we have been trying to work on a bipartisan basis, theoretically, to try to work that out and give some more money back.

It is interesting because we have been critical of the Republican proposal that was voted on last week because it basically gave most of the money or the lion's share of the money to the HMOs without any accountability and did not give enough money to the hospitals, the nursing homes, the home health cares, the basic providers of health care services.

But the bill that the gentleman from Texas talked about, the Democratic alternative, actually the one that we brought up as an alternative to this Republican bill, actually, when I look at it, most of it was actually adopted in my committee in the Committee on Commerce on a bipartisan basis.

I do not know exactly what happened to it after it left the Committee on Commerce because we had a unanimous vote with both Democrats and Republicans to do exactly what the gentleman is proposing, which would have helped the hospitals and nursing homes. Somehow, by the time it got from the committee to the floor, it changed dramatically to what we have now.

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

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. I thank the gentleman for making that point. That is a good question. What did happen? When we have a unanimous vote in the Committee on Commerce, what happened in the Committee on Ways and Means?

What is it that causes the leadership now to say what we did in the Committee on Commerce is no good, but what was done in the Committee on Ways and Means, not in a bipartisan way, but in a pure partisan way, is the only way to go, and we have to take it or leave it. I do not understand that.

That is not what this body, this House of Representatives, this body

that has for so long prided itself on doing the people's business, on having committees that actually function, and having committees that will listen to the minority, and if I minority has a good idea, accept it.

I happen to serve on the Committee on Agriculture. I am the minority on the Committee on Agriculture. Under the leadership of the gentleman from Texas (Chairman COMBEST), we do not have that problem. We have always had a give-and-take. We do not have any problems. When you see Committee on Agriculture bills come to the floor, very seldom do you have differences from the Committee. Very seldom do we get unanimous agreement in this House, but the process worked.

The process in the Committee on Ways and Means is not working. Because the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. TANNER) who was here a moment ago is on the Committee on Ways and Means, but he is on the minority. When you stop allowing the minority to have their views heard and voted upon and then it voted down, then you bring it to the floor, and if you get disagreement here, then you had better hope that you have got the President with you because, if not, nothing is going to happen. But something broke down, and that is what is causing the fussing today.

But I suspect that, if we had a unanimous agreement in the Committee on Commerce, that when we come back after November 7, that cooler heads will prevail, and that if by chance, their bill, our bill, it would not surprise me if we are going to have bipartisan support for it when it comes back. Those that say no, we are only going to do it our way or the highway, perhaps they will be on the highway.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I think the only thing I can conclude is that the major difference, of course, is that, by the time the bill came to the floor, it was weighted heavily in favor of the HMOs. Of course I conclude that that is because the majority, the Republican leadership wanted to give a lot more money to the HMOs. I think that is really what happened.

I just wanted to make a few points. I do not want to belabor it too much, because I do not know how much more time we have or how much my colleagues want to speak. But I would say that the three issues that I sort of highlighted and that the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY) have highlighted also over the last 2 years, when we talk about health care, HMO reform, prescription drug benefit under Medicare and trying to help the 40 million plus uninsured all relate to this bill that we have been talking about tonight.

What the Democrats try to do and what we did on a bipartisan basis in the Committee on Commerce with the bill actually helped in each of those areas in some ways because probably the biggest initiative to try to deal with the uninsured was the kids health care initiative that we passed on a bipartisan basis a couple years ago.

In this bill that we were trying to bring to the floor last week as an alternative to the Republicans with their HMOs, we actually expanded the kids health care program to do more outreach and to sign up more kids so that we would actually reduce the ranks of the uninsured.

In addition, in this bill, we talk about HMO reform. In the bill, there was an appeals process for people under Medicare who had been denied an operation or length of stay in the hospital a particular procedure by the HMO, that they could take an appeal where they were granted rights very similar to the Patients' Bill of Rights that passed in this House on a bipartisan basis.

But of course the Republican leadership has stymied. So in that bill, which, again, they rejected, we actually would try to make a little bit of a step towards HMO reform as well.

Then, finally, the whole issue of prescription drugs was addressed to some extent because, right now, the main way that people get prescription drugs under Medicare is if they are able to sign up for an HMO. What we did in our bill was to say that, if the HMOs are going to get more money, they had to stay in the program for 3 years, and they could not reduce their benefits, which is primarily prescription drugs.

So with this bill that the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) was talking about, this Democratic, really, bipartisan alternative that the Republican leadership rejected, we were in some small way addressing each of these major health care issues that the gentleman from Texas, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY) and I have been talking about and trying to address.

So granted there is not any time left before the election, but when we come back for the lame duck session, if we could manage to get this alternative with regard to the givebacks, the higher Medicare reimbursement rate passed, we would make a small step towards dealing with some of these health care issues, in my opinion.

It is very unfortunate that the Republican leadership rejected this and just went ahead with this bill that really does nothing but help the HMOs without any accountability.

I mean, it is one of the reasons that I am so upset with the fact that they rejected this and they refused to negotiate, and essentially nothing is happening. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. BERRY).

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, well, I think the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) makes a strong point and also the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

The fact remains that we have not gotten the job done for the American people on health care. One of the proudest moments that I have there in this House was the day that we passed, in a bipartisan way, a strong bipartisan way, a meaningful, effective Patients' Bill of Rights.

Republicans and Democrats worked together to get the job done. We have proven over and over again in this body that, when we work together, good things happen. Very seldom does a really meaningful piece of legislation ever go through this House that is not bipartisan. Yet, we continue this partisan bickering. The American people do not care about this. They want us to get the job done, and it is time for us to do that.

I would hope that, when we do come back, whether it be this year or in the 107th Congress, that we will, in a bipartisan way, address these things that are so desperately needed in this country, like a Patients' Bill of Rights, and do it in a bipartisan way.

I have never on issues pertaining to health care and the budget had any effort whatsoever made from the other side to even listen to our ideas, much less accept them, work together and try to work out a solution. I think it would be a wonderful thing if we would do that in a bipartisan way and solve some of these problems.

We have got to solve the problem of our reimbursements for our hospitals, nursing homes, home health care providers. We know that.

The distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM) has said earlier we cannot allow our rural hospitals to be destroyed because we did not deal with this problem. We have got to have prescription medicine for our seniors, and in a meaningful way, not in some clever gimmick that someone has thought up. We can do this in a bipartisan way.

I hope we come back after this time that we have spent here adjourns, and we go home, that we come back with a new resolve to get the job done in a bipartisan way.

2145

Certainly I think, to answer that question once again, how much is enough, certainly this is enough, and it is time for us to stop this, get the job done, get our work done, do what the American people sent us here to do, and not continue this partisan bickering that we get blamed for and justifiably so. I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for his leadership.

Mr. PALLONE. I want to thank my colleagues. I think that we have made the point well this evening that we really want to get the work done and we want to accomplish things for the average American. Our only frustration tonight has been that we know that the Senate is out and there is no time to do this between now and election day. So let us just hope that tomorrow as the gentleman from Texas said that we stop the partisan bickering and basically recognize the fact that the time has run out and the only way we are going to accomplish this is when we come back after the election.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BECERRA (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and November 3 on account of business in the district.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and November 3 on account of business in the district.

Mr. REYES (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and before 2:00 p.m. November 3 on account of personal business in the district.

Mr. STUPAK (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of district-related business.

Ms. WATERS (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of business in the district.

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. SHERMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DEFAZIO, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WALDEN of Oregon) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. KNOLLENBERG, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FOLEY, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HORN, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. GILCHREST, for 5 minutes, today.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on the House Administration, reported that the committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1550. An act to authorize appropriations for the United States Fire Administration, and for carrying out the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977, for fiscal years 2001, 2002, and 2003, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2462. An act to amend the Organic Act of Guam, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4846. An act to establish the National Recording Registry in the Library of Congress to maintain and preserve sound recordings that are culturally, historically, or aesthetically significant, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5110. An act to designate the United States courthouse located at 3470 12th Street in Riverside, California, as the ''George E. Brown, Jr. United States Courthouse''.

H.R. 5302. An act to designate the United States courthouse located at 1010 Fifth Avenue in Seattle, Washington, as the ''William Kenzo Nakamura United States Courthouse''.

H.R. 5388. An act to designate a building proposed to be located within the boundaries of the Chincoteague National Wildlife Refuge, as the ''Herbert H. Bateman Education and Administrative Center''.

H.J. Res. 123. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2413. An act to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to clarify the procedure and conditions for the award of matching grants for the purchase of armor vests.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, November 3, 2000, at 9 a.m.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for official foreign travel during the third quarter of 2000, by Committees of the House of Representatives, pursuant to Public Law 95–384, are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2000

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Travel to Scotland, Germany, Italy, Qatar, Jordan and England, August 7–19, 2000:											
Hon. Floyd D. Spence	8/7	8/10	Scotland		1,038.00						1,038,00
	8/10	8/12	Germany		522.00						522.00
	8/12	8/14	Italy		526.00						526.00
	8/14	8/16	Qatar		470.00						470.00
	8/16	8/18	Jordan		232.00						232.00
	8/18	8/19	England		218.00						218.00
Hon. Solomon P. Ortiz	8/7	8/10	Scotland		1,038.00						1,038.00
	8/10	8/12	Germany		522.00						522.00
	8/12	8/14	Italy		526.00						526.00
Commercial airfare							2,255.36				2,255.36
Hon. Herbert H. Bateman	8/7	8/10	Scotland		1,038.00						1,038.00
	8/10	8/12	Latvia		538.00						538.00
	8/12	8/15	Estonia		342.00						342.00
	8/15	8/17	Germany		286.00						286.00
	8/17	8/19	England		436.00						436.00
Hon. Owen B. Pickett	8/7	8/10	Scotland		1,038.00						1,038.00
	8/10	8/12	Germany		522.00						522.00
	8/12	8/14	Italy		526.00						526.00
	8/14	8/16	Qatar		470.00						470.00
	8/16	8/18	Jordan		232.00						232.00
	8/18	8/19	England		218.00						218.00
Hon. Tillie K. Fowler	8/7	8/10	Scotland		1,038.00						1,038.00
	8/10	8/12	Germany		522.00						522.00
	8/12	8/14	Italy		526.00						526.00
	8/14	8/16	Qatar		470.00						470.00
	8/16	8/18	Jordan		232.00						232.00
	8/18	8/19	England		218.00						218.00
Hon. John M. McHugh	8/7	8/10	Scotland		1,038.00						1,038.00
	8/10	8/12	Germany		522.00						522.00
	8/12	8/14	Italy		526.00						526.00
	8/14	8/16	Qatar		470.00						470.00
	8/16	8/18	Jordan		232.00						232.00
Commercial airfare							1,634.66				1,634.66
Mr. Robert S. Rangel	8/7	8/10	Scotland		1,038.00						1,038.00
	8/10	8/12	Germany		522.00						522.00
	8/12	8/14	Italy		526.00						526.00
Commercial airfare							1,868.80				1,868.80
Mr. Peter M. Steffes	8/7	8/10	Scotland		1,038.00						1,038.00
	8/10	8/12	Germany		522.00						522.00
	8/12	8/14	Italy		526.00						526.00
	8/14	8/16	Qatar		470.00						470.00

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30, 2000—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
	8/16	8/18	Jordan		232.00						232.00
	8/18	8/19	England		218.00						218.00
Mrs. Maureen P. Cragin	8/7	8/10	Scotland		1,038.00						1,038.00
	8/10	8/12	Germany		522.00						522.00
	8/12	8/14	Italy		526.00						526.00
	8/14	8/16	Qatar		470.00						470.00
	8/16	8/18	Jordan		232.00						232.00
	8/18	8/19	England		218.00						218.00
Travel to Mexico; September 21–22, 2000:											
Hon. Ciro D. Rodriguez	9/21	9/22	Mexico		217.25						217.25
Committee total					24,847.25		5,758.82				30,606.07

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

FLOYD D. SPENCE, Chairman, Oct. 31, 2000.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND FINANCIAL SERVICES, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1, AND SEPT. 30, 2000

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Cynthia Fogleman	8/8	8/12	South Africa		629.06						629.06
	8/12	8/15	Mozambique		374.06						374.06
	8/15	8/17	Zimbabwe		247.05		5,872.88				6,119.93
James McCormick	8/8	8/12	South Africa		812.00				75.00		887.00
	8/12	8/15	Mozambique		557.00						557.00
	8/15	8/17	Zimbabwe		430.00						430.00
	8/18	8/20	India		951.04						951.04
	8/18	8/20	Sri Lanka		500.00		7,965.85				8,465.85
Committed total					4,500.21		13,838.73		75.00		18,413.94

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JIM LEACH, Chairman, Oct. 31, 2000.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1, AND SEPT. 30, 2000

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
David Abramowitz	7/7	7/8	Romania		125.00						125.00
Commercial airfare	7/7	7/8					91.92				91.92
David Adams	7/29	7/31	Venezuela		530.00						530.00
	7/31	8/1	Colombia		193.00						193.00
	8/1	8/2	Nicaragua		284.00						284.00
Hon. Cass Ballenger	7/29	7/31	Venezuela		50.00				[3] 1,280.09		1,330.09
	7/31	8/1	Colombia		153.30						153.30
	8/1	8/2	Nicaragua		113.00						113.00
Paul Berkowitz	8/24	8/25	Thailand		182.00		527.57		[3] 11.10		720.67
	8/25	8/28	Bhutan		225.00						225.00
	8/28	8/30	Nepal		372.00		167.95		[3] 9.69		549.64
	8/30	8/31	India		260.00						260.00
Commercial airfare	8/23	8/31					5,631.90				5,631.90
Deborah Bodlander	7/2	7/6	Israel		1,244.00						1,244.00
	7/6	7/10	Lebanon		810.00						810.00
Commercial airfare	7/1	7/10					5,733.13				5,733.13
Malik Chaka	7/1	7/2	Guinea		186.00						186.00
	7/2	7/5	Sierra Leone		300.00						300.00
	7/5	7/7	Guinea		372.00						372.00
Commercial airfare	7/1	7/7					4,792.51				4,792.51
Mark Clack	7/1	7/2	Guinea		186.00						186.00
	7/2	7/5	Sierra Leone		300.00						300.00
	7/5	7/7	Guinea		325.00						325.00
Commercial airfare	7/1	7/7					4,792.51				4,792.51
	7/26	7/30	Nigeria		559.00						559.00
Commercial airfare	7/25	7/31					5,508.61				5,508.61
John Conger	9/14	9/18	Colombia		684.00						684.00
Commercial airfare	9/14	9/18					1,827.80				1,827.80
Hon. John Cooksey	7/1	7/2	Guinea		186.00						186.00
	7/2	7/5	Sierra Leone		300.00						300.00
	7/5	7/6	Guinea		186.00						186.00
Commercial airfare	7/1	7/6					6,223.11				6,223.11
Hon. William D. Delahunt	7/29	7/31	Venezuela		222.50						222.50
	7/31	8/1	Colombia		193.00						193.00
	8/1	8/2	Nicaragua		284.00						284.00
Nisha Desai	8/15	8/20	India		1,460.04						1,460.04
	8/20	8/24	Sri Lanka		767.05						767.05
Commercial airfare	8/14	8/24			1,309.00		7,792.92				7,792.92
Barbara Feinstein	7/8	7/15	South Africa		1,309.00						1,309.00
Commercial airfare	7/6	7/16					8,091.27				8,091.27
Adolfo Franco	8/8	8/12	South Africa		812.00						812.00
	8/12	8/15	Mozambique		557.00						557.00
	8/15	8/17	Zimbabwe		430.00						430.00
	8/18	8/20	India		951.04						951.04
	8/20	8/24	Sri Lanka		767.04						767.04
Commercial airfare	8/7	8/25					6,850.85				6,850.85
Mark Gage	7/8	7/8					2,274.22				2,274.22
Charisse Glassman	8/15	8/17	Eritrea		368.00		228.00				596.00
	8/17	8/18	Saudi Arabia		166.00		451.98				617.98
	8/18	8/24	Ethiopia		880.00		3,933.58				4,813.58

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1, AND SEPT. 30, 2000—Continued

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
	8/24	8/26	Sudan		530.00						530.00
Commercial airfare	8/14	8/15					3,676.00				3,676.00
Amos Hochstein	7/2	7/6	Israel		1,004.00						1,004.00
	7/6	7/10	Lebanon		650.00						650.00
Commercial airfare	7/1	7/10					5,733.17				5,733.17
Hon. Tom Lantos	8/26	9/1	Russia		1,750.00				[3] 221.77		1,971.77
Commercial airfare							258.00				258.00
Hon. Barbara Lee	7/8	7/10	South Africa		342.00		151.95		[3] 523.63		1,017.58
Commercial airfare	7/6	7/11					7,901.00				7,901.00
John Mackey	8/21	8/23	United Kingdom		616.00						616.00
	8/23	8/27	Ireland		924.00				[3] 504.94		1,428.94
Commercial airfare	8/21	8/27					1,149.36				1,149.36
	9/14	9/18	Colombia		884.00						884.00
Commercial airfare	9/14	9/18					1,827.80				1,827.80
Caleb McCarry	6/29	7/4	Mexico		1,115.00						1,115.00
Commercial airfare	6/29	7/4					691.63				691.63
Kelly McDonald	9/14	9/18	Colombia		684.00						684.00
Commercial airfare	9/14	9/18					1,827.80				1,827.80
Kathleen Moazed	8/24	8/25	Thailand		182.00		527.57				709.57
	8/25	8/28	Bhutan		225.00						225.00
	8/28	8/30	Nepal		372.00		167.95				539.95
	8/30	8/31	India		260.00						260.00
Commercial airfare	8/23	8/31					5,631.90				5,631.90
Vince Morelli	7/29	7/31	Venezuela		430.00						430.00
	7/31	8/1	Colombia		193.00						193.00
	8/1	8/2	Nicaragua		14.00						14.00
Frank Record	7/2	7/6	Israel		1,104.00						1,104.00
	7/6	7/10	Lebanon		700.00						700.00
Commercial airfare	7/1	7/10					5,733.17				5,733.17
Grover Joseph Rees	8/12	8/18	Kenya		791.00						791.00
	8/18	8/19	Sudan		234.00						234.00
	8/19	8/20	Kenya		158.50						158.50
	8/20	8/21	Sudan		234.00						234.00
	8/21	8/26	Kenya		722.50		153.00				875.50
Commercial airfare	8/11	8/26					6,721.40				6,721.40
Matthew Reynolds	8/1	8/3	Australia		319.00				[3] 197.17		516.17
	8/3	8/6	East Timor		450.00						450.00
	8/6	8/11	Indonesia		839.00						839.00
	8/11	8/13	Hong Kong SAR		555.00				[3] 103.10		658.10
Commercial airfare	7/30	8/13					8,493.91				8,493.91
Peter Yeo	8/2	8/3	Australia		165.00						165.00
	8/3	8/6	East Timor		450.00						450.00
	8/6	8/7	Indonesia		277.00						277.00
Commercial airfare	8/1	8/8					7,445.94				7,445.94
Committee total					34,465.97		123,011.38		2,851.49		160,328.84

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Indicates delegation costs.
[4] Commercial airfare from Romania to U.S.

BENJAMIN A. GILMAN, Chairman.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1, AND SEPT. 30, 2000

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Dana Rohrabacher	8/25	8/27	Paris, France		594.00		(3)				594.00
	8/27	8/29	Moscow, Russia		712.00		(3)				712.00
	8/29	8/31	St. Petersburg, Russia		686.00		(3)				686.00
	8/31	9/1	Dublin, Ireland		281.00		(3)				281.00
Eric Sterner	8/25	8/27	France		594.00		(3)				594.00
	8/27	8/29	Russia		712.00		(3)				712.00
	8/29	8/31	Russia		686.00		(3)				686.00
	8/31	9/1	Ireland		281.00		(3)				281.00
Richard Obermann	8/25	8/27	France		594.00		(3)				594.00
	8/27	8/29	Russia		712.00		(3)				712.00
	8/29	8/31	Russia		686.00		(3)				686.00
	8/31	9/1	Ireland		281.00		(3)				281.00
Harlan L. Watson	9/7	9/16	Lyon, France		2,000.00		6,622.03				8,622.03
Committee total					8,819.00		6,622.03				15,441.03

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Military air transportation.

F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR., Oct. 30, 2000.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1, AND SEPT. 30, 2000

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem [1]		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency [2]
Hon. Ruben Hinojosa	8/7	8/10	Scotland		1,038.00						1,038.00
	8/10	8/12	Germany		522.00						522.00
	8/12	8/15	Italy		526.00						526.00
	9/21	9/22	Mexico		(3)		2,251.80				2,251.80
Committee total											4,337.80

[1] Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
[2] If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.
[3] Unavailable.

JAMES M. TALENT, Chairman, Oct. 16, 2000.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

10866. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Fruit and Vegetable Programs, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Fresh Bartlett Pears Grown in Oregon and Washington; Decreased Assessment Rate [Docket No. FV00–931–1 FIR] received November 2, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

10867. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Livestock and Seed Program, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Pork Promotion, Research, and Consumer Information Program: Amendment to Procedures for the Conduct of Referendum [No. LS–00–10] received November 2, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

10868. A letter from the Congressional Review Coodinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Imported Fire Ant; Addition to Quarantined Areas [Docket No. 00–076–1] received November 2, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

10869. A letter from the Associate Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Science and Technology Program, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Changes in Fees for Science and Technology (S&T) Laboratory Service [Docket No. S&T–99–008] (RIN: 0581–AB91) received November 2, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

10870. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Postmarketing Studies for Approved Human Drug and Licensed Biological Products; Status Reports [Docket No. 99N–1852] received November 2, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

10871. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Gastroenterology and Urology Devices; Effective Date of the Requirement for Premarket Approval of the Implanted Mechanical/Hydraulic Urinary Continence Device; Correction [Docket No. 94N–0380] received November 2, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

10872. A letter from the Chief, Legal Branch, Competitive Pricing Division, Federal Communications Commission, Common Carrier Bureau, transmitting the Commission's final rule—National Exchange Carrier Association, Inc. Petition to Amend Section 69.3 of the Commission's Rules [CC Docket No. 99–316; RM–9486] received October 31, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

10873. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting 1999 Report Pursuant to sec. 655 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, pursuant to Public Law 104—164, section 655(a) (110 Stat. 1435); to the Committee on International Relations.

10874. A letter from the Auditor, District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of a report entitled ''Review of the Financial Transactions and Activities of Advisory Neighborhood Commission 8D for the Period October 1, 1997 through August 31, 2000,'' pursuant to D.C. Code section 47—117(d); to the Committee on Government Reform.

10875. A letter from the Associate Special Counsel for Planning and Advice, Office of Special Counsel, transmitting the Office's final rule—Filing complaints of prohibited personnel practices or other prohibited activities; Filing disclosures of information; Advisory Opinions—received October 31, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

10876. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No. 000211040–0040–01; I.D. 102400C] received November 2, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

10877. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Jet Routes J–78 and J–112; Evansville, IN; Correction [Airspace Docket No. 99–AGL–48] (RIN: 2120–AA66) received November 2, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10878. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class E Airspace; Cameron, MO [Airspace Docket No. 99–ACE–49] received November 2, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10879. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class E Airspace; Monticello, IA [Airspace Docket No. 00–ACE–5] received November 2, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

10880. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations Management, Veterans Health Administration, Department of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule—VA Payment for Non-VA Public or Private Hospital Care and Non-VA Physician Services that are Associated with Either Outpatient or Inpatient Care (RIN: 2900–AK57) received November 2, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

10881. A letter from the Chief Counsel, Bureau of the Public Debt, Department of the Treasury, Fiscal Service, transmitting the Department's final rule—Marketable Book-Entry Treasury Bills, Notes, and Bonds; Minimum Par Amounts Required for STRIPS—received November 2, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10882. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Allocation of Partnership Debt (RIN: 1545–AX09) received November 2, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

10883. A letter from the Acting Deputy Executive Secretary, Health Care Financing Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's ''Major'' final rule—Medicare Program; Revisionsto Payment Policies Under the Physician Fee Schedule for Calendar Year 2001 [HCFA–1120–FC] (RIN: 0938–AK11) received November 2, 2000, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Ways and Means and Commerce.

TIME LIMITATION OF REFERRED BILL

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker:

H.R. 1689. Referral to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure extended for a period ending not later than November 3, 2000.

H.R. 1882. Referral to the Committee on Ways and Means extended for a period ending not later than November 3, 2000.

H.R. 2580. Referral to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure extended for a period ending not later than November 3, 2000.

H.R. 4144. Referral to the Committee on the Budget extended for a period ending not later than November 3, 2000.

H.R. 4548. Referral to the Committee on Education and the Workforce extended for a period ending not later than November 3, 2000.

H.R. 4585. Referral to the Committee on Commerce extended for a period ending not later than November 3, 2000.

H.R. 4725. Referral to the Committee on Education and the Workforce extended for a period ending not later than November 3, 2000.

H.R. 4857. Referral to the Committee on the Judiciary, Banking and Financial Services, and Commerce for a period ending not later than November 3, 2000.

H.R. 5130. Referral to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure extended for a period ending not later than November 3, 2000.

H.R. 5291. Referral to the Committee on Ways and Means extended for a period ending not later than November 3, 2000.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

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

By Mr. HORN (for himself and Mr. CALVERT):

H.R. 5622. A bill to establish a commission to create a comprehensive strategy for an integrated, advanced informational infrastructure for the Medicare Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. HOLT:

H.R. 5623. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to ensure that adequate actions are taken to detect, prevent, and minimize the consequences of accidental releases that result from criminal activity that may cause substantial harm to public health, safety, and the environment and to ensure that the public has access to information regarding hazardous chemicals in the community and the potential for accidental releases of those chemicals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. MOORE (for himself, Mr. HOYER, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MORAN of Virginia, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. FILNER, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. NADLER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. INSLEE, Ms. BERKLEY, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. HILL of Indiana, Mr. HOLT, Mr. LARSON, and Mr. WU):

H.R. 5624. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to require persons making certain campaign-related telephone calls to disclose the identifcation of the person financing the call, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 908: Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 1228: Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 2166: Mr. REGULA and Mr. MENENDEZ.

H.R. 2433: Mr. COBURN.

H.R. 2953: Mr. STENHOLM.

H.R. 4154: Mr. COX.

H.R. 4215: Mr. GOODLATTE.

H.R. 4274: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

H.R. 4308: Mr. TRAFICANT.

H.R. 4654: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 4728: Mr. DEAL of Georgia and Mr. MORAN of Virginia.

H.R. 5147: Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. BENTSEN, and Mr. MEEHAN.

H.R. 5185: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 5194: Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 5200: Mr. GONZALEZ.

H.R. 5516: Mr. CRAMER, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, and Mr. HILLIARD.

H.R. 5552: Mr. PETERSON of Minnesota and Mr. GUTIERREZ.

H.R. 5585: Mr. MOORE, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. HINCHEY, and Mr. FORD.

H.R. 5612: Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. BALDACCI, Mr. BENTSEN, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Ms. CARSON, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. EVANS, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FROST, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HOLDEN, Mr. INSLEE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. LARSON, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PHELPS, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. TANNER, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. TOWNS, and Mr. TURNER.

H.R. 5613: Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, and Mr. MILLER of Florida.

H. Con. Res. 401: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H. Con. Res. 654: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas and Mr. UDALL of New Mexico.

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 146 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 2, 2000 No. 143

Senate

(Legislative day of Friday, September 22, 2000)

The Senate met at 8:30 p.m., on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore [Mr. THURMOND].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Today's prayer will be offered by our guest Chaplain, Reverend Daniel P. Coughlin, Chaplain, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

We are pleased to have you with us.

PRAYER

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

God ever faithful and lasting in love, Your word speaks wisdom to our minds and brings peace to our hearts. Be with us this evening.

Grant perseverance to the Members of the Senate as they endeavor to bring their work to completion. By Your holy inspiration, You have begun this good work in them. Through Your spirit, You continue to guide them; and by Your grace You will bring this work to fulfillment.

Our hope and our prayer is that in all things Your holy will may be accomplished and all honor, glory, and power be given to You now and forever. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Honorable FRANK MURKOWSKI, a Senator from the State of Alaska, 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 PRESIDENT pro tempore. The acting majority leader is recognized.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I take this opportunity to welcome the President pro tempore, the senior Senator in this body, Senator THURMOND. I also thank the guest Chaplain for the prayer.

NOTICE—OCTOBER 23, 2000

A final issue of the Congressional Record for the 106th Congress, 2d Session, will be published on November 29, 2000, in order to permit Members to revise and extend their remarks.

All material for insertion must be signed by the Member and delivered to the respective offices of the Official Reporters of Debates (Room HT–60 or S–123 of the Capitol), Monday through Friday, between the hours of 10:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. through November 28. The final issue will be dated November 29, 2000, and will be delivered on Friday, December 1, 2000.

None of the material printed in the final issue of the Congressional Record may contain subject matter, or relate to any event that occurred after the sine die date.

Senators' statements should also be submitted electronically, either on a disk to accompany the signed statement, or by e-mail to the Official Reporters of Debates at ''Records@Reporters''.

Members of the House of Representatives' statements may also be submitted electronically by e-mail, to accompany the signed statement, and formatted according to the instructions for the Extensions of Remarks template at http://clerkhouse.house.gov. The Official Reporters will transmit to GPO the template formatted electronic file only after receipt of, and authentication with, the hard copy, signed manuscript. Deliver statements to the Official Reporters in Room HT–60.

Members of Congress desiring to purchase reprints of material submitted for inclusion in the Congressional Record may do so by contacting the Congressional Printing Management Division, at the Government Printing Office, on 512–0224, between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 4:00 p.m. daily.

By order of the Joint Committee on Printing.

WILLIAM M. THOMAS, *Chairman.*

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Printed on recycled paper.

SCHEDULE

Mr. MURKOWSKI. On behalf of the leader, I wish to announce that today the Senate will immediately proceed to an adjournment resolution calling for a conditional adjournment of the Congress; that is, a 1-day continuing resolution and a consent governing the next few Senate session days.

The session is expected to last only a few minutes and obviously no votes will occur. However, Members are reminded that a rollcall vote is expected to occur the first day back, on November 14. Senators will be notified as to the exact time of the vote via the hotline system.

MAKING FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 2001

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate now turn to the consideration of H.J. Res. 123, the continuing resolution; that the resolution be read three times and passed, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, all without any intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (H.J. Res. 123) was read three times and passed.

PROVIDING FOR A CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF THE SENATE AND A CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a resolution I send to the desk calling for a conditional adjournment of the Congress, the concurrent resolution be agreed to, and the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table, all without any intervening action or debate.

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

The resolution (S. Con. Res. 160) was agreed to, as follows:

S. CON. RES. 160

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That when the Senate recesses or adjourns at the close of business on Thursday, November 2, 2000, or on Monday, November 6, 2000, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon on Tuesday, November 14, 2000, or until such time on that day as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Thursday, November 2, 2000, Friday, November 3, 2000, Saturday, November 4, 2000, Sunday, November 5, 2000, Monday, November 6, 2000, Tuesday, November 7, 2000, Wednesday, November 8, 2000, or Thursday, November 9, 2000, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 2 p.m. on Monday, November 13, 2000, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Majority Leader of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the Senate and the Minority Leader of the House, shall notify the Members of the Senate and House, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

STELLAR SEA LION

• Mr. STEVENS. Mr. President, after my remarks yesterday on the Steller sea lion decline, members of the press corps asked me for proof. This article provides a good summary of the research behind the sea lions' decline. I would also point out that the burden should be on the plaintiffs and the agency to prove that fishing has caused the sea lions' decline.

I ask that an article from the Pacific Fishing magazine be printed in the RECORD.

The article follows.

[From Pacific Fishing, Nov. 2000]

THE WRONG CURE?

Now that an unproven hypothesis has beached the North Pacific trawl fleet, environmental litigators have what they want. Are they honest enough to support research on whether their ''reasonable and precautionary'' solution really helps sea lions?

(By Jeb Wyman and Brad Warren)

When Judge Thomas S. Zilly banned trawling in 50,000 square miles of water designated as critical habitat for Steller sea lions, he issued a legal finding that groundfish fisheries off Alaska posed ''a reasonably certain threat of imminent harm'' to the endangered animals.

That phrase means plenty in court, but it doesn't carry much weight in the world of science, where evidence of the supposed threat from fishing has been repeatedly characterized as ''tenuous.'' Significantly, even the judges stopped short of endorsing any particular theory about what's shrinking the sea lion population. Instead, he focused on a legal principle established by prior courts' interpretations of the Endangered Species Act: If government and industry can't demolish the contention that fishing threatens the Stellers, then they must assume it does and restrain fisheries accordingly. (See ''Who Killed the Stellers?'' Pacific Fishing, October 2000, page 20.)

This converts a merely plausible threat to the Stellers into a legal mandate. Thus the three environmental groups that filed the lawsuit never had to prove that fishing is killing off sea lions. Nor did they need to show even that fishing is a more likely suspect than the other culprits that scientists are investigating. Those culprits include thoroughly documented changes in ocean climate and shifts in the available prey base for Stellers; they also include killer whales that have been videotaped devouring sea lions—a diet that one study calculates to account for most of the Stellers' recent rate of decline.

A WEAK HEART

In fact, the environmentalists' case is weakest at its heart. It depends upon the theory of ''localized depletion.'' This theory contends that trawl nets temporarily scoop out holes in schools of fish, or disperse them, for long enough so that Steller sea lions can't find enough food and thus are going extinct. No matter how it plays in court, in the harsh light of scientific inquiry the evidence and the logic behind this theory still are viewed as shaky, and other theories carry greater credence. For starters, the only field research to find evidence for localized depletion focused entirely on the Atka mackerel fishery, and even there the study's methodology and conclusions have been challenged by other scientists. Some scientists point to the complete absence, so far, of published field studies on whether pollock or cod fishing causes localized depletion. ''That's all basically a hypothesis,'' says Dr. Dayton Lee Alverson, a senior scientist who served on a federal panel investigating the Steller sea lion decline.

Scientists have many misgivings about the localized depletion hypothesis. For one, it appears that Stellers eat different fish than trawlers catch. Alverson points out that the Stellers' known foraging depths are much shallower than the waters where most pollock trawling occurs. Scientists also agree that the Stellers forage on smaller fish than trawlers target.

Another point of dispute is just how long any supposed ''hole'' or ''dispersal'' in schools may last. The assertion that ''depletion'' persists for long enough to strave sea lions relies on assumptions that few scientists or fishermen with any sea time can credit: that nearby fish don't swim into the gap left behind a trawl, and that fish don't migrate. (It's hard to show depletion after a fishing season when you know the fish would normally move on anyway.) If schools didn't ''in-fill,'' why would trawlers keep towing the same patch of water over and over? If migration didn't occur, why would fish seasonally pass through various fishing locations?

''CONJECTURES,'' NOT ''FACTS''

The National Marine Fisheries Service has drawn sharp criticism in the scientific community for allowing the tenuous hypothesis of localized depletion to drive fishery management. The North Pacific Fishery Management Council's Scientific and Statistical Committee, which includes scientists from universities and fisheries agencies around the country, has roundly condemned NMFS's new draft environmental assessment of cod fishery impacts on Stellers, which basically extends the depletion assumption to cod fisheries. The document relies on a ''flawed'' analysis to support that assumption, and it ''fails to clearly differentiate between conjectures and facts,'' the committee wrote in September. Calling for research to ''find out what works and what doesn't'' in protecting Stellers, the committee wrote: ''No one would object to the adoption of reasonable measures to arrest the decline if there was some assurance that they would lead to some improvement.'' But the scientists observed that the present lack of convincing evidence to balame fishing puts the council in a bind: ''If there is a connection between current fisheries and Steller sea lions and no action is taken, the council would be derelict in its responsibility to conserve resources under its domain. If other factors are responsible and the council imposes stringent measures, then the council would deprive individuals and even communities of their livelihoods with no justification.''

But the theory of localized depletion is crucial to the trawlers' foes, because it is clear that the U.S. fishery has not caused large-scale depletion of pollock stocks off Alaska. Between 1980 and 1990, when Steller numbers dwindled most rapidly, total pollock biomass in the Bearing Sea averaged 13.3 million metric tons, nearly twice the average of the previous decade. Catches averaged 1.1 million mt, representing a harvest

rate between 5% and 15% of the total biomass. With 12 million tons of pollock remaining in the water, on average, how likely was it that the 40,000 or so Stellers in the endangered western population couldn't find enough pollock to eat? Between 1970 and 1980, when Alaska's western and eastern Stellers combined numbered between 200,000 and 250,000 animals, average pollock biomass was just 6.9 million tons.

So for most of the years of Steller decline, more pollock has been available for them to eat than during the previous 20 years, when the sea lion population was an order of magnitude larger. As biologists say, it's a ''negative correlation.''

What's more, attempts to link population crashes at Steller rookeries with commercial fishing have come up short. A 1989 paper by NMFS biologists Richard Merrick and Tom Laughlin found only a handful of correlations, which turned out to be both positive and negative. A 1996 study by David Sampson showed a big decline in Steller numbers at rookeries near heavy pollock winter fishing and in places where no winter catches had occurred at all. In other words, the animals did badly whether anyone fished near them or not.

Still, the theory of localized depletion remains the focus of the Steller debate. The only attempts to measure localized depletion have tried to show declining Catch Per Unit of Effort (CPUE) over time. If localized depletion is occurring, the density of fish schools will decrease as vessels soak up the fish. As total catch accumulates, every hour of trawling should produce fewer and fewer fish. Studies chasing this reasoning, however, rely on a key assumption that many scientists say just doesn't make sense: These studies assume that the schools are closed systems, with no fish entering or leaving the ''box,'' either by migration or mortality. They assume that only fishing removes fish.

REPEAT THAT, PLEASE?

Repeated efforts to prove localized depletion by demonstrating a decline in CPUE have had mixed results. Only one field study supports the notion of localized depletion: NMFS biologist Lowell Fritz's research on the Atka mackerel fishery in 1998 found a ''statistically significant'' CPUE decrease in 16 of 26 areas. Martin Smith, a graduate student at the University of California at Davis, reworked data in a March 1999 report and concluded that depletion had occurred in five of six locations. But similar studies on the pollock and cod fisheries have produced less conclusive results. Plots of daily cod catch in 1998, measured as catch per hour of towing, produce an untidy geography of dots, with peaks and valleys and plateaus. Localized depletion, as shown by declining CPUE, isn't at all clear. It takes a statistician's determined hand to massage the data into a gently sloping line.

What does that gently sloping line indicate? If fish don't move, a gently sloping line is what you'd expect: after all, fish are being pulled into boats. But as many fisherman and scientists point out, it's unreasonable to assume that fish don't move. Fishermen follow fish to stay on top of them; witness this year's pollock A season, when trawlers roved into, through, and out of the Bering Sea's Catcher Vessel Operational Area, shadowing the pollock. Allen Shimada and Daniel Kimura, who tagged 12,396 cod between 1982 and 1990 and charted their movements around the Bering Sea, amply documented the fact that cod migrate.

A central problem in studies of localized depletion is the quality of the data. None of the localized depletion studies have used data that adequately account for variations in boat and net size. More horsepower means a bigger net; a bigger net means more fish per hour of towing. The slightly lower CPUE toward the end of the 1998 cod season, for example, might only reflect the departure of big boats with big nets from the fishery. It could also reflect cod incidentally caught by boats in other fisheries, or normal seasonal movements that make cod harder to catch.

Terry Quinn, a statistician and population dynamics professor with the University of Alaska-Fairbanks and also a member of the North Pacific Fishery Management Council's Scientific and Statistical Committee, has begun a two-year stud of localized depletion data. ''There's a great deal of frustration among us scientists,'' he says. ''As the resource manager, the council has the responsibility to manage the fish population for fishermen, as well as the whole health of the ecosystem. But the evidence for a strong relationship between the fishery and the Steller sea lion is tenuous at best. It focuses attention away from other theories, such as ecosystem change, that also deserve attention. If you focus only on a single issue you might blow it.''

In this case, the single issue that environmentalists have litigated into the status of orthodoxy rests on a slender pedestal of scientific evidence. No scientific publication has accepted a paper analyzing localized depletion.

WHO SWIPED LUNCH?

In contrast, the scientific literature teems with papers describing the profound climatic regime shifts of the North Pacific. Following the regime shift in 1976–77, after roughly a 20-year ''cool'' period, the stocks of dozens of fish species experienced drastic changes. Small-mesh surveys of the Gulf of Alaska conducted by NMFS since 1953 have accrued more than 90,000 individual catch records. They record the precipitous decline of shrimp, capelin, Tanner crab, red king crab, herring, greenling, and Atka mackerel during the current ''warm'' period. While these stocks withered, others surged: pollock, sole, arrowtooth flounder, jellyfish, halibut, and others.

As fish stocks rearranged themselves, so did higher predators. The Stellers took a nose dive: an annual 24% decline between 1980 and 1990 followed that regime shift in the late 1970s. As the rich, oily prey species declined, so did the marine mammals that eat them. The Steller's pinniped cousins, harbor seals, lost 80–90% of their population in that same decade; Northern fur seals are at about 50% of their historic population. Populations of kittiwake and murres, coastal seabirds that forage on the same fish as Stellers, also plunged.

So, was it Mother Nature that swiped the sea lions' nutritious lunch, giving them nothing but a horde of groundfish full of empty calories to eat? The ''junk food'' theory says so. This theory suggests that Stellers now eat too much low-fat pollock and cod because of their superabundance, and eat too few fat-rich species like herring, sandlance, capelin, and smelt because there aren't enough around. The premise relies on 50 years of studies on the diet of Stellers, based on stomach contents and scat analyses. But scat analyses are imperfect because the bones of forage species such as capelin don't usually endure the digestive process. In other words, if Stellers eat a lot of them, the scat might not show it.

It's also uncertain whether Steller sea lions eat opportunistically or selectively, whether they eat a different meal every dive, whether they eat different foods during different seasons. Nonetheless, a number of respected researchers are convinced that the Steller diet includes a far greater percentage of pollock since the regime shift. Among them is Andrew Trites, the head of the Marine Mammal Research Unit at the University of British Columbia and the director of a multi-university research consortium in the U.S. and Canada that has been trying to sort out what's happening to the Stellers and the ocean ecosystems where they live. Trites says the data show that Stellers in the Gulf of Alaska have steadily increased their diet of pollock, from 32% in 1976–78 to 85% by 1990–93. After the same time, consumption of fatty fishes decreased from 61% to 18%.

Besides the evidence of sea lion diet changes, nutritional stress has for years been a favorite explanation for the Stellers' decline because of other observations. Stellers are smaller than they once were, and reproductive success has dropped by about a third—classic signs of an ecosystem with reduced carrying capacity.

Still, not everyone believes in the junk-food theory. ''The junk-food theory is junk,'' says Vidar Wespestad, a biologist formerly at NMFS and now a consultant for the whiting fishery. ''The genus name for pollock is Theragra, which means 'animal food.' When the species was named at the start of the 19th century, I'm sure it was based on the fact that it was noted as a major food item of sea lions. The whole food thing is tenuous. There has never been shown to be a food problem with Steller sea lions in the wild. You don't find emaciated Stellers washing up on the beaches.''

Whether or not Stellers always ate pollock, Trites's empirical work is widely considered a solid showing that Stellers cannot live on pollock alone. In a paper published this year in the Canadian Journal of Zoology, Trites and his colleague David Rosen present results of dietary experiments with six juvenile Stellers. The sea lions received alternating diets of herring and pollock, as much as they wanted to eat, for periods of 11 to 24 days. The animals individually lost between 1.4% and 16.4% of their body weight, an average of more than half a kilogram a day, on the all-pollock diet. Trites and Rosen attribute the results to the measured lower nutritional value of pollock than herring, and the higher energy cost to digest it. Clearly it is ''much more difficult for Steller sea lions to thrive on a diet consisting primarily of pollock,'' he writes. ''Steller sea lions would have to consume an average of 56% more pollock than herring to maintain a comparable net energy intake.''

It happens that, in the Bering Sea, nature lately has set the Steller's table with a diet mainly of pollock. Other scientists have also found evidence that this may be unhealthy for Stellers. A study by NMFS biologist Richard Merrick in 1997, for instance, determined that Steller populations with the least diet diversity—those eating the highest percentage of pollock—suffered the greatest decline.

If, in fact, too much pollock is harming the Stellers, there's a peculiar irony afloat: fishing may actually help the Steller population. Adult pollock (three year and older) are cannibals, voraciously feeding on smaller juvenile pollock, which are the preferred prey of Stellers. Trawlers target adult pollock, reducing their consumption of juveniles. Year-by-year graphing of adult pollock biomass compared to juvenile biomass neatly shows the inverse relationship of adult to juvenile pollock.

Even so, don't expect Stellers to rebound just by increasing fishing effort. According to John Piatt, a researcher at the U.S. Geological Survey's Alaska Biological Research Center, large predatory groundfish currently eat 10 to 100 times more forage fish than seabirds, marine mammals, and humans combined. It may be, as Andrew Trites says, that ''the solution to restoring the numbers

of Steller sea lions is probably out of human control.''

But whether it's hunger or some other cause of death, the reaper has been selective. Population studies by Anne York of NMFS's Alaska Fisheries Science Center found that adult survival was essentially stable; juveniles, however, declined 10–20%, and her work is widely cited. So what's killing the young?

WHO ATE THE STELLERS?

Maybe orca whales. Skippers have plenty of anecdotal reports of orcas attacking Stellers, but the discovery of tags from 14 Stellers in the belly of an orcas that washed ashore in 1992 in Price William Sound constitutes striking scientific evidence that Stellers sea lions, endangered or not, are on the orcas's menu. Researchers at Seward's Alaska Sea Life Center have videotaped orcas charging up the beach at Chiswell Island to snatch Stellers. Studies by Craig Matkin, a recognized authority on Alaska orcas, calculate that 125 marine mammal-eating orcas (known as ''transients'') prey on the endangered western Steller population, and between 10% and 15% of their diet consists of sea lions. According to Matkin, the orcas likely erode the Steller population each year by 3.8%. That's big chunk of NMFS's observed annual decline of 5.2% on average since 1990. Other researchers believe that orcas have been forced to find something besides Stellers to eat, now that the sea lions are scarce. Jim Estes, a researcher at UC-Davis, discovered that orcas have been preying on sea otters with such zeal that between 1993 and 1997 they devoured 76% of the sea otter population at Kuluk Bay, Adak. Unlike fishermen, orcas and ocean climate regimes don't pay much heed to federal regulations. Officials at NMFS would be uncorking a political firestorm—and possible a whole new conservation problem—if they moved to cull killer whales in order to protect Stellers. That leaves NMFS facing intense pressure to crack down on fisheries, even though there's little evidence that this will help.

LET'S TEST THE CURE

To Ken Stump, a consultant to Greenpeace who is credited as the architect of the environmentalists' case against NMFS, the circumstances look like a clear mandate. Scientific uncertainty should not mean inaction, he contends. ''I'd be the first to say that we need more research, but in the near term we aren't going to get any closer to the truth,'' he says. ''In light of the available information, there is no good justification for letting the fisheries pack it in in critical habitats. It is eminently reasonable and precautionary to reduce the impacts of these fisheries while further research continues. It's the one thing we have any control over.''

With its inconsistent and fumbling legal defense, NMFS gave Judge Zilly little choice but to agree with Stump. Someday, the result probably will be construed as a grand experiment: Let's see if fishing less helps the sea lions. Yet the trawl injunction is anything but scientific. Scientists have insisted for years that barring trawlers from designated critical habitat forecloses any chance of learning whether they really do starve out the animals. That's because the strategy fails to establish ''control'' zones where fishing is allowed inside critical habitat for comparison to similar zones where fishing is prohibited. As the council's Scientific and Statistical Committee put it in September, it would be helpful ''to open some rookeries to controlled fishing in connection with observation on the foraging of Steller sea lions in the area.'' Calling for a more ''science based'' process, the committee observed that fishery managers can have no confidence they have done their job fairly or well.

According to the committee, ''The only way out of this morass is to design a research and management plan that tests hypotheses related to the Steller sea lion decline and increases the understanding of the potential interactions between groundfish fisheries and Steller sea lions.''

Whether that can happen ultimately depends upon the courts and, perhaps, Congress. Either way, the environmental litigants in the sea lion case probably would have to sign off on such a research plan. So far that doesn't look likely.

In conversation, Stump bristles at the mention of Andrew Trites, a scientist who admits he started years ago with the assumption that fishing must be to blame for the Steller's decline but found evidence of other causes instead. In print (Pacific Fishing, October 2000, page 6), Stump rails bitterly against the view that natural causes may account for the Steller's decline. In meetings in Alaska, he publicly taunts Dickie Jacobson, the mayor of Sand Point, Alaska, who says Stump's ''eminently reasonable'' solution puts his whole community at risk and could spell ''the end of the Eastern Aleut world.''

Stump has good reason to be threatened by such possibilities. He and his allies have scored their legal triumph by exploiting a wide gap in the available science; ignorance is literally their opportunity. They're laughed off requests to help pay for the research necessary to find out what's really killing sea lions. Little wonder. Any genuine scientific test of trawl closures carries a risk for them: Having vanquished trawlers from critical habitat and successfully divided the fishing industry against itself, why should the victors want to learn whether they picked the wrong cure for sea lions?●

CLOTURE VOTE ON BANKRUPTCY REFORM

● Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, yesterday I voted against cloture on the bankruptcy reform bill. I voted against cloture even though I support bankruptcy reform, and even though I supported this legislation when it originally passed the Senate.

However, I oppose the motion to invoke cloture because I am troubled by some of the actions of the Republican majority. Neither the House nor the Senate ever formally named any conferees. Instead, the majority created a sham conference, hollowing out the State Department authorization bill and inserting the provisions of the bankruptcy reform. And even though the original bankruptcy reform bill that passed the Senate was a product of bipartisan input, the majority party did not include any Democrats in the discussions regarding the final package. Negotiators made significant changes to the bill without any input from Democrats. Important provisions were dropped; others were changed dramatically. All of this without the benefit of a formal conference that allows for debate and compromise by both parties. Under these circumstances, I could not support cloture.

I still support efforts to reform our bankruptcy laws, and I hope we can achieve this goal before the Senate adjourns sine die. I am disappointed by the way in which the legislative process has been twisted and broken by the majority in the development of this bill. That is why I opposed cloture.●

IDAHO SUPPORTS WWII MEMORIAL

● Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, on November 11 of this year, we will commemorate the sacrifice made by veterans and all Americans during World War II by dedicating the National World War II Memorial. The Memorial is a tribute to the men and women who risked their lives for our freedom and democracy. Sixteen million men and women served our country during this war, and many more contributed on the home front. Each day, more veterans pass away, and it is imperative we remember the great effort they made, securing the liberties we enjoy in the United States of America.

Hundreds of Americans from all sectors of our society joined the effort to show their appreciation to America's World War II generation by raising millions of dollars. The Memorial was almost completely funded by private contributions, and among the many who contributed to this effort were students from Eagle High School in Eagle, Idaho.

In November of 1999, high school students Fi Southerland and Kate Bowen decided to raise $20,000 for the National World War II Memorial. These students were soon joined by many of the Eagle High students and staff. With the assistance and under the direction of their high school teacher, Gail Chumbley, they held various events to raise money. I am pleased to report that this group of outstanding young people and the many others involved in the project have not only met the goal of raising $20,000 but have actually surpassed it by seven thousand dollars.

Those who participated in this effort expressed how the effort changed their perspective on the great sacrifice made by our War Veterans. The students said one of the most satisfying parts of this year-long project has been letters and stories they have received from people involved in WWII. One of the most interesting was from a man who was not a veteran, but born in Holland and lived through the war and now is a United States citizen. He told the students that as a child, he heard the allied bombers flying overhead at night on their way to Germany, his parents called the ''sound of freedom.''

Kate Bowen summed up the reasons for raising the funds. ''The effort is about paying respect to that generation. Look at what they did for us.'' We recognize, with gratitude, the difference World War II veterans made in our every day lives. I commend all those involved with this project for their dedication and hard work, and hope their interest and concern will inspire others.

Other students and organizations involved in the project include Kristen Ediger, Sam Johnson, Karl Krohner,

Hilary Case, Lacey Rammel-O'Brien, Katria Taylor, Amy Marcotte, Darcy Haney, David Sant, Tony Bergman, Jennifer Martinez, Chase Deobald, Cassie Southerland, Kiley Southerland, Kristen Clark, Lindsey Marshall, Robert Frazier, Josh Miller, Melissa McGrath, Catherine Sant, Bryan Jolly, Brandon Putzier, Melvin Delic, Jason Steik, Shaun Huntington, Deanne Jenkins, Tana Martin, Traci Mayhugh, Tysen Janak, Carolyn Michaud, Jimmy Hallyburton, Taylor Cooley, Cory Snethen, Brian Price, Elizabeth Pearson, Aimee McCauley, Dawn Leavitt, Matt Reines, Devan Satterly, Ashley Ellis, Craig Cahan, Justin Bodine, Jason Gates, Patrick Bulson, John Winder, Shyann Harris, Shannon Bruce, Michael Johnson, James Burdick, Edis Kajic, Merzine Ceric, Jason Kalk, Steve McClenny, Casey Spirk, Conrad Crisman, Paul Moore, Jason Lindquist, Steven Baker, Nathan Nichols, Katie Miller, Adam Brundy, Jason Peterson, Jeff Auchampach, Roy Brewer, Danny Edvalson, Larissa Martinson, Robbie Buck, Travis Barney, Nicola Miller, Ryan Griffiths, Bret Anderson, Diana Chong, Andrea Banks, Brad Smith, Dena Smith, Robert Frazier, Kia Black, Cathy Peterson, Heidi Webb, Jeff Collier, Kimber Crosgrove, Jennifer Pengelly, Ryan Small, Linda and Mike Bowen, Kacey Bowen, Kelly Bowen, Lili Gonzales, Lindsay Miller, Brandon Rapp, Clipper Net, Chapparal Elementary School, Amanda Vissotski, Amy Barnes, Eagle Middle School, McMillian Elementary, Bill and Wendy Southerland, Emerson and Patricia Smock, Bruce Gestrin, Eagle Albertons, Dick Bengoechea, Andrea Mahan, Lori Smock, Joanna Lee, Eagle Lions Club, Eagle Volunteer Fire Department, Eagle Chamber of Commerce, Chad Chumbley, Henni Keller, Pat O'Oloughlin and Kepa Zubizaretta.●

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY ADMINISTRATIVE CHARGES

● Mr. BINGAMAN. Mr. President, in 1998, I co-authored section 3137 of the Strom Thurmond National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1999 (Public Law 105–261), which dealt with research and other activities conducted at Department of Energy (DOE) laboratories and facilities for other entities.

Section 3137(b)(2)(A) allows the Secretary of Energy to impose a federal administrative charge in an amount not to exceed 3 percent of the cost of the research carried out by Federal agencies and other entities at DOE laboratories and facilities. My preference in putting forward this language was to eliminate such charges altogether, but I agreed to some flexibility so that such a change could be phased in. We are now in fiscal year 2001, and the President has signed a bill providing for full appropriations for the Department. I would urge at this point that the phase-out of administrative costs be completed by DOE. For example, it makes little sense to have one Federal agency racking up administrative charges against other Federal agencies for the privilege of using Federal facilities. We should encourage such sharing of common assets in the name of efficient administration, instead of keeping incentives to have each agency build its own duplicative equipment and facilities. Additionally, it is in the public interest to encourage outside use of DOE facilities by other entities. This is because outside entities that want to use DOE laboratory facilities are likely to have similar research interests and aims with the DOE researchers at the labs who also use these facilities. The opportunity for enhanced scientific interaction from facilitating their use of these facilities can result in additional scientific efficiencies that will benefit the government.

Accordingly, Mr. President, I urge that the Secretary of Energy reduce these administrative costs to zero for fiscal year 2001 and each succeeding fiscal year.●

GEORGE E. BROWN, JR. UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE

● Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I am pleased that the Senate yesterday passed legislation to name the new federal courthouse in Riverside, California the George E. Brown, Jr. United States Courthouse.

It is altogether fitting that the federal courthouse in Riverside be named for the late Representative Brown. It was through his work for the people of the 42nd district of California that the courthouse was built. I only wish that he had lived to see its grand opening next year.

George was a champion of justice. Before he could vote, he helped to integrate university student housing. He fought against the internment of Japanese-Americans in World War II and stood on the side of workers in labor battles. George always asked us to use all of our assembled knowledge to improve the lives of our fellow humans and our world. In my long association with George Brown, I always knew on which side he would stand: on the side of justice.

Since his death, we have seen many tributes to the late George Brown. The USDA Salinity Laboratory at the University of California bears his name. The giant Sequoias that George loved now are protected with monument status, and he was remembered at the dedication ceremony. More tributes are planned. However, I am particularly pleased that the federal court building in Riverside will be known as the George E. Brown, Jr. United States Courthouse.●

MESSAGES FROM THE HOUSE

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 6, 1999, the Secretary of the Senate, on November 2, 2000, during the recess of the Senate, at 2:50 p.m., received a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announcing that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions:

S. 484. An act to provide for the granting of refugee status in the United States to nationals of certain foreign countries in which American Vietnam War POW/MIAs or American Korean War POW/MIAs may be present, if those nationals assist in the return to the United States of those POW/MIAs alive.

S. 698. An act to review the suitability and feasibility of recovering costs of high altitude rescues at Denali National Park and Preserve in the State of Alaska, and for other purposes.

S. 700. An act to amend the National Trails System Act to designate the Ala Kahakai Trail as a National Historic Trail.

S. 893. An act to amend title 46, United States Code, to provide equitable treatment with respect to State and local income taxes for certain individuals who perform duties on vessels.

S. 938. An act to eliminate restrictions on the acquisition of certain land contiguous to Hawaii Volcanoes National Park, and for other purposes.

S. 964. An act to provide for equitable compensation for the Cheyenne River Sioux Tribe, and for other purposes.

S. 1438. An act to establish the National Law Enforcement Museum on Federal land in the District of Columbia.

S. 1474. An act providing conveyance of the Palmetto Bend project to the State of Texas.

S. 1482. An act to amend the National Marine Sanctuaries Act, and for other purposes.

S. 1752. An act to reauthorize and amend the Coastal Barrier Resources Act.

S. 1865. An act to provide grants to establish demonstration mental health courts.

S. 2345. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a special resource study concerning the preservation and public use of sites associated with Harriet Tubman located in Auburn, New York, and for other purposes.

H.R. 660. An act for the private relief of Ruth Hairston by waiver of a filing deadline for appeal from a ruling relating to her application for a survivor annuity.

H.R. 848. An act for the relief of Sepandan Farnia and Farbod Farnia.

H.R. 1235. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into contracts with the Solano County Water Agency, California, to use Solano Project facilities for impounding, storage, and carriage of non-project water for domestic, municipal, industrial, and other beneficial purposes.

H.R. 1444. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to establish a program to plan, design, and construct facilities to mitigate impacts associated with irrigation system water diversions by local governmental entities in the Pacific Ocean drainage of the States of Oregon, Washington, Montana, and Idaho.

H.R. 2941. An act to establish the Las Cienegas National Conservation Area in the State of Arizona.

H.R. 3184. An act for the relief of Zohreh Farhang Ghahfarokhi.

H.R. 3388. An act to promote environmental restoration around the Lake Tahoe basin.

H.R. 3414. An act for the relief of Luis A. Leon-Molina, Ligia Padron, Juan Leon Padron, Rendy Leon Padron, Manuel Leon Padron, and Luis Leon Padron.

H.R. 3621. An act to provide for the posthumous promotion of William Clark of the

Commonwealth of Virginia and the Commonwealth of Kentucky, co-leader of the Lewis and Clark Expedition, to the grade of captain in the Regular Army.

H.R. 4312. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study of the suitability and feasibility of establishing an Upper Housatonic Valley National Heritage Area in the State of Connecticut and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4646. An act to designate certain National Forest System lands within the boundaries of the State of Virginia as wilderness areas, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4794. An act to require the Secretary of the Interior to complete a resource study of the 600 mile route through Connecticut, Delaware, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Virginia, used by George Washington and General Rochambeau during the American Revolutionary War.

H.R. 5239. An act to provide for increased penalties for violations of the Export Administration Act of 1979, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5266. An act for the relief of Saeed Rezai.

H.R. 5410. An act to establish revolving funds for the operation of certain programs and activities of the Library of Congress, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5478. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to acquire by donation suitable land to serve as the new location for the home of the Alexander Hamilton, commonly known as the Hamilton Grange to the acquired land.

H.J. Res. 102. Joint resolution recognizing that the Birmingham Pledge has made a significant contribution in fostering racial harmony and reconciliation in the United States and around the world, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 122. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001, and for other purpose.

Under the authority of the order of the Senate of January 6, 1999, the enrolled bills and joint resolutions were signed subsequently by the President pro tempore (Mr. THURMOND) on November 2, 2000.

The message also announced that the Speaker has signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

H.R. 1550. An act to authorize appropriations for the United States Fire Administration, and for carrying out the Earthquake Hazards Reduction Act of 1977, for fiscal yeas 2001, 2002, and 2003, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2462. An act to amend the Organic Act of Guam, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4846. An act to establish the National Recording Registry in the Library of Congress to maintain and preserve sound recordings that are culturally, historically, or aesthetically significant, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5110. An act to designate the United States courthouse located at 3470 12th Street in Riverside, California, as the ''George E. Brown, Jr. United States Courthouse.''

H.R. 5302. An act to designate the United States courthouse located at 1010 Fifth Avenue in Seattle, Washington, as the ''William Kenzo Nakamura United States Courthouse.''

H.R. 5388. An act to designate a building proposed to be located within the boundaries of the Chincoteague National Wildlife Refuge, as the ''Herbert H. Bateman Educational and Administrative Center.''

H.J. Res. 123. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes.

The enrolled joint resolution was signed subsequently by the President pro tempore (Mr. THURMOND) on November 2, 2000.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, November 2, 2000, he had presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1778. An act to provide for equal exchanges of land around the Cascade Reservoir.

S. 1894. An act to provide for the conveyance of certain land to Park County, Wyoming.

S. 2069. An act to permit the conveyance of certain land in Powell, Wyoming.

S. 2300. An act to amend the Mineral Leasing Act to increase the maximum acreage of Federal leases for coal that may be held by an entity in any 1 State.

S. 2425. An act to authorize the Bureau of Reclamation to participate in the planning, design, and construction of the Bend Feed Canal Pipeline Project, Oregon, and for other purposes.

S. 2872. An act to improve the cause of action for misrepresentation of Indian arts and crafts.

S. 2882. An act to authorize the Bureau of Reclamation to conduct certain feasibility studies to augment water supplies for the Klamath Project, Oregon and California, and for other purposes.

S. 2951. An act to authorize the Commissioner of Reclamation to conduct a study to investigate opportunities to better manage the water resources in the Salmon Creek watershed of the upper Columbia River.

S. 2977. An act to assist in the establishment of an interpretive center and museum in the vicinity of the Diamond Valley Lake in southern California to ensure the protection and interpretation of the paleontology discoveries made at the lake and to develop a trail system for the lake for use by pedestrians and nonmotorized vehicles.

S. 3022. An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain irrigation facilities to the Nampa and Meridian Irrigation District.

At 8:30 p.m., received a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Ms. Niland, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following joint resolution, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.J. Res. 123. Joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001, and for other purposes.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. MURKOWSKI:

S. Con. Res. 160. A concurrent resolution providing for a conditional adjournment or recess of the Senate and a conditional adjournment of the House of Representatives; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 1304

At the request of Mrs. MURRAY, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. TORRICELLI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1304, a bill to amend the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 to allow employees to take school involvement leave to participate in the academic school activities of their children or to participate in literacy training, and for other purposes.

S. 3110

At the request of Mr. WELLSTONE, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. TORRICELLI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3110, a bill to ensure that victims of domestic violence get the help they need in a single phone call.

S. 3164

At the request of Mr. BAYH, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. FEINGOLD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3164, a bill to protect seniors from fraud.

S. 3246

At the request of Mr. HARKIN, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3246, a bill to prohibit the importation of any textile or apparel article that is produced, manufactured, or grown in Burma.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 160—PROVIDING FOR A CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OR RECESS OF THE SENATE AND A CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. MURKOWSKI submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. CON. RES. 160

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That when the Senate recesses or adjourns at the close of business on Thursday, November 2, 2000, or on Monday, November 6, 2000, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon on Tuesday, November 14, 2000, or until such time on that day as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Thursday, November 2, 2000, Friday, November 3, 2000, Saturday, November 4, 2000, Sunday, November 5, 2000, Monday, November 6, 2000, Tuesday, November 7, 2000, Wednesday, November 8, 2000, or Thursday, November 9, 2000, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 2 p.m. on Monday, November 13, 2000, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 2. The Majority Leader of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the Senate and the Minority Leader of the House, shall notify the Members of the Senate and House, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

ORDER OF PROCEDURE

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that if between today and November 14 the Senate receives from the House of Representatives continuing resolutions funding the Government for 1 day at a time, the individual resolutions be agreed to and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table.

I further ask that if the House of Representatives passes a continuing resolution that contains language other than the funding of the Federal Government for 1 day, the Senate automatically reconvene 2 hours after receipt of the papers in the Senate and it be pending in the Senate following the granting of the routine convening requests.

I further ask unanimous consent that if the House of Representatives does not pass S. Con. Res. 160, the Senate reconvene on Monday, November 6, at 11 a.m. for a pro forma session only; that immediately following the convening on Monday, the Senate immediately stand in recess until 11 a.m. on Thursday, November 9, for a pro forma session only. I ask consent that following the convening on Thursday, the Senate stand in recess until 11 a.m. on Monday, November 13, for a pro forma session only. I ask consent sent that following the convening on Monday, the Senate automatically stand in recess until 12 noon on Tuesday, November 14, 2000, as provided in the previous order.

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

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I must say the cooperation on the unanimous consent leads this Senator from Alaska to dream a little bit about some of the bills that he would like to pass by unanimous consent such as the ANWR issue and university lands, but I guess Senate tradition dictates otherwise so it is back to reality, Mr. President.

ORDER FOR RECESS

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, in the closing script, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it recess until the hour of 12 noon on Tuesday, November 14 under the provisions of S. Con. Res. 160.

PROGRAM

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

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I would announce that if the House of Representatives does not pass S. Con. Res. 160, the adjournment resolution, then the Senate reconvenes for three pro forma sessions between now and November 14. If the House passes clean continuing resolutions each day, those resolutions will be passed upon arrival in the Senate. Also, as a reminder to all Senators, the weekly party caucuses will occur on Tuesday, November 14. Therefore, the Senate will be in recess between the hours of 12:30 and 2:15 p.m.

RECESS UNTIL TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 2000

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, seeing no other Members here and no one seeking recognition, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess under the provisions of S. Con. Res. 160.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 8:37 p.m., recessed until Tuesday, November 14, 2000, at 12 noon.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TRIBUTE TO JUDGE DAVID E. RUSSELL

HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 2, 2000

Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in tribute to Judge David E. Russell, Chief Bankruptcy Judge of the United States Court of Appeals for the Eastern District of California. After 14 years as a Bankruptcy Judge and 40 years of service in the legal profession, Judge Russell has announced his retirement. He will be honored at a retirement party on Friday, November 3, 2000 at the Tsakopoulos Library in Sacramento. As his friends and family gather to celebrate, I ask all of my colleagues to join with me in saluting his remarkable career.

David E. Russell was born on March 19, 1935 in Chicago Heights, Illinois. He was married on October 31, 1982 to Sandra Niemeyer, and they are the proud parents of seven children.

He began his education at the University of California at Berkeley, graduating in 1957 with a Bachelor of Science in Accounting. He went on to obtain his Jurisprudence Doctorate from Boalt Hall, University of California at Berkeley in 1960.

David Russell began his career as an accountant for Lybrand, Ross Brothers and Montgomery in San Francisco, CA. Here he stayed for three years, during which time he was admitted to the California Bar in 1961. In 1965, he became a partner with Russell, Humphreys and Estabrook. Later to be known as Russell, Jarvis, Estabrook and Dashiell, he continued to work with the firm as a lawyer until 1986.

In 1986, David Russell was appointed to a 14-year term as a United States Bankruptcy Judge. In those 14 years, Judge Russell has developed a reputation as a fair and honest man, and he has served his appointment admirably. I am honored to have the opportunity to congratulate Judge Russell as he begins his well-deserved retirement.

Mr. Speaker, as Judge David Russell's friends and family gather to celebrate his retirement, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to a truly remarkable person. His career with the United States Court of Appeals has indeed been commendable. I ask all of my colleagues to join with me in wishing him continued success in all his future endeavors.

MINORITY HEALTH AND HEALTH DISPARITIES RESEARCH AND EDUCATION ACT OF 1999

SPEECH OF

HON. ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD

OF GUAM

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 31, 2000

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to express my support of S. 1880, the Health Care Fairness Act of 2000. As an original co-sponsor of H.R. 3250, the House companion measure, I have long-supported legislation to expand research and education on the biomedical, behavioral, economic, institutional, and environmental factors contributing to health disparities in minority and underserved populations.

I would like to commend my colleagues, Representatives CLYBURN, LEWIS, THOMPSON, JACKSON, RODRIGUEZ, ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Senator EDWARD KENNEDY, who have worked long and hard to get this bill to the floor.

In recent years, advances in the prevention, diagnosis, and treatment of disease has improved the health status and quality of medical care to the overall U.S. population. However, while we are experiencing remarkable improvements in the health status of the overall U.S. population, we find this has not translated into similar benefits for minority populations. In fact, minority populations continue to experience disproportionate rates of disease, morbidity, and mortality. Numerous studies have proven that race and ethnicity correlate with persistent, and often increasing, health disparities among U.S. populations. These alarming disparities deserve our focused attention and call for action.

The passage of the Health Care Fairness Act would, for the first time, focus research and attention to health disparities such as those that exist in Guam, with the creation of a National Center on Minority Health and Health Disparities within the National Institutes of Health to conduct research on minority health problems and commission the National Academy of Sciences to conduct a comprehensive study of the data collection systems and practices of the Department of Health and Human Services. S. 1880 would also establish pilot projects in medical schools to develop educational tools that will reduce racial and ethnic health disparities. These improvements will increase our knowledge to the nature and causes of these disparities, as well as improve the quality and outcomes of health care services to minority and underserved populations.

As the Chairman of the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus and a member of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, I am keenly aware of the health care needs of minority communities. Particular needs regarding language and cultural competency are often not being met in our public health centers and hospitals.

On the island of Guam, Chamorros, who are the indigenous population, and other Asian and Pacific Islander groups represent a large majority of the 150,000 population. With an island largely comprised of minority populations, it is challenging to meet specific health needs of our diverse community with the limited resources that are currently available. In the case of Chamorros, diabetes affects Chamorros at five times the national average and infant mortality rates are more than double the national average. Chamorros also suffer from higher than average rates of cardiovascular disease, cancer, and Lytico-Bodig, a disease endemic to Guam, which is a combination of Parkinsonian dementia and amyotrophic lateral sclerosis. The case of mental illness is also a great concern to Guam residents with rising incidences of attempted and completed suicides.

The overall Asian Pacific American population is often mislabeled as the ''model minority'' with few health or social problems. This is a huge misnomer as emerging data reveals significant health disparities and barriers to health care and social service access exist within Asian Pacific American communities. As a group, Asian Pacific Americans experience the highest incidences of tuberculosis. Particular Asian Pacific Americans sub-population groups experience diabetes, hepatitis B, cervical cancer, liver cancer, lung cancer, nasopharyngeal cancer, and mental illness at alarming rates. Recognizing the challenges presented by the great diversity of Asian Pacific Americans and other minority populations is key to addressing the health care needs of all Americans.

The Asian Pacific American population includes indigenous and immigrant populations, which comprises 10.4 million Americans or approximately 5 percent of the U.S. population. Asian Pacific Americans represent the fastest growing and most diverse racial and ethnic group in the U.S. with more than 30 different sub-populations and are expected to reach 10 percent of the U.S. population by 2050. Approximately 20 percent of Asian Pacific Americans are currently uninsured.

It is clear that the face of America is becoming increasingly diverse as its minority populations continue to grow. And as our minority populations increase, so does the complexity of our health needs. Therefore, I urge your support of S. 1880, the Health Care Fairness Act, to develop programs and comprehensive strategies to address the health disparities among ethnic and minority groups. This bill represents a comprehensive bi-partisan effort to address the inequities in health care for all Americans.

IN RECOGNITION OF HAROLD NICHOLSON

HON. JOHN P. MURTHA

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 2, 2000

Mr. MURTHA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to pay tribute to a dedicated and hardworking gentleman on the occasion of his retirement. Harold Nicholson devoted thirty-three years of his life to the Somerset Rural Electric Cooperative, Inc., in Somerset, PA. He was its manager for the past nineteen years, longer than any other manager in the entity's sixty-one year history.

But Mr. Nicholson not only managed the cooperative, he was in many ways its heart, soul and voice. Originally hired to provide member

services, he started the SREC's monthly newsletter for which he also wrote and photographed. It became the precursor of the statewide Penn Lines magazine. Mr. Nicholson served on numerous committees within the National Rural Electric Association and was chairman of its Marketing and Energy Management committee. Additionally, he was active with the statewide Pennsylvania Rural Electric Association, where he served on the Power Supply and Engineering Committee, Transmission Policy, and Risk Management Committees and co-chaired its Consumer Choice Marketing and Consumer, Employee and Board Education Task Force committees.

He has been named Pennsylvania Rural Electric Association Man of the Year (1992), the organization's highest honor.

In addition to his many career-related credits and initiatives, he has served his community in a variety of other capacities. They include Managing Editor of the Meyersdale Republican; board member and past president of the Meyersdale Lions Club; on the Economic Development Committee of the Southern Alleghenies Planning and Development Commission; was a charter member and secretary of the Long Range Planning Committee with the Somerset County Vocational Technical School; served on the board of the Appalachian Intermediate Unit 8 serving the area's school districts; served for sixteen years including as president on the Meyersdale Area School Board; member of the Somerset County Chamber of Commerce; and a member of the Partnership for Rural Industrial Development Enterprises (PRIDE) as Secretary.

Harold Nicholson has been and continues to be an outstanding member of his community. I wish him all the best for a fulfilling and happy retirement to enjoy with his wife, four children and nine grandchildren.

IN HONOR OF THE FRANCISCAN FRIARS

HON. NANCY PELOSI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 2, 2000

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to the Franciscan Friars. The Franciscan Friars of the Santa Barbara Province have been compassionately responding to the needs of San Franciscans since 1887. It is my pleasure to honor them for their tremendous contributions on the Fiftieth Anniversary of one of their most successful projects, the St. Anthony Foundation.

The Franciscan Friars improve our city through their work at St. Boniface Church. For years, they have been feeding the poor and homeless and caring for those in need. In particular, the Friars have ministered to the immigrant communities of San Francisco's Tenderloin District, first with the German community and expanding more recently to the Hispanic, Vietnamese and Filipino communities.

The St. Anthony Foundation was founded by Franciscan Friar Alfred Boeddeker, while pastor of St. Boniface Church, to ''feed, clothe, heal and shelter the needy, empower the powerless, and promote a social order in which all persons flourish.'' Today, the Foundation serves an extraordinary number of people with their drug rehabilitation, food, health, housing, and other social service programs. The Franciscan Friars have provided the spirit, vision, and direction for the St. Anthony Foundation to complete 50 years of service to the most marginalized in our community.

The Franciscan Friars and the St. Anthony Foundation make San Francisco a better place. Their selfless dedication to those in need calls us to a higher standard. It is my honor to commend them on fifty years of service through the St. Anthony Foundation.

THANK YOU TO ADAM TUNE FOR SERVICE ON MY STAFF

HON. BART GORDON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 2, 2000

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I want to give thanks and special recognition to an intern in my office, Adam Tune

Adam attends my alma mater, Middle Tennessee State University. While still in high school he managed to work 25 hours each week, took college level preparatory courses and maintained good grades.

Interns play an invaluable role in helping congressional offices function efficiently and effectively, often performing the most thankless but essential tasks required. Adam pitches in where ever and when ever he is needed, never complaining and always accomplishing his work on-time and of the higher quality.

Adam loves politics and admires this institution. This high regard is reflected each and every day in his attitude and dependability.

Adam has been an invaluable member of my staff and deserves the highest praise for his contribution.

It has been a pleasure to have Adam Tune serve in my office and I join my staff in thanking him for all his hard work.

TRIBUTE TO ROXCY BOLTON

HON. CARRIE P. MEEK

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 2, 2000

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay a special tribute to Florida's pioneer feminist, a great woman, and a friend, Ms. Roxcy Bolton. There are not many people around like Roxcy, and I am so proud to recognize her many accomplishments.

She is a trail blazer, a persistent advocate, a remarkable woman. She put the spotlight on women, showcased their problems, and encouraged other women to take action and expand the fight for equal rights. She has proven time and again that one person can make a difference.

Roxcy O'Neal Bolton was born in 1926 in Mississippi. She became a businesswoman and was active in community and political organizations. She married Commander David Bolton U.S.N. who was later president of Men for the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA).

In 1966, Bolton helped form Florida's National Organization for Women, serving as charter president of the Miami Chapter and National Vice President in 1969.

In 1972, she founded Women in Distress, a non-profit agency providing emergency housing, rescue service and multi-discipline assistance to women in situations of personal crisis. It was the first women's rescue shelter in Florida.

In 1974 she was instrumental in establishing the Rape Treatment Center, the first of its kind at Jackson Memorial Hospital in Miami. That same year, Bolton organized Florida's first Crime Watch program to help stem crime against women.

She also founded the Women's Park in Miami and has been the recipient of numerous awards relating to her work in women's rights. In 1984, she was inducted into the Florida Women's Hall of Fame.

Less trumpeted are her countless acts of compassion: for the woman about to be replaced in her job by someone younger and better connected; for the man who is demoted from his city job because he cannot read; for the prostitute working to earn her high school equivalency diploma; for the woman who sleeps and eventually dies on the steps of a downtown church.

It is no wonder why any letter addressed simply Roxcy, Coral Gables, Fla. arrives in due course at Bolton's house.

Mr. Speaker, Ms. Bolton has been called, and rightly so, South Florida's ''Mother of Feminism''. I strongly believe that my state of Florida is a much better place for women . . . and all people . . . because of Roxcy Bolton. On behalf of the people of the 17th Congressional District, I salute her.

A TRIBUTE TO AMELIA MARY HALLE HINKLEY

HON. BILL McCOLLUM

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 2, 2000

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, today I pay tribute to Amelia Hinckley, of Warner Robins, Georgia, who passed away on September 22, 2000. Amelia, or Amy as she was known to her friends and family, was born in West Palm Beach, Florida on December 29, 1962, to Roger and Phyllis Halle.

She graduated from Stetson University in Deland, Florida, in 1984 with a double major in History and Spanish. On December 29, 1984, Amy married James Hinckley, also a Stetson graduate. Amy was a talented and dedicated educator. She began her teaching career in Texas, where she taught English as a second language to disadvantaged children of inner-city Dallas, Texas.

After several years, she and Jim moved to Florida where she nurtured new immigrant children in Central Florida. Amy loved every minute of her work. When her husband got a job as the junior high school band teacher in Warner Robins, Amy found a home at the Stratford Academy in Macon, Georgia, where she taught Spanish to high school students for nearly nine years.

Amy was a kind and loving woman, who was very involved in her community. She was a member of Faith Lutheran Church in Warner Robins, where she was active as a pianist for the Praise Band and also served as their organist. Amy was an avid traveler—organizing and chaperoning annual trips to Spain and

France with her Stratford students. The itinerary for those trips always included lots of learning and lots of fun.

Mr. Speaker, the state of Florida, the Stetson graduating Class of 1984, and the community of Warner Robins will miss Amelia Mary Halle Hinckley and the wonderful contributions she made to everyone she touched.

TRIBUTE TO BILL WILLIAMS

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 2, 2000

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, at the end of this calendar year, another remarkable chapter in the history of East Tennessee will come to an end. Mr. Bill Williams, co-anchor of Channel 10 News (NBC), will soon be retiring.

Mr. Williams is one of East Tennessee's most highly respected broadcast journalists. Seen every weeknight on WBIR–TV's top rated newscast, Bill is recognized for his superb handling of the daily news and for his compassion in dealing with human issues. He is best known for ''Monday's Child,'' an adoption program originated by Bill back in 1980 and broadcast weekly on Action 10 News. More than 570 of the special needs children introduced on the program have found permanent homes and loving families.

Since joining the WBIR news team in 1977, Bill has been recognized frequently for his contributions to broadcast journalism. Included among his many other honors are the Brotherhood/Sisterhood Award presented by the National Conference of Christians and Jews and induction into the ''Silver Circle'' by the National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences.

In May of this year Bill was awarded an honorary Doctor of Divinity degree from Carson Newman College, and ''Child Help U–S–A'' honored Bill with that organization's annual ''Angel Award,'' in recognition of his tireless efforts on behalf of area children.

After 23 years on the 6:00 p.m. and 11:00 p.m. desk, Bill is now easing into retirement and will be leaving in December. However, Bill plans to remain a part of WBIR for a long time, especially continuing his hosting of Monday's Child, the Children's Hospital Telethon and Mission of Hope.

Mr. Speaker, I know that I join with the citizens of the City of Knoxville in congratulating Bill Williams for his service and devotion to the people of East Tennessee. I wish him well in the years to come. I ask my fellow colleagues and other readers of the RECORD to join me in thanking Bill Williams for his many years of service and contributions to East Tennessee. Our Nation is certainly a better place because of people like Bill Williams and his family.

TRIBUTE TO BILL BARRETT OF NEBRASKA

SPEECH OF

HON. DAVID MINGE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 31, 2000

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to add my comments to the many voices honoring BILL BARRETT, the honorable gentleman from Nebraska, who is retiring from a long career of public service at the end of this Congress.

Congressman BILL BARRETT has been a valuable and influential voice in agriculture. He has served his constituents well, and has been an able leader in the House of Representatives. Congressman BARRETT came to the House with a background in community service in local government, a member of the Nebraska Unicameral Legislature, and with business experience in a 3-generation firm specializing in insurance and real estate. This foundation of government and business has served him well in his ten years in the House of Representatives. During his years of service he has gained the respect and admiration of members on both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, I have served with Congressman BARRETT on the Agriculture Committee and have come to appreciate his leadership as Vice-Chairman as well as his role as Chairman of the General Farm Commodities, Resource Conservation and Credit Subcommittee. His close and frequent contact with his constituents, combined with his seniority has made him an effective leader in Congress. As we have faced difficult decisions he has always worked hard on behalf of his constituents, and with respect for his fellow Members. I share his concern for balancing the federal budget and for wise and disciplined use of taxpayers money.

As Chairman of the General Farm Commodities Subcommittee, he has extended his courtesy to me as we brought an oversight field hearing in Minnesota, lending his influence to issues of conservation and preservation of the environment in Minnesota.

I am especially proud to have worked with Congressman BARRETT as we served as two of the four co-chairs of the Alcohol Fuels Caucus. During our work to promote ethanol, I have found Congressman BARRETT to be innovative and enthusiastic in his advocacy on behalf of all corn growers. Through co-authorship of bills supporting the usage of renewable resources in the production of energy, he has helped to provide economic opportunity for agricultural producers, a self-sustaining energy program, and a cleaner environment for the nation.

This legislative body will miss the wise and thoughtful influence of one of its leaders. I will miss a good friend and colleague.

CENTRAL NEW JERSEY RECOGNIZES REV. DAVID H. MCALPIN, JR., FOR HIS SERVICE TO THE COMMUNITY

HON. RUSH D. HOLT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 2, 2000

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I today pay tribute to an individual who, throughout his long and distinguished career has been tireless in his efforts to help the people of central New Jersey and the Nation. This Friday, November 3, Rev. David H. McAlpin, Jr., is being honored as he steps down as president of the Trenton Area Habitat for Humanity. I want to take this moment to thank him and Habitat for Humanity for their long service to the Nation and its needs.

We are all very familiar with the fine work that the Habitat for Humanity does in providing affordable housing and creating safe, self-sustaining communities. Habitat has built over 61,000 houses throughout the world for needy families. Their programs are a classic example of providing opportunities for deserving Americans, through their selling of completed houses with no-interest mortgages to families who complete 500 hours of work hours or ''sweat equity,'' earned through participating in other building projects.

Reverend McAlpin, as president of the Trenton Area Habitat for Humanity, has worked with over 2,000 committed volunteers to provide decent housing for all low-income central New Jersey residents. Since its inception in 1986, Trenton Area Habitat has completed 39 houses in the Trenton and Princeton areas. I join with the people of central New Jersey, and the nation in congratulating him on his fine efforts and the work of Habitat for Humanity. His example shows us all what the American people can be capable of if they all come together to solve the Nation's problems.

Reverend McAlpin is truly a remarkable citizen who sets an example for us all. I urge all my colleagues to join me in recognizing his dedication to our community and the needs of our Nation.

HONORING DONNA MCPHERSON

HON. GARY G. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 2, 2000

Mr. GARY MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor that I honor Ms. Donna McPherson, an operations supervisor, at the Pomona, CA, Social Security Administration Office.

Ms. McPherson has been with the Social Security Administration since 1989. She began her career with the agency at the Ontario, CA office as a claims representative and was later promoted to her current position of operations supervisor in Pomona, CA. She currently facilitates a variety of Social Security Administration outreach forums and ensures that the work of those under her supervision is completed in a timely and accurate manner. Additionally, she is the direct liaison for congressional inquires.

The outstanding work of Ms. McPherson has been recognized by many. She has received the annual Special Act Award numerous times. This award is given to Social Security Administration employees who excel at their duties above and beyond what is required, or accomplish something unique on the job. Ms. McPherson has done both, and as a result, she received this award in 1991, 1993, 1997, and 1999. In addition, she has also received the Performance Award which recognizes a continual commitment to the job and outstanding performance in all areas of the workplace, and the On the Spot Award for her problem-solving skills.

When she is not excelling in her responsibilities at the Social Security Administration, she enjoys spending time with her family and friends, attending to the numerous cats and dogs under her care, and playing Bunko. Ms. McPherson is also active with her church and devotes much of her time to the women's prayer group.

Ms. McPherson's coworkers describe her as hard-working, reliable, dedicated, and most importantly, as a person who goes the extra mile for Social Security clients. Indeed, I have found her to be an invaluable resource. Ms. McPherson takes special consideration to ensure that her correspondence with my office is prompt and frequent, an attribute which serves to greatly assist me in responding to my constituents in an efficient manner. Her knowledge of Social Security policy is immense, and her ability to translate complex, directives into an easy to understand language is remarkable. She often invests personal time and concern in order to ensure each constituent's satisfaction.

Ms. Donna McPherson makes government work by cutting through the redtape of bureaucracy one person at a time. Mr. Speaker, I ask that this 106th Congress join me in thanking Ms. McPherson for her dedication and commitment, praising her for a consistent record of hard work, and recognizing her as an asset to the Social Security Administration and the constituents of California's 41st Congressional District.

IN RCOGNITION OF THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF HEIDELBERG COLLEGE, TIFFIN, OH

HON. PAUL E. GILLMOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 2, 2000

Mr. GILLMOR. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I today express a special tribute and congratulations to Heidelberg College on the anniversary of its founding. This November 11th marks 150 years since the college first opened its doors in Tiffin, Ohio. These 150 years have marked 15 decades of service to its students and the community.

Founded by members of the German Reformed Church in 1850, Heidelberg College began humbly, on the third floor of a building in the business district in Tiffin. Since then, it has grown both in size and number far beyond what its founders could ever have dreamed.

Currently, the college is located on a 110-acre campus in northwestern Ohio. Heidelberg offers 36 courses of study in 19 different fields of concentration, both for undergraduates and graduate students. As a church-based liberal arts college, an area of particular emphasis for Heidelberg is the integration of faith into academic and professional life. Heidelberg students, and the communities into which they enter after graduation, benefit greatly from this faith-based approach.

While the college is located in Ohio, it truly has a global view. As part of their undergraduate experience at Heidelberg, many students take advantage of a variety of domestic and foreign off-campus study programs, these include opportunities to study for a semester at American University here in Washington, DC, a year at Heidelberg University in Germany, or to take classes at its Japan Campus in Sapporo, Japan.

As a mark of its dedication to the community, Heidelberg College does not just cater to the traditional student, but is also pioneering lifelong learning opportunities for the nontraditional student. Whether through its Weekend College program on its main campus or at its Maumee Branch extension, Heidelberg offers a variety of ways for these adult learners to earn bachelor's degrees.

Another way that Heidelberg College serve the community is through its Water Quality Laboratory. With its state of the art equipment, the laboratory undertakes research directed at understanding the long-term effects of agricultural chemicals and runoff, especially in Lake Erie. The work is critical in analyzing the dangers that these chemicals may pose to humans and ecosystems in the Ohio and Great Lakes area.

Mr. Speaker, the foremost way an institution such as Heidelberg serves the community however, is through its graduates. In 150 years, Heidelberg graduates have offered the highest level of commitment to their communities, and especially Ohio. Whether they are businessmen, scientists, or artists, Heidelberg alumni have been true to the college's goal of graduating ''whole persons who can act effectively with human values in a world of continuing change.'' I hope that my colleagues will join me in congratulating the college on its history of service to Ohio, the Nation and the world throughout the past 150 years. Additionally, we wish the Heidelberg community the best in the future.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JIM DeMINT

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 2, 2000

Mr. DEMINT. Mr. Speaker, due to air traffic congestion, I was unavoidably detained in my district last night. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yes'' on both Roll Call Votes 584 and 585.

TRIBUTE TO SUSAN E. POOLE ON HER RETIREMENT FROM THE CALIFORNIA INSTITUTION FOR WOMEN

HON. JOE BACA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 2, 2000

Mr. BACA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize Susan E. Poole, who is retiring from state service after more than 28 years, most recently as Warden of the California Institution for Women. I would like to acknowledge Susan's dedication, extensive education and accomplishments. It is truly a pleasure to salute her service to the people of the State of California.

A list of positions Susan has held over the years demonstrates her long and distinguished tenure of service: Warden of the California Institution for Women; Assistant Deputy Director of Institutions Division; Correctional Administration Program Administrator; Assistant Transition Coordinator; Correctional Counselor III; Staff Services Manager; Associate Personnel Analyst; Administrative Assistant II; Staff Services Analyst; Correctional Counselor; Correctional Sergeant; Correctional Program Supervisor; Correctional Officer; Teaching Assistant.

Susan has received a distinguished list of awards for her exemplary performance, including Outstanding Young Woman of America for 1983; Leadership Award—Brotherhood Crusade—1998; James E. Stratten Award—Association of Black Correctional Workers 1991 and 2000—for Outstanding Community Service and Dedication to Excellence; Resolution #1322—Honorable Ruben Ayala for Career and Civic Achievements as Warden at CIW for more than a decade, 1998; California's Warden of the Year Nominee for the North American Association for Wardens and Superintendents—1998; Certificate of Recognition—Honorable Larry Walker, County Supervisor, 4th District—1998; and Certificate of Recognition—Honorable Fred Aguiar, 61st Assembly District.

Susan has an unflinching commitment to public service, as demonstrated by the large number of organizations to which she has given her time and talent: American Correctional Association; Association of Black Correctional Workers; Correctional Peace Officers Foundation; Criminal Justice Advisory Council, California State University, San Bernardino; National Association of Blacks in Criminal Justice; Lamda Kappa Mu Sorority; Member, Board of Directors, Mt. Baldy United Way; Member 3rd Vice Chair, Board of Directors McKinnley Children's Center, Member/3rd Vice Chair, Board of Directors McKinnley Children's Center; Member/Vice Chair Opportunities Unlimited; Member, Association of Women Executives in Corrections.

In addition, Susan has compiled an impressive list of work-related activities during her notable career, including Consulting to CDC Labor Relations Board; Member of Oral Interview Panel—Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department; Guest Lecturer at UCLA, USC, UCR, and Riverside City College; EEO Counselor, CDC, Consultant to National Institute of Corrections (NIC); Consultant to National Institute of Justice (NIJ); Former Chairperson CDC Training Advisory Committee (DTAC)(5 years); Former Member CDC Executive Women's Advisory Committee (EWAC)(3 years); Member, United Way Resource Allocation Committee (Mt. Baldy Region).

I know we all wish Susan joy and success in this new adventure in her life. I wish Susan my good prayers and best wishes, with the hope for a long, productive, and enjoyable retirement. The people of the State of California thank you for your service!

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ALLEN BOYD

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 2, 2000

Mr. BOYD. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall Nos. 589, 590, and 591 I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea'' on rollcall votes 589, 590, and 591.

IN HONOR OF THE CHILDREN'S ASSESSMENT CENTER

HON. KEN BENTSEN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 2, 2000

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate the Children's Assessment Center located in Houston, Texas as it begins its tenth year of service to Harris County's children.

The Children's Assessment Center (CAC) was founded in 1991 to address the unique needs of sexually abused children in Harris County. Since the Center first opened, it has served more than 38,000 children by fulfilling its mission to protect children by providing a professional, compassionate and coordinated approach to the treatment of sexually abused children. The CAC also helps to advocate on behalf of these children through the court system. I believe that the ''one-stop'' shopping provided at the CAC is the right approach to ensure that these children receive services in one convenient, nurturing environment. Sexual abuse is one of the most heinous crimes and we must work together to protect these children.

The CAC is a collaborative effort between the Harris County Commissioners' Court and the Children's Assessment Center Foundation. The CAC's $10.5 million state-of-the-art facility, located in my district, was specially designed to provide an environment that will meet each child's needs for warmth, support, and protection. The CAC is also a member of the National Children's Alliance and the largest of its kind in the nation. The Center houses professionals from fifteen partner agencies, including law enforcement, the University of Texas Health Science Center Medical School, psychological/psychiatric professionals and students, and governmental investigative entities which work cooperatively to protect children and investigate sexual abuse. This team approach is critically important to successfully helping these children to recover from sexual abuse.

Earlier this year, the CAC was awarded the Legacy Award for Excellence and Innovation by the National Association of Counties at a ceremony held at the U.S. Capitol. This Legacy Award for Excellence was presented to the CAC because it had shown itself to be the program that most fully embraced the spirit of volunteerism and has set itself apart from all others across the nation with its distinct and unparalleled services. Each year, the CAC works with more than 150 volunteers who assist in protecting and improving the lives of sexually abused children in Harris County. None of these accomplishments would have been possible without the leadership of Ellen Cokinos, the Executive Director of the CAC. Ellen has worked tirelessly on behalf of these children and we should all thank her for her leadership in helping these children to heal.

I want to commend the Children's Assessment Center, its staff, Board members and volunteers for their leadership in helping sexually abused children and applaud their efforts to raise awareness about the special needs of sexually abused children.

CENTRAL NEW JERSEY WELCOMES KURT LANDGRAF—PRESIDENT OF THE EDUCATION TESTING SERVICE

HON. RUSH D. HOLT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 2, 2000

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, today I recognize Kurt Landgraf. Recently, Mr. Landgraf, former chairman and CEO of DuPont Pharmaceuticals, took over as president and CEO of the Education Testing Service in Princeton, NJ. ETS develops and annually administers over 11 million tests worldwide on behalf of clients in education, government, and business.

Mr. Landgraf served as associate marketing director of ETS from 1970 to 1974. Following that he held various marketing and financial management positions with Upjohn Co. In 1980, Mr. Landgraf joined E.I. DuPont de Nemours & Co., where he worked within the pharmaceuticals division.

In 1993, Mr. Landgraf was appointed president and CEO of DuPont Merck Pharmaceutical Co. At the same time, the Harvard Business Review Case Study highlighted Mr. Landgraf's efforts to create a highly diverse and inclusive organization.

In 1996, Mr. Landgraf was appointed chief financial officer of E.I. DuPont de Nemours & Co. Later, he would be appointed executive vice president and chief operating officer and chairman of DuPont Europe.

Kurt brings solid leadership, combined with the global business experience, understanding of education issues and strong support of ETS' mission to the position. Mr. Landgraf excelled as a senior executive of a successful company and has a solid track record in identifying and developing talent, a perfect complement to ETS' mission.

Once again, I welcome Kurt Landgraf to ETS and ask all my colleagues to join me in recognizing his achievements.

HONORING SUSAN POOLE

HON. GARY G. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 2, 2000

Mr. GARY MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, today I honor Ms. Susan Poole, Warden of the California Institution for Women, as she retires after 28 years of outstanding service.

Ms. Poole began her career with the State Department of Corrections in 1972. She has served as a Correctional Counselor III, Assistant Transition Coordinator, Program Administrator, Correctional Administrator, Assistant Deputy Director, and Warden. In each of these positions, Ms. Poole has succeeded above and beyond the call of duty.

As Warden of the California Institution for Women, Ms. Poole has been responsible for the administration and direction of all department policies. She has focused her attention on improving the internal management of the department as well as its reputation with community organizations. As a result of her leadership, the department was able to set high standards and develop clear goals and strategies which contribute to the mission of California Institution for Women.

While striving to meet the high goals of the Institution, Ms. Poole also set high personal goals. After receiving a BA from the University of Redlands, Ms. Poole continued her education through career training and educational programs. She has taken courses in management, women's studies, and prison security.

Ms. Poole's hard work and expertise has been recognized by many. In 1983, she was awarded the ''Outstanding Young Women of America'' Award. She is also the recipient of the Leadership Award—Brotherhood Crusade, the James E. Stratten Award for Outstanding Community Service and Dedication to Excellence, and numerous accolades from local government officials. In 1998, she was nominated as California's Warden of the Year, by the North American Association for Wardens and Superintendents.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that this 106th Congress join me in recognizing the contributions Ms. Susan Poole has made to the California Corrections Community over her 28 years of dedicated service.

RECOGNITION OF THE LEARN SHOP, INC.

HON. CONSTANCE A. MORELLA

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 2, 2000

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pride that I recognize the achievements of Learn Shop, Inc., a Montgomery County based United Way organization that is dedicated to improving economically disadvantaged school communities throughout the Baltimore-Washington Metropolitan area. Entering its second year, their ''Drive for Supplies'' program has made significant advances towards reducing poverty in school communities by aiding underprivileged students, schools, and communities. This creative recycling program, in conjunction with Montgomery County Public Schools, encourages students at the end of the school year to donate their used but usable school supplies to impoverished students in disadvantaged school communities.

The ''Drive for Supplies'' program has already had significant success in its first year. At the end of last school year, with the full support of Montgomery County Public School Superintendent Dr. Jerry Weast, the program collected $75,000 in school supplies. Learn Shop Inc. is helping students realize that what was previously regarded as trash can be turned into usable school supplies, clothing, and computers. These items not only help disadvantaged students in other school communities but it also gives students a sense that they are filling a need in the world.

Along with promoting community action, the ''Drive for Supplies'' saves schools money each year by reducing disposal costs while also reducing waste in our community. For their innovation, ''Drive for Supplies'' has enjoyed a glowing recognition from the Environmental Protection Agency.

Children and communities positively affected by the ''Drive for Supplies'' program have been more than grateful for Learn Shop Inc.'s efforts. Not only has Learn Shop Inc. distributed school supplies to local area children,

they have also donated supplies to refugee students affected by the war in the Balkans in Kosvo. The ''Drive for Supplies'' program truly has the ability to reach thousands of students across the world.

Beginning with Maryland and the Mid-Atlantic Region, Learn Shop hopes to expand the program around the nation, in hopes of reducing poverty nationally and helping children in need. I applaud the efforts of Learn Shop and encourage them to continue all the work that is greatly needed in our communities.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. SHEILA JACKSON-LEE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 2, 2000

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to inform the House about my leave of absence from March 21 through March 24 of this year. I was out of the country on official business. Accordingly, I was unable to cast any votes.

If present, I would have voted ''no'' on rollcall vote No. 75, H. Con. Res. 290, the Budget Resolution for FY 2001.

''Yes'' on rollcall vote No. 74, on agreeing to the Spratt amendment to H. Con. Res. 290.

''No'' on rollcall vote No. 73, on agreeing to the Sununu amendment to H. Con. Res. 290.

''Yes'' on rollcall vote No. 72, on agreeing to the Stenholm amendment to H. Con. Res. 290.

''Yes'' on rollcall vote No. 71, on agreeing to the DeFazio amendment to H. Con. Res. 290.

''Yes'' on rollcall vote No. 70, on agreeing to the Owens amendment to H. Con. Res. 290.

''No'' on rollcall vote No. 69, on a motion that the Committee rise to H. Con. Res. 290.

''No'' on rollcall vote No. 68, providing for consideration of H. Con. Res. 290, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for FY 2001.

''No'' on rollcall vote No. 67, providing for consideration of H. Con. Res. 290, establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for FY 2001.

''Yes'' on rollcall vote No. 66, on approving the Journal.

''Yes'' on rollcall vote No. 65, on passage of H.R. 3822, the Oil Price Reduction Act of 2000.

''No'' on rollcall vote No. 64, providing for consideration of H.R. 3822, the Oil Price Reduction Act of 2000.

''No'' on rollcall vote No. 63, on passage to S. 1287, the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 2000.

''Yes'' on rollcall vote No. 62, to commit with instructions S. 1287, the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 2000.

''No'' on rollcall vote No. 61, whether the House will consider S. 1287, the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 2000.

''No'' on rollcall vote No. 60, providing for consideration of S. 1287, the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 2000 (H. Res. 444).

''No'' on rollcall vote No. 59, providing for consideration of S. 1287, the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act (H. Res. 444).

''Yes'' on rollcall vote No. 58, on approving the Journal.

''Yes'' on rollcall vote No. 57, expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that the National Park Service should take full advantage of support services offered by the Department of Defense (H. Res. 182).

TRIBUTE TO DYLAN GEORGE MOHAN

HON. JAMES M. TALENT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 2, 2000

Mr. TALENT. Mr. Speaker, today I honor the May 16, 2000, birth of Dylan George Mohan. Dylan was born at Sibley Memorial Hospital in Washington, DC, at 8:56 p.m. He is the son of Kristin Young and Matthew Mohan. Dylan is the first grandson of his grandparent George and Phyllis Young and grandparents Jim and Mary Mohan.

Mr. Speaker, I ask you to join me in congratulating this new family and to wish Dylan much joy and happiness in the years to come.

HONORING REV. CURTIS COFIELD II, ON THE OCCASION OF HIS RETIREMENT

HON. ROSA L. DeLAURO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 2, 2000

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to join the Immanuel Baptist Church and the New Haven community in paying tribute to my dear friend and an outstanding member of the New Haven, CT, community—Rev. Curtis Cofield. As a pastor and community leader, Reverend Cofield has dedicated his life to making a real difference in the lives of the residents of Greater New Haven.

The clergy has always played a vital role in our community and Reverend Cofield is a sterling example. His commitment to the service of our community through religious leadership is admired by many and rivaled by few. His involvement, not only with the congregation of the Immanuel Baptist Church, but with the entire community, has had a tremendous impact on many lives, especially those who face arduous struggles and frustrating situations in their daily lives. Working with his wife Elsie and the AIDS Interfaith Network, Reverend Cofield has helped hundreds of individuals and their families cope with the devastating effects caused by this terrible illness. For years, he has ministered to the spiritual needs of countless people in the New Haven community—strengthening the bonds of faith and helping to build stronger neighborhoods of which we can all be proud.

Throughout his decades of service to the New Haven community, Reverend Cofield has been a leading advocate for some of our country's most vulnerable citizens. He has served as a strong voice for their best interests. As a member of over 30 service and religious organizations throughout his career, he has demonstrated a remarkable commitment to ensuring that his actions and participation enriched his community. I have always held a deep admiration for community service and those who provide it. With his extraordinary record of service, Reverend Cofield serves as an example to all that one person really can make a difference.

As the first African-American chairman of the Connecticut State Freedom of Information Commission, organizing founder of the Dwight Neighborhood Corporation, and as a pastor at Immanuel Baptist Church, Reverend Cofield has enriched the lives of residents in New Haven and across the State of Connecticut. His dedication has been recognized locally, nationally, and internationally. The myriad awards and honors that adorn his walls are testimony to his unparalleled commitment and dedication.

It is with great pride that I stand today to join Elsie, his children, family, friends, and the entire New Haven community to extend my deepest thanks and appreciation to Reverend Curtis Cofield for all of the good work he has done. As a pastor, community leader, and friend, he has touched the lives of thousands and leaves a legacy of dedication and inspiration second to none.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LOIS CAPPS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 2, 2000

Ms. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to express my support for H.J. Res. 123. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye.''

Mr. Speaker, I stayed in Washington until the last possible moment, hoping that Congress could finish the business of the people of the Central Coast and all Americans. There are critical unresolved issues still on the table—including school modernization, common-sense tax relief, and adequate funding for Medicare.

I am deeply dismayed that the Congressional leadership has decided to push these issues off to a lame duck session. The American people deserve better.

LAOTIAN-AMERICANS FROM PROVIDENCE, RHODE ISLAND PARTICIPATION IN U.S. CONGRESSIONAL FORUM ON LAOS

SPEECH OF

HON. PATRICK J. KENNEDY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 1, 2000

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker, many of my constituents form Rhode Island recently participated in a U.S. Congressional Forum on Laos held on October 19. Laotian and Hmong leaders from around the United States and the globe gathered to present testimony to policymakers and Members of Congress. They joined in a special ceremony in Congress to honor former Congressman Bruce Vento, who recently passed away, for his leadership role on behalf of the freedom-loving for the people of Laos.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to represent a significant Laotian and Hmong-American population in Rhode Island. I share their deep concern about their relatives and countrymen still in Laos—and the need for human rights and democracy. My uncle, President Kennedy, also believed strongly in freedom for the people of Laos, and committed the United States to that goal. I am honored to continue that

fight in the United States Congress today, and firmly believe that forums like this are an excellent way to work toward that goal. I also appreciate their efforts to honor my colleague, former congressman Bruce Vento, for his work on behalf of freedom and human rights for Laotian people.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Mr. Thongsavanh Phongsavan, of the Lao Representatives Abroad Council, based in Providence, Rhode Island, for his important work in the Laotian community. I am grateful that Laotian students from Rhode Island played a leadership role in the event, including Mr. Thongkhoune Pathana, Ms. Viengsavanh Changhavong, Ms. Sothida Bounthapanya, and Ms. Ammala Douangsavan. Many Hmong-Americans also attended from Providence including Mr. Xay Ge Kue, Mr. Xia Xue Kue, Mr. Toua Kue, and Mr. Nhia Sue Yang. I also want to thank Mr. Philip Smith, Executive Director for the Center for Public Policy Analysis, for helping to convene this important forum. The National Democratic Institute (NDI) and many other important organizations were able to speak and participate with regard to the ongoing need to promote human rights and democracy.

Mr. Speaker, I would commend my colleagues in Congress the following testimony of Mr. Thongsavanh Phongsavan from the Lao Representatives Abroad Council:

Thank you Mr. Philip Smith, Honorable Congressman, Honorable Senator, Your Excellency, and Distinguished Guests:

On behalf of the Laotian Representatives Abroad Council I am deeply encouraged by the promise that this historic U.S. Congressional Forum VI hold for the future. With the wisdom of our Laotian Leaders, this new era of co-operation will inspire peace and prosperity for many generations to follow. This new age will also give rise to opportunities for our peoples unimaginable only a short while ago. In the eyes of industrialized nations, no longer will we be viewed as a group of ethnicities closed and divided, but as a model of the tremendous progress that freedom, democracy and free enterprises can achieve in the Laos.

Now more than ever, we need to work together to secure this vision of hope. At this point there can be no turning back; only the swift and purposeful push towards a more productive future. Indeed, the Twenty-First Century is our oasis in the desert. It is a place where Laotian people and ideas will come together for the betterment of all of Humanity, Respect and justice to all.

Laotian Representatives Abroad Council and Lao Progressive and their emissaries have been hard at work to help bring these new developments into focus. Working not only with the Laotian people, but with peoples of all ethnicities, it has achieved tremendous economic opportunity through the expansion of business development, job opportunity, education, social orientation, and political consultations.

For more than 30 generations, the people of Laos and their leaders have stood proud despite the winds of social burden. The history of our nation runs deep and wide. And from the beginning, its many political, social and economic struggles have been overcome in the name of freedom, democracy and prosperity.

With French colonization late in the last century and the sociopolitical breakdowns that followed, Laos 65 ethnic groups were divided by pressure from within and without—as other, developing nations, aspired to progress. Men, women and children bound by a common vision of hope fought for independence. But isolated by differences of language and culture within their own borders, their collective strength was diminished.

The ensuring years provided few signs of relief. Relations among the struggling classes and the French remained tenuous at best. And despite the growing numbers of young Laotian being educated in French universities by the 1920's higher education was yet restricted to all but Laos' social elite.

Lack of education and poor agriculture imbued further hardships for both the people and the land. The colonist, indifferent to the idea of investing in the masses through improved social opportunity, employed unskilled labor in mining operations; the harsh conditions of which caused many workers to perish. Times grew much worse for the rural and uneducated people. And without a means of unifying their philosophies, de Gaulle and other leaders could place little hope on maintaining Laos' status quo as a French colony.

Lao History in its later chapters is plagued by struggles of even greater intensity. Prolonged war ensued between the Pathet Lao and the Royal government. And this turmoil was further compounded by the fact that government control in Vientiane passed back and forth between General Phoumi Nonsavan's pro-Western alliance, and Laos' Neutralists, which were led by Prince Souvanna Phouma.

The stunning success of the LPF and its allies in winning thirteen of the twenty-one seats contested in the May 4, 1958, elections to the National Assembly changed the political atmosphere in Vientiane. This success had less to do with the LPF's adroitness than with the ineptness of the old-line nationalists, more intent on advancing their personal interests than on meeting the challenge from the LPF. The two largest parties, the Laos Progressive Party and the Independent Party, could not agree on a list of common candidates in spite of repeated prodding by the United States embassy and so split their votes among dozens of candidates. The LPF and the Peace (Santiphab) Party carefully worked out a strategy of mutual support, which succeed in winning nearly two-thirds of the seats with barely one-third of the votes cast. Souphanouvong garnered the most votes and became chairman of the National Assembly. The Laos Progressive Party and the Independent Party tardily merged to become the Rally of the Laos People (Lao Rouam Lao).

In the wake of the election fiasco, Washington concentrated on finding alternatives to Souovanna Phouma's strategy of winning over the Pathet Lao and on building up the Royal Lao Army as the only cohesive nationalist force capable of dealing with the communists' united front tactics. On June 10, 1958, a new political grouping called the Committee for the Defense of the National Interests (CDNI) made its appearance. Formed mainly of a younger generation not tied to the big families and as yet untainted by corruption, it announced a program for revitalizing the economy, forming an anticommunist front that excluded the Pathet Lao, suppressing corruption, and creating a national mystique.

Washington which was paying the entire salary cost of the Royal Lao Army, was enthusiastic about the ''young turks'' of the CDNI. This enthusiasm was not altogether shared by United States ambassador Horace H. Smith, who asked what right a group untested by any election had to set its sights on cabinet appointments. Whereas Souvanna Phouma tried and failed to form a government, creating a drawn-out cabinet crisis, Phoui Sunanikone eventually succeeded and included four CDNI members and Phoumi Nosavan in a subcabinet post.

In 1961, a 14-nation conference held in Geneva sought to defuse the conflict by establishing a neutralist coalition government under Souvanna Phouma. However, the warring factions soon clashed again. And in the increasing chaos that followed, Laos' upheaval would be viewed as merely an appendage to the Vietnam War.

The final coalition government was established in April, 1974. This entity was led by Souvanna Phouma, and included his half-brother, the Pathet Lao Leader Souphanouvong. After south Vietnam's and Cambodia's fall to Communist rule in 1975, the Pathet Lao assumed full control in Laos. In December of that year, Souvanna Phouma's government was terminated and the Royal Monarchy abolished. As many as 30,000 former government and police officials were sent to political reeducation centers. And against this great body of humanity, many serious abuses of human rights were witnessed.

After 1975 an estimated 400,000 refugees, including most of Laos' educated and wealthy elite, fled the country. Laos signed a peace accord with Vietnam in 1977, and a border delineation treaty with that country in 1986. Vietnam then agreed to provide Laos with aid to develop its agriculture, forestry, industries, and transportation facilities; and to allow duty-free access to port facilities in Da Nang. Laos' alliance with Vietnam and the former Soviet bloc was bolstered after Vietnam's invasion of Kampuchea in 1979.

As the Twenty-First Century is at our hand, important changes in the Lao infrastructure are again imminent. Just as the stone age wheel precede the ox cart and wagon, each advancement we make today is an investment toward the future. Among the important changes we must not prepare for is the enactment of socio-economic reforms. Surely with a strong foundation on which to build, the framework for a better tomorrow will be achieved. In terms of Indochina's pending Globalization toward a free-market economy, a serious dialogue must now begin to assume that needed improvements in education, labor, health care and many other social issues will be squarely met.

Both high level and intermediate talks among our leaders and those of the industrialized nations will aid in this transition. Participation in such dialogue will also improve relations with our neighbors; promoting understanding, while forging a new alliance among those who embrace this long awaited opportunity.

The teaching of English as a Second Language is also a vital necessity. This advantage will not only help us fulfill the promise of unifying the people of our region, but aid in the development and expansion of commercial interests throughout the world. To achieve this result without compromising our respective traditions or values, improved teaching in all areas of study shall play a decisive role, with present advancements in education, technology and industry—Televisions, Computers and internet access in the classroom are among the chosen tools for building a better future.

Laos is also blessed with an abundance of undeveloped natural resources. Gold, Oak timber, Raw minerals, Gemstones and Hydroelectric Power are among the most substantial of its treasures. Along with the installment of valid reforms, development in farming, construction and hybrid technologies will easily bring this country's economy over the top within the next five to ten years.

Educators, students and interested members of the business and private sectors may also take an active role in this development. Individually or as part of an established group, they themselves have the power to

initiate political, economic and social reforms through positive involvement in their own land.

Specific ways in which these steps can be followed include:

1. Reading and learning about the history of Southeast Asia and it's struggles.
2. Becoming involved through further sociopolitical study and debate.
3. Acquiring specific knowledge and technology in fields relation to agriculture, medicine, electronics and engineering.
4. To aid in this transition by lending your direct support to our nation and its people.

Writing or speaking with U.S. Congressmen, Senators and even the President will also help to set the wheels of progress into motion. Promoting the involvement of other nations and leaders will add credibility and support to these efforts, while establishing a dialog of wise words and encouragement that will achieve enormous benefits for this worldly cause.

Improved teaching is but one avenue to be fully explored and attended. Equally important considerations are met as we reach each new crossroad in the quest for a greater unity. Improved agriculture, communications private ownership and the recognition of minorities are just some of the prevailing elements of an economically stable system. In the context of greater struggles, political reforms and the redefinition of Civil freedoms will promote a wider approval of this cause.

Today we stand united, as the dawning of a new and enlightened age has arrived. Only with our combined efforts could such a proud and prosperous moment come to bear. And with the health and well-being of our children in our hands, together we will strive to uphold the values that will lead our people into a brighter future.

The establishment of universal reform leading to free, multi-political party elections will provide our cultures the competitive edge that is needed. This adoption of democratic systems will give our leaders not only a confident voice, but allow a greater sense of identity for our people to embrace.

Last but most important is the question of our youth. As our children come of age in the prosperous civilization that is our future, what will be the quality of their existence? With overpopulation, pollution and the twin civilians of hunger and disease. The conservation of forests, wildlife, clean air and water must not take second place to our more immediate desires—for once these diminishing resources are gone, there will be no means of replenishing them. This threatens the very core of our existence on this fragile planet, as without adequate methods to assure the protection of our natural environment, we may one day be without the life sustaining elements that we so humbly share.

The next few years 2002 will provide the test from which these hopes will be won or defeated, without the cooperation and commitment of great nations and leaders, this enormous challenge will most certainly be lost. To seize this opportunity and achieve and effective head start as the dawning of this millennium year. We must now join hands with a single vision—and with the welfare of our children in our hearts. The blueprint for a better tomorrow is already in our hands. Our social, Economic and Political stuggles are being squarely met. And now, with the help of our dedicated supporters, our plea for Peace, Democracy and Freedom in finally being heard.

The ultimate realization of these goals will require the continued support of everyone who shares this vision of social and economic prosperity. It will require the active participation of people of different ideas and ideologies to bring about such Freedom and Change. Achieving these solutions may not always be easy, but the alternatives are far less forgiving. The imprisonment, torture and eventual execution of H.R.H., King Sisavang Vathana, is but one lasting reminder of this tragic legacy.

The drive toward social reconstruction is our greatest challenge. The coming age will be the turning point from which our success or failure will be determined. In building this bridge in the 21st Century, we must be willing to follow but one voice. We must be able to look to one person who will lead us on this course, and who will speak for all who have succeeded in conquering odds that had once seemed insurmountable.

Working as a team, we will succeed together the needed resources to make this bold vision a reality. To achieve this cooperation, better means of communication among our leaders, allies and supporters must now be sought and clear.

Developing these vital links will be the first step in building a greater unity. For once a true sense of solidarity is established with our neighbors throughout this land, more ambitious roles for the Loatian people and their neighbors will begin to take shape. However, without bold intervention by the end of this year, the future of Laos as an independent nation is far less certain. With conflicting ideologies on both sides of its borders, and with its young and old griped by the differences of age, language and culture, the Leadership's reluctance to join hands and resist oppression now threatens this best chance for Democracy and Freedom of our people.

Indeed, the key to a free and Democractic Laos may be found in the partnership of citizens young and old. While traditions live long and new ideaologies are often favored over those of the past, people on both sides of the issue must come to the bargaining tables for the sake of their national sovereignty. Accomplishing this may not be an easy task, but prevailing over any struggle has never been simple. The best solution to this multi-sided issue lies with willingess of each division to set aside it differences, and to consider this new and determined plan. Laotian Representatives Abroad Council and The Lao Progessive Party will play an active role in these joint endeavors. Together, with the strong and powerful will of both our friends and former adversaries, Southeast Asia's mission to achieve free and lasting reforms will be down in history as the greatest success of the 21st Century.

The establishment of new opportunity through peaceful diplomacy will be the rising sun of our future. Working in partnership toward this common vision, we are certain that a greater understanding can and will be achieved. The point that one must realize is that these changes will not be made for the benefit of the elite few, but for the common good of our future generations.

Improved education, health and employment are all central to these efforts. So too is the introduction of multi-party elections, a unifying language and free trade. A truly free society is one based on a prosperous economy and enterprise. Our wish is to create opportunity from which our nation, her neighbors and all hard working people will universally benefit. Laotian Represetnatives Abroad Council and The Lao Progressive Party had demonstrated that this model of socioeconomic reform is an attainable goal. Through it's efforts here in America, it has worked to foster Humanity and Progress; sparing many of thousands from great hardship through the promotion of these principals.

Your challenge, should you choose to accept it, will be to use your wisdom and experience in finding ways to develop peaceful cooperation around Asia and the World, whether you are a representative of Laos or a sensible neighbor, we must now joint hands or accept the failures of our action. We must also educate our young to the old and new systems before their sense of national identity is lost. The adoption of these fundamental principals during this time of reconciliation will not only assure your country's acceptance into the United Nations, but awaken the free world to southeast Asia's immense capability and strength.

Thank you very much for allowing me this opportunity to speak with you today. I wish to express my deepest gratitude for your show of faith. It is with great confidence in you, my friends that I accept this great challenge and reaffirm my delegation's commitment of support.

TURKEY AND POSSIBLE MILITARY EQUIPMENT SALES

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 2, 2000

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the United States has a longstanding dynamic relationship with our NATO ally, the Republic of Turkey, and I believe that the strength of that relationship relies on forthright candor. I have willingly recognized positive developments in Turkey, and I have sought to present fairly the various human rights concerns as they have arisen. Today, I must bring to my colleagues' attention pending actions involving the Government of Turkey which seem incongruous with the record in violation of human rights. I fear the planned sale of additional military aircraft to Turkey could potentially have further long-term, negative effects on human rights in that country.

As Chairman of the Helsinki Commission, I presided over a hearing in March of 1999 that addressed many human rights concerns. The State Department had just released its Country Reports on Human Rights Practices covering 1998. Commissioner and Assistant Secretary of State for Democracy, Human Rights and Labor Harold Hongju Koh noted in testimony before the Commission that ''serious human rights abuses continued in Turkey in 1998, but we had hoped that the 1998 report would reflect significant progress on Turkey's human rights record. Prime Minister Yilmaz had publicly committed himself to making the protection of human rights his government's highest priority in 1998. We had welcomed those assurances and respected the sincerity of his intentions. We were disappointed that Turkey had not fully translated those assurances into actions.''

I noted in my opening statement, ''One year after a commission delegation visited Turkey, our conclusion is that there has been no demonstrable improvement in Ankara's human rights practices and that the prospects for much needed systemic reforms are bleak given the unstable political scene which is likely to continue throughout 1999.''

Thankfully, eighteen months later I can say that the picture has improved—somewhat.

A little over a year ago the president of Turkey's highest court made an extraordinary speech asserting that Turkish citizens should be granted the right to speak freely, urging

that the legal system and constitution be ''cleansed,'' and that existing ''limits on language'' seriously compromised the freedom of expression. The man who gave that speech, His Excellency Ahmet Necdet Sezer, is the new President of the Republic of Turkey. Last summer several of us on the Commission congratulated President Sezer on his accession to the presidency, saying, in part:

We look forward to working with you and members of your administration, especially as you endeavor to fulfill your commitments to the principles of the Helsinki Final Act and commitments contained in other Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) documents. These human rights fundamentals are the bedrock upon which European human rights rest, the solid foundation upon which Europe's human rights structures are built. It is worth remembering, twenty-five years after the signing of the Final Act, that your predecessor, President Demerel, signed the commitments at Helsinki on behalf of Turkey. Your country's engagement in the Helsinki process was highlighted during last year's OSCE summit in Istanbul, a meeting which emphasized the importance of freedom of expression, the role of NGOs in civil society, and the eradication of torture.

Your Presidency comes at a very critical time in modern Turkey's history. Adoption and implementation of the reforms you have advocated would certainly strengthen the ties between our countries and facilitate fuller integration of Turkey into Europe. Full respect for the rights of Turkey's significant Kurdish population would go a long way in reducing tensions that have festered for more than a decade, and resulted in the lengthy conflict in the southeast.

Your proposals to consolidate and strengthen democracy, human rights and the rule of law in Turkey will be instrumental in ushering in a new era of peace and prosperity in the Republic. The Helsinki Final Act and other OSCE documents can serve as important guides in your endeavor.

We all recall the pending $4 billion sale of advanced attack helicopters to the Turkish army. I have objected to this sale as leading human rights organizations, Turkish and western press, and even the State Department documented the use of such helicopters to attack Kurdish villages in Turkey and to transport troops to regions where civilians were killed. Despite repeated promises, the Turkish Government has been slow to take action which would hold accountable and punish those who have committed such atrocities.

And we recently learned of the pending sale of eight even larger helicopters, S–80E heavy lift helicopters for Turkey's Land Forces Command. With a flight radius of over three hundred miles and the ability to carry over fifty armed troops, the S–80E has the potential to greatly expand the ability of Turkey's army to undertake actions such as I just recounted.

Since 1998, there has been recognition in high-level U.S.-Turkish exchanges that Turkey has a number of longstanding issues which must be addressed with demonstrable progress: decriminalization of freedom of expression; the release of imprisoned parliamentarians and journalists; prosecution of police officers who commit torture; an end of harassment of human rights defenders and re-opening of non-governmental organizations; the return of internally displaced people to their villages; cessation of harassment and banning of certain political parties; and, an end to the state of emergency in the southeast. Is the administration prepared to suggest that Turkey has adhered to these human rights objectives?

The human rights picture in Turkey has improved somewhat in the last several years, yet journalists continue to be arrested and jailed, human rights organizations continue to feel pressure from the police, and elected officials who are affiliated with certain political parties, in particular, continue to be harassed.

Anywhere from half a million to 2 million Kurds have been displaced by the Turkish counter insurgency campaigns against the Kurdistan Workers Party, also known as the PKK. The Turkish military has reportedly emptied more than three thousand villages and hamlets in the southeast since 1992, burned homes and fields, and committed other human rights abuses against Kurdish civilians, often using types of helicopters similar to those the Administration is seeking to transfer. Despite repeated promises, the Government of Turkey has taken few steps to facilitate the return of these peoples to their homes, assist them to resettle, or compensate them for the loss of their property. Nor does it allow others to help. Even the ICRC has been unable to operate in Turkey. And, finally, four parliamentarians—Leyla Zana, Hatip Dicle, Orhan Dogan, and Selim Sadak—continue to serve time in prison. We can not proceed with this sale, or other sales or transfers, when Turkey's Government fails to live up to the most basic expectations mentioned above.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is also time that the United States establishes an understanding with Turkey and a credible method of consistent monitoring and reporting on the end-use of U.S. weapons, aircraft and service. An August 2000 report from the General Accounting Office (GAO) entitled ''Foreign Military Sales: Changes Needed to Correct Weaknesses in End-Use Monitoring Program'' was a cause for concern on my part regarding the effectiveness of current end-use monitoring and reporting efforts. While we had been assured that end-use monitoring was taking place and that the United States was holding recipient governments accountable to the export license criteria, the GAO report reveals the failure of the Executive Branch to effectively implement monitoring requirements enacted by Congress. For example, the report points out on page 12:

While field personnel may be aware of adverse conditions in their countries, the Defense Security Cooperation Agency has not established guidance or procedures for field personnel to use in determining when such conditions require an end-use check. For example, significant upheaval occurred in both Indonesia and Pakistan within the last several years. As a result, the State Department determined that both countries are no longer eligible to purchase U.S. defense articles and services. However, end-use checks of U.S. defense items already provided were not performed in either country in response to the standard. DSCA officials believed that the State Department was responsible for notifying field personnel that the criteria had been met for an end-use check to be conducted. However, DSCA and State have never established a procedure for providing notification to field personnel.

Currently, the end-use monitoring training that DSCA provides to field personnel consists of a 30-minute presentation during the security assistance management course at the Defense Institute of Security Assistance Management. This training is intended to familiarize students with en-use monitoring requirements. However, this training does not provide any guidance or procedures on how to execute an end-use monitoring program at overseas posts or when to initiate end-use checks in response to one of the five standards.

In the past there have been largely ad hoc attempts to report on the end-use of U.S. equipment. Therefore, I was pleased to support the passage of H.R. 4919, the Security Assistant Act of 2000 that was signed by the President on October 6. Section 703 of this Act mandates that no later than 180 days after its enactment, the President shall prepare and transmit to Congress a report summarizing the status of efforts by the Defense Security Cooperation Agency to implement the End-Use Monitoring Enhancement Plan relating to government-to-government transfers of defense articles, services, and related technologies. I want to commend House International Relations Committee Chairman BEN GILMAN for his efforts in trying to make our end-use monitoring and reporting programs effective and accurate. I look forward to working with him and others to ensure that an effective and credible monitoring program is put in place without further delay.

We must be consistent in our defense of human rights, and our relations, including our military relations, must reflect that commitment. For this reason, Mr. Speaker, I am not prepared to support the sale of additional weaponry and aircraft to Turkey at this time.

TRIBUTE TO BILL BARRETT OF NEBRASKA

SPEECH OF

HON. WILLIAM L. JENKINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 31, 2000

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in honoring the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska, the Honorable BILL BARRETT.

In addition to being a successful businessman, BILL has been a dedicated public servant, serving his country in the U.S. Navy, serving in many local and State capacities, representing Nebraska in the State legislature as speaker, and serving as a hard-working, conscientious Member of this institution since 1991. He has worked tirelessly for his constituents in one of the largest and most rural congressional districts in the country.

During this time he has been an effective advocate for issues of importance to the Nation with his work on the House Committee on Agriculture and Education and the Workforce. As a colleague who also represents a district with significant farming interests, he has been of significant help to me through his work as chairman of the House Subcommittee on General Farm Commodities, Resource Conservation, and Credit.

Most importantly, BILL is a man of honor and integrity who is respected by colleagues on both sides of the aisle. He has been a tremendous asset to the House of Representatives, working with Members in a bipartisan fashion. As long as I have known BILL, he has been a humble, tenacious, and effective voice for his constituents. I am honored to have had

the opportunity to work with BILL BARRETT over the past 4 years. He is a good friend and a great Congressman.

Mr. Speaker, over the past 10 years BILL BARRETT has served the people of the Third District of Nebraska and the people of this country with honor and distinction. The House of Representatives will miss his service.

GENETIC ENGINEERING: A TECHNOLOGY AHEAD OF THE SCIENCE AND PUBLIC POLICY?

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 2, 2000

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, Federal regulatory review of biotechnology products is patchy and inadequate. Spread out over three regulatory agencies—the Food and Drug Administration (FDA), the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)—the system is characterized by huge regulatory holes that fail to safeguard human health and environmental protection. Furthermore, independent scientific advice available to the agencies is severely limited.

Despite the fact that GE food may contain new toxins or allergens, the FDA determined in 1992 that GE plants should be treated no differently from traditionally bred plants. Consequently, the FDA condones an inadequate premarket safety testing review and does not require any labeling of GE food products. The FDA has essentially abdicated these responsibilities to the very companies seeking to market and profit from the new GE products. FDA's recent proposed rule for regulating biotechnology will hardly change the present system. Although the proposal requires that companies notify the Agency before marketing new GE products, it still fails to require a comprehensive pre-market safety testing review or mandatory labeling.

The FDA's 1992 decision to treat GE food as ''substantially equivalent'' to conventional food (thereby exempting most GE food on the market from independent premarket safety testing or labeling) is a violation of the public's trust and an evasion of the Agency's duties to ensure a safe food supply. The concept of ''substantial equivalence'' has been challenged in numerous scientific journals. FDA's failure to label GE foods led a 1996 editorial in the New England Journal of Medicine to conclude that ''FDA policy would appear to favor industry over consumer protection.''

EPA's regulation of environmental hazards is equally inadequate. Under the nation's pesticide laws, EPA regulates biological pesticides produced by plants. It does not, however, regulate the plants themselves, leaving that duty to the USDA. Consequently, EPA regulates the B.t. toxin, but not the corn, cotton or potato plants exuding the toxin. EPA has allowed B.t. crops to come to the market without conducting a comprehensive environmental review. Much further research is needed on the impacts of ''pest protected'' crops as outlined by a National Academy of Sciences report. For plants engineered for other traits, such as herbicide tolerance or disease tolerance, EPA does no environmental review at all.

The USDA's Animal Plant and Health Protection Service (APHIS) is charged with evaluating potential environmental impacts of field tests of GE crops. However, having virtually abandoned its original permit system which registered an environmental impact assessment before a field test, the Agency can no longer claim to be doing its job. APHIS has adopted a much less rigorous ''notification'' system which permits researchers to conduct field trials without conducting an environmental risk assessment and without submitting specific environmental impact data.

The National Academy of Sciences (NAS), the premier scientific body in our nation, has recently published a scientific assessment of GE foods. Unfortunately, many of the scientists on the NAS review committee had financial links to the biotech industry. The failure of the NAS to find an unbiased panel is problematic because their mission to supply decision makers and the public with unbiased scientific assessments cannot be achieved. This reduces the lack of independent science for our regulatory agencies to rely upon.

POPULAR DEMAND FOR AN EVOLUTION IN POLICY REGARDING GE FOOD

A strong testament to consumers' desire for labeling and greater safety testing of GE food is the flurry of legislative activity and ballot initiatives that have taken place at the state and local levels. Over the past year, the city councils of Boston, Cleveland and Minneapolis have passed resolutions calling for a moratorium on GE food, and Austin has called for the labeling of all GE food. Boulder, CO has banned GE organisms from 15,000 acres of city-owned farmland. Bills requiring labeling of GE food were introduced in the state legislatures of New York, Minnesota, California and Michigan. The state legislature in Vermont considered legislation that would require farmers to notify the town hall if they were planting genetically engineered seeds. In California, a task force is exploring whether schools should be serving GE food, and in 1999 a petition signed by over 500,000 people demanding labeling was submitted to Congress, President Clinton and several federal agencies including the FDA.

In survey after survey, American consumers have indicated that they believe all GE food should be labeled as such. Consumers have a right to know what is in the food they eat and to make decisions based on that knowledge. While some observe strict dietary restrictions for religious, ethical or health reasons, others simply choose not to be the first time users of these largely untested foods.

The failure to label GE crops and food is short-sighted and could close off key markets for U.S. farm exports. Labeling protections have been established in Europe, Japan, South Korea, Australia and New Zealand. The Cartagena Biosafety Protocol drafted early this year allows nations to refuse imports of GE organisms.

OTHER IMPACTS OF GE FOODS DESERVING ATTENTION

The gene revolution is being led by the agribusiness industry. These are a handful of multinational companies which own much of the world's supplies of seeds, pesticides, fertilizers, food and animal veterinary products. The result of numerous acquisitions and mergers, the agri-business conglomeration has spent millions of dollars on research and development of GE products. Given such heavy investment, it should come as no surprise that its primary goal is to recover its expenses and turn a profit.

It is to profit-seeking companies, therefore, that we are ceding the right to re-engineer the earth—our plants, our food, our fish, our animals, our trees, even our lawns. Genetic engineering in agriculture should be considered a commercial venture that includes the privatization of agriculture knowledge through the patenting system and the increasing concentration of key agricultural resources in a handful of multinational agricultural companies.

Marketed by agrichemical companies, genetic engineering in agriculture promises to perpetuate the present industrialized system of agriculture—a system characterized by large farms, single cropping, heavy machinery and dependence on chemical pesticides and fertilizers. Such a system has consolidated acres into fewer and larger farms, marginalizing small farmers and reducing the number of people living on farms and in rural communities.

With a goal of marketing GE seeds worldwide, genetic engineering will continue the trend of industrialized farming to reduce crop diversity, making our food supply increasingly vulnerable to pests and disease. The Southern Corn Leaf Blight which in 1970 destroyed 60 percent of the U.S. corn crop in one summer, clearly demonstrates that a genetically uniform crop base is a disaster waiting to happen. The linkages of genetically engineered seeds and pesticides, such as Monsanto's GE Roundup Ready Seeds will ensure continued use of agricultural chemicals.

Genetic engineering is likely to further diminish the role of the farmer. GE seeds are designed to be grown in a large scale agricultural system in which farmers become laborers or ''renters'' of seed technology. Desperate to increase their yields to make up for low prices, many U.S. farmers have adopted the ''high-yielding'' GE seeds. In doing so, they have been forced to sign contracts legally binding them to use proprietary chemicals on their transgenic crops and in some cases to permit random inspections of their fields by biotechnology company representatives who check that farmers are not saving and reusing the licensed seed. Despite the premium farmers pay for high tech seeds, they receive no warranty for the performance of these seeds as the contracts protect biotechnology seed companies in the event of seed failures.

A PROTECTIVE REGULATORY STRUCTURE

Despite the uncertainties associated with genetic engineering, nevertheless, GE crops covered 71 million acres of U.S. farmland last year, and GE ingredients are present throughout the food supply. Ranging from ice-cream and infant formula to tortilla chips and veggie burgers, foods produced using genetic engineering line our supermarket shelves. These foods are unlabeled and have not been appropriately assessed for safety. Consumers, therefore, are unwitting subjects in a massive experiment with their food.

Our regulatory system has clearly failed to ensure the protection of human health, the environment and farmers. In response I have authored legislation in the 106th Congress that would fill the regulatory vacuum.

To ensure food safety, I have introduced a bill that requires that GE food go through the FDA's current food additive process, acknowledging that a food is fundamentally altered when a new gene is inserted into it. The review process would look at concerns unique to

GE products including allergenicity, unintended effects, toxicity, functional characteristics and nutrient levels.

To date, the public has been largely left out of the biotechnology regulatory process, and that needs to change. Consequently, I propose that the FDA conduct a public comment period of at least 30 days once a completed safety application is available to the public. All studies performed by the applicant must be made available including all data unfavorable to the petition. The FDA should also maintain a publicly available registry of the GE foods for which food additives are pending or have been approved.

When the FDA was called upon to confirm the Taco Bell taco shell contamination for a possible regulatory enforcement action, it was unable to do so because it lacked the necessary testing protocols. The FDA should correct this failure by immediately creating testing protocols for all GE foods and test for potential contamination in these foods. Until then, the FDA cannot determine the ingredients in our food supply, it is unlikely that the FDA can ensure the American public that other foods are not contaminated.

I have also introduced a bill requiring mandatory labeling of GE foods or foods containing GE ingredients so that American consumers can make informed choices about what they are eating. Packaged foods carry nutritional labels, drugs and medications come with descriptions of their contents. There is no reason that GE food should not also be labeled granting consumers their fundamental right to know what is in their food.

Clearly, environmental regulations for the release of the GE organisms need to be strengthened. Similarly, the USDA allows field trials of all GE plants that prevent adequate assessments of the environment risks posed by these plants. Though genetically engineered fish are predicted to be commercialized by 2001, it is still unclear which agency will regulate them. The US Fish and Wild Life Service as well as the National Marine and Fish Service must pay a role in developing regulations for GE fish.

Finally, Congress should hold hearings on the failure of the regulatory agencies in protecting the American public.

CONCLUSION

The controversy surrounding genetically engineered food should not be a surprise to anyone. The mechanical manipulation of genes in the food one eats instinctively raises questions of health and safety. We instinctively trust farmers to grow and raise our food, but we must question the motivation of large corporations who want to create impure food for pure profit. When we feed our family, we don't take chances. If we are not sure how old the leftovers in the back of the fridge are, we throw them out. And as long as we are not convinced that this new technology is flawless, people should be hesitant to serve genetically engineered food to their children. New technologies always have unforseen effects. The American consumer does not want to be a part of an experiment at their dinner table.

IN CELEBRATION OF THE 140TH ANNIVERSARY OF LAKESHORE AVENUE BAPTIST CHURCH, OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA

HON. BARBARA LEE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 2, 2000

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to celebrate the one hundred and fortieth anniversary of the establishment of the Lakeshore Avenue Baptist Church in Oakland, California. This milestone will be commemorated on Sunday, November 12, 2000.

Lakeshore Avenue Baptist Church was founded in 1860 in Oakland, California, and is a member of the American Baptist Churches. This congregation first began as the First Baptist Church of Brooklyn, California, a community that was near Lake Merritt but is now a part of the City of Oakland, California. Once Brooklyn became a part of Oakland, the name of the church changed to the Tenth Avenue Baptist Church. Since that time, the church's structure was destroyed twice by fire, first in 1945 and again in 1955, but through the faith and dedication of the congregation, the present structure was built and dedicated in 1957 as the Lakeshore Avenue Baptist Church.

Lakeshore is one of our most diverse congregations in our community with a membership of 55% African American, 40% Caucasian and 5% Asian Americans.

Lakeshore contributes to the community in many ways. For sixty years, they have sponsored one of the oldest weekday religious radio programs. Lakeshore also worked to integrate the neighborhood surrounding the church, founded the Lakeshore Children's Center (now the Children's Peace Academy), established a Hunger Task Force which supports hunger relief programs in the Bay Area, assisted immigrants and refugees in settling in Oakland, and co-founded the Oakland Coalition of Congregations.

Lakeshore Avenue Baptist Church is a great source of civic pride and a valuable resource for the community, I proudly join the church's members, friends and neighbors in saluting and honoring the history and spirit of this landmark church.

Daily Digest

HIGHLIGHTS

Senate passed Continuing Resolution.

The House passed H.J. Res. 123, Making Further Continuing Appropriations.

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S11503–S11509

Measures Introduced: One resolution was submitted, as follows: S. Con. Res. 160. **Page S11508**

Measures Passed:

Continuing Resolution: Senate passed H.J. Res. 123, making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001. **Page S11504**

Conditional Adjournment: Senate agreed to S. Con. Res. 160, providing for a conditional adjournment or recess of the Senate and a conditional adjournment of the House of Representatives. **Page S11504**

Continuing Resolution Agreement: A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing that if between today and November 14th the Senate receives from the House of Representatives continuing resolutions funding the government for 1 day at a time, that the individual resolutions be agreed to and the motions to reconsider be laid upon the table. Further, that if the House of Representatives passes a continuing resolution that contains language other than the funding of the federal government for 1 day, that the Senate automatically reconvene 2 hours after receipt of the papers in the Senate, and it be pending in the Senate, following the granting of the routine convening requests. Further, that if the House of Representatives does not pass S. Con. Res. 160 (Conditional Adjournment Resolution), the Senate reconvene on Monday, November 6 at 11 a.m., on Thursday, November 9 at 11 a.m., and on Monday, November 13 at 11 a.m., for pro forma sessions. **Page S11509**

Messages From the House: **Pages S11507–08**

Additional Cosponsors: **Page S11508**

Enrolled Bills Presented: **Page S11508**

Recess: Senate convened at 8:30 p.m., and, in accordance with the provisions of S. Con. Res. 160, recessed at 8:37 p.m., until 12 noon, on Tuesday, November 14, 2000; or if the House of Representatives does not agree to S. Con. Res. 160 (Conditional Adjournment), as agreed to by the Senate, the Senate will reconvene at 11 a.m. on Monday, November 6, 11 a.m. on Thursday, November 9, and 11 a.m. Monday, November 13, 2000 for pro forma sessions. (For Senate's program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today's Record on page S11509.)

Committee Meetings

No committee meetings were held.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Bills Introduced: 3 public bills, H.R. 5622–5624; were introduced. **Pages H11812–13**

Reports Filed: No reports were filed today.

Further Continuing Appropriations Resolutions: The House passed H.J. Res. 123, making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001 by a yea and nay vote of 310 yeas to 7 nays, Roll No. 592. Earlier, agreed to an amendment providing $7.1 million for Presidential transition functions. **Pages H11784–86**

H. Res. 662, the rule that provided for consideration of the joint resolution was agreed to on Oct. 30, 2000.

Quorum Calls Votes: One yea-and-nay vote developed during the proceedings of the House today and appears on pages H11785–86. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 6 p.m. and adjourned at 9:45 p.m.

Committee Meetings

No committee meetings were held.

NEW PUBLIC LAWS

(For last listing of Public Laws, see DAILY DIGEST, *p. D 1163)*

H.R. 3244, to combat trafficking of persons, especially into the sex trade, slavery, and slavery-like conditions in the United States and countries around the world through prevention, through prosecution and enforcement against traffickers, and through protection and assistance to victims of trafficking. Signed October 28, 2000. (P.L. 106–386)

H.R. 4461, making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2001. Signed October 28, 2000. (P.L. 106–387)

H.J. Res. 118, making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001. Signed October 28, 2000. (P.L. 106–388)

H.J. Res. 119, making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001. Signed October 29, 2000. (P.L. 106–389)

H.R. 707, to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to authorize a program for predisaster mitigation, to streamline the administration of disaster relief, to control the Federal costs of disaster assistance. Signed October 30, 2000. (P.L. 106-390)

H.R. 1654, to authorize appropriations for the National Aeronautics and Space Administration for fiscal years 2000, 2001, and 2002. Signed October 30, 2000. (P.L. 106–391)

H.R. 2348, to authorize the Bureau of reclamation to provide cost sharing for the endangered fish recovery implementation programs for the Upper Colorado and San Juan River Basins. Signed October 30, 2000. (P.L. 106–392)

H.R. 2389, to restore stability and predictability to the annual payments made to States and counties containing National Forest System lands and public domain lands managed by the Bureau of Land Management for use by the counties for the benefit of public schools, roads. Signed October 30, 2000. (P.L. 106–393)

H.R. 2842, to amend chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, concerning the Federal Employees Health Benefits (FEHB) Program, to enable the Federal Government to enroll an employee and his or her family in the FEHB Program when a State court orders the employee to provide health insurance coverage for a child of the employee but the employee fails to provide the coverage. Signed October 30, 2000. (P.L. 106–394)

H.R. 2883, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to confer United States citizenship automatically and retroactively on certain foreign-born children adopted by citizens of the United States. Signed October 30, 2000. (P.L. 106–395)

H.R. 3767, to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to make improvements to, and permanently authorize, the visa waiver pilot program under section 217 of such Act. Signed October 30, 2000. (P.L. 106–396)

H.R. 3995, to establish procedures governing the responsibilities of court-appointed receivers who administer departments, offices, and agencies of the District of Columbia government. Signed October 30, 2000. (P.L. 106–397)

H.R. 4205, to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2001 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe personnel strengths for such fiscal year for the Armed Forces. Signed October 30, 2000. (P.L. 106–398)

H.R. 4828, to designate wilderness areas and a cooperative management and protection area in the vicinity of Steens Mountain in Harney County, Oregon. Signed October 30, 2000. (P.L. 106–399)

H.R. 5417, to rename the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act as the ''McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act''. Signed October 30, 2000. (P.L. 106–400)

H.J. Res. 120, making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001. Signed October 30, 2000. (P.L. 106–401)

S. 1809, to improve service systems for individuals with developmental disabilities. Signed October 30, 2000. (P.L. 106–402)

H.J. Res. 121, making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year 2001. Signed November 1, 2000. (P.L. 106–403)

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR FRIDAY, NOVEMBER 3, 2000

Senate

No meetings/hearings scheduled.

House

No Committee meetings are scheduled.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

12 noon, Tuesday, November 14, 2000; or (if the House of Representatives does not pass S. Con. Res. 160 (Conditional Adjournment)) the Senate reconvenes at 11 a.m. Monday, November 6, 11 a.m. Thursday, November 9, and 11 a.m. Monday, November 13, 2000 for pro forma sessions

---

Senate Chamber

Program for Tuesday: After the transaction of any morning business (not to extend beyond 12:30 p.m.), *Senate will recess until 2:15 p.m. for their respective party conferences;* following which, Senate expects to consider any cleared legislative and executive business.

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OR REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Friday, November 3

House Chamber

Program for Friday: Consideration of H.J. Res. 124, Making Further Continuing Appropriations (closed rule, one hour of debate); and

Consideration of the conference report on S. 2796, Everglades Restoration and Water Resources Development Act of 2000 (rule waiving points of order).

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

HOUSE

Baca, Joe, Calif., E2066
Bentsen, Ken, Tex., E2067
Boyd, Allen, Fla., E2066
Capps, Lois, Calif., E2068
DeLauro, Rosa L., Conn., E2068
DeMint, Jim, S.C., E2066
Duncan, John J., Jr., Tenn., E2065
Gillmor, Paul E., Ohio, E2066
Gordon, Bart, Tenn., E2064
Holt, Rush D., N.J., E2065, E2067
Jackson-Lee, Sheila, Tex., E2068
Jenkins, William L., Tenn., E2071
Kennedy, Patrick J., R.I., E2068
Kucinich, Dennis J., Ohio, E2072
Lee, Barbara, Calif., E2073
McCollum, Bill, Fla., E2064
Matsui, Robert T., Calif., E2063
Meek, Carrie P., Fla., E2064
Miller, Gary G., Calif., E2065, E2067
Minge, David, Minn., E2065
Morella, Constance A., Md., E2067
Murtha, John P., Pa., E2063
Pelosi, Nancy, Calif., E2064
Smith, Christopher H., N.J., E2070
Talent, James M., Mo., E2068
Underwood, Robert A., Guam, E2063

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.