

lands or interests therein may be acquired except with the consent of the owner thereof.

(b) STATE AND LOCAL LANDS.—Lands or interests therein owned by the State of New Mexico or a political subdivision thereof may only be acquired by donation or exchange.

(c) ACQUISITION OF LESS THAN FEE INTERESTS IN LAND.—The Secretary may acquire less than fee interests in land only if the Secretary determines that such less than fee acquisition will adequately protect the Monument from flooding, erosion, and degradation of its drainage waters.

SEC. 5. ADMINISTRATION.

The Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the National Park Service, shall manage the national Monument, including lands added to the Monument by this Act, in accordance with this Act and the provisions of law generally applicable to units of National Park System, including the Act of August 25, 1916, an Act to establish a National Park Service (39 Stat. 535; 16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.), and such specific legislation as heretofore has been enacted regarding the Monument.

SEC. 6. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There is authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purpose of this Act.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN).

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

Mr. Speaker, S. 1132 is a bill introduced by Senator JEFF BINGAMAN and has support from the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. REDMOND), both from the State of New Mexico.

Senator BINGAMAN and the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. REDMOND) have worked to develop a bill that will increase the size of Bandelier National Monument and protect its watershed.

Mr. Speaker, 1132 modifies the boundary to include lands within the upper watershed of the Bandelier National Monument which potentially can threaten the monument with flooding, erosion and water quality. The expansion will include approximately 935 acres of land and can only be acquired with the consent of the landowner.

This boundary expansion will enhance the protection of lands within the Bandelier National Monument.

I urge my colleagues to support S. 1132.

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

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

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

This bill adds 935 acres in the northern boundary of the national monument. The lands include the headwaters of a watershed that drains into the park. The bill has had no hearings or markups in the House.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 1132.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the 8 bills just debated.

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

There was no objection.

REGARDING HOUSE RESOLUTION 598

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. While we are waiting, I would just like the Members of Congress to know that later today House Resolution 598 will be brought to the floor relative to the problem of illegal dumping of foreign steel in our markets that has destroyed American families, our economy, destabilized much of our industry. And this is a very important vote in a very important debate today because, regardless of your personal persuasion on trade policy, this is not a debate about free trade today. This is not a debate about fair trade today, to a degree. It is a debate about illegal trade and enforcement of our trade laws.

We can pass laws, but they are not ours to enforce. We will ensure today by the vote of the Congress that this illegal dumping be addressed and challenged. I am hoping that all Members will participate and support that resolution, H. Res. 598.

MORE ON H. RES. 598

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

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I apropos to the remarks by the gentleman from Ohio, I remember the first time that I was in the Oval Office was during the Reagan administration, at which time the President then was adamant about the voluntary restraints that foreign steel producers would be subjected to were we to continue our program and

which we assented was necessary to protect our steel making jobs.

Ever since then we have been on a highly visible plain of watching carefully the steel dumping syndrome across the world. I join with the gentleman from Ohio to keep on alert as Members of Congress and as citizens on this clandestine way of ruining our ability to keep our steel industry intact.

When that resolution comes up, I hope that the common sense of our Chamber will take hold.

TREATMENT OF GOVERNMENTAL PENSION PLANS AS STATE PENSION PLANS FOR CERTAIN PURPOSES

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4572) to clarify that governmental pension plans of the possessions of the United States shall be treated in the same manner as State pension plans for purposes of the limitation on the State income taxation of pension income, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4572

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

SECTION 1. CLARIFICATION OF APPLICATION OF LIMITATION ON STATE INCOME TAXATION OF PENSION INCOME.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subparagraph (G) of section 114(b)(1) of title 4, United States Code, is amended by inserting before the semicolon "or any plan which would be a governmental plan (as so defined) if possessions of the United States were treated as States for purposes of such section 414(d)".

(b) CORRECTION OF CLERICAL ERROR.—Section 114 of such title 4 is amended by redesignating subsection (e) as subsection (c).

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to amounts received after the date of the enactment of this Act.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the resolution under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

During the last session, the Congress passed a very useful piece of legislation which in essence said that when someone retires with a pension in a particular State and then moves to another State, that we would end the process by which that State could still follow and reach out with its long arm and gain tax revenues from a pensioner no

longer in the State but who earned that pension in that State. We felt that that was an unfair proposition.

I remember very well my congressional classmate Barbara Vucanovich spearheaded the effort because, as it turned out, in her State there were many former California residents who were under double taxation. They were retired in her State, yet they had to pay California taxes on their pensions which were coming from California. But we decided to end that process. We did happily for all Americans.

But in doing so, a glitch occurred with the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. It appears that the definitions of "State" and of "possessions," et cetera, which the bill intended to cover back then in and the law now on the books intended to cover, did not include the status of Puerto Rico as a commonwealth. So all we are doing with this piece of legislation, Mr. Speaker, is bringing Puerto Rico into the plan that was originally set forth for all Americans. And that is why this bill is necessary.

It is a technical amendment because it just catches up with the legislation that we passed last term. But it is not just a technical amendment to those former residents of Puerto Rico who earned a pension there and who live elsewhere now when they have to be compelled to pay taxes to Puerto Rico. So it is more than technical to them, but for our purposes, it is a catchup technical amendment.

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

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

I want to concur with the assessment of this legislation by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS). We want to thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS) for the fine job he has done not only on this but many other pieces of legislation relative to these matters.

This bill, as stated, clarifies the tax treatment of certain pensions. More specifically, as was stated by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS), technical to others but to the people impacted very substantive, because the bottom line, this deals with an issue passed in the last Congress which protects the pension income of retirees who retire from a State which has an income tax to a State with no income tax, as cited by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS).

Having said that, I believe it is the right thing to do. It makes the correction which is necessary under law. We support the legislation.

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

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

I thank the gentleman from Ohio for cooperating and seconding the proposition before us. I urge support of this bill. I state for the RECORD that the manager's amendment contains one

minor clerical change. Mr. Speaker, this does not require a filibuster of any type.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GEKAS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4572, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TEMPORARY REENACTMENT OF CHAPTER 12, TITLE 11, UNITED STATES CODE

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4831) to temporarily reenact chapter 12 of title 11 of the United States Code, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 4831

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

SECTION 1. TEMPORARY REENACTMENT OF BANKRUPTCY PROVISIONS RELATING TO FAMILY FARMERS.

(a) *REENACTMENT.*—Chapter 12 of title 11 of the United States Code, as in effect on September 30, 1998, is hereby reenacted for the period beginning on October 1, 1998, and ending on April 1, 1999.

(b) *CONTINUATION OF CASES.*—All cases commenced or pending under chapter 12 of title 11, United States Code, as reenacted under subsection (a), and all matters and proceedings in or relating to such cases, shall be conducted and determined under such chapter as if such chapter were continued in effect after April 1, 1999. The substantive rights of parties in connection with such cases, matters, and proceedings shall continue to be governed under the laws applicable to such cases, matters, and proceedings as if such chapter were continued in effect after April 1, 1999.

SEC. 2. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall take effect on October 1, 1998.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

Throughout a full year now, as the Speaker knows, we have been considering bankruptcy reform. And as it turned out, the House, in a bipartisan

vote, overwhelmingly approved bankruptcy reform twice, both in the original bill and in the conference report.

The Senate, on its side, approved on a great bipartisan vote with only one dissenting vote, I think 97 or 98 to 1, a similar bankruptcy reform bill. The conference was never able to have the bill passed in both chambers. It succeeded only in the House. So it sort of fell by its own weight over in the Senate.

□ 1300

But an important feature of the bankruptcy reform legislation, right from the start, was an extension of chapter 12. What does that mean? Chapter 12 is devoted specifically and uniquely to the farmers of our Nation who experience unique types of financial crises almost on a monthly basis.

We, through chapter 12 in the current code, accord our farmers a special set of rights and abilities to cope with their financial situation. So we had hoped that, with the total bankruptcy reform bill it seemed on a way to a successful conclusion, to also extend the benefits of chapter 12 which we did have in the bill.

But if the bill fell, then chapter 12 had to fall with it. That meant that, on October 1 of this year, the authorization previously in effect for chapter 12 ended.

So what we are about here is an extension of that chapter 12 set of benefits. A leader in this movement, I must tell my colleagues, from the first day that we began contemplating bankruptcy reform was the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. SMITH), who doggedly pursued for his purpose, for his great cause, the farmers' financial situation, the extension of chapter 12.

I had assured him on many occasions that we are going to make sure that it is going to be part of the bankruptcy reform bill, but I really did not expect that it would crash down as it did in the last minutes of this session.

But that sets the stage, then, for the passage of this legislation, which everyone should agree has to occur, else the October 1 end of chapter 12 authority for special treatment of farmers will also crash down. So we are eager to extend the benefits of chapter 12, the sole purpose of this piece of legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to join in support of this legislation. Mr. CONYERS is not here today. He is very busy. He supports extending these protections in bankruptcy, chapter 12 protections for the farmers.

There is a concern that we have, but it is not enough of a concern for us to oppose this legislation. Our concern is that this is but a 6-month extension, and we would have liked to have seen a little more of an extension and perhaps maybe even a permanent correction.