United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 145 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, MAY 24, 1999 No. 75

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
May 24, 1999.

I hereby appoint the Honorable THOMAS E. PETRI to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

PARTNERSHIPS FOR A CLEAN ENVIRONMENT AND BETTER COMMUNITIES

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, since I was elected to Congress, I have been focusing on the issue of livable communities and how we can create better partnerships between the Federal Government and our citizens. Unfortunately, one of the obstacles we face is the efforts by some people to create false choices. Last week, we saw two examples here in Congress, one dealing with efforts to reduce gun violence, and the other an important environmental announcement by one of our leading auto companies.

Repeated throughout the discussion regarding guns in our communities have been people who have tried to paint very stark pictures that suggest that really there is nothing that we can do to take simple common sense steps. Hopefully, the action in the Senate indicated that there are things that we can do that bring people together that will make a difference. I am optimistic that we may be able to yet have that discussion on the floor of this House.

At the same time, we find people trying to paint these same sorts of false choices as it relates to the environmental community. Some argue that we have to work against business or manufacturing when the government seeks to improve the environment. This simply does not have to be the case. Last week we had an excellent example of what happens when companies recognize that they are partners in our efforts to protect the environment and improve air quality.

For the last 25 years, trucks and the SUVs have been allowed to produce 2.5 times as much smog-causing gas as cars, and next year, when stricter rules take place, these full-sized vehicles will be producing five times as much as cars under the new rules. Regulations for pickups and the sport utility vehicles were originally more lenient because they were used theoretically primarily by small business, yet today they comprise half of all family vehicles.

Last Monday, Ford Motor Company announced that starting with its model 2000 year, its full-sized pickup trucks will meet current pollution standards for cars. All but the largest will meet the stricter new car requirements as well as the proposed truck requirements that go into effect between the year 2002 and 2007. Ford made their announcement a week after a Federal appeals panel, in a radical departure from established judicial precedent, invalidated air quality regulations set by EPA which were designed, in part, to decrease ground level ozone, a major contributor to smog. If that ruling is upheld, efforts like Ford's will take on much more significance.

Ford is taking this initiative because they recognize that consumers want cars and trucks that are environmentally sound, and that by producing them, Ford will have a competitive advantage. Jacques Nasser, Ford's chief executive and president, said that Ford is doing this because it will benefit the company financially and because ''it is the right thing to do.''

As the use of pickup trucks and SUVs has increased, so has the amount of smog-producing gas they produce. Manufacturers cleaning up their trucks will allow for cleaner air and easier breathing. Ford's action on the national level will allow each individual driver to contribute less pollution to their community every day, and this new equipment will not adversely affect performance and will come to Ford customers at no extra cost, since Ford has agreed to absorb the $100 per truck cost.

Clean air and a healthy environment benefit each of us and all of our communities. Ford has acknowledged that their industry must be a partner in our efforts to protect and preserve our environment. They are to be commended for this action, and I challenge other car and truck manufacturers to do the same.

This example of the private sector stepping forward and acting on behalf of the environment should be a wake-up call to this Congress as well. We need to do our part by considering rewarding those companies rather than potentially even penalizing them. We must also work together to avoid the debacle that occurred last week with unrelated environmental riders that

Printed on recycled paper.

were added to the supplemental appropriations bill.

Ford's action demonstrated that preserving the environment is a priority for the American people, and that we must do all we can to create an environmental record we can be proud of. I would hope that as we approach further efforts dealing with the environmental protection and, for that matter, the reduction of gun violence, we can avoid the false choices offered by the extreme.

SUPPORT THE SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE ''SAFE DEPOSIT BOX''

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

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow we will consider legislation to ensure that we will no longer use the Social Security Trust Fund for any other purpose than for what it was intended for.

Now, my colleagues might ask, ''Why is this necessary?'' The answer is quite simple. Despite repeated efforts over the years, we have not been able to stop perpetual raids on the Social Security Trust Fund. We have attempted to stop this violation of the trust fund going as far back as 1990.

Now, that year we enacted legislation, the Budget Enforcement Act, which removed Social Security taxes and benefits from the budget and from calculations of the budget deficit. That was done to prevent Social Security from masking the true size of the deficit and to protect it from budgetary cuts.

The rationale was that if this was done, Congress would not use Social Security in devising the Nation's overall fiscal policies. Historically, the Social Security Trust Fund Board have invested surplus Social Security revenues in U.S. Government securities. These investments are honored just like investments from the private sector. Interest is earned on the monies invested, and returned to the trust fund to help offset long-term obligations to future beneficiaries. It was felt that without such an enforcement mechanism, this practice would continue unless Congress took action to prevent this dishonest bookkeeping from continuing.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the intent of the 1990 law has not been fully adhered to, and to guarantee honesty in budgeting we must end the misuse of Social Security Trust Fund investments. This Social Security Trust Fund surplus should not be used to fund any other programs, and it should not be used to mask our Nation's debt.

We have been very zealous in cutting wasteful spending and reducing the size of our government's bureaucracy. We should keep up our efforts to continue to cut unnecessary and wasteful spending. That is why I applaud my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. HERGER) for introducing H.R. 1259 which will, among other things, provide a mechanism to ensure that all Social Security surpluses are dedicated to saving the program and Medicare.

I fully endorse this concept and believe we will be fulfilling our pledge to our Nation's seniors if we pass this legislation. We must stop this phoney bookkeeping and leave Social Security money alone. Right now, the trust fund is running a $126 billion surplus and it is used to mask the yearly deficit.

In 1997, Congress passed the historic Balanced Budget Act of 1997, which of course reduced wasteful government spending. We believed it was a restraint on Federal spending that has led to a reduction in our yearly deficits. With our Nation's strong economy and fiscal responsibility, there has been a strong revenue growth in this country and it has helped the national Treasury. These two factors make it possible to stop the much-used practice of commingling the Social Security Trust Fund money with the general revenue.

So, my colleagues, this week we can make history, make history by standing up for not only what we believe to be right, but what is absolutely necessary if we are going to make good on our promise to save Social Security and Medicare for this and future generations. We can pass H.R. 1259, stop this practice which started when President Lyndon Johnson unified the budget in 1969. It was then that Social Security and the other Federal trust funds were officially accounted for in the entire Federal budget.

So this ''Safe Deposit Box Act'' establishes the submission of separate Social Security budget documents by excluding outlays and receipts of the old-age, survivors, and disability program under the Social Security Act, thereby, Mr. Speaker, preventing Social Security surpluses from being used for any other purpose other than for the Social Security Trust Fund and the Medicare program.

So I urge my colleagues tomorrow and this week to support H.R. 1259.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

We pray, gracious God, that Your spirit of comfort and serenity will be with the neediest of people who turn to You with their life's concerns. We remember the refugees of the world and all those who suffer pain or hunger or fear for the days ahead. Remind us all, O God, that when the resources of the world are not with us, we can rely on Your grace. And when people must walk through the roads of danger and hostility, we earnestly pray that Your healing power and Your reconciling spirit will be with them whatever their need or trouble. O loving and eternal God, bless us and all Your people, now and evermore. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. SERRANO 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.

CHINESE ESPIONAGE

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

Mr. WICKER. Mr. Speaker, this headline from the New York Times says it all: China Stole Nuclear Secrets for Bombs. Although the bipartisan Cox report on Chinese espionage will not be officially released until tomorrow, we already know enough that all Americans should be outraged.

According to Chairman COX, the threat to our security from this major intelligence catastrophe will not be years into the future but within the next few months. Look to the Chinese Communist government to begin testing nuclear ICBMs within a few months, using United States nuclear secrets. While our law enforcement officials were asleep, our national security was compromised. It is not just Attorney General Janet Reno. The entire Clinton-Gore administration owes the United States public an explanation for this outrage.

TWO FORMS OF VIOLENCE

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

Mr. SERRANO. Mr. Speaker, the debate goes on in this country as we try

earnestly to find solutions for the problem of violence in our schools and throughout our society. At the same time the 6 o'clock news reports school violence, it reports the violence of war. So I wonder and I ask out loud, is it possible that our children are imitating the actions of our government, that every time we have a difference with another country, we use violence to solve that difference?

Secondly, this week on the agriculture appropriation bill we will say ''no'' once again to selling food and medicine to Cuba. Food and medicine. Economic violence. Is it possible that our children are simply imitating the violence they see coming from our adult behavior?

ON MILK POLICY

(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, very soon a great debate will begin to rage here in the halls of Congress. That debate will be about how we price milk. My friends from other regions of the country will complain that if the system is reformed and the playing field is leveled, their dairy farmers would receive less or they would lose relative to other parts of the country.

But, Mr. Speaker, we should understand that dairy farmers in my region of the country have been losers under the current convoluted milk marketing order system for over 60 years. This makes no economic sense. Even Justice Anton Scalia has called the system ''Byzantine.'' All we are asking for is equal pay for equal milk, and we will not give up this fight until we get it.

TRADE DEFICIT HITS RECORD HIGH

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

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, another record. For the third straight month, America's trade deficit is going through the roof. It is now averaging $20 billion a month. That is 400,000 good-paying American jobs being lost every single month. It is so bad even Commerce Secretary Daley said America cannot continue to subsidize the world. Unbelievable. Something stinks.

Why is this administration still coddling to China on MFN and WTO membership? Enough is enough. America is going bankrupt at warp speed and Uncle Sam is buying the rocket fuel. I say it is time to get to the bottom of this action with China. Tell us the truth, White House, before we do not have a job left.

OPPOSE H.R. 45 AND KEEP NUCLEAR WASTE OUT OF NEVADA

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

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, when I was a young child, people used to say that little green men lived on Mars and the moon was made of cheese. That is when fantasies and rumors were the tools that shaped opinions and science was the unattainable.

Unfortunately, many of my colleagues look at transporting and storing high-level nuclear waste in Nevada in much the same way.

Fantasy and nonsense have no place in scientific studies, studies which prove that a repository site at Yucca Mountain is 10 times more prone to earthquakes and lava flows than government scientists previously estimated, studies that show Nevada ranks third in the Nation for current earthquake activity and has experienced over 650 earthquakes in the last 20 years.

That means with over 30 earthquakes a year. Clearly Yucca Mountain is not suitable and is one of the worst places to store the deadliest material ever created by man.

The space program proved that the moon is not made of cheese and that little green men do not live on Mars, and if the DOE properly addresses this new scientific information as the law requires them to do, they will not force green people to live in Nevada.

Mr. Speaker, oppose H.R. 45 and place true science before fantasy, misinformation and conjecture.

COMBATTING SCHOOL VIOLENCE

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

Mr. WISE. Mr. Speaker, mercifully events in Georgia last week produced no deaths in the school shooting. But this shows why it is that all of us at every level of government and every part of our community have to be working harder to reduce school violence. There are things that this Congress can be doing, things that our communities can be doing.

One area that we are working on in West Virginia and which I hope might be of benefit in other areas is we are designing a school safety report card: What are the elements of a safe school, listing them and then giving that to each community so each community can evaluate its own school.

One thing that I have learned following four hearings across our State is that there is no one-size-fits-all. We have to tailor our responses to each community and to each school. But we also have to dedicate ourselves to the proposition that as school ends this year, that when it resumes next year the schools will be safer than they have been.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

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

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COLLEGE ACCESS ACT

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 974) to establish a program to afford high school graduates from the District of Columbia the benefits of in-State tuition at State colleges and universities outside the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 974

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''District of Columbia College Access Act''.

SEC. 2. ESTABLISHMENT OF SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM.

There is hereby established the District of Columbia College Access Scholarship Program (hereafter in this Act referred to as the ''Program'') under which the Mayor of the District of Columbia shall award scholarships in accordance with section 4 using amounts in the District of Columbia College Access Fund established under section 3.

SEC. 3. DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA COLLEGE ACCESS FUND.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is hereby established on the books of the government of the District of Columbia the District of Columbia College Access Fund (hereafter in this Act referred to as the ''Fund''), which shall consist of the following amounts:

(1) Amounts appropriated to the Fund under law.

(2) Gifts and bequests.

(3) Refunds paid under section 4(b)(4).

(4) Interest earned on the balance of the Fund.

(b) ADMINISTRATION.—The Mayor of the District of Columbia shall administer the Fund, in consultation with the Secretary of Education.

(c) USE OF FUND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Amounts in the Fund shall be used solely to award scholarships in accordance with section 4, except that not more than 10 percent of the balance of the Fund with respect to a fiscal year may be used for the administration of the Fund during such year.

(2) DETERMINATION OF AMOUNT AVAILABLE FOR SCHOLARSHIPS.—With respect to each academic year for which scholarships may be awarded under this Act, the Mayor shall determine the amount available from the Fund for awarding scholarships.

(d) INVESTMENT.—The Mayor shall invest such portion of the Fund as is not in the judgment of the Mayor required to make current payments for scholarships. Such investments shall be in such form as the Mayor considers appropriate.

SEC. 4. ADMINISTRATION OF SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM.

(a) APPLICATIONS.—Any qualified graduate seeking a scholarship under the Program

shall submit an application to the Mayor in such form and containing such information as the Mayor may prescribe by regulation. The Mayor shall make applications for scholarships under the Program available not later than October 1 of the academic year preceding the academic year for which the scholarships will be awarded, and shall announce the recipients of scholarships under this section not later than a date determined by the Mayor in consultation with the Secretary of Education.

(b) AWARDS AUTHORIZED.—

(1) AWARDS TO EACH QUALIFIED GRADUATE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—From the amount available from the Fund under section 3(c)(2) for any academic year, the Mayor shall award scholarships to each qualified graduate submitting an application that is approved pursuant to subsection (a).

(B) AWARDS TO STUDENTS AT ELIGIBLE PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS BASED ON IN-STATE TUITION.—Subject to subparagraph (D) and paragraph (2), such scholarship shall provide, for attendance at an eligible public institution located outside the District of Columbia, an amount equal to the difference between—

(i) the amount of the tuition normally charged by that institution to a student who is not a resident of the State in which that institution is located for the program of instruction in which the qualified graduate is enrolled or accepted for enrollment; and

(ii) the amount of the tuition normally charged by that institution to a student who is a resident of such State for such program of instruction, or the amount of the tuition normally charged by that institution to a student who is a resident of the county in which the institution is located for such program of instruction, whichever is less.

(C) TUITION ASSISTANCE GRANTS TO STUDENTS AT ELIGIBLE PRIVATE INSTITUTIONS.—Subject to paragraph (2), such scholarship shall provide, for attendance at an eligible private institution, a tuition assistance grant in a uniform amount determined by the Mayor, not to exceed $3,000 for the academic year.

(D) CAP ON AMOUNT PROVIDED.—The amount of a scholarship provided to an individual under subparagraph (B) for an academic year may not exceed $10,000.

(2) RATABLE REDUCTION IF FUNDS INSUFFICIENT.—If the amount available from the Fund under section 3(c)(2) for any academic year is not sufficient to pay the scholarship amount determined under paragraph (1) for each qualified graduate submitting an application that is approved pursuant to subsection (a), the amount of such scholarships shall be ratably reduced. If additional sums become available for such academic year, such reduced scholarships shall be increased on the same basis as they were reduced (until the amount allotted equals the amount determined under paragraph (1)).

(3) DISBURSEMENT.—The scholarships awarded under this section shall be disbursed to the eligible institution at which the qualified graduate is enrolled or accepted for enrollment by check or other means that is payable to and requires the endorsement or other certification by such graduate.

(4) REFUNDS.—The Mayor may prescribe such regulations as may be necessary to provide for the refund to the Fund of a portion of the amount awarded under this section in the event a recipient of a scholarship under this section withdraws from an institution during a period of enrollment in which the recipient began attendance.

(c) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to require an institution of higher education to alter the institution's admissions policies or standards in any manner in order for a qualified graduate to receive a scholarship to attend such institution under this Act.

(d) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section:

(1) QUALIFIED GRADUATE.—The term ''qualified graduate'' means an individual who—

(A) has been a resident of the District of Columbia for not less than the 12 consecutive months preceding the academic year for which the scholarship is sought;

(B) begins his or her undergraduate course of study within the 3 calendar years (excluding any period of service on active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States, in the Peace Corps or Americorps) of graduating from a secondary school, or receiving the recognized equivalent of a secondary school diploma;

(C) is enrolled or accepted for enrollment in a degree, certificate, or other program (including a program of study abroad approved for credit by the institution at which such student is enrolled) leading to a recognized educational credential at an eligible institution;

(D) if the student is presently enrolled at an institution, is maintaining satisfactory progress in the course of study the student is pursuing, as determined under section 484(c) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1091(c));

(E) is a citizen or national of the United States, a permanent resident of the United States, able to provide evidence from the Immigration and Naturalization Service that he or she is in the United States for other than a temporary purpose with the intention of becoming a citizen or permanent resident, or a citizen of the Republic of the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, or the Republic of Palau;

(F) does not owe a refund on grants previously received under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965, and is not in default on any loan made, insured, or guaranteed under such title;

(G) has not completed his or her first undergraduate baccalaureate course of study; and

(H) is not incarcerated.

(2) ELIGIBLE INSTITUTION.—The term ''eligible institution'' means eligible public institution or an eligible private institution.

(3) ELIGIBLE PUBLIC INSTITUTION.—The term ''eligible public institution'' means an institution of higher education that—

(A) is established as a State-supported institution of higher education by the State in which such institution is located;

(B) is eligible to participate in student financial assistance programs under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.); and

(C) has entered into an agreement with the Mayor containing such requirements for the management of funds provided under this Act as the Mayor may specify, including a requirement that the institution use the funds to supplement and not supplant assistance that otherwise would be provided to students from the District of Columbia.

(4) ELIGIBLE PRIVATE INSTITUTION.—The term ''eligible private institution'' means an institution of higher education that—

(A) is located in the District of Columbia, the State of Maryland, or the Commonwealth of Virginia;

(B) is not established as a State-supported institution of higher education by the State in which such institution is located;

(C) is eligible to participate in student financial assistance programs under title IV of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.); and

(D) has entered into an agreement with the Mayor containing such requirements for the management of funds provided under this Act as the Mayor may specify, including a requirement that the institution use the funds to supplement and not supplant assistance that otherwise would be provided to students from the District of Columbia.

(5) INSTITUTION OF HIGHER EDUCATION.—The term ''institution of higher education'' has the meaning given that term under section 101 of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001).

(6) SECONDARY SCHOOL.—The term ''secondary school'' has the meaning given that term under section 14101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8801).

SEC. 5. ADMINISTRATION OF PROGRAM AND FUND.

In carrying out the Program and administering the Fund, the Mayor of the District of Columbia—

(1) shall consult with the Secretary of Education; and

(2) may enter into a contract with a nongovernmental agency to administer the Program and the Fund if the Mayor determines that it is cost-effective and appropriate to do so.

SEC. 6. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated for payment to the Fund such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 2000 and for each of the 5 succeeding fiscal years.

SEC. 7. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR UNIVERSITY OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

There is authorized to be appropriated to the University of the District of Columbia for fiscal year 2000 and each of the 5 succeeding fiscal years such sums as may be necessary to enhance educational opportunities for the University.

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

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

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. DAVIS of Virginia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, first of all my thanks to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY) for permitting the expeditious consideration of this bill. My gratitude as well to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) the ranking member of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA), the gentleman from California (Mr. HORN), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SCARBOROUGH) and all the cosponsors and those who have expressed encouragement and support for our efforts.

I would also like to thank some of the staff people who have worked so hard on this legislation: My former staff director Peter Sirh, staff director and counsel Howie Denis, communications directory Trey Hardin, Anne Mack Barnes, Jon Bouker the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia's staff, and Noah Woofsy of the legislative counsel's office.

Today we take a giant step forward in our quest to enhance educational opportunities in the Nation's capital. My

thanks to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia, the ranking member of the subcommittee I chair, and all the others who have expressed encouragement and support for our efforts.

The bill we consider today, H.R. 974, the District of Columbia College Access Act, reflects the constitutional reality that Congress is the de facto State legislature for the District of Columbia. The city by its very nature lacks the capacity for a university system of higher education as that concept is understood in the 50 States. The same choices and opportunities simply do not exist for students and parents here as exist elsewhere in the United States. This has too often led to an out-migration of population in order to take advantage of the higher educational opportunities all other Americans enjoy as residents of a particular State.

A strong element in all of our reform legislation since the creation of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia has been directed at stopping the bleeding of the population out of the District. This is critical for us all, as you cannot have a healthy Washington region without a healthy city.

The District has lost hundreds of thousands of residents in recent decades, particularly middle-income taxpayers. The Subcommittee on the District of Columbia has helped to lead a strong bipartisan evident in Congress to change that. Our efforts have included economic development, such as facilitating the MCI Center and the new convention center project. We have encouraged home ownership with the $5,000 tax credit for first-time homebuyers. We have improved personal safety, water quality and financial stability itself. Congress can be proud of its efforts to revitalize the Nation's capital.

Congress, in full cooperation with the city and the Federal Government, has in fact restructured relationships so as to have the Federal Government assume many of the functions normally performed by States, such as care for felony prisoners. This has put the District on a glide path to recovery. It is now in a better position to improve delivery of municipal services.

I am pleased to commend those leading local foundations and companies that have banded together in an extraordinary and historic effort to assist District students. The legislation we are voting on today is essential to those great efforts in the private sector.

It is my strong belief that this is the best money the Federal Government will ever spend in this city.

Mayor Williams has characterized H.R. 974 as ''very, very important legislation not only in improving education but in bringing our city back.'' This bill can be a shining example of a bipartisan urban agenda.

While giving graduates more choices, subject to the caps and limits in the bill, this legislation fully respects and leaves untouched college admission policies and standards.

The bill will enable District residents who are high school graduates to attend public institutions at in-State rates in other States in the union. We have included tuition assistance grants as another option for other colleges in D.C., Virginia and Maryland. This is yet another incentive to encourage local population stability through educational enhancement. This TAG program is highly successful in Virginia and many other States.

H.R. 974 helps to level the playing field for District high school graduates. I was deeply moved by the reaction to this bill as I saw it in the eyes of students at Eastern High School, not far from our Capitol building. These students need and deserve a break. They need and deserve the same opportunities that students in other school systems in other States across this land have.

As the students took my hand, looked into my eyes and thanked me for introducing this bill, I knew we were on the right track. Fighting for educational opportunity legislation is one of the reasons I entered public life. I look forward to working with colleagues who share this vision for the future as we move this bill to the other body.

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

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

The District of Columbia College Access Act before us is but one example of a series of bipartisan bills benefiting the residents of the Nation's capital on which the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) and I have worked since he became chair of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia. I want particularly to thank the gentleman from Virginia for his indispensable leadership on legislation that has been critical to the rescue of the Nation's capital from fiscal crisis. I particularly appreciate his work on H.R. 974, the District of Columbia College Access Act, a bill that signals the move of the Subcommittee on the District of Columbia from crisis to rebuilding.

May I also take this opportunity to thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON) who has treated the city's problems with great attention and urgency, always moving bills quickly and helpfully; the gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN) whose assistance and wise counsel has been much appreciated; and the members of the subcommittee, all of whom support H.R. 974 and have contributed to this and other bills that have rescued the Nation's capital.

□ 1415

The committee, the subcommittee and the administration have worked closely together on H.R. 974 in an indispensable collaboration. We have worked closely with officials of the administration including Mrs. Clinton, Secretary Richard Riley and Assistant Secretary Scott Fleming in crafting H.R. 974.

I want to particularly thank the President, who included funds for this bill in his own budget, raising substantially the amount that would otherwise have been available.

In its three features, H.R. 974 goes a considerable distance toward offering District residents and students the State public higher education available to residents of the 50 States. Funds are authorized for grants for students to attend State colleges and universities anywhere in the United States at in-State rates for a limited private college alternative, such as some States offer to broaden the State's option, and for the District's own public admissions university, the University of the District of Columbia.

The central feature of H.R. 974 is authorization for funding for students to attend any State college or university where admission has been granted at in-State tuition rates. This provision is essential because unlike every State in the Union, the District has only one public institution of higher education, an open admissions university. One size does not now and never has fit all in higher education and certainly not in today's fast-moving technological society.

In addition, the in-State tuition provision is critical to keeping and attracting taxpayers, the sine qua non for the continuing recovery of the city. The cost of higher education is so high today that it alone drives many parents with children out of the city.

H.R. 974 also provides more limited funding for private colleges in the District, Maryland and Virginia, just as States often offer some funding for private college attendance in order to increase the diversity of options students need today.

Encouraged by H.R. 974, the private sector is raising an even larger amount to help District students prepare for and attend college. Business leaders in the District and the region approached the chairman, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS), and me some months ago, disturbed that many students in the District did not go to college or dropped out for lack of funds. These leaders have raised nearly $20 million in private funds to supplement money D.C. parents and students raise or win on their own. They suggested that in-State tuition rates could greatly enhance the educational opportunities they were raising funds to expand. Thus, H.R. 974 is a true public-private effort with the private sector, more than equaling what we do here today.

The symmetry and opportunities in this bill take higher education in the Nation's Capital a great distance toward providing D.C. residents with equal opportunity, compared with opportunities routinely available the residents of the States. Many students can now go out of State. Some will remain in the District to get limited

funding to attend private colleges and universities in the district or go to Maryland and Virginia with such funds. Many more will attend the District's own open-admissions State university that allows any student to qualify for admission to college. The UDC pool of students will not be able to take advantage of the in-State provision. Two-thirds of UDC students work, many have families, many go to college after years in the work force. Despite severe financial hardships resulting from the fiscal crisis including a 6-week shutdown, entering freshman enrollment rose dramatically by 70 percent in only 1 year. This extraordinary growth is the best evidence that D.C. residents must also have their own State university in addition to the out-of-State options provided in this bill.

In the State tuition and UDC provisions, H.R. 974 tries to achieve a mirror image of what D.C. parents and students would have if they lived in other jurisdictions. Residents who have stuck with the city during the tough times when so many have left deserve some encouragement to remain. The fact that there is near unanimous support in the city for this bill is some indication that it is probably already having the effect of encouraging residents to remain in the District. What we do here today is a step along the way of assuring equal citizenship for District residents.

H.R. 974 addresses a critical educational deficit that not only affects students and other residents, but the revitalization of the city itself. No longer will D.C. youngsters be the only Americans without access to the full complement of the State university systems that are routinely available to the residents of every State as a matter of right.

I want to again not only express my personal thanks to the leaders of my committee and the members of my subcommittee. I want also to assure the House that the parents and the children of the Nation's Capital are particularly grateful for the opportunities provided in the District of Columbia College Access Act.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me just note, as my colleague, this does not level the playing field for District students as opposed to other States, but it goes a long way toward that. They still have to compete to get into these university systems out-of-State as out-of-State students, which in many cases is an admissions hurdle that one would not get if they lived within that State; so they are not taking in-State slots, they are taking out-of-State slots.

But should they achieve that, should they overcome that obstacle, this legislation simply says they would then only have to pay in-State. At least it makes that dream affordable for them, and that is all this legislation does.

We are giving to the students in the District of Columbia, our Nation's Capital, the same affordable educational opportunities that we are finding in the other 50 States. It is a modest step forward, but it is a very important one if we are to integrate our kids in our District with the rest of the region, have them pick up jobs we need to fill in this region. The Northern Virginia Technology Council recently estimated that there were 18,000 available jobs that we could not find qualified applicants to fill.

We want the District of Columbia to be part of this regional economy as well. There is no reason that they should not be given the equal opportunity and affordable educational opportunities this legislation offers.

Mr. Speaker, I am just very proud to support this bill, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, while I appreciate the words of our chairman, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS), this bill in and of itself will encourage youngsters to go to college in the first place who simply would never have tried, despite their qualifications. They know full well that they have the money only for a semester or for a year, and now with this bill, providing 4 years of tuition to go to college, what we have here is a bill that encourages youngsters to do well in school, in junior high school and in high school.

The District of Columbia College Access Group that is supplementing our own efforts with private funds has indicated that it was astonished at how many of our youngsters simply drop out of college after getting into college and earning the right to go to college. The gentleman from Virginia has indicated something very important here, and that is that these youngsters have to get into college in the first place. So here we have an incentive to do well enough to get into college, and what this will do for youngsters is indicated by reference to the gentleman's own premier university, the University of Virginia, one of the best colleges in the United States.

Well, a youngster in Virginia, no matter what the family income, from the richest to the poorest, pays less than $5,000 to go to one of the best universities in the United States. If a youngster from my side of the river applies to go to University of Virginia, those parents must come up with about three times that amount of money, or $16,000. Imagine what it means to my taxpayers to know that they can encourage a youngster to compete to go to UVA or to go to University of Maryland and that the parents will be able to afford that.

I want to mention something else to the gentleman. The gentleman from Virginia and I have fought very hard for this bill to be nationwide, and I want to inform the gentleman that he and I are going to have to continue that fight.

Our bill says that if one gets into the University of Michigan, if one gets into a junior college in Texas, they can take this money and have it follow the student, and we are going to have to fight for that provision. And I think that is a very important provision, as much as I admire the roster of colleges in Maryland and Virginia, but I want to encourage youngsters to fly, to broaden their horizons, and this is a provision we are going to have to fight for.

One of the reasons that I want us to fight for this provision is that they have other bills introduced which do not have nationwide application, but the reason they do not have nationwide application is because there is a need to make sure that there is enough money. The bill that the gentleman and I have worked on recognizes that it may be necessary to circumscribe the bill based on the amount of money. So the chairman, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS), and I have delegated to the mayor of the District of Columbia, whomever he appoints, the task of drawing the bill in to fit the funds.

Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) has acted wisely in this regard, not only for home rule reasons, because, of course, the mayor and those closest on the ground know best, but because we do not want to have the first year or two some of these funds go unused because we have prematurely circumscribed who can, in fact, get these funds. How silly we would feel if, because some youngsters may get scholarships to private schools, they do not want to go to school in Maryland and Virginia, we have leftover funds from this bill that could desperately be used by a student who has achieved admission to the University of Michigan or the University of Alabama, but cannot go because from on high, in the capital of the United States, we have without any data and any way to get any data circumscribed how the bill should be drawn.

Let me finally say that the gentleman has often spoken with good reason about the extraordinary number of jobs in the region, one of the fastest-growing technological regions in the country that has jobs that cannot be filled, and they are all the way from jobs way down on the technological ladder to way up. Our own State university has not had the technology to adequately prepare students for these jobs with the grant to allow UDC to become a historically black college and university. We go a long step toward preparing youngsters for jobs in the regions since that money will be used for technology and infrastructure and, of course, within State tuition, allowing our youngsters access to some of the best schools in the United States. We, of course, allow them to get the preparation necessary to make our regional jobs available to everyone in our region

including the residents of the District of Columbia.

I want to say to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) that his own hard work on this bill has been absolutely indispensable. Where we have worked together trying to fashion a bill that he and I could both agree upon, we have reached out to the residents in order to find what their concerns were from the private colleges who wanted to make the kind of private college alternative available here that is available in Virginia. We have reached out to UDC where there are students who cannot possibly take advantage of out-of-State tuition and because we have worked so closely together and worked with the Secretary of Education and with members of the administration, we have reached a bill that we think fits and serves the residents of the District of Columbia.

He spoke, the chairman spoke, about the students at Eastern High School, and I do not believe that he exaggerated when he spoke about how absolutely thrilled these youngsters were to think of going to school outside of the District of Columbia, to have their opportunities broadened so spectacularly with one bill.

I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS), the members of my committee and the leadership of the full committee for a Herculean effort not only in designing this bill but in working with the Speaker and the minority leader to bring this bill forward so that it could get and achieve early passage so early in the 106th Congress.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. NORTON. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, let me just add one final point and that is this, if we really want to change the culture in this city where education becomes the thing to do for high school students, where it becomes matter of fact that one goes to high school and they move on to college or higher education, this is the kind of legislation that is needed because right now it is only a dream and not an achievable dream for many.

To be able to go to a quality private or State university system and have an array of choices and have that affordable to someone, we think will break that cycle and will encourage more people to go in.

The contrast between the surrounding suburbs where sometimes over 90 percent of the kids who graduate from high school go on to higher education and in the city is astounding. This, I think, could help change that around by making it truly achievable. Again, I commend my friend, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) for her efforts in this and look forward to prompt passage.

Ms. NORTON. I could not agree more with the words of the gentleman, and so much so that I want him to know that I will be working with the city to see if residents can use this bill beginning with this school year.

If they tool up, I think that they can make it happen, even though our fiscal year begins October 1 and school usually begins in August and September. I thank the gentleman again for his leadership and for his great assistance on this bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 974, 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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 974, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

NOAL CUSHING BATEMAN POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1251) to designate the United States Postal Service building located at 8850 South 700 East, Sandy, Utah, as the ''Noal Cushing Bateman Post Office Building''.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1251

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

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The United States Postal Service building located at 8850 South 700 East, in Sandy, Utah, shall be known and designated as the ''Noal Cushing Bateman Post Office Building''.

SEC. 2. REFERENCES.

Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the building referred to in section 1 shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Noal Cushing Bateman Post Office Building''.

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

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

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. COOK) introduced H.R. 1251 on March 24, 1999, designating the United States Postal Service building located at 8850 South 700 East, Sandy, Utah, as the ''Noal Cushing Bateman Post Office Building''. This legislation is cosponsored by each Member of the Utah delegation to the House of Representatives pursuant to the policy of the Committee on Government Reform.

The Congressional Budget Office has determined that enactment of this measure would have no significant impact on the Federal budget and would not affect direct spending and receipts.

Pay-as-you-go procedures, therefore, would not be applicable.

Mr. Bateman, honored by the bill before us, served in the Sandy City council for 20 years and was mayor for 6 years. He also served as head of the local PTA chapter and led a successful school construction bond campaign. He attained leadership positions in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support this bill, H.R. 1251.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to join my colleague, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS), in bringing to the House Floor five postal-naming bills. These five measures have met the Committee on Government Reform requirement and enjoy the full support and cosponsorship of their respective House congressional delegations. All of these bills were reported unanimously out of the Subcommittee on Postal Service and the full committee. I urge their immediate consideration and approval.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. COOK).

Mr. COOK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, today the House of Representatives is poised to pass H.R. 1251, a bill to rename the post office in Sandy, Utah, the Noal Cushing Bateman Post Office. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Noal Cushing Bateman represents the best of Utah. In his lifetime, he has seen Sandy City grow from a struggling farming community of 3,000 to a thriving business center with over 100,000 residents. Not only has he witnessed the growth but his planning and vision in large measure made it possible. His service to the community has spanned most of the 20th century.

Beginning in 1935, he served 20 years on the Sandy City council, 14 years as Sandy City treasurer and 6 years as mayor. He served for 35 years as the director for the Salt Lake County Water Conservancy District. At an age when many people retire, Noal Bateman was just catching his second wind. At age 69, he chaired the Community Development Block Grant Committee, a position he held for 9 years.

He was president of the Sandy PTA and lead a campaign for a bond issue to build the present Sandy Elementary School. Today, at age 87 he remains active in the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints and in the community.

Sandy City presents an annual award to the person who best exemplifies the volunteer and community service that makes Sandy such a wonderful place to live, to work, to raise a family. This award is called the Noal Bateman Award. It is only fitting that we honor the man whose vision made Sandy what it is today by renaming the Sandy Post Office at 8850 South 700 East the Noal Cushing Bateman Post Office.

The measure is a small gesture of gratitude for decades of tireless efforts by Mayor Bateman on behalf of the citizens of Sandy.

I would like to thank the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BURTON), chairman of the Committee on Goverment Reform, for his prompt measure on this action in the committee, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. 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 Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1251.

The question was taken.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1251.

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

There was no objection.

JOHN J. BUCHANAN POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1377) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service at 13234 South Baltimore Avenue in Chicago, Illinois, as the ''John J. Buchanan Post Office Building''.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1377

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

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 13234 South Baltimore Avenue in Chicago, Illinois, is hereby designated as the ''John J. Buchanan Post Office Building''. Any reference to such facility in a law, regulation, map, document, paper, or other record of the United States shall be considered to be a reference to the ''John J. Buchanan Post Office Building''.

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

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

(Mr. DAVIS of Virginia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER).

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

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, as we work this year to strengthen our local schools, lower taxes for the middle class and save Social Security and Medicare, I particularly want to the thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) and the committee for this opportunity to honor the work and dedication of Alderman John J. Buchanan who retired last month as alderman for the 10th Ward in the City of Chicago after almost 20 years of public service.

I introduced H.R. 1377 to recognize Alderman Buchanan's outstanding public service record in Chicago and honor him through the designation of the United States Post Office at 13234 South Baltimore Avenue as the John J. Buchanan Post Office. I have enjoyed working with the alderman personally over the last 4 years in a bipartisan effort to help 10th Ward residents who have particularly worked very closely for improvements to Brainard Avenue in the Hegewish area and the continued construction of the Deep Tunnel Project designed to protect our Lake Michigan drinking water.

John Buchanan has been a life-long resident and public servant for the 10th Ward. The only time he left the community was during his years of service in the United States Navy. He was first elected to office in 1963 and served the community until 1971.

From 1972 until 1977, he served as coordinator of economic development for the Chicago Mayor's office. While in this position, he successfully instituted programs for the retention and attraction of new business and industry. In 1991, Alderman Buchanan was once again elected to serve as alderman of the 10th Ward of Chicago. His city council committee membership included Aviation; Budget and Government Relations; Rules and Ethics; Economic and Capital Development; Finance; Human Relations; and Police and Fire.

Alderman Buchanan and his wife, who I would point out is his high school sweetheart, have two children and five grandchildren.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to report that every Member of the Illinois Congressional Delegation has agreed to support this legislation as cosponsors. I want to thank the gentleman and the committee for this opportunity to recognize the exceptional public service of Alderman John J. Buchanan through this special honor.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1377 was introduced by my colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. WELLER), on April 13, 1999. This measure designates the United States Postal Service facility located at 13234 South Baltimore Avenue in Chicago as the John J. Buchanan Post Office Building.

Mr. Buchanan is a City of Chicago alderman who recently retired as a lifelong resident and public servant of Chicago's 10th Ward. He has resided in Chicago his entire life. John Buchanan serves on the board of directors of several community organizations, including the south Chicago YMCA and Trinity Hospital Governing Council. We are pleased to support this naming bill for John J. Buchanan.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. 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 Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1377.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1377.

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

There was no objection.

CLIFFORD R. HOPE POST OFFICE

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 197) to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service at 410 North 6th Street in Garden City, Kansas, as the ''Clifford R. Hope Post Office''.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 197

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

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION.

The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 410 North 6th Street in Garden City, Kansas, is hereby designated as

the ''Clifford R. Hope Post Office''. Any reference to such facility in a law, regulation, map, document, paper, or other record of the United States shall be considered to be a reference to the ''Clifford R. Hope Post Office''.

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

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

(Mr. DAVIS of Virginia asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, it is a great honor for me to speak today on behalf of this legislation honoring Clifford R. Hope. Mr. Hope was an active public servant involved in Kansas politics for more than 37 years. Naming the post office in his hometown of Garden City, Kansas, is an honor. It is a small tribute to Mr. Hope's lifetime accomplishments.

During Mr. Hope's political career, his first leadership opportunities presented themselves as a member of the Kansas House of Representatives. First elected in 1921, Mr. Hope at the age of 31 became the youngest speaker of the Kansas House of Representatives.

As in many other States in the 1920s, tension mounted surrounding civil rights issues. Mr. Hope, an ardent opponent of the Klu Klux Klan, took the politically difficult stance to ensure that Kansas' history as a free State was not tarnished and that individual liberties of all its citizens were protected.

After 3 terms in the State legislature, Clifford R. Hope was elected to Congress in 1926. Mr. Hope became a respected leader in this House, ultimately serving as the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture from 1946 to 1951. Mr. Hope was the last Republican chairman of the committee until another Kansan, PAT ROBERTS, assumed that position in 1995.

Mr. Hope was deeply involved in establishing many of the agricultural programs that still exist today. In addition to his work on behalf of agriculture, Mr. Hope was a strong advocate for defense programs and was heavily involved in the military programs essential to our successful war efforts during World War II.

□ 1445

Mr. Hope was a veteran of World War I.

Spanning the presidential administrations of Presidents Coolidge, Hoover, Roosevelt, Truman and Eisenhower, Mr. Hope's time in Congress was a period of extraordinary change in our Nation. Through the end of the roaring 1920s, the Depression and World War II, and the critical rebuilding years that followed, Mr. Hope faithfully served Kansans and was actively involved in many legislative accomplishments that we take for granted today.

He was an avid supporter of conservation programs. Mr. Hope first experienced legislative success by passing into law the bill creating the Cheyenne Bottoms Wetlands in Kansas. It was created in 1928, and this wetland still today serves the goals of environmental restoration and preservation. While Mr. Hope's initial bill was aimed at Kansans, it was followed by one of the largest nationwide conservation programs, the Small Watershed Program, which was developed under Mr. Hope's tenure as the Committee on Agriculture Chairman. Passed in 1954 and known as P.L. 566, the Small Watershed Program has been successful in reducing runoff, controlling erosion and protecting countless communities from flooding for more than 40 years.

In addition to conservation programs, Chairman Hope also had great success in promoting the United States humanitarian role in the world. The Food for Peace Program, P.L. 480, was signed into law by President Eisenhower in July of 1954. From its inception, Food For Peace has been the backbone of the United States's food donation efforts around the world. However, not all of Mr. Hope's feeding programs had such worldly goals. Authorized in 1946, the zeal with which Mr. Hope promoted the School Lunch Program earned him the title of ''Hot Lunch Cliff.''

While it is often common to measure a man by his accomplishments, it is the manner in which those accomplishments are achieved that is truly important. In this day of harsh rhetorical battles, it is refreshing to honor a Member with character and demeanor. Our former Governor of Kansas, William H. Avery, also a former member of this body, perhaps said it best about Mr. Hope's character:

''I never heard Cliff speak a harsh word against those with whom he disagreed, either in debate or in personal conversation. He had the respect and admiration of all who knew him. He will always be remembered as an honest man with an infectious personality, kind to both his friends and adversaries, but unshakable in his convictions.''

In the epilogue to the book ''Quiet Courage,'' written in 1997 by Congressman Hope's son, Clifford Hope, Jr., also a distinguished Kansan, the son speaking of his Congressman father concludes that:

First of all, Congressman Hope had a solid record of substantial legislative accomplishments. He probably spent more time from 1933 until 1957 on farm support legislation than any other single issue, seeking to secure a safety net for farmers and, equally important, striving to ensure a stable supply of inexpensive food and fiber for consumers. His more lasting legislative accomplishments were in the area of soil and water conservation, agricultural research and marketing, and the Food For Peace program.

Although preoccupied with agriculture problems, Congressman Hope spent many hours studying and seeking the truth on all important issues. Hope's legislative achievements were not, in his son's opinion, his primary reason that he considered his father a role model Congressman and considered so by many of his contemporaries as well. He was a role model, rather, because of the virtues and values he held dear. In recent years there has been a rediscovery of, or at least a renewed interest in, personal virtues.

William J. Bennett, in his ''Book of Virtues'' quotes stories and poems which exemplify 10 virtues: responsibility, self-discipline, compassion, friendship, work, courage, perseverance, honesty, loyalty and faith. Senator Frank Carlson, also a former member of the House of Representatives, in his congressional ceremony honoring his friend Cliff Hope in 1956 cited a list of nine virtues that make up the stature of the perfect man: patience, kindness, generosity, humility, courtesy, unselfishness, sincerity, good temper, and guilelessness.

Hope would be the first to disclaim that he was a perfect man, but in large measure, he did possess the virtues cited by Bennett and Drummond. All of these in particular were ones imparted and taught to all of those he came in contact with.

So, Mr. Speaker, today as we seek passage of this legislation, H.R. 197, I encourage all of us to strive for these characteristics. We too will leave a mark on the history of this country, and I hope that during my term of service in the United States Congress that I will never forget a fellow Kansan, Clifford R. Hope, that he provided a role model for those of us who engage in this business each and every day, and that we will all strive to serve with quiet courage.

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 197, introduced by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) on January 6, 1999, designates the United States Postal Facility at 410 North 6th Street in Garden City, Kansas as the Clifford R. Hope Post Office.

Mr. Hope was a former Member of Congress representing the 7th congressional district in Kansas from 1927 to 1957. His political career began in the Kansas House of Representatives, where he served as Speaker of the Kansas House. Following his election to Congress, Mr. Hope became Chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture.

I am pleased to honor such a distinguished colleague, and we are pleased to support this bill from this side of the aisle.

Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise today in support of legislation authored by

my friend and colleague from Kansas' Big First District, Representative JERRY MORAN, and cosponsored by the Kansas House of delegation, that would designate the Garden City, Kansas, post office as the ''Clifford R. Hope Post Office.''

Clifford Ragsdale Hope was born in Birmingham, Iowa, in 1903. He was educated in the public schools and attended Nebraska Wesleyan University of Lincoln, Nebraska. He graduated from my alma mater, Washburn University School of Law, in Topeka, Kansas, in 1917, and was admitted to the Kansas bar that same year.

Clifford Hope then served in World War I as a second lieutenant with the 35th and 85th Divisions in the United States and France from 1917–1919. After the war, he began the private practice of law in Garden City, and served in the Kansas House of Representatives from 1921–27, where he became speaker pro tempore in 1923 and speaker in 1925.

Representative Hope was elected as a Republican member of the 70th Congress and to the fourteen succeeding Congresses, serving from 1927 to 1957. He chaired the House Agriculture Committee in the 80th and 83rd Congresses, when his party held a majority of seats in this body. He did not seek renomination in 1956, but returned to Garden City, where he served as president of Great Plains Wheat, Inc., of Garden City, Kansas, from 1959–63.

Former Representative Hope died in Garden City, Kansas, on May 16, 1970. He lived a life dedicated to public service for his community, state, and nation. Our home state of Kansas, the United States of America, and American agriculture were all made better because of him. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to have the opportunity to present remarks in support of this measure to name the Garden City post office after Clifford Hope and I am confident we will see it signed into law in the near future.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 197.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 197.

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

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1660

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1660. I believe it was an honest mistake. I was confused with another Davis in the House on that legislation. I do not support the legislation.

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

There was no objection.

ROXANNE H. JONES POST OFFICE BUILDING, FREEMAN HANKINS POST OFFICE BUILDING, AND MAX WEINER POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 100) to establish designations for United States Postal Service buildings in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 100

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

SECTION 1. ROXANNE H. JONES POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The United States Postal Service building located at 2601 North 16th Street, in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, shall be known and designated as the ''Roxanne H. Jones Post Office Building''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the building referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Roxanne H. Jones Post Office Building''.

SEC. 2. FREEMAN HANKINS POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The United States Postal Service building located at 5300 West Jefferson Street, in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, shall be known and designated as the ''Freeman Hankins Post Office Building''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the building referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Freeman Hankins Post Office Building''.

SEC. 3. MAX WEINER POST OFFICE BUILDING.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The United States Postal Service building located at 2037 Chestnut Street, in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, shall be known and designated as the ''Max Weiner Post Office Building''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference in a law, map, regulation, document, paper, or other record of the United States to the building referred to in subsection (a) shall be deemed to be a reference to the ''Max Weiner Post Office Building''.

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

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

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH), who is also the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Postal Service, introduced H.R. 100 on January 6, 1999. The bill names three post offices located in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Pursuant to the long-standing policy of the Committee on Government Reform, all of the Members of the House Delegation of the State of Pennsylvania support the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the committee voted unanimously to bring this legislation to the floor. I would also like to inform all of our colleagues that the Congressional Budget Office has reviewed this bill, and estimates the enactment of the provisions would have no significant impact on the Federal budget and would not affect direct spending or receipts. Therefore, pay-as-you-go procedures would not apply. Furthermore, the provision contains no intergovernmental or private sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act, nor would it impose any costs on State, local or tribal governments.

The legislation indicates the Postal Service building located at 2601 North 16th Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, be known and designated as the ''Roxanne H. Jones Post Office Building.'' In 1984, Roxanne H. Jones was the first African-American woman elected to the State Senate in Pennsylvania. She was reelected for two additional terms prior to her death in 1997. During her tenure, she helped pass legislation that aided people on welfare to break the cycle of welfare dependency by supporting legislation providing job training opportunities, introducing and passing legislation to expand affordable housing, and to obtain State funding for drug treatment centers for addicted mothers and their children. Ms. Jones was a former welfare recipient.

The bill also designates the Post Office located at 5300 West Jefferson Street in Pennsylvania as the ''Freeman Hankins Post Office Building.'' Freeman Hankins was elected to the Pennsylvania Senate in 1968 and served until his retirement in 1989. He served on the boards of the Pennsylvania Higher Development Agency, Lincoln University and the Mercy Douglas Corporation.

Additionally, H.R. 100 provides that the United States Postal Service building located at 2037 Chestnut Street in Philadelphia be designated as the ''Max Weiner Post Office building.'' Mr. Weiner, a steadfast advocate for consumer rights and protections, was the founder of the Consumers Education and Protective Association and the Independent Consumer Party. He was effective in helping many Pennsylvanians to keep their homes, heat their homes, protect their privacy and have access to public transportation.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania for recognizing these individuals who worked diligently for the betterment of their community. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 100 designating the naming of three post offices in Philadelphia.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 100 was introduced by my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH), the ranking minority member of the Subcommittee on the Postal Service.

H.R. 100 establishes designations for United States Postal Service buildings in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH) has named post offices after three great community leaders: the late State Senator, Roxanne H. Jones, the late State Senator Freeman Hankins, and the late Max Weiner, a tireless advocate for consumer rights. I am pleased to join the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH) in honoring such fine individuals.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. 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 Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 100.

The question was taken.

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. Davis of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 100.

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

There was no objection.

CARDISS COLLINS POST OFFICE BUILDING, OTIS GRANT COLLINS POST OFFICE BUILDING, MARY ALICE (MA) HENRY POST OFFICE BUILDING, AND ROBERT LEFLORE, JR. POST OFFICE BUILDING

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1191) to designate certain facilities of the United States Postal Service in Chicago, Illinois.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1191

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

SECTION 1. CARDISS COLLINS POST OFFICE BUILDING.

The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 433 West Harrison Street in Chicago, Illinois, is hereby designated as the ''Cardiss Collins Post Office Building''. Any reference to such facility in a law, regulation, map, document, paper, or other record of the United States shall be considered to be a reference to the ''Cardiss Collins Post Office Building''.

SEC. 2. OTIS GRANT COLLINS POST OFFICE BUILDING.

The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 2302 South Pulaski Street in Chicago, Illinois, is hereby designated as the ''Otis Grant Collins Post Office Building''. Any reference to such facility in a law, regulation, map, document, paper, or other record of the United States shall be considered to be a reference to the ''Otis Grant Collins Post Office Building''.

SEC. 3. MARY ALICE (MA) HENRY POST OFFICE BUILDING.

The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 4222 West Madison Street in Chicago, Illinois, is hereby designated as the ''Mary Alice (Ma) Henry Post Office Building''. Any reference to such facility in a law, regulation, map, document, paper, or other record of the United States shall be considered to be a reference to the ''Mary Alice (Ma) Henry Post Office Building''.

SEC. 4. ROBERT LEFLORE, JR. POST OFFICE BUILDING.

The facility of the United States Postal Service located at 50001 West Division Street in Chicago, Illinois, is hereby designated as the ''Robert LeFlore, Jr. Post Office Building''. Any reference to such facility in a law, regulation, map, document, paper, or other record of the United States shall be considered to be a reference to the ''Robert LeFlore, Jr. Post Office Building''.

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

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

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS), an active, dedicated and respected member of the Subcommittee on Postal Service, introduced H.R. 1191 on March 18, 1999. This legislation names four post offices, all located in Chicago, Illinois.

Pursuant to the policy of the Committee on Government Reform, H.R. 1191 enjoys the cosponsorship of all members of the House Delegation from the State of Illinois. As was the case in previous bills naming post offices, the Congressional Budget Office has determined that the enactment of this bill will have no significant impact on the Federal budget and would not affect direct spending or receipts. Therefore, pay-as-you-go procedures would not apply.

Section 1 of H.R. 1191 designates the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 433 West Harrison Street in Chicago, Illinois as the ''Cardiss Collins Post Office Building.'' Ms. Collins, many of us will remember, represented Illinois' 7th Congressional District for 22 years. I had the pleasure and the opportunity to work with her for two of those years. She was the first and only African-American woman from Illinois to serve in the U.S. House of Representatives. She was known for her outstanding work on the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight and on the Committee on Commerce.

Section 2 of the legislation designates the Postal Service building located at 2302 South Pulaski Street in Chicago, Illinois as the ''Otis Grant Collins Post Office Building.'' Mr. Collins served the 21st District in the Illinois General Assembly for four terms. He is recognized as a premier activist against insurance redlining in the country. Mr. Collins died in 1992.

Section 3 of H.R. 1191 designates the postal facility located at 4222 West Madison Street as the ''Mary Alice (Ma) Henry Post Office Building.'' Ma Henry was known as one of the leading activists on the West Side, dedicating her life to serving humanity and building her community. She developed a plan for a primary care clinic at Garfield Hospital and that was dedicated in 1976 as the Mary Alice ''Ma'' Henry Family Health Center, and it presently serves more than 20,000 patients yearly. ''Ma'' Henry died in 1995.

H.R. 1191, in section 4, also names the postal facility located at 50001 West Division Street as the ''Robert LaFlore, Jr. Post Office Building.'' Mr. LaFlore served in the Illinois General Assembly for 11 years and was known as a powerful voice for the disadvantaged and underprivileged. Prior to his death in 1993, Mr. LaFlore left behind legislation to help children and senior citizens. Mrthcoah

Mr. Speaker, this legislation has passed both the subcommittee and the committee levels. I urge all Members to support H.R. 1191, introduced by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS).

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

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1191 was introduced by my good friend and colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS). The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) is the sponsor of a bill to designate four postal facilities in the 7th Congressional District of Illinois.

□ 1500

The four individuals the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) seeks to name these postal facilities for have a long history of being servants, activists, heroes and heroines in their respective communities. In fact, the first person, the honorable Cardiss Collins, is a former Member of Congress, well-known to many Members of this body and fondly remembered still. She served as ranking member of this very committee, the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight, before she retired in 1996.

Representative Collins represented the residents of the 7th Congressional District for almost 24 years. I must take a moment to express my special and personal pleasure at this bill in Cardiss Collins' name. She was a dear and distinguished colleague in this

House, much revered on both sides of the aisle here. When I was elected to Congress in 1990, she had served for some years then as the only black woman in the Congress, because others had left. During that time and for her entire career here, however, she was known for her devotion, not only to her Chicago constituents and to women and to people of color, but for her dedication to the American people.

Cardiss Collins is remembered here for her astute judgment, for her ability, for her collegiality and for her dedication. It is a special pleasure to speak to this bill in particular, and I know that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DAVIS) will regret that he was detained on an airplane and unable to perform this particular service for a woman I know is also his very good friend.

The second postal facility is named for Otis Grant Collins, who, prior to his death in 1992, was recognized as one of the premier activists in apprenticeship training in this country. In addition, while serving as state representative in the Illinois General Assembly, he was a champion of laws that protected minority communities from redlining.

The third postal facility is named for Mary Alice Ma Henry, who, prior to her death in 1995, was recognized as one of Chicago's most caring and compassionate community activists. She is remembered as a courageous leader for the poor, uninsured and the left out of our society. In 1976, the Mary Alice Ma Henry Family Health Center was dedicated and now serves over 20,000 patients every year.

The fourth postal facility is named after former state representative Robert LeFlore, Jr., who, prior to his death in 1993, was recognized as a leading advocate for the disadvantaged and the underprivileged. He was a tireless worker on behalf of seniors and children, and his contributions will be remembered for a long time.

These individuals represent the best of Chicago and the nation. Their contributions have been significant and their legacies have been embedded in the communities they touched. I am pleased to sponsor this bill on behalf of some of the great African American leaders in the Chicago community and in our country.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, today I join with my colleagues in commemorating the contributions of an outstanding former Member of Congress. Cardiss Collins, who served in Congress from 1973 to 1985 representing Illinois' 7th district, was a leader in so many ways. Naming a Chicago postal building after her is a much deserved honor.

After losing her husband in a tragic plane crash, Cardiss Collins committed to continuing the fight for social justice, won the 1973 special elections and began a distinguished tenure here in Washington. Her six terms of service were then the longest service for an African American female.

Cardiss Collins' career in Congress was highlighted by a number of notable positions. Congressman Collins was the ranking minority member on the Government Operations Committee, Where she chaired the Subcommittee on Manpower and Housing. Cardiss Collins was the first African American and the First woman to serve as Democratic whip-at-large. In 1979, Collins was the Chairwoman of the Congressional Black Caucus.

Congresswoman Collins' commitment to the people of her district and the people of Illinois was apparent even before she came to Congress. A graduate of Northwestern University, she began her career at the Illinois Department of Labor. She later went on to the Illinois Department of Revenue. Cardiss Collins' commitment to the American political system was also evident through her service as Democratic Committeeman of the 24th Ward.

Again, I applaud the most honorable career and dedication of Congresswoman Collins. I am proud to join my colleagues in the Illinois delegation who share this sentiment.

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

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. 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 Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1191.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DAVIS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 1191.

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

There was no objection.

NURSING RELIEF FOR DISADVANTAGED AREAS ACT OF 1999

Mr. ROGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 441) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act with respect to the requirements for the admission of nonimmigrant nurses who will practice in health professional shortage areas.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 441

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the ''Nursing Relief for Disadvantaged Areas Act of 1999''.

SEC. 2. REQUIREMENTS FOR ADMISSION OF NONIMMIGRANT NURSES IN HEALTH PROFESSIONAL SHORTAGE AREAS DURING 4-YEAR PERIOD.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF A NEW NONIMMIGRANT CLASSIFICATION FOR NONIMMIGRANT NURSES IN HEALTH PROFESSIONAL SHORTAGE AREAS.—Section 101(a)(15)(H)(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(H)(i)) is amended by striking ''; or'' at the end and inserting the following: '', or (c) who is coming temporarily to the United States to perform services as a registered nurse, who meets the qualifications described in section 212(m)(1), and with respect to whom the Secretary of Labor determines and certifies to the Attorney General that an unexpired attestation is on file and in effect under section 212(m)(2) for the facility (as defined in section 212(m)(6)) for which the alien will perform the services; or''.

(b) REQUIREMENTS.—Section 212(m) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(m)) is amended to read as follows:

''(m)(1) The qualifications referred to in section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(c), with respect to an alien who is coming to the United States to perform nursing services for a facility, are that the alien—

''(A) has obtained a full and unrestricted license to practice professional nursing in the country where the alien obtained nursing education or has received nursing education in the United States;

''(B) has passed an appropriate examination (recognized in regulations promulgated in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services) or has a full and unrestricted license under State law to practice professional nursing in the State of intended employment; and

''(C) is fully qualified and eligible under the laws (including such temporary or interim licensing requirements which authorize the nurse to be employed) governing the place of intended employment to engage in the practice of professional nursing as a registered nurse immediately upon admission to the United States and is authorized under such laws to be employed by the facility.

''(2)(A) The attestation referred to in section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(c), with respect to a facility for which an alien will perform services, is an attestation as to the following:

''(i) The facility meets all the requirements of paragraph (6).

''(ii) The employment of the alien will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of registered nurses similarly employed.

''(iii) The alien employed by the facility will be paid the wage rate for registered nurses similarly employed by the facility.

''(iv) The facility has taken and is taking timely and significant steps designed to recruit and retain sufficient registered nurses who are United States citizens or immigrants who are authorized to perform nursing services, in order to remove as quickly as reasonably possible the dependence of the facility on nonimmigrant registered nurses.

''(v) There is not a strike or lockout in the course of a labor dispute, the facility did not lay off and will not lay off a registered nurse employed by the facility within the period beginning 90 days before and ending 90 days after the date of filing of any visa petition, and the employment of such an alien is not intended or designed to influence an election for a bargaining representative for registered nurses of the facility.

''(vi) At the time of the filing of the petition for registered nurses under section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(c), notice of the filing has been provided by the facility to the bargaining representative of the registered nurses at the facility or, where there is no such bargaining representative, notice of the filing has been provided to the registered nurses employed at the facility through posting in conspicuous locations.

''(vii) The facility will not, at any time, employ a number of aliens issued visas or

otherwise provided nonimmigrant status under section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(c) that exceeds 33 percent of the total number of registered nurses employed by the facility.

''(viii) The facility will not, with respect to any alien issued a visa or otherwise provided nonimmigrant status under section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(c)—

''(I) authorize the alien to perform nursing services at any worksite other than a worksite controlled by the facility; or

''(II) transfer the place of employment of the alien from one worksite to another.

Nothing in clause (iv) shall be construed as requiring a facility to have taken significant steps described in such clause before the date of the enactment of the Nursing Relief for Disadvantaged Areas Act of 1999. A copy of the attestation shall be provided, within 30 days of the date of filing, to registered nurses employed at the facility on the date of filing.

''(B) For purposes of subparagraph (A)(iv), each of the following shall be considered a significant step reasonably designed to recruit and retain registered nurses:

''(i) Operating a training program for registered nurses at the facility or financing (or providing participation in) a training program for registered nurses elsewhere.

''(ii) Providing career development programs and other methods of facilitating health care workers to become registered nurses.

''(iii) Paying registered nurses wages at a rate higher than currently being paid to registered nurses similarly employed in the geographic area.

''(iv) Providing reasonable opportunities for meaningful salary advancement by registered nurses.

The steps described in this subparagraph shall not be considered to be an exclusive list of the significant steps that may be taken to meet the conditions of subparagraph (A)(iv). Nothing in this subparagraph shall require a facility to take more than one step if the facility can demonstrate that taking a second step is not reasonable.

''(C) Subject to subparagraph (E), an attestation under subparagraph (A)—

''(i) shall expire on the date that is the later of—

''(I) the end of the one-year period beginning on the date of its filing with the Secretary of Labor; or

''(II) the end of the period of admission under section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(c) of the last alien with respect to whose admission it was applied (in accordance with clause (ii)); and

''(ii) shall apply to petitions filed during the one-year period beginning on the date of its filing with the Secretary of Labor if the facility states in each such petition that it continues to comply with the conditions in the attestation.

''(D) A facility may meet the requirements under this paragraph with respect to more than one registered nurse in a single petition.

''(E)(i) The Secretary of Labor shall compile and make available for public examination in a timely manner in Washington, D.C., a list identifying facilities which have filed petitions for nonimmigrants under section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(c) and, for each such facility, a copy of the facility's attestation under subparagraph (A) (and accompanying documentation) and each such petition filed by the facility.

''(ii) The Secretary of Labor shall establish a process, including reasonable time limits, for the receipt, investigation, and disposition of complaints respecting a facility's failure to meet conditions attested to or a facility's misrepresentation of a material fact in an attestation. Complaints may be filed by any aggrieved person or organization (including bargaining representatives, associations deemed appropriate by the Secretary, and other aggrieved parties as determined under regulations of the Secretary). The Secretary shall conduct an investigation under this clause if there is reasonable cause to believe that a facility fails to meet conditions attested to. Subject to the time limits established under this clause, this subparagraph shall apply regardless of whether an attestation is expired or unexpired at the time a complaint is filed.

''(iii) Under such process, the Secretary shall provide, within 180 days after the date such a complaint is filed, for a determination as to whether or not a basis exists to make a finding described in clause (iv). If the Secretary determines that such a basis exists, the Secretary shall provide for notice of such determination to the interested parties and an opportunity for a hearing on the complaint within 60 days of the date of the determination.

''(iv) If the Secretary of Labor finds, after notice and opportunity for a hearing, that a facility (for which an attestation is made) has failed to meet a condition attested to or that there was a misrepresentation of material fact in the attestation, the Secretary shall notify the Attorney General of such finding and may, in addition, impose such other administrative remedies (including civil monetary penalties in an amount not to exceed $1,000 per nurse per violation, with the total penalty not to exceed $10,000 per violation) as the Secretary determines to be appropriate. Upon receipt of such notice, the Attorney General shall not approve petitions filed with respect to a facility during a period of at least one year for nurses to be employed by the facility.

''(v) In addition to the sanctions provided for under clause (iv), if the Secretary of Labor finds, after notice and an opportunity for a hearing, that a facility has violated the condition attested to under subparagraph (A)(iii) (relating to payment of registered nurses at the prevailing wage rate), the Secretary shall order the facility to provide for payment of such amounts of back pay as may be required to comply with such condition.

''(F)(i) The Secretary of Labor shall impose on a facility filing an attestation under subparagraph (A) a filing fee, in an amount prescribed by the Secretary based on the costs of carrying out the Secretary's duties under this subsection, but not exceeding $250.

''(ii) Fees collected under this subparagraph shall be deposited in a fund established for this purpose in the Treasury of the United States.

''(iii) The collected fees in the fund shall be available to the Secretary of Labor, to the extent and in such amounts as may be provided in appropriations Acts, to cover the costs described in clause (i), in addition to any other funds that are available to the Secretary to cover such costs.

''(3) The period of admission of an alien under section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(c) shall be 3 years.

''(4) The total number of nonimmigrant visas issued pursuant to petitions granted under section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(c) in each fiscal year shall not exceed 500. The number of such visas issued for employment in each State in each fiscal year shall not exceed the following:

''(A) For States with populations of less than 9,000,000, based upon the 1990 decennial census of population, 25 visas.

''(B) For States with populations of 9,000,000 or more, based upon the 1990 decennial census of population, 50 visas.

''(C) If the total number of visas available under this paragraph for a fiscal year quarter exceeds the number of qualified nonimmigrants who may be issued such visas during those quarters, the visas made available under this paragraph shall be issued without regard to the numerical limitation under subparagraph (A) or (B) of this paragraph during the last fiscal year quarter.

''(5) A facility that has filed a petition under section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(c) to employ a nonimmigrant to perform nursing services for the facility—

''(A) shall provide the nonimmigrant a wage rate and working conditions commensurate with those of nurses similarly employed by the facility;

''(B) shall require the nonimmigrant to work hours commensurate with those of nurses similarly employed by the facility; and

''(C) shall not interfere with the right of the nonimmigrant to join or organize a union.

''(6) For purposes of this subsection and section 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(c), the term 'facility' means a subsection (d) hospital (as defined in section 1886(d)(1)(B) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395ww(d)(1)(B))) that meets the following requirements:

''(A) As of March 31, 1997, the hospital was located in a health professional shortage area (as defined in section 332 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 254e)).

''(B) Based on its settled cost report filed under title XVIII of the Social Security Act for its cost reporting period beginning during fiscal year 1994—

''(i) the hospital has not less than 190 licensed acute care beds;

''(ii) the number of the hospital's inpatient days for such period which were made up of patients who (for such days) were entitled to benefits under part A of such title is not less than 35 percent of the total number of such hospital's acute care inpatient days for such period; and

''(iii) the number of the hospital's inpatient days for such period which were made up of patients who (for such days) were eligible for medical assistance under a State plan approved under title XIX of the Social Security Act, is not less than 28 percent of the total number of such hospital's acute care inpatient days for such period.

''(7) For purposes of paragraph (2)(A)(v), the term 'lay off', with respect to a worker—

''(A) means to cause the worker's loss of employment, other than through a discharge for inadequate performance, violation of workplace rules, cause, voluntary departure, voluntary retirement, or the expiration of a grant or contract; but

''(B) does not include any situation in which the worker is offered, as an alternative to such loss of employment, a similar employment opportunity with the same employer at equivalent or higher compensation and benefits than the position from which the employee was discharged, regardless of whether or not the employee accepts the offer.

Nothing in this paragraph is intended to limit an employee's or an employer's rights under a collective bargaining agreement or other employment contract.''.

(c) REPEALER.—Clause (i) of section 101(a)(15)(H) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(H)(i)) is amended by striking subclause (a).

(d) IMPLEMENTATION.—Not later than 90 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Labor (in consultation, to the extent required, with the Secretary of Health and Human Services) and the Attorney General shall promulgate final or interim final regulations to carry out section 212(m) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (as amended by subsection (b)).

(e) LIMITING APPLICATION OF NONIMMIGRANT CHANGES TO 4-YEAR PERIOD.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to classification petitions filed for nonimmigrant status only during the 4-year period beginning on the date that interim or final regulations are first promulgated under subsection (d).

SEC. 3. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR ALTERNATIVE REMEDY FOR NURSING SHORTAGE.

Not later than the last day of the 4-year period described in section 2(e), the Secretary of Health and Human Services and the Secretary of Labor shall jointly submit to the Congress recommendations (including legislative specifications) with respect to the following:

(1) A program to eliminate the dependence of facilities described in section 212(m)(6) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (as amended by section 2(b)) on nonimmigrant registered nurses by providing for a permanent solution to the shortage of registered nurses who are United States citizens or aliens lawfully admitted for permanent residence.

(2) A method of enforcing the requirements imposed on facilities under sections 101(a)(15)(H)(i)(c) and 212(m) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (as amended by section 2) that would be more effective than the process described in section 212(m)(2)(E) of such Act (as so amended).

SEC. 4. CERTIFICATION FOR CERTAIN ALIEN NURSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) Section 212 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182) is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(r) Subsection (a)(5)(C) shall not apply to an alien who seeks to enter the United States for the purpose of performing labor as a nurse who presents to the consular officer (or in the case of an adjustment of status, the Attorney General) a certified statement from the Commission on Graduates of Foreign Nursing Schools (or an equivalent independent credentialing organization approved for the certification of nurses under subsection (a)(5)(C) by the Attorney General in consultation with the Secretary of Health and Human Services) that—

''(1) the alien has a valid and unrestricted license as a nurse in a State where the alien intends to be employed and such State verifies that the foreign licenses of alien nurses are authentic and unencumbered;

''(2) the alien has passed the National Council Licensure Examination (NCLEX);

''(3) the alien is a graduate of a nursing program—

''(A) in which the language of instruction was English;

''(B) located in a country—

''(i) designated by such commission not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of the Nursing Relief for Disadvantaged Areas Act of 1999, based on such commission's assessment that the quality of nursing education in that country, and the English language proficiency of those who complete such programs in that country, justify the country's designation; or

''(ii) designated on the basis of such an assessment by unanimous agreement of such commission and any equivalent credentialing organizations which have been approved under subsection (a)(5)(C) for the certification of nurses under this subsection; and

''(C)(i) which was in operation on or before the date of the enactment of the Nursing Relief for Disadvantaged Areas Act of 1999; or

''(ii) has been approved by unanimous agreement of such commission and any equivalent credentialing organizations which have been approved under subsection (a)(5)(C) for the certification of nurses under this subsection.''.

(2) Section 212(a)(5)(C) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1182(a)(5)(C)) is amended by striking ''Any alien who seeks'' and inserting ''Subject to subsection (r), any alien who seeks''.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect on the date of the enactment of this Act, without regard to whether or not final regulations to carry out such amendments have been promulgated by such date.

(c) ISSUANCE OF CERTIFIED STATEMENTS.—The Commission on Graduates of Foreign Nursing Schools, or any approved equivalent independent credentialing organization, shall issue certified statements pursuant to the amendment under subsection (a) not more than 35 days after the receipt of a complete application for such a statement.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 441.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, because of a shortage of nurses in the late 1980's, Congress passed the Immigration Nursing Relief Act of 1989. That act created for a period of 5 years the H–1A temporary visa program for registered nurses. When the H–1A program sunset, the House of Representatives decided against extending it.

There does not appear to be a national nursing shortage today, so there is no need to revise the H–1A program. However, a number of hospitals with unique circumstances are still experiencing great difficulty in attracting American nurses. Hospitals serving mostly poor patients in inner-cities have special difficulties. So do certain hospitals in rural areas.

H.R. 441, the Nursing Relief for Disadvantaged Areas Act of 1999, introduced by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH), has been drafted very narrowly to help precisely these kind of hospitals. It will create a new temporary registered nurse visa program designated H–1C that would provide up to 500 visas a year and that would sunset in 4 years.

To be able to petition for an alien, an employer would have to meet 4 conditions: First, the employer would have to be located in a health professional shortage area as designated by the Department of Health and Human Services. Second, the employer would have to have at least 190 acute care beds. Third, a certain percentage of the employer's patients would have to be Medicare patients. Finally, a certain percentage of patients would have to be Medicaid patients.

The H–1C program created by this bill would adopt those protections for American nurses contained in the expired H–1A program. For instance, for a hospital to be eligible for H–1C nurses, it would have to agree to take timely and significant steps to recruit American nurses. Also H–1C nurses would have to be paid the prevailing wage.

Additional protections have also been added. H–1C nurses cannot be able to comprise more than 33 percent of a hospital's workforce of registered nurses and a hospital cannot contract H–1C nurses to work at another facility.

Our goal should be that set out by the Immigration Nursing Relief Advisory Committee created by the Immigration Nursing Relief Act of 1989. We need to balance both the continuing need for foreign nurses in certain specialties and localities for which there are not adequate domestic registered nurses and the need to continue to lessen employers' dependence on foreign registered nurses and protect the wages and working conditions of U.S. registered nurses.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this bill successfully balances both these needs. Because it is so narrowly drafted it is not opposed by the American Nurses Association. I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation introduced by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) which addresses a pressing need for nurses at low income inner-city hospitals. When similar legislation was proposed last Congress, I expressed my concerns that it did not include adequate safeguards to protect American workers. Fortunately, this legislation was amended to specify that the relief was only temporary and to allow us to move more firmly in the direction of developing a more permanent solution to this problem that will utilize nurses from the American workforce instead of continuing to rely on foreign labor. I supported the revised bill, which passed the committee in the House last year before we ran out of time in the Senate.

The legislation being considered today is nearly identical to the legislation the House approved last Congress. It would allow up to 500 fully qualified foreign nurses to enter the United States each year to work for 3 year periods at hospitals that have not been able to hire enough nurses from the American workforce.

Since we are facing a temporary shortage of workers, the legislation sunsets in 4 years. The bill also provides for a determination to be made on whether the hospitals are taking reasonable steps to recruit and retain

nurses from the American workforce. In addition, the Department of Labor and the Department of Health and Human Services would be required to conduct a study to establish ways for these American hospitals to meet their staffing needs with nurses from the American workforce instead of continuing to rely on foreign labor.

Finally, the legislation also includes a provision creating an abbreviated certification process for foreign nurses who meet specified qualification standards. This change is needed to eliminate unnecessary and inappropriate steps in the certification process for ensuring the qualifications of these nurses to work in the United States.

I am a proud cosponsor of this bill, and I would certainly like to congratulate the work of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), and, of course, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) on H.R. 441.

On a note relating to Guam, Guam, unfortunately, does not qualify because of a certain threshold here on hospital beds, but certainly I hope we will be able to work that out at some time along in the process or perhaps with different legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished gentleman from Guam, one, for his cosponsorship and leadership, and certainly I appreciate his effort on our behalf with respect to managing the time on this legislation.

The distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. ROGAN) and, of course, the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH), the chairman of this committee, and myself are delighted to bring H.R. 441 to the floor of the House. We want to congratulate and applaud the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH), who had the insight and leadership to bring this legislation forward.

I would like to take the time, Mr. Speaker, to read into the record the words and comments of the American Nurses Association, and will subsequently have this letter submitted into the RECORD.

I read the letter primarily because I think this is also, this legislation, an affirmation of the importance of nurses in our Nation. We want to thank them. The American Nurses Association stands as the longstanding organization, the only full service professional nursing organization in the country, along with, of course, other organizations that have organized themselves around nursing.

The letter begins, ''Dear Congresswoman Lee, the American Nurses Association appreciates the opportunity to comment on H.R. 441, the Nursing Relief Act for Disadvantaged Areas of 1999.'' They again state that they are the only full service professional nursing organization. ''We have a longstanding interest in the development of nursing workforce policy.''

''Overall, the ANA believes that we need to address the root causes for the instability of the nursing workforce that has led to swings in the supply and demand of registered nurses. It is clear that over reliance on foreign educated nurses by the hospital industry serves only to postpone real efforts to address the nursing workforce needs of the United States.''

However, they remain neutral, and state they will ''look forward to ongoing discussions with the committee to address this complex issue.''

Mr. Speaker, I include the letter for the RECORD.

AMERICAN NURSES ASSOCIATION,
600 MARYLAND AVENUE, SW,
Washington, DC, March 18, 1999.

Hon. SHEILA JACKSON LEE,
Ranking Minority Member, Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims, Washington, DC

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN LEE: The American Nurses Association (ANA) appreciates the opportunity to comment on H.R. 441, the Nursing Relief for Disadvantaged Areas Act of 1999. As the only full-service professional nursing organization, we have a long-standing interest in the development of nursing workforce policy.

Overall, ANA believes that we need to address the root causes for the instability of the nursing workforce that has led to swings in the supply and demand of registered nurses. It is clear that over reliance on foreign educated nurses by the hospital industry serves only to postpone real efforts to address the nursing workforce needs of the United States.

With regard to H.R. 441, ANA has taken a position of neutrality. However, ANA will adamantly oppose any amendments which seek to broaden the application of this visa or would lessen the protections afforded registered nurses under this measure.

ANA looks forward to opportunities for ongoing discussions with the Committee as they seek to address this complex issue.

Sincerely,

BEVERLY L. MALONE, PHD, RN,
President.

Mr. Speaker, they too recognize the importance of addressing the question of the shortage of nurses. I want to thank them for their responsible letter that says that they will not oppose this legislation and will work along with us.

They have worked with us during this process to ensure that the process would be limited and, I believe, with the leadership of the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) and the gentleman from Texas (Chairman SMITH), that we have come to a point where all of us can agree on this legislation.

The Registered Nurse Temporary Visa Program was created by the Immigration Nursing Relief Act of 1989 and expired in 1997. The Immigration Nursing Relief Act was enacted in response to a nationwide shortage of nurses sufficient to disrupt the delivery of services to patients in some of our health care institutions and to potentially place patients in jeopardy.

The program allowed health care institutions who attested there would be a substantial disruption in the provision of health care services without the help of the alien nurses to essentially sponsor such a nurse.

Nurses admitted under the program were permitted to stay in the United States for an initial period of 3 years, but that period was subject to a possible extension up to a total of 5 years. The New York City, Chicago, Houston, Los Angeles and Miami areas accounted for two-thirds of all petitions filed because of the enormous need in these communities.

I support H.R. 441 because it creates a new registered nurse temporary visa program that would sunset after 5 years in collaboration with the insight provided for us by the American Nurses Association. It would limit the number of visas that can be issued to 50 a year and hospitals would be able to petition for an alien nurse to those in need. H.R. 441 would serve to decrease the nursing shortage in the United States and set up a new H–1C visa program.

I would also like to note, as I indicated earlier again, that the American Nurses Association has offered themselves to work and collaborate with us on stabilizing the nursing profession. There is no greater asset to our hospital and health profession industry, if you will, or the nurturing of Americans that does not include our nursing professionals, whether it is in home care, whether it is in our community clinics, or whether it is in our hospitals. They are an important aspect of our medical system in this Nation.

□ 1515

So I am delighted that they are not opposing this legislation.

I also want to close, simply, Mr. Speaker, by acknowledging again the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) who has worked on this legislation for now two sessions, and we are delighted that we are able to bring it to the floor of the House.

I know that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) was en route, but all of us has found ourselves struggling with the air traffic today. I know that he will want to submit his statement into the RECORD. I want to congratulate him.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I certainly would like to again reiterate our congratulations to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) for his diligence in this, and I thank the majority for their cooperation.

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

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to encourage my colleagues to vote for H.R. 441, the Nursing Relief for Disadvantaged Areas Act of 1999.

My reason for introducing and encouraging support for this legislation is simple—it will assist the underserved communities of this nation by providing adequate health care for their residents.

Today, there are some areas in this country which experience a scarcity of health professionals, even though numbers indicate that no nursing shortage exists nationally. Such an

area exists in my district, the First Congressional District of Illinois. The Englewood community, a poor, urban neighborhood with a high incidence of crime, is primarily served by St. Bernard's Hospital. This small community hospital's emergency room averages approximately 31,000 visits per year; 50% of their patients are Medicaid recipients and 35% receive Medicare.

The Immigration Nursing Relief Act of 1989 created the H–1A visa program in order to allow foreign educated nurses to work in the United States. the rationale for the H1–A program, as acknowledged by the AFL–CIO, the American Nurses Association and others, was to address spot shortage areas. St. Bernard's Hospital utilized the H1–A program to maintain an adequate nursing staff level. The H1–A program was vital to St. Bernard's continued existence. Prior to this program, St. Bernard hired temporary nurses. As a result, the hospital's nursing expenditures increased by approximately $2 million in an effort to provide health care to its patients in 1992. This additional cost brought St. Bernard's close to closing its doors. The H1–A visa program expired on September 30th of 1997. Currently, no program exists that would assist hospitals such as St. Bernards in their effort to retain qualified nurses.

My legislation merely seeks to close the gap created by the expiration of the H1–A program. H.R. 441, prescribes that any hospital which seeks to hire foreign nurses under these provisions must meet the following criteria: (1) be located in a Health Professional Shortage Area; (2) have at least 190 acute care beds; (3) have a medicare population of 35%; and (4) have a Medicaid population of at least 28%.

As one who has always fought for the American worker, I can assure you, that this proposal does not have a detrimental effect on American nurses. My legislation sets a cap on the number of new visas that may be issued each year. The legislation also includes processing requirements, that require employers to attest that the hiring of foreign nurses will not adversely affect the wages and working conditions of registered nurses. The Secretary of Labor will oversee this process and provide penalties for non-compliance.

Health care is a basic human right. The hallmarks of civilized nations are health care, education, and democracy.

the state of health care is a grave concern in my district. Hospitals have closed. City health clinics are closing. Payments for Medicare and Medicaid have been cut back.

The legislation we must pass today, is aimed at helping hospitals, like St. Bernard's, keep their doors open to the communities they serve.

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that we are returning today to some unfinished business from the 105th Congress—noncontroversial legislation that provides short-term relief to hospitals with critical needs that cannot recruit and retain adequate numbers of registered nurses. H.R. 441, the ''Nursing Relief for Disadvantaged Areas Act of 1999,'' is designed in response to a crisis facing some large hospitals with high percentages of Medicare and Medicaid patients in areas where there are shortages of health care professionals. The viability of essential health care for large numbers of people is threatened when certain acute care facilities in medically underserved, impoverished communities are unable to meet their requirements.

H.R. 441 provides such hospitals relief in compelling circumstances by facilitating the temporary admission to the United States of registered nurses in an H–1C nonimmigrant visa category—subject to a nationwide ceiling of 500 visas issued annually and limits of 50 or 25 (depending on a state's population) on the numbers of nurses who can receive visas each year for employment by hospitals in any one state. The legislation includes an exception from per state limits to facilitate the potential use of otherwise unused visas—as long as the annual nationwide ceiling is not breached.

This narrowly focused program for nurses, which will sunset after a four period, addresses urgent needs that cannot be met in any other way. The House bill was introduced by our colleague from Illinois, Mr. RUSH, with my cosponsorship—and its Senate counterpart was introduced by Senator DURBIN with Senator HUTCHISON's cosponsorship.

I became involved in this effort to enact remedial legislation when Saint Bernard Hospital, located in the Englewood Community in Chicago, brought its precarious situation with regard to nursing shortages to my attention during the last Congress. Because I knew the continued functioning of Saint Bernard Hospital would be so essential to the residents of the Englewood Community, I decided to endorse an appropriately limited legislative remedy.

H.R. 441, like the bill that passed the House last year, clearly merits bipartisan congressional support. It provides relief to particularly vulnerable hospitals and incorporates many safeguards designed to protect American jobs.

I commend the gentleman from Texas [LAMAR SMITH], Chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims, and the gentleman form Michigan [JOHN CONYERS], Ranking Minority Member of our full committee, for their important contributions to this carefully crafted legislation. Because the language of the bill in its current form reflects a consensus among House and Senate members of both parties, I am hopeful that it can be enacted into law expeditiously. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation, introduced by Mr. RUSH, which addresses a pressing need for nurses at low income, inter-city hospitals.

When similar legislation was proposed last Congress, I expressed my concerns that it did not include adequate safeguards to protect American workers. Fortunately, the legislation was amended to specify that the relief was only temporary and to allow us to move firmly in the direction of developing a more permanent solution to this problem that will utilize nurses from the American work force instead of continuing to rely on foreign labor. I supported the revised bill which passed the committee and the House last year, before we ran out of time in the Senate.

The legislation being considered today is nearly identical to the legislation the House approved last Congress. It would allow up to 500 fully qualified foreign nurses to enter the United States each year to work for three-year periods at hospitals that have not been able to hire enough nurses from the American work force. Since we are facing a temporary shortage of workers, the legislation sunsets in four years.

The bill also provides for a determination to be made on whether the hospitals are taking reasonable steps to recruit and retain nurses from the American work force. In addition, the Department of Labor and the Department of Health and Human Services would be required to conduct a study to establish ways for these hospitals to meet their staffing needs with nurses from the American work force instead of continuing to rely on foreign labor.

Finally, the legislation also includes a provision creating an abbreviated certification process for foreign nurses who meet specified qualification standards. This change is needed to eliminate unnecessary and inappropriate steps in the certification process for ensuring the qualifications of these nurses to work in the United States.

Mr. ROGAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for their comments.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROGAN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 441.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The Speaker pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 21, 1999.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received from the White House on May 21, 1999 at 5:30 p.m. and said to contain a message from the President whereby he submits draft legislation entitled, ''Educational Excellence for All Children Act of 1999.''

With best wishes, I am
Sincerely,

JEFF TRANDAHL.

EDUCATIONAL EXCELLENCE FOR ALL CHILDREN ACT OF 1999—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 106–68)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, the Committee on Armed Services, and the Committee on Banking and Financial Services and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit for your immediate consideration the ''Educational Excellence for All Children Act of 1999,'' my Administration's proposal for reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) and other elementary and secondary education programs.

My proposal builds on the positive trends achieved under current law. The ''Improving America's Schools Act of 1994,'' which reauthorized the ESEA 5 years ago, and the ''Goals 2000: Educate America Act'' gave States and school districts a framework for integrating Federal resources in support of State and local reforms based on high academic standards. In response, 48 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico have adopted State-level standards. Recent results of the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) show improved performance for the economically disadvantaged and other at-risk students who are the primary focus of ESEA programs. NAEP reading scores for 9-year olds in high-poverty schools have improved significantly since 1992, while mathematics achievement has also increased nationally. Students in high-poverty schools and the lowest-performing students—the specific target populations for the ESEA Title I program—have registered gains in both reading and math achievement.

I am encouraged by these positive trends, but educational results for many children remain far below what they should be. My proposal to reauthorize the ESEA is based on four themes reflecting lessons from research and the experience of implementing the 1994 Act.

First, we would continue to focus on high academic standards for all children. The underlying purpose of every program within the ESEA is to help all children reach challenging State and local academic standards. States have largely completed the first stage of standards-based reform by developing content standards for all children. My bill would support the next stage of reform by helping States, school districts, schools, and teachers use these standards to guide classroom instruction and assessment.

My proposal for reauthorizing Title I, for example, would require States to hold school districts and schools accountable for student performance against State standards, including helping the lowest-performing students continually to improve. The bill also would continue to target Federal elementary and secondary education resources on those students furthest from meeting State and local standards, with a particular emphasis on narrowing the gap in achievement between disadvantaged students and their more affluent peers. In this regard, my proposal would phase in equal treatment of Puerto Rico in ESEA funding formulas, so that poor children in Puerto Rico are treated similarly to those in the rest of the country for the purpose of formula allocations.

Second, my proposal responds to research showing that while qualified teachers are critical to improving student achievement, far too many teachers are not prepared to teach to high standards. Teacher quality is a particular problem in high-poverty schools, and the problem is often exacerbated by the use of paraprofessionals in instructional roles.

My bill addresses teacher quality by holding States accountable for stronger enforcement of their own certification and licensure requirements, while at the same time providing substantial support for State and local professional development efforts. The Teaching to High Standards initiative in Title II would help move challenging educational standards into every classroom by providing teachers with sustained and intensive high-quality professional development in core academic subjects, supporting new teachers during their first 3 years in the classroom, and ensuring that all teachers are proficient in relevant content knowledge and teaching skills.

The Technology for Education initiative under Title III would expand the availability of educational technology as a tool to help teachers implement high standards in the classroom, particularly in high-poverty schools. My bill also would extend, over the next 7 years, the Class-Size Reduction initiative, which aims to reduce class sizes in the early grades by helping districts to hire and train 100,000 teachers. And the Title VII Bilingual Education proposal would help ensure that all teachers are well trained to teach students with limited English proficiency, who are found in more and more classrooms with each passing year.

Third, my bill would increase support for safe, healthy, disciplined, and drug-free learning environments where all children feel connected, motivated, and challenged to learn and where parents are welcomed and involved. The recent tragedy at Columbine High School in Littleton, Colorado, reminds us that we must be ever vigilant against the risks of violence and other dangerous behaviors in our schools. Our reauthorization bill includes several measures to help mitigate these risks.

We would strengthen the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act by concentrating funds on districts with the greatest need for drug- and violence-prevention programs, and by emphasizing the use of research-based programs of proven effectiveness. Moreover, with respect to students who bring weapons to school, this proposal would require schools to refer such students to a mental health professional for assessment and require counseling for those who pose an imminent threat to themselves or others; allow funding for programs that educate students about the risks associated with guns; expand character education programs; and promote alternative schools and second chance programs. A new School Emergency Response to Violence program would provide rapid assistance to school districts that have experienced violence or other trauma that disrupts the learning environment.

My High School Reform initiative would support innovative reforms to improve student achievement in high schools, such as expanding the connections between adults and students that are necessary for effective learning and healthy personal development. This new initiative would provide resources to help transform 5,000 high schools into places where students receive individual attention, are motivated to learn, are provided with challenging courses, and are encouraged to develop and pursue long-term educational and career goals.

Fourth, in response to clear evidence that standards-based reforms work best when States have strong accountability systems in place, my proposal would encourage each State to establish a single, rigorous accountability system for all schools. The bill also would require States to end social promotion and traditional retention practices; phase out the use of teachers with emergency certificates and the practice of assigning teachers ''out-of-field;'' and implement sound discipline policies in every school. Finally, the bill would give parents an important new accountability tool by requiring State, district, and school-level report cards that will help them evaluate the quality of the school their children attend.

Based on high standards for all students, high-quality professional development for teachers, safe and disciplined learning environments, and accountability to parents and taxpayers, the Educational Excellence for All Children Act of 1999 provides a solid foundation for raising student achievement and narrowing the achievement gap between disadvantaged students and their more advantaged peers. More important, it will help prepare all of our children, and thus the Nation, for the challenges of the 21st century. I urge the Congress to take prompt and favorable action on this proposal.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 21, 1999.*

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 6 p.m.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 6 p.m.

□ 1800

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PETRI) at 6 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

Votes will be taken in the following order:

H.R. 1251, by the yeas and nays;

H.R. 100, by the yeas and nays.

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

NOAL CUSHING BATEMAN POST OFFICE BUILDING.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 1251.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS), that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1251, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 362, nays 0, not voting 71, as follows:

[Roll No. 145]

YEAS—362

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

NOT VOTING—71

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Baker
Bass
Becerra
Berry
Borski
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Burr
Buyer
Capuano
Carson
Chenoweth
Clay
Clement
Coburn
Cooksey
Crowley
Delahunt
DeLauro
Frank (MA)
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gonzalez
Gutierrez
Hansen
Hefley
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Kasich
Kelly
Lantos
Lazio
Lipinski
Lowey
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
McGovern
McKinney
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Moakley
Morella
Neal
Norwood
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Porter
Rangel
Rodriguez
Rothman
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez
Sanders
Scarborough
Schaffer
Shows
Smith (TX)
Stabenow
Tauzin
Tierney
Velazquez
Weiner
Weygand
Young (FL)

☐ 1822

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

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 145, I was unavoidably detained by official business in my district. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PETRI). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair announces that he will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device will be taken on the additional motion to suspend the rules on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

ROXANNE H. JONES POST OFFICE BUILDING, FREEMAN HANKINS POST OFFICE BUILDING, AND MAX WEINER POST OFFICE BUILDING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 100.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. DAVIS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 100, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 368, nays 0, not voting 65, as follows:

[Roll No 146]

YEAS—368

Abercrombie
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baird
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bateman
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burton
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Clayton
Clyburn
Coble
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards

Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Largent
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Metcalf
Mica
Millender-McDonald
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Minge
Mink
Mollohan
Moore
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Nethercutt
Ney
Northup
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ose
Oxley
Packard
Pastor
Paul
Pease
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Rush
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Vento
Visclosky
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield
Wicker
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Wynn
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—65

Ackerman
Baker
Bass
Becerra
Berry
Borski
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Burr
Buyer
Capuano
Carson
Chenoweth
Clay
Clement
Coburn
Cooksey
Crowley
Delahunt
DeLauro
Frank (MA)
Gejdenson
Gonzalez
Gutierrez
Hansen
Hefley
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Kasich
Kelly
Lantos
Lazio
Lipinski
Lowey
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
McGovern
Meehan
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Moakley
Neal
Norwood
Ortiz
Owens
Pallone
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Porter
Rodriguez
Rothman
Ryan (WI)
Sanchez
Sanders
Schaffer
Shows
Smith (TX)
Stabenow
Tauzin
Tierney
Velazquez
Weiner
Weygand
Young (FL)

□ 1830

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 146, I was unavoidably detained by official business in my district. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained due to delays in air traffic control. I missed rollcall votes 145 and 146. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1906, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2000

Mr. LINDER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106–159) on the resolution (H. Res. 185) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1906) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1259, SOCIAL SECURITY AND MEDICARE SAFE DEPOSIT BOX ACT OF 1999

Mr. LINDER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 106–160) on the resolution (H. Res. 186) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1259) to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to protect Social Security surpluses through strengthened budgetary enforcement mechanisms, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1083

Ms. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. CRANE) be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 1083. He was inadvertently added last week.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PETRI). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Washington?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.J. RES. 33

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be withdrawn as a cosponsor of House Joint Resolution 33.

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

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

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

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, May 24, 1999.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received for the White House on May 24, 1999 at 4:30 p.m. and said to contain a message for the President whereby he submits certifications in accordance with the resolution of advice and consent to ratification of the Amended Mines Protocol of the Convention on Conventional Weapons.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

JEFF TRANDAHL.

CERTIFICATIONS REGARDING AMENDED MINES PROTOCOL OF CONVENTION ON CONVENTIONAL WEAPONS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

In accordance with the resolution of advice and consent to ratification of the Amended Protocol on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Mines, Booby-Traps and Other Devices, together with its Technical Annex, adopted by the Senate of the United States on May 20, 1999, I hereby certify that:

In connection with Condition (1)(B), Pursuit Deterrent Munition, the Pursuit Deterrent Munition shall continue

to remain available for use by the United States Armed Forces at least until January 1, 2003, unless an effective alternative to the munition becomes available.

In connection with Condition (6), Land Mine Alternatives, in pursuing alternatives to United States anti-personnel mines or mixed anti-tank systems, I will not limit the types of alternatives to be considered on the basis of any criteria other than those specified in the sentence that follows. In pursuit of alternatives to United States anti-personnel mines, or mixed anti-tank systems, the United States shall seek to identify, adapt, modify, or otherwise develop only those technologies that (i) are intended to provide military effectiveness equivalent to that provided by the relevant anti-personnel mine, or mixed anti-tank system; and (ii) would be affordable.

In connection with Condition (7), Certification with Regard to International Tribunals, with respect to the Amended Mines Protocol, the Convention on Conventional Weapons, or any future protocol or amendment thereto, the United States shall not recognize the jurisdiction of any international tribunal over the United States or any of its citizens.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 24, 1999.*

SPECIAL ORDERS

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

Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. CUNNINGHAM addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

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

(Mr. CUMMINGS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

URGENCY REQUIRED IN DEALING WITH GUN SAFETY LEGISLATION

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

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of my remarks is to try and gain support within the Republican leadership to move and to move in an urgent fashion with respect to the gun safety provisions that have passed the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, this country has been shocked over the past 2 years as we have witnessed the shootings in Springfield, Oregon; Fayetteville, Tennessee; Edinboro, Pennsylvania; Jonesboro, Kansas; West Paducah, Kentucky; Pearl, Mississippi; and in Littleton, Colorado, as we have seen children take up arms against their schoolmates, against their friends, in school.

And while we will be discussing these matters at great length for a long period of time in the Congress as the Nation and the Congress come to grips with what we might do to try and prevent these actions in the future, one thing seems to be very clear among the people in this country, and I would hope among the people in the Congress and certainly among the Republican leadership, and that is that keeping guns out of the hands of kids will help to ensure that the feelings of anger and hostility do not lead to fatal shooting sprees.

We clearly need to listen to children and parents and make sure that school counseling and mental health resources are sufficient, and we must understand that the causes of youth violence are complicated and that the solutions must be broad-based, and we must strive to understand what brings children to this point where they would take up this violent action with guns against their schoolmates.

It is urgent to the American public that the Congress be able to respond to the problems of children having guns, having easy access to guns, and the irresponsibility of some parents who make those guns available or negligently leave those guns lying around the house, in many instances loaded and unlocked, with easy access by these children.

Last week the Senate passed several pieces of legislation designed to improve the margins of gun safety, if you will, requiring background checks for all gun sales, including gun shows. We have a companion bill here by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BLAGOJEVICH) requiring new handguns to be sold with safety locks. We have companion legislation here by the gentlewoman from Indiana (Ms. CARSON) outlawing high density ammunition clips, so they will not be made available.

I think that these are measures that the American public can understand, that the American public supports, that the American public, whatever their positions are with respect to gun control, understand that these are gun safety issues about the safety of our children.

Our children are, in many instances, some of our most vulnerable citizens, who go to school with all the expectations that we all went to school with when we were growing up, only to find out that it can become a shooting gallery because of the easy access of a troubled teen or a troubled youngster to these kinds of guns. Yet what we see is an effort to somehow not address this legislation on a timely fashion, not to take that legislation from the Senate and to pass it, not to have a freestanding piece of legislation which we can pass and send to the Senate that is identical to that which they passed so that they might be able to put it on the President's desk before we leave for Memorial Day.

No, what we see is, we are going to get one hearing this week, and then action perhaps in the committee sometime in June. Knowing the July schedule, knowing the August schedule. It is very likely, it is very likely, that America's schoolchildren will start the next school year without the Congress of the United States having addressed this issue.

I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the very distinguished gentleman from California for yielding to me.

I would say to the gentleman, 13 young people die from firearms every single day. That amounts to nearly 5,000 a year. It is the second leading cause of death among young people.

There is a reason why there are more deaths from firearms of young people in the United States than in all 25 other industrialized nations combined. Something is wrong here. What is wrong is the fact that there are over 225 million guns available in the United States that invariably are getting into the hands of our young people.

There are many things we could and should be doing.

□ 1845

For one thing, we have concealed weapons laws. In the Commonwealth of Virginia it is lawful to take a concealed weapon into a children's recreation center. In the Commonwealth of Virginia and many other States, one can take guns and park one's vehicle in a high school parking lot with a gun in or on one's vehicle. That does not make sense.

It does not make sense to be able to buy more than one handgun a month. What people oftentimes do is buy a whole case of guns in one State. They travel up the East Coast and then set up shop on a street corner in an urban area and sell those guns.

These are not responsible situations when we see the kind of death and destruction that is occurring from firearms every day. It is time for the House to take action to complement the action of the Senate, to put forward a good, responsible juvenile justice bill that will in fact make our schools and streets safer for our children.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) very much for his contribution. His remarks point out the urgency and the danger that these guns present to young people in this Nation. He has pointed out that 13 children under the age of 18 are killed each day because of guns.

Guns cause one in every four deaths of teenagers between the ages of 15 and 19. Firearms are the fourth leading cause of accidental death among children five to 14. Clearly the easy availability and proximity of guns, handled in an irresponsible fashion, to young children is lethal to those children.

We have an opportunity with the very common sense proposals that were presented in the Senate to address this matter and to address it now, with the same sense of urgency that parents are asking themselves about, whether or not they should send their children for the remainder of the school year, whether or not they should pull their children out of school before school closes, whether or not they should try to find another school that they might think will be more safe than the one they are in.

But what we have learned over the last 18 months, we do not know what school that would be. We do not know where a troubled child has easy access to a gun and then acts out anger, frustration or problems that that child has by shooting their schoolmates.

That is why we are asking the Republican leadership to schedule this debate, to schedule this vote this week before we go home for Memorial Day, Memorial Day, a rather significant day in the history of this country. But tragically now many will be celebrating Memorial Day at the loss of their children because of these tragic shootings. I think that is why we cannot play this by the ordinary rules of legislative procedure and process and jurisdiction and all of those arguments that are designed to keep these common sense approaches from coming to the floor of the House to be voted on.

Why are they doing that? Because the people who oppose trigger locks on guns that are accessible to children, the people that are opposed to getting rid of the loophole for gun shows where one can buy guns and gun shows without a background check, that one would not be allowed to if one went into a gun shop, people who oppose limiting the high density ammunition clips, they want time to regroup, to rescramble, to put pressure on the Congress, to give campaign contributions, to lobby the Congress so that they can overwhelm the judgment and the determination of the American people.

The Republican leadership ought not to become a tool for those interests, because it is those interests that are keeping guns in the presence of young children in an irresponsible fashion.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER).

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I strongly associate with his comments.

I have only been in Congress 3 years; but in the course of the time that I have been in Congress there have been eight multiple shootings on school yards.

I look at my colleague, the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE), she and I were present earlier before tragic shootings in our State, seeking the attention of the Republican leadership and of this Congress to at least allow a vote on simple, common sense, direct approaches that would minimize the impact of gun violence with our children.

We pleaded, for instance, to have the opportunity to at least vote on the most benign of child access protection legislation in the last Congress. We were denied the opportunity in the last juvenile justice bill to have any vote at all on any legislation, any amendment, even modestly taking the tack of trying to increase the safety of guns in the home.

It was frustrating for me that we could have 15 States, starting with the State that was the home of the Chair of that subcommittee that had child access protection, the State of Florida, 15 States have followed, and yet we have not been able to have the most innocuous of votes in this Chamber.

I am pleased that finally we are starting to see some movement, that we have seen some action on the Senate side, and perhaps the Republican leadership will find it in their heart to allow a vote on the floor of this Chamber. There are a number of proposals that have absolutely nothing to do with the rights of the hunting population around this country. In fact, they are supported by the overwhelming majority of gun owners.

Why? Why do we still sell guns in this country that do not tell one whether or not there is a bullet in the chamber? There are dozens of people who are killed every year because of the so-called unloaded gun. Why is it that we do not spend a few cents, up to 75 cents or a dollar, to have a mechanism so that when the clip is removed from an automatic pistol, that it sweeps the chamber and unloads it? Why is it that there are more consumer protection devices for toy guns than real guns?

Mr. Speaker, I think the time has come for the people on this floor to seize control of this issue ourselves. If it takes a discharge petition in order to be able to vote on these simple, common sense steps that will save children's lives, that are in fact supported not just by the majority of Americans, but by the majority of the gun-owning Americans, I think that the time has come.

I deeply appreciate the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) yielding me some time. I appreciate this discussion that is taking place here this evening. I hope the American public will add their voice so that they are in fact heard and this Congress takes its head out of the sand, takes simple, common sense steps that will in fact save the lives of children in America.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for his remarks, and he does point out the incredible inconsistency that we would put child-proof caps on aspirin, child-proof locks on gates and child-proof locks on car doors, and all of these efforts to save our most precious resources, the children of this Nation, but we would not think about doing it with respect to a lethal weapon like a gun that is unfortunately all too often left lying around the house.

Fifty-five percent of the handgun owners keep their guns loaded in their homes, and 34 percent of them keep them loaded and unlocked, loaded and unlocked in their homes, and in many instances with very young children present; and tragically sometimes, as we know, children with a lot of difficult problems who end up then acting out in a fashion that is lethal to their friends and to their classmates.

So I think that is why, as we see America starting to respond to the tragedies in Oregon and Colorado and Georgia and elsewhere, they start to say, why should people not have to be responsible in all the homes with locking the gun with the trigger lock, and the people who sell these guns be responsible for providing trigger locks with the sale of these guns so that their children can be safe, so that they can know that it is the denial of the easy and spontaneous access.

That does not mean that somebody someday will not hammer the lock off of the gun or, as we saw tragically witnessed here recently, break off the locks on the cabinet, but it is the standard of care that we owe our children.

I thank the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for raising those points.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE).

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, Columbine High School is just a few blocks from my congressional district. Columbine High School had its graduation this last weekend, honoring those kids who graduated with their class and honoring those who could not be there.

No one would be so shallow as to suggest that the only solution to these terrible shootings we have had in high schools around the country is gun control. But a troubled youth who does not have a gun is a troubled youth. A troubled youth with a gun is a killer.

I have been inundated with calls. Many of my colleagues have been inundated with calls from around the country, from suburban parents, moms and dads, from urban and rural parents, moms and dads, asking the simple question: Why cannot we do something, a little something, to keep guns out of the hands of kids?

No one believes that children in an unsupervised way, especially in or around a school, should have a gun. There are several proposals that we can pass on behalf of the American public and on behalf of American children, simple proposals which will give safety for guns and kids.

The first proposal is one which will make gun shows comply with the same laws that gun shops comply with. Gun shop owners, to sell a gun to somebody, have got to conduct a background check. They have got to have some identification to know that the person buying the gun is 18 years old or older. They have to have some kind of registration and way to trace that they sold the gun.

Gun shows can have numerous dealers which are not registered and which can sell guns to anybody for any amount of money, no questions asked. One year ago this last June, a staff member from my Denver office walked into a gun show in the Denver area, the Tanner Gun Show. The Tanner Gun Show is held 10 times a year. He bought a gun, no questions asked, cash on the barrel head, $450. It was a semi-automatic weapon. The two boys at Columbine High School bought their guns at the Tanner Gun Show, the very same gun show we had been at just a few months before.

Another thing we can do before we leave this week is we can pass legislation banning once and for all multiple-round ammunition cartridges. Why on earth does one need a cartridge of 15 or 25 or 30 bullets to hunt? One does not need those. Those cartridges are designed to kill human beings; and kill human beings they did, at Columbine High School. They kill police officers around the country every year. We thought we banned them in 1995. But because of a loophole in the law, these cartridges are still legally available, and that loophole needs to be closed.

Last, but certainly not least, Congress can pass legislation this week which will establish child safety locks on guns. This would prevent kids who should not have guns from getting them and using them. This is a common sense proposal. Parents across the country want to know why Congress has not enacted this law already.

As I said, Columbine High School's graduation was last Friday. Many more schools will still be in session through next week. Congress should send a message to the parents across America that we care; that part of the solution, although not all of the solution, is that Congress will take steps to enact child gun safety laws, not next month, not next fall, not sometime in the future, but now, before school is out, to begin to ensure the safety of every child across America.

That is why I appreciate the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER) taking on this important task tonight. That is why I intend to work this week to let our Speaker and everyone in this Congress know Congress must discuss child gun safety legislation and pass common sense, narrowly drawn rules before we leave for the Memorial Day recess. The only and best way we can memorialize these kids this week in Congress is to pass legislation before Memorial Day.

□ 1900

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman very much for her remarks and thank her for the kind of vehicle she is going to provide the Congress to express its opinion to get this done now.

As she points out, these are provisions, the safety locks on guns, the getting rid of the loophole provided by gun shows as opposed to gun shops, and multiple rounds, high-density ammunition clippings, these are very common-sense remedies and closure of loopholes that the American people understand and that they support.

The Senators in the United States Senate have passed these provisions. They should be sent over here. We should pass a freestanding bill and make sure that we can have this become law before our children get back to school. I think it is important that we address it with that kind of urgency.

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding. I particularly thank him for allowing me to join him and my colleagues on an issue of such moment, if you will, and to be able to say to the American people and to my colleague, common sense tells us that guns do kill.

They do kill. Ask any law enforcement officer, any person who is responsible for keeping law and order. Ask teachers. Ask parents. And, of course, ask injured children and ask the loved ones of those children who are killed.

I have heard the response by those who are advocates of the idea that the Second Amendment should prevail above all, that guns do not kill, people do. But people use guns to kill. And I think the American people are way out in front on this issue right now, because if we read the Second Amendment, it has to do with the keeping of a militia for a founding country of 13 colonies trying to survive.

And do my colleagues know what? We have a militia, the National Guard. And no one is trying to take guns away from the National Guard. We also know that the people of America have guns in their homes, and no one is trying to take guns away from the American people.

But in 1995, over 440 children died just of unintentional shootings alone. In my home City of Houston, Texas, a few years ago, almost 10 years ago, I did something unheard of. I rose up off of City Council and said, we are going to pass an ordinance that holds adults responsible for allowing guns to get in the hands of children.

If my colleagues know Texas, and I do not think my fellow Texans will allow me to praise them as well as to cite that it was an unheard of thing to do for a City Council member to do in the City of Houston. And there was a lot of opposition. The National Rifle Association sent people in to testify against it. But the mothers came forward and said, we want this.

Out of that ordinance came a State law that is now in place in the State of Texas that holds parents responsible, holds parents responsible, for letting guns get in the hands of children. And what we have seen is a 50-percent decrease in unintentional shootings since that was what it was to be directed toward.

To the family in Conyers, Georgia, if those guns had been more secure, as we are attempting to say to parents, not only in a nice display case with a glass front that could be broken, but away from the eyesight of children, it is our responsibility to try and keep them safe, but it is our responsibility to keep law enforcement officers safe as well.

Firearms are the fourth leading cause of accidental death among children 5 to 14 and the third leading cause of death among 15 to 24 years old. If this were a medical problem, we would call it an epidemic. In 1994, 70 percent of the murder victims between the ages of 15 and 17 were killed by a handgun and 2 in 25 high school students, almost 8 percent, reported having carried a gun in the last 30 days.

As a member of the House Committee on the Judiciary, we have had an opportunity to move this legislation forward. In fact, we could have done just what the Senate did to amend the juvenile bill that the Senate just passed with common-sense response to these gun issues.

We could, for example, stamp out the loophole in gun shows. Enormously important. We could provide for the safety locks that would protect our children and to realize that they protect others, as well.

My colleagues could not imagine the gun shows that travel around the Nation. And many times there are store owners that participate in these gun shows. But let me assure my colleagues, there are a lot of individuals who come and say, I have no license. I have no permit. I have nothing. I am just here. And the reason I have nothing is because these are in my personal possession.

This is a loophole. And so, we get the individual driving up to the gun show with 25 AK–47s and they say, this is part of my personal ownership. And they sell 10 or 15 to an individual who gives no reason. I have talked to law enforcement officers who went and bought a gun from someone, an automatic rifle, and said, ''I am going to use this to kill a cop in New York.'' And the person who was unlicensed said, ''All right. Here is a silencer to go with it. But make sure when you do it, do not call my name.''

There are too many guns in America. And most Americans want to be safe in their homes. They want law enforcement officers to be safe, as well. And so, I am joining with my colleagues to ensure the closing the loophole in the gun shows. I would like to see a Brady waiting period for those gun shows to protect individuals. I want to see raising the handgun purchase age from 18 to 21. I think child safety locks are an imperative.

And frankly, I wish we could pass the same legislation in the comprehensive gun legislation offered by my colleague, the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY) to deal with the idea of holding adults responsible.

When I spoke to some parents and teachers and explained to them that, no, I am not trying to disadvantage parents, I chair the Congressional Children's Caucus, I do not want to point the blame and put parents, who are already distraught, in a situation where they are criminally liable, but I think such a piece of legislation is common sense, and I think if they understand it fully, they would be running towards supporting it.

Because what it says is, know what your children are doing. Do not leave guns on coffee tables and in places conspicuously, where the child can get it. And if their child is in a garage or reading the Internet and building bombs, they need to know what is going on. Because we have to protect their children and our children. And how much more can we get from not listening to our children.

Let me close by simply saying to my colleagues, and I thank again the gentleman from California for yielding, that we know that there are other aspects of this, the video and entertainment industry. I am working on legislation to deal with mental health services, an omnibus mental health services for our children that deals with schools but also deals with other needs that our children have, so that if they are on medication they are not off of it one day and on it the next day.

I think America should be ashamed that we have a children's memorial that acknowledges the number of children that have been killed by guns. And allow me to share with my colleagues.

Chris Hollowell, age 5, was unintentionally shot and killed by his 10-year-old brother.

Sean Harvey, 16, was killed by a man who mistakenly thought the boy was stealing the neighbor's car.

Brian Crowell, 12, was unintentionally shot by a 14-year-old.

Amanda Garza died from a gunshot wound to the head after shooting herself with a .357.

Amanda Rogers, dead, 6 years old, was playing with a Nintendo with her cousin and was unintentionally shot by them.

Karissa Miller, 2, was unintentionally shot and killed by a 7-year-old boy.

Christopher Murphy, 11 years old, the son of two police officers, unintentionally shot and killed by his 11-year-old friend.

Christopher David Holt, 4, unintentionally shot and killed himself with a .357 Magnum.

Amanda Drukenbrod, 13, shot and killed at home when a teenage boy was showing off his gun.

I can go on and on, pages and pages of young children who died at the hand of a gun. Not a knife, not a stick, but a gun.

I think it is time now to say that we will not go home for this Memorial Day recess unless we stand up and be counted in the United States Congress and put a bill on the President's desk that he can sign.

I say to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), join us in getting this legislation on the floor of the House because our children are dying and we cannot stand by any longer.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her remarks and urge that the Speaker make this in order this week before we leave town for the Memorial Day break.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MCCARTHY).

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), he and I are on the same Committee on Education and the Workforce; and in the last past year and a half, we have talked about violence in our schools, we have talked about what can be done.

A week ago Tuesday, we had six young people come in to talk to us, talk to us about how gun violence has affected their lives. And it was very hard because here we had so many young people that faced death, lost their friends.

There are many of us that are victims. A lot of us are adults. We try and say we can handle that kind of pain. But even as adults, it is always hard. But to hear the young people talk about what happened in their schools, it was a real heartbreaker. And yet, here in Congress we continually hear silence.

I came to Congress to try and reduce gun violence in this country. That was a promise I made to my son. It is a promise I have made to my new grandson. It is something I plan on doing. And we have had our Littletons, we have had our shootings in Georgia, so many shootings. But I want people to look at this because this is where people do not realize what is happening. We have a Littleton every single day.

Every single day, we lose 13 young people, whether it is an accidental death, whether it is a suicide, or whether it is a homicide, we lose 13 young children a day.

We have an opportunity here in Congress to try and do something. We have an obligation to the people of America to do something. We have been talking about comprehensive reform on reducing gun violence and helping our young people. And yet in the Senate the other night, when they asked for more money for school counselors and psychologists, it was voted down. That can be part of a comprehensive package.

No one is saying that it is not just guns. There are a lot of factors that go into gun violence. The young fellow in Georgia, when he shot six of his classmates, he was really on the verge of suicide. He still does not understand why he did what he did.

We can help a lot of these kids. What I am hearing constantly is, this is too big for all of us to handle. We cannot do anything about it. But do my colleagues know what? That is what we hear when they want defeat before they even start.

We have to change the debate. When I am home in my district, I have NRA members that come up to me all the time, ''Carolyn, we support what you are doing.'' But then we have so many Members that are afraid of the NRA leadership. They are afraid of what they can do to them as congresspersons.

Certainly, they are not going to come after me about guns in my district because the people in my district support me on what I am trying to do. But we have Members here, and they have every right to be afraid of the NRA because the NRA will come in and say things about the Member that have absolutely nothing to do with guns, or make up lies. And they do make up lies.

What I am asking the American people, the mothers, the fathers of this land, call their congresspersons, give them the support that they need. Because if we only hear from one side, I guarantee my colleagues, in a couple of months, we will be back here when school opens again and there will be another shooting in the school and people will say, why can we not do something?

A year ago, when we had a committee hearing, a psychologist said it was not a matter of if there would be another school shooting, it was a matter of when there would be another school shooting.

□ 1915

But a lot of these young people that were shot, killed, injured, they did not make the newspapers across the country. They might have made it in their hometown newspaper, but they did not make it on the front pages, because they are all individuals.

My colleague before me talked about a health care crisis. We have four young people left in Colorado that have spinal cord injuries. Do you know what it is going to cost the American people on health care? The estimates, the low estimates of health care to our young people on a yearly basis for those that survive their injuries is $14 billion. $14 billion. Can you imagine what we could do with that? Can you imagine what we

could do with that money here in Congress? Education, health care, all the things that we want to do.

I am asking every mom, every dad, let us hear from you. We have to hear your voices. Grassroots, that is what we need. That is what changes and certainly motivates this Congress, because if they do not, there are a number of us that will continue to fight to reduce gun violence in this country, but it would be nice if we had a few more voices to be heard so we could give our colleagues the strength to do the right thing. They have got to hear from you. If you want to make a difference, then your voice does count. Do not sit there saying, ''Oh, so and so will call. I don't have to.'' You have to let the Congresspeople here know what you want. Then we will win.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I thank the gentlewoman very much for her remarks and think she makes a very important point. It is highly unlikely that we will have this kind of common sense gun legislation to help protect our children, to help protect our communities from the easily accessible and irresponsible ownership of guns, if the American people do not call their Members of Congress and insist upon it.

Over the last couple of weeks as I have been out in the public in my district and talking to groups and just being on the streets of my district, people have come to me and asked time and again: Why can you not do this and do it now?

When they saw the Senate not do it, they were infuriated, and the Senate doubled back and took a new vote and then came in line with what the American people wanted. Then the Senate doubled back a second time and came in line with what the American people wanted.

But apparently the Republican leadership in this House and the NRA are going to delay this legislation, fully understanding that delay is the enemy of legislation, that you get it jammed up at the end of the session against a recess, against the appropriations bills, and this starts to fall through the cracks, and it is nobody's fault and it is everybody's fault.

We need the American people to call the Republican leadership, to call their Members of Congress and tell them that these three or four measures, very common sensical measures, should be passed and should be passed immediately. They could, if in fact the leadership wanted to do it, be passed before we leave for Memorial Day.

They are having a hearing on the day we leave town, because then they are hoping for a week where there will not be any discussion of this measure and there will not be a sense of urgency about the American people to have Congress address this when we come back, and pretty soon we will find ourselves addressing it in September or October. It is the oldest legislative strategy in this town, just delay and delay.

Already we see Members that are supporters of the NRA going around the floor with checklists from the NRA trying to line up their support, who they have given their contributions to, will they stand tough on this. That is why they want the time. They want the time to kill this bill, not to give it great general consideration but to kill these ideas that have passed overwhelmingly in the Senate of the United States.

I would hope that people would heed your call for them to call Members of Congress and ask them to pass these child gun safety measures that have been passed by the Senate.

I yield to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and I particularly thank him for his leadership on this special order, because there is a hunger and a thirst in the American public for this legislation and for education about this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, this chart came home to the American people finally in Littleton and in Georgia. Close to 60,000 deaths during the tragic Vietnam War for 11 years. That is compared to 11 years at home, close to 400,000 deaths, increasingly the deaths of children. The reason that so many of us on both sides of the aisle cannot go home for Memorial Day without a bill is that we cannot face our constituents without a bill, not after the massacre in Littleton and the attempted massacre in Georgia.

I want to focus for just a few minutes on gun shows, because frankly I was ignorant until recently of the fact that anybody can buy a gun at a gun show free of any Federal requirement. I am sure most of the public does not know that there is no Federal requirement that says that a person with a mental defect has to be checked before buying at a gun show, with a felony conviction has to be checked before buying at a gun show, or even that a child has to be checked before buying at a gun show. Remember that some of the guns used in Littleton were bought at a gun show.

The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN) was on the floor earlier. He is from the district adjoining mine. My district has an absolute ban on guns of any and every kind. As I speak, my district is flooded with guns of every kind. Many of those guns come from gun shows in Virginia, because anybody can buy a gun at gun shows in Virginia. Maryland also provides guns through gunrunning into the District of Columbia.

That is why we need Federal law and Federal regulation. State by State is almost useless, given how porous are the boundaries in our country. We can go from one place to the other. You do not have to go through any kind of check to go from one place to the other, and it is a free country and we would not want you to have to go through a check. But we do want to contain these guns so that we can begin to deal with these contrasts.

The gentleman from California (Mr. WAXMAN), the ranking member of the Committee on Government Reform, and I sat on a special hearing before the Georgia incident where we heard astounding testimony from the GAO on how easy it is to buy .50 caliber sniper rifles from legitimate dealers, leave aside gun shows. Now, a .50 caliber sniper rifle is a rifle that can penetrate armor if you stand out on the back steps of the Capitol and aim it toward the Lincoln Memorial.

The GAO went undercover and asked for .50 caliber weapons of the kind, to use their words, that would pierce a limousine or bring down a helicopter. My friends, this is the Nation's capital. The people who ride in limousines and helicopters are Members of Congress, the President, the Vice President, and members of the Cabinet.

What this says, of course, is that even here, someone who wanted to take out anybody from the highest official to an ordinary citizen anywhere in the city or the region could buy a gun from a legitimate dealer, even telling them virtually that that is what they wanted to do. Imagine what a person with a mental defect could do by going to a gun show.

We must remember that this very building was the site of the assassination of two brave Capitol policemen. That gun was shot by a schizophrenic man. At a gun show, he might easily have purchased such a weapon.

The long and short of it, my friends, is that what we have in this country is massive gunrunning across the borders, between one State and another, sometimes shipped in large numbers. The result is that in the large cities such as the one I represent, the District of Columbia, the murders take place one by one. Now in the suburbs the murders take place in groups, by massacre. Choose your style. The difference is the same. They are all our children.

I focus on gun shows this evening because of the ages of the youngsters in the last two incidents. A 15-year-old in Georgia, a 17 and an 18-year-old in Littleton. These are precisely the ages of children that could go into a gun show today in many States and purchase a weapon.

Sometimes we are told that what was passed in the Senate the other day will not make much difference, it is at the margins, why pass it? The simple answer to that is if it will not make much difference, then pass it. If in fact those who cherish guns think that these bills will not hurt them very much, then pass the bills. There will be some slight inconvenience to the legitimate public, but who would say that that inconvenience would not be worth it if the lives of only a few children were saved?

And may I remind the House that most of the deaths we will never hear about because they are accidental deaths. We hear about the massacres, we hear about the drive-by shootings.

But when these guns are kept in homes, they are most often used accidentally by family members or friends within the homes. The 15-year-old youngster broke into a locked chest to get the gun that he used in suburban Georgia last week.

The silent deaths, the accidental deaths will be reduced, and certainly the deaths that have outraged the country will be reduced if we pass the modest legislation that came forward finally from the Senate last week. That is the very least this House can do if we want to make sure that this gap never appears again in our country.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I thank very much the gentlewoman for her remarks. I want to thank my colleagues who joined me in this special order to try and urge the Republican leadership to pass this week the common sense gun safety provisions that have passed the Senate of the United States.

We do so with the full understanding that the problems and the tragedies in Littleton or in Georgia or in Oregon or in Kentucky and other such States where young people have taken up guns and assaulted and killed their classmates and their friends, that that problem will not be addressed solely with the questions of gun safety legislation. But clearly in each of these cases or most of these cases, what we find is the easy access of young children, in some cases disturbed young children with the irresponsible possession of guns in the home.

We believe that trigger locks will help increase the margin of safety in our communities. We believe that not letting young people go into gun shows or people go into gun shows on behalf of young people and with no questions asked be able to buy a gun, a gun they could not buy if they went into a gun shop. They could not do that. They would have to undergo that check. We urge the leadership to pass these common sense gun safety measures.

I yield to the gentleman from Guam.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding. I want to extend my congratulations for this excellent special order on the issue of the proliferation of guns. Even in a place as remote as Guam, which lies some 9,000 miles away from here, a couple of weeks ago a couple of young ladies in middle school were detained in school for having handguns, bringing handguns to school. Guam, the place that I come from, is a place where lots of people own weapons.

□ 1930

Fortunately, most people on Guam who feel that they need to own weapons are in total agreement with their registration and with their regulation, so I am happy to report that. But it appears to me that certainly the country's supply of weapons, the availability of weapons, the easy access of weapons is really the crux of what we are getting at.

It is rather clear that the guns in and of themselves may not be causing these violent episodes that our Nation has been subjected to, but certainly the fact that the weapons are so easily available has made sometimes what would be seen as minor violent acts turn into major, major tragedies, and I cannot help but wonder where is the wisdom that is supposed to be part of the legislative body that we belong to in trying not to address this issue when it is rather obvious that this cries out for action.

As a career educator, and actually early on in my career I was what would be seen as a disciplinarian in a very large high school, and I served in that capacity for several years, one of the things that certainly would help us in trying to deal with all the issues that are attendant to the growth of children and the work of children inside educational institutions is to not allow them the opportunity to have things that would be harmful to them. And we think of all the things that we deny them that would be harmful to them, think of all the efforts, extraordinary efforts, that we go through to deny them things that we know are not in their own best interests, things which may lead to tragic circumstances; and yet we seem to hesitate, we seem to falter when it comes to the issue of guns.

So I certainly appreciate and I want to congratulate the work of the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER) and all the other speakers during this special order.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Guam.

Finally, I just like to say, Mr. Speaker, that I had an opportunity to meet with a group of students at Pinole Valley High School in my district and had subsequent conversations with five of those students, Brian Davenport, Marcus Maxwell, Jamian Johnson, Kari Washington and Brett Parsons about Littleton, and those students and the students in the larger group had spent a great deal of time watching the news, listening to the news on the Internet, over the networks and elsewhere, acquiring information about what took place at Littleton.

They clearly understood that this was about them, it was about their peers, it was about their generation, children of their same age, and they were terribly troubled about it, and they understood that this is not a problem that can be answered with one solution, that it is, in fact, very complex.

I was also quite pleasantly surprised, the extent to which the students understood they clearly had a very strong role to play in the solution to these outbreaks of rage and the violence and the killing that have taken place in these schools, that they understood that maybe they should be nicer to some of their fellow students, that there were students who they knew were somewhat loners or did not feel a part of the student body, that they should extend themselves, they should go over and talk to them, that maybe they should stop making fun of students or characterizing students because of the way they dressed, whether they had the latest clothes or they did not have the latest clothes, or the latest sneakers, or the wrong color clothes or what have you; that they had to think about not doing that, that students should not be characterized and categorized whether or not they participate in a religious organization after school or the debate club or they were on the track team or the football team.

All of these cliques that are natural, very, very natural during the adolescent years in schools, they understood that that was unfair to those students.

They had formed, they had many celebrations of their differences at Pinole High School over the years. The day I was there, they decided to celebrate their unity, to celebrate their sameness, to celebrate the fact that they were part of one student body drawn from many different communities.

It was a very exciting thing to see happen in response to Littleton.

So while we are focused on guns this evening and while we are focused on the need of the Republican leadership to expedite the consideration of these common sense gun safety measures, we also appreciate the complexity and the magnitude of this problem.

And let us not forget, let us not forget as we keep talking about children and schools and violence and killings, that 25 million teenagers are enrolled in 20,000 schools nationwide. Eight of those youths in six schools perpetrated the school killings of the last 8 months. Twenty-five million children came and went to school every day without being subjected to this danger or perpetrating this danger. We are talking about a handful of young children.

Some people have suggested, and I think the minority whip said it this week in Salt Lake City: The problem is not guns; the problem is, we are raising children to kill children.

No, we are not raising children to kill children. Twenty-five million teenagers went to school yesterday, the day before, and the day before Littleton and the day before all of these tragedies, and afterwards, and did not engage in the killing of their classmates or their friends. But a very small handful, because of the easy access and proximity and the irresponsible ownership of these guns and possession of these guns in their homes and the easy ability to purchase them through a loophole in the law at gun shows; that handful of students was able to perpetrate an incredible amount of violence and incredible amount of killing on their school friends and on their communities.

So this is not to suggest that these are children of a generation of a culture of violence and killing because it

is not true. Those kinds of generalizations will cause us to miss the problem, will cause us to miss the complexity of it.

But what we do know in this particular case was these young people had relatively easy access to these guns, and what we do know is that we have that part, as my colleagues know, that part of the solution coming together in the passage of these measures that have passed the Senate.

So I think we ought to keep and we ought to understand our children, and we should not, we should not paint them with the very broad brush of a relatively and, well, less than two handfuls of children that have perpetrated this kind of violence over the last 18 months. If this was the culture of violence in this young generation, as Michael Males, who is at the School for Social Ecology at the University of California, Irvine, points out, if this was a culture of violence, if we had raised children to kill children, then these killings would not be thousands of miles apart and months apart. This is what all children would be doing.

But they are not doing it. Like all of the children before them, they are going to school to get an education, to socialize and become part of their community, to grow up and to mature and decide what they are going to do with the rest of their lives. And their parents did not raise them to kill children.

But some parents unfortunately have been very irresponsible about leaving loaded guns and leaving firearms around, easily accessible to their children, apparently have not had the kind of communication or have not imposed upon their children the kind of discipline I grew up with about a gun.

I hunted, my father hunted, my children hunt. We have very, very strict rules about when one can touch a gun and when they cannot touch a gun and what to do with a gun in the home and what to do with the gun in the field.

Now some parents apparently have not been able to convey that or not willing to convey that or do not understand the kind of risk. We have got to deal with the questions of that kind of parental irresponsibility and with placing some responsibility and liability on those who fail to be the proper custodians of their children and of these firearms.

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, the tragedy at Columbine was heartbreaking for all Americans, but it was particularly difficult for the people in my home state of Oregon, where we endured a similar tragedy just one year ago at Thurston High School in Springfield.

At Thurston High, two young students were killed, and America reacted with sadness and sympathy.

At Columbine High, as we all know, thirteen students were killed by the two gunmen. America reacted with profound grief and a renewed sense of urgency.

Ladies and Gentlemen, thirteen children die every day in America—the result of handgun violence. Columbine happens every single day.

It is not nearly as dramatic, there are no CNN cameras, the nation does not stop and hold its breath, and watch . . .

But, every day in America, 13 children die unnecessary deaths from guns.

This is a children's health epidemic—and it is high time this Congress start paying attention to it, and take some steps in the right direction.

Now is the right time to begin the search for answers. Clearly, this is not an easy task. There are many approaches we can take to reduce youth violence:

We can make it easier for parents to spend time with their children.

We can reduce class size so teachers can identify troubled children, and get them the help they need.

We can better teach our young people the value of human life.

We can devote more resources to school counselors and mental health providers.

And we can simply open up the channels of communication between adults and teenagers . . .

What I've learned from listening to Oregon students in their schools, is that perhaps the most important thing we can do to make schools safer, is to create an atmosphere where it is more acceptable for students to talk to adults when they see danger signs.

These are all important steps . . .

Each will be helpful, but none alone or all together will be effective enough to curb this health epidemic without a commitment from this Congress to make guns less accessible to young people.

Conflicts and emotions that get the better of people can sometimes be sorted out with words, sometimes they get sorted out with fists, or with knives . . .

But the only tool of anger that can mow down thirteen students in a school library—is a gun.

Simply passing laws will not address the root causes of this tragedy, but there are steps we can take to keep guns out of the hands of violent juveniles.

That is why I urge my colleagues to support reasonable gun safety measures being introduced by Democrats:

First, let's close the ''gun show loophole,'' which allows criminals to trade weapons anonymously. By instituting background checks for those seeking to anonymously purchase firearms at gun shows, we can make guns less accessible to criminals, and to violent youths.

Second, let's raise the minimum age for handgun purchases from 18 to 21.

Third, let's make sure that guns are childproofed at least as well as a bottle of aspirin—by requiring gunmakers to equip all guns with child safety locks.

And finally, let's show the American people that we're serious about stopping the illegal transfer of guns. I hope my colleagues will join Mr. WEXLER of Florida, myself, 95 other Democrats, and one Republican, Ms. MORELLA, in supporting HR 315—a bill which limits the number of handgun purchases to one per month.

Once again, I don't think that any law will ever be a complete solution. None of us do.

But we're not expected to always find the complete solution. We are here to do what we can to make this country better, safer, healthier, and more prosperous.

These sensible measures are steps in the right direction, steps down a right and sensible path.

I hope our colleagues on the other side of the aisle will take these steps with us. Sooner rather than later.

Because this is an epidemic that waits for none of us. Every day we wait—thirteen more children die—another Columbine—every single day.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, these three measures that have passed the Senate are the beginning step in that area, so I want to thank my colleagues who joined me in this special order. I plead with the American public to call their Member of Congress, to call the Republican leadership, ask them to schedule these gun safety measures as soon as possible, to do it this week. We have a relatively clear calendar. It can all be passed and wrapped up before we go home for the Memorial Day break.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order today.

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

There was no objection.

CLINTON ADMINISTRATION CREATING PERCEPTION THAT ALL IS WELL IN THE WORLD

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

Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, we can only spin national security issues and concerns so long, and eventually the truth catches up to us. The truth is about to hit the fan this week in Washington on the national security concerns of this country.

For 7 years, Mr. Speaker, we have heard the rhetoric coming from the White House that the world is safe, there are no problems, our security is intact, and therefore, we can dramatically cut the size of our defense forces and we can, in fact, shift that money over to other purposes.

During the 7 years that that has occurred, Democrats and Republicans alike in this body and the other body have joined together to constantly remind the administration that things were not quite as good as they were being portrayed to the American people.

Unfortunately, we were not as successful as we would have liked. In fact, Mr. Speaker, State of the Union speech after State of the Union speech the President would stand before the American people and would talk about the economy, would talk about jobs, would talk about crimes domestically, but no mention of national security concerns. In fact, Mr. Speaker, this

past January, as I sat through the State of the Union speech in this very room, I timed the President's speech. He spoke for 1 hour and 17 minutes. The total amount of time he devoted to national security was 90 seconds, 90 seconds to talk about the problems we have with our relationship with China, 90 seconds to talk about the problems that are resulting from the economic instability in Russia, 90 seconds to talk about the proliferation that has now caused Iran and Iraq and Syria and Libya to begin to develop medium- and eventually long-range missile systems, 90 seconds to talk about the sabre rattling between India and Pakistan, 90 seconds to talk about the problems with North Korea, both our nuclear development program and their testing of long-range missiles which the CIA acknowledges now for the first time ever can actually hit the mainland of the U.S.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, during those 90 seconds, all the President did was point up to the gallery and praise one of our young pilots.

Mr. Speaker, support for our military is not when the commander in chief parades a group of soldiers down the White House lawn for a photo op, it is not when the commander in chief stands on the deck of an aircraft carrier and talks about the pride in our services while morale is reaching an all-time low. We have serious problems, Mr. Speaker, and this week, starting tomorrow, those problems are going to be made available for the American people to see firsthand.

Now, as I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, we are aware that this administration has tried to create the perception, and with a great deal of success, that everything is okay in the world, all is safe, Russia is our new friend, China is our new friend and partner, we do not have to worry about the Balkans because we have got our troops deployed.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, what has been occurring over the past 7 years with strong concerns expressed by both Democrats and Republicans alike in this body is that we have committed our troops to too many places in a short period of time to be effective in modernizing for the future and in protecting America's vital interests around the world.

I have used this comparison frequently, Mr. Speaker, and I want to use it again:

In the time period from the end of World War II until 1991, during the administration of all those Presidents in between, from Harry Truman through Democrat and Republican administrations ending with George Bush, all of those commanders in chief, as they have the ability to under our Constitution, deployed our troops a total of 10 times, 10 times at home and around the world. Some of those deployments were very serious, like Korea and Vietnam and Desert Storm.

Since 1991, Mr. Speaker, our current commander in chief has deployed our troops 33 times, 33 times in 8 years versus 10 times in 40 years. Mr. Speaker, none of these deployments were paid for, none of them were budgeted for, none of these deployments had the administration asking the Congress to vote in support of the deployment before our troops were committed.

In the case of Bosnia, it was not that this Congress is isolationist. Nothing could be further from the truth. The problem in this Congress among Democrats and Republicans was why was America putting 36,000 troops into Bosnia when, for instance, Germany right next door, our friend and ally, was only committing 4,000 troops? It was a question of fairness. Why was America being asked in each of these 33 deployments to pick up an unusually large amount of the responsibility?

In Kosovo today, when we see the nightly news of the bombing raids the previous night, we see U.S. and British planes conducting the bulk of those air strikes. By law and by NATO's mandate, the U.S. is only supposed to provide 22 percent of the support for NATO.

□ 1945

So Members of Congress rightfully ask the question, where are the other NATO allies? Why is not Europe playing a larger role in these kinds of operations?

In fact, Mr. Speaker, that was the reason why we passed the supplemental bill several weeks ago and just last week approved the defense authorization bill, calling for increases in funding to partially replace the funds that were siphoned off to pay for these 33 deployments, none of which were budgeted for.

When the President would commit our troops to, say, Bosnia or to Haiti, we would then have to find the money in our defense budget, taking it from other programs or from quality of life issues for the troops to pay the costs of these operations. The comptroller of the Pentagon estimates that that cost us $19 billion over the past 7 years. In fact, Bosnia alone has already cost us close to $10 billion. At a time where we have been convinced that the world is safe, partially because our troops are today at this time deployed all over the world, we have decimated our ability to prepare for the future in our military.

Some other things have occurred, Mr. Speaker, and I want to talk about them briefly.

First of all, this President, working along with Tony Blair from Great Britain, decided it was in the best interest of the U.S. and Britain, along with our NATO allies. And make no mistake about it, the bulk of NATO is decided by our President and Tony Blair, NATO really is dependent upon the leadership of the U.S. and Britain. I do not think Luxembourg would have much of a chance in stopping America from doing anything it wanted in terms of NATO. The decision to go into Kosovo was one that required the debate and the consent of this body, but that was not to be.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, hindsight always being 20/20 we can now look back, as I have, and talk to some of our analysts in the intelligence operation, which I have. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I have learned that every CIA Balkan analyst in the CIA, every one of them, unanimously, agree that an aerial attack on Serbia and Kosovo would not stop ethnic cleansing.

The CIA, for all of its faults, and I was as troubled by the bombing of the Chinese Embassy as anyone, but the CIA's analysts who are the experts on the Balkans told this administration that the bombing that we eventually got involved in would cause a massive problem of refugees. The CIA Balkan analysts told the administration that bombing would not work, would not stop the ethnic cleansing.

All of this was done prior to the administration's decision. In fact, there were documents internally within the intelligence community, submitted to the administration, outlining the CIA's concern that if the bombing took place it would cause a humanitarian catastrophe, and that is exactly what has happened. It is far worse than just the humanitarian catastrophe.

In fact, many of those analysts said that we actually contributed to the refugee crisis because when we bombed, it obviously caused the observers who were in the former Yugoslavia to leave that country, which then gave Milosevic a free hand to continue at a much higher level the ethnic cleansing and the significant attacks on innocent people.

So in effect, Mr. Speaker, what the intelligence community was saying to us as a Nation, prior to a decision to conduct the aerial campaign, was that if we went ahead, we would cause the situation to become much worse. That is exactly what has occurred.

We are now into our 60-something day of consecutive bombing and many in this body, having seen the fact that we do not have the dollars to put forward to pay for the Kosovo deployment, which is now in excess of probably $2 billion, are now wondering what our strategy is to stop the bombing, what is our strategy to end the crisis. Since many of our colleagues, including myself, do not feel that we have a legitimate strategy to end the conflict, we wonder what the strategy is to win the conflict, because we are controlling what our military can and cannot do in Kosovo, in Serbia.

We are limiting the strikes. We never committed to a ground force. So the question we have to ask is, if we do not have a strategy to end the conflict, and if we do not have a strategy to win the conflict, what is our strategy? For many of us, there is no strategy, Mr. Speaker. It is just a continuing massive amount of aerial attacks that in many cases are harming innocent civilians.

Now, let me add further, Mr. Speaker, if we have to look at the situation in the former Yugoslavia and see what we have done, we can look certainly at three different things. We have now rallied all of the people in Serbia, many of whom were against Milosevic, many of whom are ready to try to remove him forcefully, we have managed to rally all of them in support of Milosevic as their hero.

We have managed to help cause an extensive increase in the refugee crisis, to the extent now that we have almost 1 million men and women and children in outlying regions around Kosovo, with no decent housing and no decent food and no timetable to return them to their country.

We have done something else, Mr. Speaker. We have managed to do what one colleague of mine from the Russian Duma told me the Soviet communist party could not accomplish in 70 years, after expending billions of dollars, to convince the Russian people that America was evil, that we really were designed as a nation to hurt innocent people. He said Russians are now convinced, after some 55 days of bombing, which it was when he was here, that this country really is evil. So we have managed to do in 55 days what the Soviet communist party could not accomplish in Russia in 70 years.

Mr. Speaker, we are doing ourselves long-term harm in our relationship with Russia. First of all, after starting the aerial campaign, we did not engage Russia. Now the administration would have us believe otherwise. There was no direct contact with Russia after Rambouillet until, in fact, a group of Russian pro-western parliamentarians contacted us in the Congress and said: You do not understand what you are doing. You are driving our party out of power. We who support strong relations with America, we who want to help you solve the proliferation problem in our country, we who want to get rid of the communists and the ultranationalists are being driven out because your policies in the Balkans are causing the Russian people to identify with the communists and the ultranationalists.

When the elections are held this year, if you continue this policy, you are going to drive Russia back into a Cold War era like we saw in the Soviet days.

Our policies in the Balkans are very much of a concern to me, not just because of the crisis being created with the Serbs and with the Kosovars and the refugees, but also because of the long-term implications in our relationship with Russia.

Now, make no mistake about it, Mr. Speaker. Like all of our colleagues in this body, I abhor what Milosevic has done. He is a thug. He is a war criminal, and after this is over we need to proceed in convening a war crimes tribunal.

Our policies, Mr. Speaker, have not succeeded either. We need to have this administration understand that continuing a mistake is worse than trying to find an honorable solution. We have that opportunity.

As I said on this floor several times, 11 Members of this body, 5 Democrats and 6 Republicans, attempted to find common ground with members of the Russian Duma 2 weeks ago in Vienna. We found that common ground. In fact, the agreement that we reached became the basis for the G–8 accord that came out 5 days later, which the U.S. was a signatory of.

That agreement calls for a negotiated settlement along the lines of the five key NATO principles that our President has said are most important for us. Now is the time for us to use the leverage that we have and our NATO partners have and Russia has to convince Milosevic that he must come to the table on our terms.

I am not convinced our administration is still at this very moment doing enough to engage the Russians in applying the appropriate pressure to Milosevic.

Mr. Speaker, the agreement that we reached in Vienna we brought back to Washington, we faxed to the 19 parliaments of all the NATO countries and we asked them to apply pressure to their governments, not to cave into Milosevic, not to hand him a victory but to say now is the time to use our leverage to get this crisis done at the negotiating table, which I am firmly convinced can occur.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, we introduced a resolution in support of our framework agreement in the Congress 2 weeks ago, and held a congressional hearing in the Committee on International Relations last week on that resolution. The Duma, following our lead, did the same, and on Friday of last week the State Duma of the Russian Federation passed that document as a formal document on the floor of the State Duma.

We are now asking our leadership to work with us to accomplish a similar task, not because we are trying to embarrass the administration but because we understand the urgency of solving this crisis before any more lives are lost, before any more ethnic cleansing is done, before any more Americans are placed in harm's way. Now is the time for this administration to stand up and do what is right, and that is to bring Milosevic to the table and to do it directly, and to use the Russian leverage, which is considerable, in having Milosevic agree to the terms that we laid out with our NATO friends. This disaster is having a terrible effect on our long-term relationship with Russia.

Mr. Speaker, we were supposed to have on Thursday of this week the Russian parliamentarians come back to Washington for a public press announcement in support of the work that we are doing. Because of the press of business and the fact that we will break for the Memorial Day recess this week, they will be coming back the first full week in June.

Something else will happen tomorrow, Mr. Speaker. Two things of significant importance to all of our colleagues, which I hope our colleagues will convey to every constituent all across America. The first is, between 4:00 and 6:30 we will host probably one of the most investigative reporters on security issues in this city at a book signing ceremony in EF–100 of the U.S. Capitol building. Bill Gertz, who writes for the Washington Times, will be here to unveil to Members of Congress and our staffs his book entitled ''Betrayal.''

Every Member of Congress should read this book. In fact, it has hit the bestseller list in just the first week it was on the stands. Why is this book so important, Mr. Speaker? Because it details, in depth, an analysis of this spin on defense concerns in this country over the past 7 years.

In one chapter in this book Mr. Gertz goes into great detail to talk about an incident involving a Canadian and a U.S. military officer that were flying in a helicopter out in the Seattle area, when a Russian ship that was supposedly spying, pointed and fired a laser weapon at that helicopter. The laser beam hit our American officer in the eye and did permanent eye damage to him.

That incident, Mr. Speaker, if one reads the Gertz book, was covered up for 30 days. To this day, our government has never acknowledged that that Navy officer was hit deliberately by a Russian laser generator on a Russian vessel. We did not do the proper investigation. We did not hold the Russians accountable.

Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, I am someone who spends a lot of time working on improving relations with Russia, but with Russia we have to understand one very basic tenet that Ronald Reagan knew very well. We must deal with the Russians from a position of strength, consistency and candor. When we are not candid with the Russians, when we do not call them when they violate treaties, when we do not ask them about things like Yamantau Mountain in the Urals where they are spending billions of dollars on a huge underground complex that we just do not know the purpose of, the Russians lose respect for us.

□ 2000

That is the problem this administration has with Russia. We were so concerned with not embarrassing Boris Yeltsin that we forgot over the past seven years that Russia had to be held accountable for those things it did that were in violation of arms control regimes, that were things that destabilized our relationship, and we are now paying the price for those policies.

A second chapter in Mr. Gertz's book deals with a letter that, up until this book, has been classified. The letter was sent and signed by President Bill Clinton to President Boris Yeltsin. Mr. Speaker, every one of our colleagues needs to read this letter because in the

letter our President tells Yeltsin, ''Don't worry. Our policies will help you in your reelection effort.''

We were so concerned about not doing anything to expose Russian problems for what they were that we even went to the length of ignoring reality. When the Russians transferred technology to Iran for the SHAHAB–3 missile, we ignored it. When we caught the Russians transferring accelerometers and gyroscopes to Iraq, we ignored it. We were afraid to do anything to expose violations because we did not want to embarrass President Yeltsin.

We are now paying the price for those policies, Mr. Speaker, and our national security has been harmed because of the absolutely overwhelming proliferation that has gone out from Russia to every destabilized country in the world, technology being used for missile proliferation, weapons of mass destruction, because we did not want to hold the Russians accountable for violations and for their lack of tight controls in terms of technology that could be used abroad. We are now paying the price for those policies, and Russia is a much more destabilized nation.

And now, because of the Kosovo conflict, we are backing Russia into a corner, and the pro-western leaders in Russia are saying we are going to hand Russia over to the Communists and the ultranationalists if we do not get our policy back together again.

The Gertz book documents these stories, Mr. Speaker, and I would encourage our colleagues to stop by EF–100 tomorrow between 4 o'clock and 6:30 to meet Bill Gertz personally and get a copy of his book and to read for themselves the hard evidence.

In fact, I saw an article last week that the FBI may be considering actually pressing charges against Gertz for some of the revelations that he has exposed. It is an absolute shame and outrage when, in America, we have to have a reporter for a newspaper expose to us information that Members of Congress and the public should have a legitimate right to understand and know.

It reminds me of that famous national intelligence estimate that this administration spun out four years ago when the President said we have no need to worry about any long-range missiles hitting America for at least 15 years, when the CIA publicly put that document out and the President used that document to veto our defense bill. Three years later, after tremendous pressure from many of us in this room from both sides of the aisle, the CIA has now publicly reversed itself and has acknowledged that North Korea has a long-range ICBM today. That is the kind of spin that this administration has placed on national security issues for seven years, but now it is about to unfold.

Also tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, at 10:30 in the morning the gentleman from California (Mr. COX) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) and nine members in total of the Cox committee, the Select Committee to look at technology transfer from the U.S. to China, which I was honored to be a member of, will issue our public statement.

For five months, Mr. Speaker, we have tried to get the administration to declassify the Select Committee's report, and for five months we have been stonewalled. Nine Members of Congress, five Republicans and four Democrats, very honorable people, met behind closed doors all during the breaks, all during the holidays from July through January 1 and 2 of this year.

Behind closed doors we interfaced with the FBI, the CIA, the Defense Intelligence Agency. We held hearings, we called witnesses in, and we said nothing on the record. In a bipartisan way we developed a document that resulted in 32 specific recommendations of how to deal with the tremendous amount of technology transfer that has occurred to the People's Republic of China. We looked at cases where there was espionage involved. We looked at cases where companies went too far and perhaps violated U.S. laws, and we looked at cases where our government relaxed our technology controls to allow Chinese companies to buy technologies that should not have been on the marketplace.

All of that information was summarized and by the first week of January of this year, our report was complete. With its 32 recommendations, all of which were classified, and with the volumes of data we had assembled, we sent the report to the administration and we asked the administration to look at our recommendations, to come back to us and begin a dialogue of how to protect our Nation's security.

What did the administration do? Mr. Speaker, as they have done for seven years, they spun America's national security. Instead of dealing with it up front, putting the report on the table, they leaked stories out.

One story that was leaked to the Wall Street Journal by the administration dealt with the Chinese acquiring our W–88 missile technology, or our nuclear warhead technology, not missile technology. And the reason why that was leaked is because that leakage occurred during a Republican administration.

Now, I can tell my colleagues that the members of the Select Committee, both Democrats and Republicans, were not looking at what administration was responsible for security breaches. We did not care whether it was Clinton, Bush, Reagan, Carter, whomever. Our job was to do the right thing for America.

But what did the administration do? They tried to spin it: ''We will leak the story about the W–88 because of the press feeds on that, and they will think that is what the China Select Committee looked at, and that was done during a Republican administration,'' and as the administration tried to say, ''Well, we corrected those problems.'' That was their initial spin.

Then they went to the business community and they said, ''You have to understand what the Select Committee is doing. They are about ready to come out with a report that is going to lay all the blame at the feet of American industry,'' and that was not the case and is not the case, Mr. Speaker. In fact, I am going to publicly say tomorrow, as I am saying tonight, that while there were some cases where American companies went too far, and there are criminal investigations of at least two of those companies under way right now, the bulk of the time American companies have done the right thing. They have wanted to abide by the law.

Now, the law has been changing. The regulations have changed. But it was not for us to blame only industry.

Mr. Speaker, the administration would also have some believe, through its spin efforts, that it is all the fault of China, and China is this bad country that has been able to use espionage to get access to technology that they should never have gotten access to. And in some cases, that is the story. We are currently seeing that with the story on our laboratories.

But, Mr. Speaker, how can we blame a country like China for buying technology if we as a Nation voluntarily allow that technology to be sold abroad? That is what has occurred over the past seven years. We allowed technology to be sold abroad that up until this administration was very tightly controlled and regulated, and was checked by a series of efforts within the intelligence community and the defense and State Department establishments to make sure that that technology would not enhance the capability militarily of a potential or current adversary. So blaming China alone is not going to be acceptable.

No, Mr. Speaker, the reason why, as we will see tomorrow, we have had such problems with our technology has, in my opinion, largely been the direct result of this government, our own government. We have sent the mixed signals. We have lowered the threshold. We have removed the whistleblowers. We have stopped people from doing their job. The question of why that occurred is something that needs to be explored. Our Select Committee did not look at that, but the problem of the technology being transferred is real.

For five months, Mr. Speaker, we have tried. Every one of the nine members of the Select Committee has tried to get this document out for the public to see. My comment was repeatedly, look, let us not have any more spin, just release the document and let the American people and the Members draw their own conclusions. It has taken us five months to make that happen. Tomorrow, that report will be released.

I can remember back to February 1, Mr. Speaker, and this is probably the best example I can give of the attempt

to spin this that I can think of. February 1, Sandy Berger, head of the National Security Council, issues a public response to selected media personnel in this city of the response of the administration to the 32 classified recommendations that we made in the Cox committee.

So in January we make our recommendations and we issue the report and it is all classified. Without discussing their actions at all with any member of the Cox committee, on February 1 Sandy Berger releases in a public format the White House's response to those 32 recommendations.

Now, if that was not bad enough, Mr. Speaker, two days later we have a Committee on National Security brief that is open to Members only. The brief is being given to us by the Director of Central Intelligence, George Tenet. When he is finished his brief about emerging threats and we get to the question and answer session, I ask the DCI, the Director of Central Intelligence, a question.

I said, ''Mr. Tenet, you know that the China Select Committee one month ago issued its report, because we gave you a copy. You are the intelligence leader for our country. In that report we made 32 recommendations for changes, but we also reached a very simple unanimous conclusion, and that conclusion, Mr. Tenet, you know is that America's national security has been harmed in a significant way by technology transfers to China.'' I asked Mr. Tenet, ''Do you agree with that assessment that the nine of us reached unanimously?''

This was his answer, Mr. Speaker, two days after Sandy Berger gave the media an unclassified response to our recommendations. George Tenet said, ''Mr. Congressman, can I get back to you? I have not finished reading the report yet.''

So here was the White House on February 1 issuing to selected media outlets unclassified response to a report that the Director of Central Intelligence two days later said he had not finished reading yet.

Mr. Speaker, that is why we have problems with our national security. Tomorrow, the American people get to see for themselves. They get to hear about the warheads and the technology that we have lost. They get to hear about the neutron bomb. They get to hear about technology involving our space launch capability. They get to hear about the MIRVing nuclear warhead. They get to hear about military-industrial technology, high-performance computers.

They get to hear about all of these things, and in the end, the administration is going to try to blame someone. They are either going to try to find a scapegoat within the administration who they can say caused these problems, as they are currently trying to do in the Department of Energy, trying to blame the labs, when some of the labs were doing an adequate job but others were not; or they are going to try to blame someone up in the Cabinet who can be the fall guy or gal who takes the blame for what has occurred.

In the end, Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that the blame for our security lapses, as Harry Truman said, started at the top where the buck stops. The administration sets the policy.

Now, some would say, well, the President cannot know everything, and this is true. Some of my CIA friends have told me that this is one of the first Presidents since Eisenhower who never sees the CIA's morning briefers, never sees them. He chooses not to see the briefers who are coming in to advise him of security concerns. The CIA does not even know if the President reads the daily brief provided to him. What the CIA analysts that I have talked to say is that they think that what Clinton gets is filtered through Madeleine Albright and Sandy Berger.

Mr. Speaker, this is going to be a bad week in the history of America. The Kosovo crisis continues; Russia is being backed into a corner, to the point where they are now very antagonistic toward America; Bill Gertz comes out with a book called ''Betrayal'' which documents specific events that have occurred that have undermined our national security; and tomorrow, a select group involving nine Members of Congress, five Republicans and four Democrats, present a unanimous report and finding of what we found, that our national security has been harmed by our sale and transfer of technology to China.

Many Members are going to use this as a platform to jump all over China and blame the Chinese and say they are an evil nation. I am going to be one, Mr. Speaker, that stands up and says, let us pause a moment.

□ 1815

We need to engage China. Has China done some things that are wrong? Yes. We must deal with them. Does this mean we should isolate ourselves from China and consider all Chinese to be bad people? Absolutely not, because, in the end, Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that the bulk of the problems that we uncovered were caused by our own government. If we are stupid enough to allow another nation to buy sensitive technologies, then we cannot blame that nation. We blame our own policies that caused those technologies to be allowed to be sold for the first time.

In our testimony and in public statements that have been on the record, so I am not revealing any sensitive information, the first director of our Defense Technology Agency called DTSA, whose responsibility it was to monitor applications for technology sales abroad, and which was decimated during this administration, Steve Brian said that in 1996 China had zero high performance computers. None. These are the high end supercomputers, high performance computers in the 8 to 10,000 MTOPS range, very capable computers that are only used for very elaborate research or for weapons design. China had none.

Only two countries were manufacturing those high performance computers at that time, the U.S. and Japan, and both of our countries had an unwritten understanding that neither would sell these high performance computers to those nations which were or could become potential adversaries of the U.S.

We relaxed our policy on exporting high performance computers, Mr. Speaker, and in two years, by 1998, China had acquired over 350 high performance computers.

Now, we were told the State Department would monitor where they were being used, but they did not do that, because China would not let our State Department monitor where these computers went. We know now that many of them are being used by organs of the People's Liberation Army. They are being used for weapons design, they are being used for their nuclear programs, and those devices came from this country.

Mr. Speaker, China did not steal those high performance computers; they bought them. They bought them because we changed our policies. We allowed Chinese entities to acquire technologies that up until the mid-1990s had been tightly controlled and monitored by those people who are watching out for our security concerns, now and in the 21st Century.

Mr. Speaker, by Thursday of this week I expect to unveil two new documents, documents which I have been working on with a small group of people for the past four months. These two documents will not just focus on the China Select Committee, but will go beyond that.

By Thursday of this week, it is my hope, if the graphic artists have completed the work, which I expect they will, to present two large charts, if you will, the visual presentation of what has happened in terms of technology transfer to China.

The first chart, Mr. Speaker, which I have a rough sketch of, will trace every front company and operative arm of the People's Liberation Army that tried to acquire and did acquire technology in America, who the leaders were, what their ties are and were, and how they were able to get the approval to buy technology that is very sensitive and is being used by the Chinese military today, most of it with the support of our government.

The second chart, Mr. Speaker, will be a depiction of a time-line, starting in 1993 and running through 1999. It will take every major technology area of concern that we have, encryption, high performance computers, military-industrial technology, space launch capability, nuclear weapons, it will take all of those technology disciplines and will track them through that 6 year time period, and it will list specific dates when actions took place in this administration to allow those technologies to

be transferred. Almost all of those actions were done voluntarily by our country.

Mr. Speaker, in the end we have got to understand that we are now going to begin to pay the price for 7 years of gloating over our economy, 7 years of gloating over what was supposed to be world security, 7 years of pretending Russia and China were not potential problems, and rather than being up front and candid and transparent with Russia and China, we glossed over problems. We pretended things were not happening. We told Yeltsin we would help him get reelected. We did not want to offend Jiang Zemin. In doing that, we gave away technology that America is going to have to deal with for the next 50 years.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a partisan issue. Democrats and Republicans in this body and the other body have been together on national security concerns. Democrats and Republicans have worked hand-in-hand over the years in protecting America's security.

This battle, Mr. Speaker, is between the White House and the Congress. This White House has done things that this Congress has tried to stop and overturn.

Starting tomorrow and continuing through the next year and a half, until the presidential elections and both parties attempt to win the White House, the American people will have to judge as to whether or not our security has been harmed, how extensively it has been harmed, what is going to be the remedy for us to deal with these concerns that we have relative to technology flowing into hands that eventually could be used against America.

I want to caution our colleagues, Mr. Speaker, not to rush to snap judgments. We should not tomorrow when the China Select Committee reports come out and bash all Chinese citizens, or certainly not Chinese-Americans. Some of our most capable leaders in this country are Chinese-Americans. In fact, some of my best friends are Chinese-Americans, leaders in the academic world, the scientific world, the technology world. We must make sure that we let them know that they are solid Americans that we respect. We must not let this report come out and be an effort where Members of Congress come out and trash China and trash our relationship with those Chinese American leaders in our communities across this country.

The problem in the end, Mr. Speaker, is with us. It is within our own government. We should not try to find any scapegoats. We should not try to blame industry. We should not try to just blame the Chinese. We should not just try to blame any one group.

The bulk of the problems I think we will find were caused by our own actions, by our own decisions, to ease up on the control mechanisms, to make technology available for sale. This is not to say there are not cases of espionage, because there are, and they need to be dealt with, as in our laboratories and the network that the Chinese established. But if we are foolish enough to allow China to set up front companies and buy technology from us, who is wrong? The Chinese, who are abiding by our laws and buying technology in many cases that we sell them, or are we at fault for loosening our controls and allowing them to buy these technologies?

The same thing is true with companies. American industry by and large wants to do the right thing, but if we send confusing signals, if we change the regulations, if we loosen up the standards, then most American industry should not be blamed when these very technologies are then sold abroad because we have allowed those practices to go on.

As I said earlier, there are companies that deserve to be investigated, and two are under criminal investigation right now. But I would hope tomorrow and for the rest of this week as we get ready to celebrate the Memorial Day holiday that we as a Nation step back and begin to seriously consider our national security.

It has not been a high focus for the past 7 years. We have been lulled into a false sense of complacency. The economy is going strong, people are working, inflation is low, unemployment is low, and we have been convinced that the world is safe. Now, all of a sudden, we wake up and see Russia backed into a corner, China involved in technologies that we never thought they should have, North Korea deploying long and short range missiles that now threaten not just our territories, but the mainland of the U.S., Iran-Iraq developing medium range systems with the help of Russia, India and Pakistan saber rattling with nuclear warheads and medium-range missiles.

Where did they get the weapons from, Mr. Speaker? Where? We saw China supplying Pakistan with the M–11 missiles. We saw China supplying Pakistan with ring magnets. We saw China supplying Pakistan with the technology for the nuclear furnaces. We saw Russia supplying India with technology.

Why are we surprised? All of a sudden we come with the realization, we have problems in the world, and we have not dealt with those problems in a fair, open and honest way, in spite of tremendous efforts by Republicans and Democrats in this body and the other body.

It is time to end the spin, Mr. Speaker. It is time for this administration to end the nauseating spin, the spin doctors at the White House, who want to spin everything, to make it look as if they have no role to play, just as they did when they lost the Congressional elections and did not want to accept any responsibility in the White House. It was all the fault of those Members of Congress who were out of touch.

It is about time this administration and this President understand that once in awhile he needs to accept the responsibility for his actions and the collective actions of this administration.

ASIAN PACIFIC AMERICAN HERITAGE MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to share with the American people and the Members of the House a special order on Asian Pacific American Heritage Month.

As many people know, and it is being widely celebrated in various communities throughout the Nation, May of every year is Asian Pacific American Heritage Month. I want to thank the previous speaker for making a clear distinction between some of the problems and some of the issues concerning espionage and some of the security issues that we are currently experiencing. Mr. Weldon certainly is one of the body's leading experts on national security, and I serve with him on the Committee on Armed Services, and while we may not fully agree on some of the interpretations given to some of the challenges we face, we are certainly unanimous in the sense that all of this discussion should stay clear of any kind of aspersions cast upon the Asian-American community.

As chairman of the Asian Pacific American Caucus for the 106th Congress, it is my privilege and honor to try to bring to the attention of the body and the attention of the American people the multifaceted contributions of the Asian Pacific American community to American life and society.

As members of the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus tonight, my colleagues that will participate and I will use this opportunity to honor, remember and celebrate the Asian and Pacific Islander Americans in our country.

In fact, it is important to note that over 65 Congressional districts have a population of at least 5 percent Asian Pacific Americans, and some 28 Congressional districts have over 10 percent Asian Pacific Americans in their home areas.

The history of APA month dates back to some legislation introduced by former representative Frank Horton from New York in 1978 establishing Asian Pacific American Heritage Week to draw attention to the contributions and to the conditions of this growing part of the American population. In 1990 the week was extended to a month, and it was not until 1992 that legislation was actually passed to make APA month a permanent occasion during the month of May.

This is supposed to be the time that America recognizes the heritage that the many communities which actually make up the rubric of Asian Pacific

America bring to the cultural complex of America, and it is a very complex contribution, and a series of actually many heritages.

I am a Pacific islander, and with us today are the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) a Pacific islander, and Mr. WU, a freshman member from Oregon, who is of Chinese ancestry. We represent a wide variety of cultures and civilizations. Actually the area that we draw off account for over half of the world's population. These multiple heritages range from the ancient civilizations of the Indian subcontinent and China, to the island Pacific, from Japan, Korea, Vietnam and the Philippines. We add our customs and traditions to the beautiful tapestry which makes up American life.

□ 2030

This diversity is good for America. Sometimes we think of minority groups, minority communities as somehow areas of problems to resolve, that there is always some dimension of them that invites solutions to some preceding problem.

I want to happily acknowledge that, as Pacific Americans, indeed all Americans of all races and all ethnic backgrounds should be proud of who they are and the multifaceted contributions that they have made to America's social fabric.

Despite the diversity of the backgrounds that make up the Asian Pacific American community, we are united by a characteristic concern for family, for making sure that we protect and nurture each other, those in our immediate once commonly referred to as nuclear family, as well as in our extended family, whether in education, in business, and just about everything in life, we are working hard not only for ourselves, but for our families, and making sure they get better opportunities and encouraging our young people while we pay attention to our elders.

This concern for family across generations I think is characteristic, good strong characteristic of all of the communities which make up Asian Pacific America, and it is something that we proudly wish to share with the rest of America.

This is the month where we can call attention to the best of our community and to demonstrate to Washington and to the Nation that Asian Pacific Americans are making their mark and making their contributions in all segments of society.

There are people like Vera Wang and Josie Natori, both fashion designers who are internationally renowned for their creations. There are entrepreneurs like Jerry Yang, founder of Yahoo, Incorporated, and Robert Nakasone, president and chief executive officer of Toys ''R'' Us.

We also shine in the education field. Dr. Chang-Lin Tien is the former chancellor of U.C. Berkeley and has made many outstanding contributions to the field of scientific research and journal publications and government consultation.

In the field of the arts, we have performers like Yo-Yo Ma, a cellist with the Boston Symphony Orchestra who dazzles us with his artistry and has some 12 Grammy awards to his name.

We also have actresses like Ming Na-Wen, who not only starred in critically acclaimed movies such as the ''Joy Luck Club,'' but also lent her voice to the famous animated musical ''Mulan.''

In the area of government, we have outstanding civil leaders such as Bill Lann Lee, acting attorney general for civil rights, who has led our Nation's fight for equal opportunity for the past year and a half and has done an outstanding job.

In our armed forces, we have General Eric Shinseki, current Vice Chief of Staff for the U.S. Army, who has had 33 years of military service, won numerous awards, and has recently been nominated to the post of Chief of Staff for the U.S. Army, which would make him the highest ranking officer in the U.S. Army, certainly the highest ranking officer of Asian Pacific American ancestry to rise to that position in our country's history.

In the scientific field, we have innovative doctors such as Dr. David Ho, Times Magazine's 1996 Man of the Year. Dr. Ho is renowned for his groundbreaking research on HIV and AIDS, and he is currently the scientific director of the world's largest independent AIDS research laboratory.

Kalpana Chawla, on the other hand, is renowned in her work on the 1997 Columbia Space Shuttle mission. She is the first East Indian American who has traveled to space.

In the media, we are graced with such talented television journalists as Ann Curry, a two-time Emmy award winning anchor, and she has joined the cast of ''NBC Dateline'' and the highly popular national morning news show, ''The Today Show.''

Michelle Kwan's artistry and elegance on the ice have demonstrated to us just how far determination and dedication can take us. On the other hand, the grace of Michelle Kwan is balanced with the agility and force of Junior Seau. American Samoan by ancestry, Junior is a football player with the San Diego Chargers, has been voted for six consecutive Pro-Bowls and was named 1994 NFL linebacker of the year.

We have, of course, the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA), who, despite the size of his congressional district, has more players in the NFL than probably any six other congressional districts combined. So I am sure he will tell us a little bit more about that.

Of course we have in politics, we have not as many as we would like, but we certainly have a number of them.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to Vice Chair of the Asian Pacific American Caucus, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU), who has recently been featured in a very complimentary article in A Magazine, which is a national Asian magazine. I want to congratulate him for that. He has a number of issues to share. I was certainly glad that he has come to this House to grace us with his presence.

Mr. WU. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) for yielding to me.

It is a special pleasure for me to stand here in honor of Asian Pacific American Heritage Month. I am proud to serve as the Vice Chair of the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus, and it is my great privilege to stand on the floor of this House as the first Chinese American to serve in this body in the 220-year history of this country.

We all may have our small footnotes in history, but I try to keep a touch of humor, and in this town maybe even tougher, a touch of humility about what happens around here.

I would like to share a little story that happened right here in this Chamber. The story is only slightly humorous, but perhaps more importantly, it helps illustrate the point which I would like to make tonight.

When I was younger, I attended one year of medical school, and sometime during the fall of that year decided that I wanted to leave medical school to make a broader difference. When I called home to share that with my father, let us just say that he was not pleased. He was not pleased at all.

During the next year, when I took a leave of absence and worked for a while, I received a stream of articles, newspaper articles from my parents, from my dad in particular, and it was all about doctors, doctors who were doing wonderful things in impoverished neighborhoods, really working in communities where they were needed. It was also about lawyers and those articles about ambulance-chasing lawyers who were up to no good. My father was really, really hoping, I think, that I would go back to medical school.

Now fast forward 20 years, and I was sitting just about there on this floor. It was January 6 of this year. I was about to be sworn in as a Member of Congress, probably the proudest day of my live. My parents were sitting right up there. My wife was somewhere over here. My in-laws were somewhere over here, and I could not see them.

But I could see my father. I could see my father. As I looked up at him, I could not help but think, I wonder if he still wishes that I graduated from medical school?

I am telling that story because I think that it is something very positive in our community, that we have a lot of people who have become prosperous, who are engineers, who are scientists, who are business owners, but very few people who have gone on to fields like law and politics.

But I am proud to say that there is a movement afoot across America, and I am proud to report to the House tonight that there is a very positive

trend occurring in Asian American communities. Gordon Quan in Houston, Max Inge in New York City, Barry Chang, whom I just visited in California, Silicon Valley, Charlie Woo, who is visiting in Washington today but who is starting a movement in Los Angeles, and other places like my home in Portland, Oregon, from Chicago to St. Louis to Washington, D.C., where Asian Americans are recognizing the importance of encouraging the next generation to branch out, to branch out from the traditional professions like science, like engineering, as good as those professions are, from dentistry, from medicine, into new fields like art or journalism or law or even politics.

I believe that it is vitally important for Asian Americans to participate in the political process. We often hear complaints about not being fairly treated in the media or in other public bodies. But I submit to my colleagues that the only way to make a truly lasting and positive and constructive difference is to get involved and to stay involved, to become part of shaping the dialogue and influencing the process ourselves.

That is what is happening across the Nation today, to do what groups across America are doing to continue to instill in our generation and the next the importance of taking school seriously, and not just taking school seriously but taking participation in the political process seriously, to pass on to our young folks what we have learned from our lives and the lives of our parents: that the opportunity to participate in the American dream is a gift of the American spirit, and that we should not let any part of this gift slip away. We must fully participate in the process.

I am grateful every day to share in that process. I do my job each and every day with the faith that we are serving a larger process. We all need to participate as Americans. This is the message being brought to other Asian Americans, to urge them to get involved and to stay involved.

Each new immigrant group that comes to America has learned, sometimes the hard way, that to be a voice at the table, we must make sacrifices. We as Asian Americans are clearly in the early formative stages of political participation.

Like every other group that has come to America before us, so many sacrifices have been made already. But one more sacrifice is left to be made. I add this to Asian Americans of the older generation, to those of my parents' generation, perhaps to anyone who is older than I: You who have made so many sacrifices already, you have come to a foreign country, learned a foreign language, you have worked hard to make your families prosperous. You have really helped your children get an education and helped them become Americans.

That is perhaps one of the largest sacrifices that you have made, to encourage your children to grow up in this country, to be a part of this culture and, in so doing, to become different from you. It is a great sacrifice for any parent to make, and countless generations of immigrants before you have made that sacrifice.

But I am here to ask you to make one more sacrifice, and that is to encourage your children to pursue their passions, no matter what that passion is, whether that is to become a doctor or become a dentist or teacher. But if they choose to become an artist, a journalist, a lawyer, or even to enter into public life, to encourage them in the pursuit of that passion, to make one more sacrifice for your children.

I will say to your children that it is a two-way street. When I was young, my parents encouraged me to keep up my Chinese and to study hard. There was always something better to do, whether it was to go out and play with my friends or because the ice cream truck was coming by.

I say to the younger generation, listen to what your parents have to say. Keep in touch with the culture and the language. It is good for you, and your parents are asking something that will be ultimately good for you, and you will appreciate it in the years to come.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to stand on the floor of the House tonight on the occasion of Asian Pacific American Heritage Month and report to my colleagues that, while much still remains to be accomplished, we have made great progress, and we will continue to make that progress year by year, generation by generation.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU) for his remarks, and he certainly tried to encourage generations, the younger generation, to increase their level of participation in the public and political life in this country.

During this past week, as part of Asian Pacific American Heritage Month, there were efforts here to help train some locally elected officials from various parts of the country who are of Asian Pacific American heritage, and that is a very important contribution. I think it is good not only for those communities, I think it is good for America and certainly will help to strengthen America.

□ 2045

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to be permitted to include therein extraneous material on the subject of this special order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA), my fellow Pacific Island brother, for any remarks he might add. I am proud to say that he went to school on Guam in middle school.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague for the opportunity to hold this celebration to commemorate the rich and diverse heritage of Asian-Pacific Americans who call our great Nation, the greatest democracy in the world, home.

I want to further commend our host, the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD), chairman of the congressional Asia-Pacific Caucus and my fellow Pacific Islander, for his tremendous leadership of the Asia-Pacific Caucus and his magnificent job in coordinating this event today.

And I certainly would like to commend my colleague, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU) and also the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK), who will also be participants, as they will be participating in this dialogue.

A few years ago, I was privileged, along with my Asian-Pacific colleagues on Capitol Hill, to attend a special White House ceremony where President Clinton signed an official proclamation declaring the month of May as ''National Asian-Pacific Heritage Month.''

Today I am privileged again to be here before my colleagues to speak to the Nation and to our colleagues and to share this occasion honoring the enduring legacy of those Americans whose roots extend from the soils of nations in the Asian-Pacific region.

Mr. Speaker, in honoring this month as our national Asian-Pacific Heritage Month, it was my privilege to have been invited recently to speak before our men and women in uniform stationed at Fort Campbell, Kentucky, Fort Knox, Kentucky, and also at Edwards Air Force Base in California to share with them an historical perspective on the contributions of the Asian-Pacific community as part of our Nation's heritage.

Mr. Speaker, I want to personally thank Major General Robert Clark, the Commanding General of the 101st Airborne Division; Colonel Virgil Packett, II, the Assistant Division Commander; and Command Sergeant Major Iuni Savusa, both members of the 101st Airborne Division. I want to thank these gentlemen for the courtesies, the briefings, and the hospitality that were extended to me during my visit.

And my commendations also go to Colonel Scott Feil, Commander of the First Armored Training Brigade; Colonel George Edwards, the Garrison Commander; Mr. Jack Eubanks, the Chief Protocol Officer; and Sergeant First Class Emani Masaniai of Fort Knox, Kentucky.

These gentlemen received me during my visit at Fort Knox, and they did a splendid job in making the proper preparations for the special event and the opportunity to meet with the active duty and retired military personnel and their families. I thank them for my visit to Fort Knox.

Last but not least, Mr. Speaker, I want to also extend my sincere thanks

and appreciation to Major General Richard Reynolds, the Commanding General of the Edwards Air Force Base Flight Test Center; Mr. Jim Papa, the Executive Director of the Air Force Flight Test Center; Ms. Mary Jane Gugliotte, the Protocol Officer; Ms. Leonila Marcelino of the Asian-Pacific Employment Office; Mr. Nuu Moa of the Samoan community; and Air Force Major Kevin Toy from the Air Force Congressional Liaison Office. I want to thank them all for making my stay at Edwards Air Force Base a positive experience that I will not forget.

In particular, I want to thank General Clark of the 101st Airborne Division and General Reynolds of the Edwards Air Force Base Test Center for the depth of their knowledge of our Nation's security needs. And I thank both of these gentlemen for the outstanding leadership roles that they demonstrate not only to the airmen and soldiers under their commands, but more importantly their commitment to provide as best as possible for the needs of our men and women in uniform and especially their families.

Mr. Speaker, I am privileged today to be here before my colleagues to speak to the Nation and to share this occasion in celebrating the contributions of the Asian-Pacific American community, well over 10 million strong and among the fastest growing demographic group in the United States today.

During this time for celebration, it is only fitting that we honor our fellow citizens of Asia-Pacific descent, both from the past and from the present, that have blessed and enriched our Nation. I submit that the Asian-Pacific Americans have certainly been an asset to our country's development, and it is appropriate that we make this recognition accordingly.

As many of you are aware, immigrants from the Asia-Pacific countries are amongst the newest wave to arrive in the United States in recent years. However, they are merely the latest chapter in the long history of Asian-Pacific Americans in our nation.

The people of Asia-Pacific have contributed much to America's development in the field of sciences and medicine. For example, nothing exemplifies this more than Time Magazine's selection of a Chinese American in 1996 as its Man of the Year, Dr. David Ho, head of the prestigious Aaron Diamond AIDS Research Center at New York City's New York University Medical School.

Dr. Ho's journey started as a 12-year-old immigrant from Taiwan. Gracing the cover of Time Magazine has given hope to millions of people around the world afflicted by the HIV virus. His story is a stirring testimony to the significant concrete contributions that Asian-Pacific American immigrants have made to our Nation. Dr. Ho's scientific advances continue a long record of service by Asian-Pacific Americans.

In 1899, a Japanese immigrant arrived on the shores of this Nation. After years of study and work, this man, Dr. Hideyo Noguchi, isolated the syphilis germ, leading to a cure for the deadly, widespread disease.

For decades, Dr. Makio Murayama, a Japanese-American, conducted vital research in the United States that laid the groundwork for combating sickle cell anemia.

In 1973, Dr. Leo Esaki, another Japanese-American, an immigrant also to our country, was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize in physics for his electron tunneling theories.

And in engineering, Mr. Speaker, few have matched the architectural masterpieces created by the genius of Chinese-American, I.M. Pei.

In the field of business and commerce, the names of prominent Asian-Pacific American corporate leaders and legal scholars are too numerous to mention. One only need read our Nation's top periodicals and newspapers to document that Asian-Pacific American students, both in high school and at secondary and post-secondary levels are among the brightest minds that our Nation has produced.

In the entertainment field and sports, American martial arts expert Bruce Lee, the late Bruce Lee, captivated the movie audiences of this Nation while destroying the stereotype of that passive, quiet Asian-American male.

World class conductor Seiji Ozawa has led the San Francisco Symphony Orchestra through some brilliant performances over the years.

About 70 years ago, Mr. Speaker, a native Hawaiian named Duke Kahanamoku shocked the world by winning the Olympic Gold Medal in swimming, followed by Dr. Sammy Lee, a Korean-American who also won an Olympic Gold Medal in high diving.

And the strange thing about Dr. Sammy Lee, Mr. Speaker, at the time when the Olympic members of our team were practicing for the Olympics at that time, Dr. Lee was not even permitted to practice along with his fellow divers, American divers, simply because he was not white.

Then there was Tommy Kono of Hawaii, also an Olympic Gold Medalist in weightlifting. And, yes, perhaps the greatest Olympic diver ever known to the world, a Samoan-American by the name of Greg Louganis, who recorded a record in gold medals and national championships that will be in the books for a long, long time.

And, yes, the enthralling Olympic ice-skating performances of Japanese-American Kristi Yamaguchi and Chinese-American Michelle Kwan continue the legacy of milestone achievements by our Asian-Pacific community.

In professional sports, of course, we have Michael Chang blazing new paths in the sport of tennis. Pacific Islanders, and I know some of our fellow Americans are not well up on the sport of rugby, but by mentioning names of Pacific Islanders like Brian Williams and Jonah Lomu and Michael Jones and others of Polynesian descent.

And, yes, in the field of professional American football, as has been alluded to earlier by my colleague from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD), we currently have approximately 21 American-Samoans who play in the NFL. And I am humble enough to say that we probably produce more NFL players, Mr. Speaker, than anybody here in this country.

Yes, Junior Seau, the perennial all-pro linebacker from the San Diego Chargers. I am sorry to say that Jesse Sapolu of the San Francisco Forty-Niners just recently retired.

I can go on, Mr. Speaker, but my colleagues might be bored by their hearing these remarks.

In the field of professional boxing, I would suggest to my colleagues and to my fellow Americans to keep an eye on this young Samoan heavyweight boxer by the name of David Tua. Yes, David Tua. He now ranks among the top 10 in the world in the heavyweight division in boxing.

And one of the brightest stars to emerge recently from our community, Mr. Speaker, is none other than Tiger Woods. Yes, Tiger Woods, the professional golfer. I think Tiger Woods could not have said it better. He is part American Indian, he is part black American, he is part white; but his mother is from Thailand. And he said this is what makes him the best golfer there is in the world.

Tiger made history, of course, in one of the world's most important golf tournaments. And before his career is finished, I submit, Mr. Speaker, he will reinvent the game of golf.

We also have Asian-Pacific Americans who are making their mark in history not in our country, but in the Far East. Yes, a Samoan-American by the name of Salevaa Atisanoe weighs over 578 pounds, participates in the ancient sport in Japan called sumo wrestling and wrestles by the name of Konishiki. Yes, he weighs only 578 pounds, Mr. Speaker, but he can bench press 600 pounds. Figure that out. Konishiki was the first foreigner in Japan's centuries-old sport to break through to the rarified air of sumo's second highest rank.

And another of Tongan-Samoan descent, Mr. Leitani Peitani, who now is known basically as Musashimaru, has also gained prominence in the sport of sumo wrestling.

And, yes, we also have native Hawaiian Chad Rowen, who wrestles by the name of Akebono, the first foreigner to achieve the highest ranking in this ancient sport and the rank of Yokozuna.

Mr. Speaker, in honoring the Asian-Pacific Americans that have served to enrich our country, I would be remiss not only as a Vietnam veteran, but as a former member of the 100th Battalion 442nd Infantry Reserve Unit in Hawaii if I did not honor the contributions of the Japanese-Americans who served in the U.S. Army's 100th Army Battalion and 442nd Infantry Combat Group.

Mr. Speaker, history speaks for itself in documenting that none have shed their blood more valiantly for America

than the Japanese-Americans who served in these units while fighting enemy forces in Europe during World War II.

Mr. Speaker, the records of the 100th Battalion and 442nd Infantry are without equal. These Japanese-American units suffered an unprecedented casualty rate of 314 percent and received over 18,000 individual declarations, many awarded posthumously, for bravery and courage in the field of battle.

Given the tremendous sacrifices of lives, a high number of medals were awarded to these units: 52 Distinguished Service Crosses; 560 Silver Stars; 9,480 Purple Hearts. I find it unusual, Mr. Speaker, that only one Medal of Honor was awarded.

Nonetheless, 442nd Combat Group emerged as the most decorated combat unit of its size in the history of the United States Army. President Truman was so moved by their bravery on the field of battle, as well as that of black American soldiers who served in World War I and World War II, that he issued an executive order to desegregate the armed services.

I am proud to say we can count on the Honorable DANIEL INOUYE and the late Senator Spark Matsunaga, both from the State of Hawaii, as not only Members of Congress that distinguished themselves in battle as soldiers with the 100th Battalion and 442nd Infantry. It was while fighting in Europe that Senator INOUYE lost his arm and was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross, the second highest medal for bravery, as it is noted today.

These Japanese-Americans, Mr. Speaker, paid their dues in blood to protect our Nation from its enemies. And it is a shameful mark, Mr. Speaker, on the history of our country that when the patriotic survivors of the 100th Battalion and 442nd Infantry returned to the United States, many of these soldiers were reunited with their parents, their brothers and sisters, who were locked up behind barbed wire fences living in concentration camps.

□ 2100

My colleagues on the hill might be interested to know that the gentleman from California (Mr. MATSUI) and former Representative Norman Mineta were children of the concentration camps. Mr. Speaker, I do not know if I am ever able to perform what these Japanese American soldiers could do. If you could well imagine coming home from war, facing the reality that you might never return and then when you come home, you have to find your parents and your brothers and sisters in these concentration camps, I say, Mr. Speaker, something was awfully wrong at that time in our country.

The wholesale and arbitrary abolishment of the constitutional rights of these loyal Japanese Americans will forever serve as a reminder and testament that this must never be allowed to occur again. When this miscarriage of justice unfolded in World War II, while some Americans of German and Italian ancestry were discriminated against, these Americans were not similarly jailed en masse like Japanese Americans. Some declared the incident as an example of outright racism and bigotry in its ugliest form. After viewing the Holocaust Museum recently, Mr. Speaker, in Washington, D.C., I understand better why the genocide of some 6 million Jews has prompted the cry, ''Never again. Never again.'' Likewise, I sincerely hope that mass internments on the basis of race will never again darken the history of our great Nation. I am also told that probably one of the reasons why the Italian Americans were not also placed in concentration camps, can you imagine if Joe DiMaggio's father was given the same treatment at the time when Joe DiMaggio was the great American baseball player and hero of all the people? That is exactly what happened.

To those that say, ''Well, that occurred decades ago,'' I say, we must continue to be vigilant in guarding against such evils today.

I am pleased to announce for the first time, as has been mentioned earlier by my colleague from Guam, that President Clinton has nominated General Eric Shinseki, an American of Japanese descent from the State of Hawaii, to become the new Chief of Staff for the Army. General Shinseki is currently the Vice Chief of Staff for the U.S. Army. Previous to his current position, General Shinseki was formerly Commanding General of U.S. Army Europe, Commander of Allied Land Forces in Central Europe and was Commander of the NATO Stabilization Force in Bosnia.

I am pleased by General Shinseki's appointment. It was not long ago we had the case of Bruce Yamashita, a Japanese American from Hawaii who was discharged from the Marine Corps officer training program in an ugly display of racial discrimination. Marine Corps superiors taunted Yamashita with ethnic slurs and told him, ''We don't want your kind around here. Go back to your own country.'' The situation was made worse when the Commandant of the Marine Corps at the time who appeared on television's ''60 Minutes'' stated, ''Marine officers who are minorities do not shoot, swim or use compasses as well as white officers.''

After years of perseverance and appeals, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Yamashita was vindicated after proving he was the target of vicious racial harassment during his officer training program. The Secretary of the Navy's investigation into whether minorities were deliberately being discouraged from becoming officers in the Marine Corps resulted in Yamashita receiving finally his commission as a captain in the United States Marine Corps.

I am also disturbed, Mr. Speaker, by events of recent years involving campaign funding where the integrity of the Asian Pacific American community has been unfairly tarnished in the media for the alleged transgressions of a few.

I find this racial scapegoating to be repugnant and morally objectionable. Playing up fears of the ''Asian connection'' serves to alienate Asian Pacific Americans from participating in our political process. Moreover, this negative reporting acts to marginalize Asian Pacific American political empowerment at a time when we are coming of age in American politics.

When whites raise money for whites, it is called gaining political power. But when Asian Pacific Americans begin to participate, we are accused of being foreigners trying to infiltrate the mainstream of our Nation's political system. On this note, Mr. Speaker, remember the Oklahoma City bombing incident? Americans of Arab descent were immediately targeted and investigated by local Federal law enforcement agencies. Mr. Speaker, I submit it is simply wrong and unAmerican to react this way.

To protect America's greatness, we should all be sensitive to the fact that democratic participation by people of all races and backgrounds, including Asian Pacific Americans, is crucial to our Nation's health and vitality.

I believe Yamashita's case and the hysteria surrounding the Asian Pacific American contributions bear implications not just for the military and the media but for our society as a whole. It asks the question, how long do we have to endure the attitude of those who consider Asian Pacific Americans and other minorities as lesser Americans?

I applaud Captain Yamashita and others like him who have spoken out to ensure that racial discrimination is not tolerated. During this month as we recognize the diverse experiences and contributions of the Asian Pacific American community to our Nation, I would hope that we will all take inspiration from this example.

When I envision America, I do not see a melting pot, Mr. Speaker, designed to reduce and remove racial differences. The America I see is a brilliant rainbow, a rainbow of ethnicities and cultures, with each people proudly contributing in their own distinctive and unique way. That is what America is all about. And Asian Pacific Americans wish to find a just and equitable place in our society that will allow them, like all Americans to grow, to succeed, to achieve and contribute to the advancement of this great Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I wish there were no labels. I wish I was not considered a Pacific American or an Asian American or a Black American or a Native American. I never hear of people classifying themselves as French Americans, or British Americans. But why these labels?

With that in mind, Mr. Speaker, I would like to close my remarks by asking, what is America all about? I think it could not have been said better than on the steps of the Lincoln Memorial in

1963 in that hot summer when a Black American, an American, by the name of Martin Luther King Jr. echoed this saying, ''I have a dream. My dream is that one day my children will be judged not by the color of their skin but by the content of their character.''

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from American Samoa for those very inspirational remarks and the cataloging of a number of successes that members of various Asian Pacific American communities have had and their contributions that have been made to this country. Nevertheless we continue to face many serious issues. Sometimes we must address those issues in a way that communities must in order to find ways to resolve problems that continue to exist. Some of these problems are long-standing. Some of them have to do with new immigrant status. Some of them have to do with current practices and current laws and current perceptions.

I know that in that regard and in working on those issues, the gentlewoman from Hawaii has been on the forefront of many of these issues. She has had a very distinguished career here in the House of Representatives and has served as previous chair of the Congressional Asian Pacific American Caucus, Mr. Speaker, and in that capacity not only continued the struggle for fairness and justice and equality in this country but continued to serve as a mentor for those of us who are following in her footsteps.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Hawaii.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD), and I want to express the appreciation of all of the members of the Asian Pacific Congressional Caucus for his leadership and for his effort in making sure that we have this time this evening in which to express our thoughts about Asian Pacific issues. The gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) has certainly demonstrated in the short time that he took this evening the extensive record that has been accomplished by so many Asian Pacific individuals throughout this country. I know that he just elaborated on a few. If we had time, we could document many, many more individuals who certainly have brought great credit and recognition to the Asian Pacific community throughout this country. I do not think that there is a single individual in the Congress of the United States that does not recognize the contributions that have been made by Asian Pacific individuals, even in their constituencies. But notwithstanding the tremendous accomplishments of so many of our distinguished Asian Pacific brothers and sisters throughout this country, there are still some very nagging problems that confront us, problems that have to do with the way we look and the assumptions that people make because of the way we look, the way we are treated when we enter certain places, how we are looked down upon because of the mere fact of our Asian appearance. The conclusions that are leaped to, that we neither speak English nor have been educated in this country, and that we are undoubtedly immigrants, recent immigrants, or some characterization like that. This is very hurtful for many Asians. And so compounding on this day-to-day experience that we have to endure and suffer throughout our lives, the crescendo of criticism that has been levied upon all of us because of the misconduct of a few or the apparent misconduct of a few among us is an extremely painful experience. As the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU) suggested, we have a huge task, therefore, as Asian Pacific elected individuals in the Congress of the United States to serve as role models, to make sure that the young people who are thinking in terms of government service, of elective office, or seeking high positions in their local communities, that they are not discouraged by this dramatic news coverage that hits us every now and then.

Following the 1996 campaign, there was so much controversy that even the Congress got overwhelmed by a lot of that discussion. Out of it I believe came some of the very, very discouraging amendments that were added to welfare reform legislation and campaign spending reform legislation which singled out people in our society who are legally present in this country, who are legal residents but notwithstanding were somehow characterized by virtue of their status as not worthy Americans. They could not participate in programs, even though they had worked their 10 years and paid their taxes into Social Security, they were somehow unworthy because they had not seen fit to become U.S. citizens and therefore were pushed aside and denigrated and certain programs were denied them.

In the campaign spending reform, what was the most egregious provision that was added in a floor amendment was to say that a legal resident could not make a political contribution to a Federal candidate, and that the Federal candidate in receiving a contribution from a legal resident could be held accountable and even criminally found accountable for having received such a contribution. That was the most egregious of all the provisions that have been added over the years. I found that so egregious, that notwithstanding the fact that I was a strong supporter from the very beginning of campaign spending reform, I felt compelled in the end to vote against that legislation because I could not tolerate the idea that we were enacting into law this kind of disparate treatment of people who are legally within the United States.

So I would hope that when we take up campaign spending reform again this year, that that provision is not included or not considered for an appropriate amendment.

My point is that we have achieved a lot as a group, but there are continuing problems as we go through our lives. And it is important for the Asian Pacific community to stand up as a group, to be proud of their contributions to American life, proud of their citizenship, proud of their ancestry and of those who have come in recently, and to always work to defend their right to live here under the Constitution and to be fully protected by all of the provisions of the Constitution of the United States.

I want to take this opportunity this evening to thank the members on both sides, the House and the Senate, in their work in the conference committee in approving the $4.3 million which is the last funding for the payment of the reparations that the gentleman from American Samoa mentioned had been enacted in 1988 to pay for the great harm, the insult, the travesty that occurred in their being placed in relocation camps during World War II.

□ 2115

Congress finally said this is a terrible wrong, the Constitution was totally abrogated in this instance, and so for all those who survived, in 1988 they were provided a payment of $20,000 for each survivor. The funds simply ran out, and there was not enough money in the fund to pay the last several hundred of those that have been found eligible. So the Congress in its wisdom provided the extra dollars to make sure that every single person found eligible received their sum that the Congress had promised.

One added implication to this whole issue was the fact that late in the whole process it became known that Japanese individuals who were living in Latin America were picked up in the dark of the night and put on board ship, and shipped over to the United States and placed in the same types of concentration camps with the concurrence of the Latin American governments and under the instruction by the United States Government. These individuals have been trying to qualify for the same benefits that have been accorded our own Japanese American citizens, but despite their efforts they were denied under some sort of legal argument that they were not legally here.

Well, how could they be legally here if they were kidnapped in the middle of the night? Most of these individuals, now part of our communities, many of them have become citizens and are part of our community, and they felt very, very much discriminated against when they were excluded from the arrangements that the Congress made in 1988.

Thankfully, Mr. Speaker, the Justice Department entered into a settlement with these individuals, not quite as much as the other AJAs, but at least a recognition of the great harm that had been perpetrated upon these individuals, several thousand of them who were captured in the night and brought here under the assumption that they

would be traded with our prisoners of war that were captured by Japan, and indeed about 800 of them were, in fact, bartered in this way and were moved over to Japan and perhaps continued to live there. But nonetheless, the Congress has accepted responsibility, the administration has accepted responsibility for this terrible act in the middle of war and made some measure of compensation.

I would hope, as the delegate from American Samoa said, that there would be continuing lessons to be learned by what happened during World War II, and I think it is our job to continue this education process, and so in moments like this it is important to remind the country about what happened. In another generation it will probably be forgotten. That is the tragedy: We have no place in which this story can be permanently told so that the people in this country can understand what happened, and what a terrible injustice it was and an outright violation of the U.S. Constitution.

So, Mr. Speaker, I hope that there will be efforts to establish a fund, an education fund that will be meaningful and will carry this story not in a negative sense of condemnation, but in a hopeful sense that this kind of history would never be repeated again, ever, to any segment of our population.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Hawaii for her eloquent statement, and as the gentlewoman will know, tomorrow is going to be a very important occasion whereby the Cox committee is going to submit a report to the Congress and to the Nation. This is in reference, of course, to the issue of the Chinese government having solicited or gaining access to the secrets and the computers and all of that. And I, as a member of the Committee on International Relations, I thank the gentleman that talked or made his presentation earlier this evening, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. WELDON).

The fear that I have in what is going to happen tomorrow and in the coming weeks, and I am just going to simply label it China bashing, and I am very concerned about this because this is going to be exactly the issue that we have tried to discuss this evening where the stereotyping and the labeling becomes so instantaneous, and I must submit that the media is not going to do any better, that we can just see what is going to happen to the Chinese American community. They are all going to be looked upon with suspicion and having some second thoughts about them being not American simply because they are Chinese.

And I sincerely hope that this is not going to be the case, but I am fearful, just as has been my experience in the several hearings that we have held in the Committee on International Relations when we talk about human rights. It seems that we have only focused on human rights violations in China, but not on other countries and other regions of the world. And I seriously raise the issue if there is fairness and equity in the process, just as I would like to submit that in tomorrow's presentation that there should be a firm understanding that this has nothing to do with the Chinese people.

And what I am really puzzled about is that even our own allies have spied upon this government, and there seems to be no word or indication from the media that Chinese are not the only ones that are spying, if they, in fact, are doing this. But I understand through the media that the report is quite firm, with whatever data that they are going to submit, that this did happen. But I am at least grateful to the gentleman from Pennsylvania saying this should not be taken as an attack, not only to our Chinese-American community but even to the Chinese government, because it was our own government and officials that were responsible.

So I think that again I want to thank the gentlewoman for yielding and to allow me to submit this concern that I have in listening to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the remarks he had made earlier about this report that is going to be submitted tomorrow.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. The temptation is certainly going to be ever present that people will scapegoat and bash and make generalizations about the entire Asian community. If one looked at my colleague, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. WU) and my colleague, the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD), perhaps not so much my colleague from American Samoa, but his mustache, but myself, they probably could not make a distinction. Somebody would probably think we are all Chinese.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I have been to Israel, and they think that I am Arab; I have been to Pakistan, they think I am Indian; I have been to India, they think I am Polynesian; and, coming from the islands, they think I am from the Punjab region of India; and the gentlewoman probably remembers, and I remember last year one of my own colleagues right here on this floor of the House addressed me as the gentleman from Somalia.

So I fully understand. There is a little problem of understanding where I come from.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, however we come out on this whole issue of China's connection with what occurred at the labs, I certainly think that it is up to us to be completely vigilant on how this debate is characterized, that when they are talking about the government of China, that they make absolutely clear that they are not disparaging in any way the Chinese American people who are living in the United States. I mean that has to be the bottom line for all of us, to be there, to make sure that the debate, the media frenzy and all of that that will follow does not in any way characterize the loyal, hard-working, diligent, wonderful Chinese Americans who are living within the United States.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, the point is well made by the gentlewoman from Hawaii.

A classic example: The gentleman that has been fired from the Department of Energy, supposedly giving secrets, in the media, the first instance, it is a Chinese American. Never say the name of the gentleman, but why does it have to be stated that he is a Chinese American? That is my point, and I think it is wrong for the media to make these types of stereotypes.

I do not hear my fellow Americans saying a French American doing this or a British American or a Scandinavian American or a Balkanese American. Why the labels? And I just think that the media has done a real disservice in adding this frenzy or this hype on this race issue which I really think is not only inappropriate but is just out of place.

Mrs. MINK of Hawaii. Mr. Speaker, we have our task cut out for us, and I do want to thank the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) again for making this time available to me. I did want to go into the matter of the Filipino veterans and the great inequity that they have had to endure, but understanding that we are having a special order on that issue alone some time during the week, I will refrain from putting these remarks in at this time and await that other period.

So I thank the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD). I appreciate his leadership in this effort tonight.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I thank very much the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK), and as she has indicated, we will have a special order on the matter of the Filipino veterans I believe on Wednesday, and the gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER), who has taken a strong leadership position on that issue, and the gentlewoman's own work in terms of the work of the Congressional Asian Pacific Caucus has been remarkable in this. So this is one of the ongoing issues that is a remnant of the war experience, Filipinos who have fought under the U.S. flag, but being denied the veterans' benefits that were promised to them as a result of them fighting under the American flag against the common enemy.

Just to add a little bit more to the issue of how the espionage should be dealt with, it is important, and not just for perceptual reasons, because that in itself is important, but it will have an impact on the employment and contractual opportunities of individuals, and that is where the rubber hits the road on issues like this, in much the same way that was experienced during all the discussion of the fundraising scandals. I know that I heard many reports from individuals who had difficulties having access to elected officials, who had appointments broken,

and to the same extent that if we are not careful in how we deal with this particular issue, there will be additional questions asked of Asian American scientists. And in a way it is an ironic contrast to the fact that the technological lead role of this country is due in large measure to the presence of Asian American scientists, and in fact Asian American scientists continue to make this country much more secure, not less secure, and certainly much stronger and not weaker.

The Asian Pacific American Caucus has many serious issues to attend to: the issue of Filipino Veterans' Rights v. Cayetano, a native Hawaiian case; an effort to try to get President Clinton to meet leaders of the South Pacific nations; census issues; immigration rights issues; and health issues which we will continue to work on as a caucus. But we tend to look at APA month as a time to bring recognition to this enormous community which has made significant progress in this country and enormous contributions to strengthen this country, and we will continue to pursue those issues.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, it is with great honor that I join my colleagues of the Congressional Asian Pacific Caucus in recognizing the month of May as Asian Pacific American Heritage Month.

This year's theme, ''Celebrating Our Legacy,'' commemorates the contributions Americans of Asian and Pacific Islander descent have made to our country. What better place than our nation's Capitol to highlight the historical legacy of Asian and Pacific Islander Americans.

Their contributions, which have enriched our American society and strengthened its core values, are vast and varied. This evening I would like to focus on their valiant efforts to protect our nation.

There is no better example of the critical role Asian Pacific Islanders played in defense of our country than during World War II. Although their families and friends were forcibly being moved out of their homes and put into internment camps encircled by barbed wire, Japanese American men insisted on being allowed to fight for their country. This resulted in the formation of the 442nd Regimental Combat Team.

Among the 442nd,s many heroes is Sadao Munemori from Los Angeles. Mr. Munemori received the Congressional Medal of Honor posthumously for saving the lives of his fellow soldiers while sacrificing his own.

In Europe, on April 5, 1945, Mr. Munemori led the attack against the last stronghold of Hitler's army in Italy. Thrust into command when his squad leader was wounded, Munemori attacked two German machine gun nests that had pinned down his squad in a minefield. After withdrawing due to heavy enemy fire, Munemori took refuge in a shell crater already occupied by two of his men. When an unexploded hand grenade bounced off his helmet and rolled toward his companions, Munemori jumped on it, absorbing the blast.

In the South Pacific, Filipino American soldiers fought along side American soldiers in some of the bloodiest battles of the war. For almost four years, during the most intense and strategically important phases of World War II, more than 200,000 Filipinos fought side-by-side with Allied forces and willingly sacrificed their lives and well-being in defense of freedom. By holding off the enemy at the Battle of Corregidor for six months, these Filipino American veterans enabled forces to mobilize back home. Moreover, many Filipino American soldiers lost their lives as POW's during the Bataan Death March, demonstrating their ultimate loyalty to our country. These courageous men won the freedom of the Filipino people and made a tremendous impact on our ability to prevail in the Pacific Theater.

There are many more unsung heroes like Mr. Munemori and the Filipino veterans. And it is their legacy that we celebrate during the month of May. Generations of Asian Americans have given us their culture, traditions, and values and greatly enriched American society. I ask all my colleagues to join us in expressing our heartfelt appreciation to all Americans of Asian and Pacific Islander descent for their contributions to our country.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Asian Pacific American Heritage Month this month and to introduce a congressional resolution which condemns prejudice against Asian and Pacific Islander Americans and supports the political and civic participation by Americans of Asian and Pacific Islander ancestry.

All too often, Asian and Pacific Islander Americans are subject to prejudice and acts of violence that often go unnoticed by the public eye. These Americans have suffered unfounded and demagogic accusations of disloyalty throughout the history of the United States. A 1992 report of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights found that Asian and Pacific islander Americans are still frequent victims of racially motivated bigotry and violence. As recently as this past weekend, the Los Angeles times published a story reciting recent and increasing incidence of ethnic prejudice at our nation's nuclear weapon laboratories because of the ongoing investigations at Los Alamos.

Mr. Speaker, we should recognize the rich cultural heritage of the Asian and Pacific Islander American community and all these communities have contributed to America and American values. We must distinguish between the activities of spies and foreign agents and those in the Asian American communities that contribute tremendous energy and knowledge to our nation's economy and defense.

In my Congressional District, which includes Silicon Valley, Americans of Asian ancestry are intimately involved in making the technology sector vibrant and our economy expand. But mine is not the only example we can find. Asian and Pacific Americans are woven into our national and local communities and add cultural diversity, knowledge attainment, and loyalty to America and the values we hold dear.

I'm proud to reintroduce a congressional resolution tonight which condemns all prejudice against Asian and Pacific Islander Americans and supports the political and civic participation by these Americans.

We must not forget the strength our country has gained from the inspiration, the hard work and the loyalty of Americans of Asian and Pacific Islander ancestry and what their contributions have meant for a stronger, more prosperous America.

[From the Los Angeles Times, May 21, 1999]

SPY SCARE TAINTS LABS' CLIMATE, ASIAN AMERICANS SAY

(By Nick Anderson)

WASHINGTON.—On the surface the incidents cited by employees in the nation's nuclear weapon laboratories were not explosive: a snide remark here, an ambiguous warning there. It was hardly material for a clear-cut case of workplace discrimination.

But to Asian Americans who work in the labs, the incidents were real and their implications disturbing. Amid congressional espionage inquiries and press reports that a Chinese American lab employee may have helped China purloin vital nuclear weapon secrets, a small, indignant group of scientists and engineers decided that something should be done to defuse the threat of ''ethnic profiling.''

''There were enough things happening that we were very concerned about suspicions and [whether Asian Americans] were being treated differently,'' said Raymond Ng, a mechanical engineer for Sandia National Laboratories in Albuquerque. ''There was a lot of fear and concern about what was going on. Management was not aware of these things. We needed to make it known.''

So Ng joined with Joel Wong, an industrial hygienist at Lawrence Livermore Laboratory near San Francisco, to give Energy Secretary Bill Richardson a short list of recent incidents of ethnic insensitivity reported by coworkers who wished to remain unnamed. Richardson, who oversees the labs, said that he considers the reports to be generally true, even if some particulars remain unverified.

In one account, snickering and hushed laughter broke out in a roomful of computer users as a person with a Chinese surname was introduced to lead a session on computer security. In another, a lab manager told an Asian American employee that ''personal characteristics'' would determine a person's career opportunities in the wake of recent disclosures of security breaches, implying that ethnicity was one such characteristic.

Then there was the teasing. Someone wondered aloud whether an Asian American employee got ''rich'' by selling classified information, according to Ng and Wong. Someone else said he was wary of sharing information with a colleague of Asian descent who might be a ''spy.''

Two Chinese American lab employees who insisted on anonymity recounted similar incidents in separate interviews with a Times reporter. One said he had been asked at work whether he had ''dual loyalties.''

CONCERNS RAISED IN LABS AND ELSEWHERE

Whether an ethnic backlash actually is occurring to any significant degree is hard to determine. But concerns about possible ethnic stereotyping are rising and not just among national lab employees. The subject comes up in government circles, in the scientific community, in the ethnic Asian media, in high-tech business groups and among Asian American civic leaders who fear a replay of the uproar directed at Asian American political donors after revelations of attempts by foreign interests to influence the 1996 elections.

Prominent Asian Americans have met with Richardson four times and once with White House Chief of Staff John Podesta to seek assurances that scientists and engineers in U.S. labs would not be subject to discrimination.

''Asian Pacific Americans are concerned that their loyalty and their patriotism are being challenged,'' Richardson acknowledged in a speech April 30. ''And that's because of racism.''

The Energy secretary vowed to protect the rights of all laboratory workers and to visit the labs in person to drive the point home.

In Congress, Reps. Tom Campbell (R-San Jose) and David Wu (D-Ore.), who is the first Chinese American member of the House, are drafting a resolution expressing support for Chinese Americans.

Wu said there is ''widespread concern in the Chinese American community and particularly the Chinese American scientific community. These are folks who work very, very hard. They are Americans. By all accounts that I know of, they work hard and play by the rules.''

Campbell said that some scientists and engineers in Silicon Valley now worry about traveling to professional conferences in mainland China for fear that they will be suspected of leaking technological secrets to the Communist regime.

Still, many lawmakers assert that the United States must raise its guard against Chinese espionage and set new limits on scientific exchange with China and other countries seeking to develop nuclear weapons. Their campaign is likely to gain considerable momentum with the release of a House investigative panel's report citing evidence of widespread leakage of sensitive military technology to China. The committee's bipartisan findings are expected to be made public next week by its chairman, Rep. Christopher Cox (R–Newport Beach).

Asian American scientists, engineers and civil leaders hasten to condemn espionage. But they content that some Republican leaders in Congress, aided by unbalanced media reports, have cast a cloud over Chinese Americans—and Chinese nationals—doing legitimate scientific work in the weapons labs and elsewhere.

SENATOR REFERS TO ''VERY CRAFTY PEOPLE''

Asked about the extent of Chinese espionage on the NBC program ''Meet the Press,'' Sen. Richard C. Shelby (R–Ala.), chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, said in March: ''We've got to remember the Chinese are everywhere as far as our weapons systems, not only in our labs that make our nuclear weapons and development, but also in the technology to deliver them. We've seen some of that. They're real. There here. And probably in some ways, very crafty people.''

A spokeswoman for the senator, Andrea Andrews, said that Shelby was referring to Chinese spies, not to Chinese Americans in general. But other read more into his statement. Charles Sie, vice chairman of the Committee of 100, an influential Chinese American group whose founders include the architect I.M. Pei and the cellist Yo-Yo Ma, called Shelby's words a ''ridiculous'' example of ethnic stereotyping.

Also ''ridiculous,'' said Jeff Garberson, spokesman for Lawrence Livermore, was the request he recently received from a national newsmagazine for a generic photo of an Asian American employee at work ''to illustrate a story on espionage.'' The request was refused.

Leading science periodicals are closely monitoring the espionage issue, especially the possible fallout for foreign-born scientists who may be U.S. citizens, permanent U.S. residents or distinguished visitors. A headline in the June issue of Scientific American read: ''Explosive Reactions: A Backlash From a Nuclear Espionage Case Might Hurt Science and Do Little to Bolster National Security.''

Many of the top scientists in America in this century have been foreign-born, including some from mainland China or Taiwan. Many more, including several Nobel Prize winners, are of Asian heritage.

Asian American engineers also have been deeply involved in the U.S. defense industry. According to the National Science Foundation, more than 300,000 people of Asian descent were working in the United States as scientists and engineers in 1995, the latest year for which figures are available. That's about 10% of all scientists and engineers and far more than any other ethnic minority. Many Chinese American scientists said that they are most concerned about lasting damage the espionage allegations could have on the career prospects of promising graduate students in engineering or the physical sciences, a significant number of whom are foreign-born or Asian American.

''What one is afraid of are possible future actions with regard to employment promotion, retention of top Chinese American scientists,'' said Cheuk-Yin Wong, who is chairman of the Overseas Chinese Physics Assn., which has about 400 members nationwide. He is no relation to Joel Wong.

Lab administrators said that they want to prevent such consequences. C. Paul Robinson, head of Sandia National Laboratories, recently told Chinese American employees that they should not be judged responsible for a particular espionage case so long as white Americans, like himself, were not held equally responsible for the disastrous Aldrich Ames spycase.

''Can we all please think extra hard about that?'' Robinson implored in an electronic newsletter. ''Our work is important; we need all the good brainpower that we can bring to bear in our work and we certainly must not mistreat loyal Americans.''

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, but certainly all Members are invited to submit statements for the RECORD in terms of the experiences of their own individual districts and the participation in these social, economic, educational and political life of Asian Pacific Americans in their districts.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. ORTIZ (at the request Mr. GEPHARDT), for today and Tuesday, May 25, on account of official business in the district.

Mrs. CARSON (at the request Mr. GEPHARDT), for today, on account of official 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:)

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CUMMINGS**, for 5 minutes, today.**

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, for 60 minutes, today.

Mr. UNDERWOOD, for 60 minutes, today.

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

Mr. SCHAFFER, for 5 minutes, on May 25.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM, for 5 minutes, today.

A BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Administration, reported that that committee did on the following date present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

On May 21, 1999:

H.R. 1141. Making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1999, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 29 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 25, 1999, at 9 a.m., for morning hour debates.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

2293. A letter from the Acting Executive Director, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Revision of Federal Speculative Position Limits and Associated Rules (RIN: 3038–AB32) received May 14, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2294. A letter from the Administrator, Commodity Credit Corporation, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—1998 Single-Year and Multi-Year Crop Loss Disaster Assistance Program (RIN: 0560–AF75) received May 14, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2295. A letter from the President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank, transmitting a statement with respect to transactions involving U.S. exports to the Republic of Korea; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

2296. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule—Notice of Final Funding Priorities for Fiscal Years 1999–2000 for Certain Centers—received April 16, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2297. A letter from the Secretary of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Sixth Triennial Report to Congress on Drug Abuse and Addiction Research: 25 Years of Discovery to Advance the Health of the Public, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 290aa–4(b); to the Committee on Commerce.

2298. A letter from the Special Assistant Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Implementation of Section 309(j) of the Communications Act—Competitive Bidding for Commercial Broadcast and Instructional Television Fixed Service Licenses; Reexamination of the Policy Statement on Comparative Broadcast Hearings; Proposals to Reform the Commission's Comparative Hearing Process to Expedite the Resolution of Cases [MM Docket No. 97–234, GC Docket No. 92–52, GEN Docket No. 90–264] received May 14, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2299. A letter from the Special Assistant Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Amendment of Section 73.202(b) Table of Allotments, FM Broadcast Stations by substituting Channel 244C for Channel 244C1 and reallotting the channel (Ely and Carlin, Nevada) [MM Docket No. 98–185, RM–9355] received May 14, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2300. A letter from the Chief, Policy and Program Planning Division, Common Carrier Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Implementation of the Local Competition Provisions in the Telecommunications Act of 1996 [CC Docket No. 96–98] Interconnection between Local Exchange Carriers and Commercial Mobile Radio Service Providers [CC Docket No. 95–185] received May 14, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2301. A letter from the Legal Advisor, Cable Services Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Satellite Delivery of Network Signals to Unserved Households for Purposes of the Satellite Home Viewer Act [CS Docket No. 98–201; RM No. 9335; RM No. 9345] received April 18, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

2302. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's Plan for Transferred Government Spectrum; to the Committee on Commerce.

2303. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a determination and certification of eight countries which are not cooperating fully with U.S. antiterrorism efforts: Afghanistan, Cuba, Iran, Iraq, Libya, North Korea, Sudan, and Syria; to the Committee on International Relations.

2304. A letter from the Chairman, Federal Election Commission, transmitting a copy of the annual report in compliance with the Government in the Sunshine Act during the calendar year 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(j); to the Committee on Government Reform.

2305. A letter from the Director, Office of Surface Mining, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Alabama, Arkansas, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Louisiana, Missouri, Oklahoma, and Texas Abandoned Mine Land Reclamation Plans and Regulatory Programs [Technical Amendment No. MCRCC–01] received April 20, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

2306. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher Processors using Trawl Gear in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands [Docket No. 990304063–9063–01; I.D. 050599B] received May 13, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

2307. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Summer Flounder Fishery; Commercial Quota Harvested for Maine [Docket No. 981014259–8312–02; I.D. 032699A] received April 14, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

2308. A letter from the Rules Administrator, Federal Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule—Visiting: Notification to Visitors [BOP 1071–F] (RIN: 1120–AA67) received May 14, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2309. A letter from the Director, National Legislative Commission, The American Legion, transmitting a copy of the Legion's financial statements as of December 31, 1998, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 1101(4) and 1103; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2310. A letter from the Program Support Specialist, Aircraft Certification Service, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Eurocopter France Model SA341G and SA342J [Docket No. 99–SW–03–AD; Amendment 39–11174; AD 99–11–03] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received May 17, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2311. A letter from the Chief, Regs and Admin Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Drawbridge Operating Regulation; Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, TX [CGD08–99–034] (RIN: 2115–AE47) received May 17, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2312. A letter from the Assistant Administrator for Weather Services, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—American Meteorological Society's Industy, Government Scholarship, and Fellowship Program [Docket No. 990208045–9045–01] (RIN No: 0648–ZA61) received May 14, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Science.

2313. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting proposed draft legislation that provides for the transfer to Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, for five years, the full amount of the excise tax collected on imported rum; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

[Pursuant to the order of the House on May 20, 1999, the following reports were filed on May 21, 1999]

Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 1905. A bill making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes (Rept. 106–156). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. SKEEN: Committee on Appropriations. H.R. 1906. A bill making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes (Rept. 106–157). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

[Filed on May 24, 1999]

Mr. BURTON: Committee on Government Reform. H.R. 974. A bill to establish a program to afford high school graduates from the District of Columbia the benefits of in-State tuition at State colleges and universities outside the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 106–158, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 185. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1906) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes (Rept. 106–159). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. LINDER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 186. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1259) to amend the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to protect Social Security surpluses through strengthened budgetary enforcement mechanisms (Rept. 106–160). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ARCHER: Committee on Ways and Means. H.R. 1833. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2000 and 2001 for the United States Customs Service for drug interdiction and other operations, for the Office of the United States Trade Representative, for the United States International Trade Commission, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 106–161). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Mr. SPENCE: Committee on Armed Services. H.R. 1401. A bill to authorize appropriations for fiscal years 2000 and 2001 for military activities of the Department of Defense, to prescribe military personnel strengths for fiscal years 2000 to 2001, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 106–162). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X, the Committee on Ways and Means discharged from consideration of H.R. 974. Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

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

[The following action occurred on May 21, 1999]

H.R. 434. Referral to the Committees on Ways and Means and Banking and Financial Services extended for a period ending not later than June 11, 1999.

[The following action occurred on May 24, 1999]

H.R. 974. Referred to the Committee on Ways and Means extended for a period ending not later than May 24, 1999.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

[Reported on May 21, 1999]

By Mr. TAYLOR of North Carolina:

H.R. 1905. A bill making appropriations for the Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.

By Mr. SKEEN:

H.R. 1906. A bill making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes.

[Reported on May 24, 1999]

By Mr. COBLE (for himself, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. HYDE, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. GOODLATTE, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. PEASE, Mr. WEXLER, and Mr. GALLEGLY):

H.R. 1907. A bill to amend title 35, United States Code, to provide enhanced protection for inventors and innovators, protect patent terms, reduce patent litigation, and for other

purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GILMAN (for himself and Mr. GEJDENSON):

H.R. 1908. A bill to authorize the transfer of naval vessels to certain foreign countries; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

H.R. 1909. A bill to make supplemental appropriations for fiscal year 1999 to ensure the inclusion of commonly used pesticides in State source water assessment programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GREEN of Texas:

H.R. 1910. A bill to prohibit abuses in the use of unsolicited bulk electronic mail, and for other purposes; referred to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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. LOBIONDO:

H.R. 1911. A bill to require that health plans provide coverage for a minimum hospital stay for mastectomies and lymph node dissection for the treatment of breast cancer and coverage for secondary consultations; referred to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MORAN of Virginia:

H.R. 1912. A bill to require the Secretary of the Army to designate Fort Belvoir, Virginia, as the site for the planned National Museum of the United States Army; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. POMEROY (for himself, Mr. HILL of Montana, and Mr. BALDACCI):

H.R. 1913. A bill to authorize registration of Canadian pesticides for agricultural crops; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. THOMAS:

H.R. 1914. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to permit cooperatives to pay dividends on preferred stock without reducing patronage dividends; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. ESHOO (for herself, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. ABERCROMBIE, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. LANTOS, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mrs. MINK of Hawaii, and Mr. WAXMAN):

H. Con. Res. 111. Concurrent resolution condemning all prejudice against Asian and Pacific Islander Americans in the United States and supporting political and civic participation by such Americans throughout the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 119: Mr. SCHAFFER and Mr. JEFFERSON.
H.R. 121: Mr. SCHAFFER.
H.R. 137: Mr. KIND.
H.R. 206: Mr. ENGLISH.
H.R. 353: Mr. GEKAS, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. QUINN, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. SHAW, Mr. GIBBONS, and Mr. MARKEY.
H.R. 360: Mr. GONZALEZ.
H.R. 415: Mr. JEFFERSON.
H.R. 430: Mr. JEFFERSON.
H.R. 488: Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut.
H.R. 534: Mr. TRAFICANT.
H.R. 608: Mr. GOODE.
H.R. 670: Mr. UDALL of Colorado and Mr. FORBES.
H.R. 675: Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. PASTOR, Mr. STRICKLAND, OF Mr. TANCREDO.
H.R. 693: Mr. GEPHARDT.
H.R. 699: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 730: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.
H.R. 776: Mr. TIERNEY and Mr. WU.
H.R. 798: Mr. SNYDER.
H.R. 826: Mr. ALLEN.
H.R. 850: Mr. BAIRD.
H.R. 868: Mr. OXLEY.
H.R. 894: Mr. BLILEY and Mr. ISAKSON.
H.R. 902: Mr. ABERCROMBIE and Mr. SHERMAN.
H.R. 912: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 961: Ms. CARSON, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 974: Mr. LEWIS of California, Mr. BOUCHER, Mr. SCARBOROUGH, and Mrs. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 997: Mr. HYDE.
H.R. 1003: Mrs. MINK of Hawaii.
H.R. 1053: Mr. JEFFERSON.
H.R. 1071: Mr. JEFFERSON.
H.R. 1074: Mr. HUNTER, Mr. BACHUS, Mrs. BIGGERT, and Mr. NEY.
H.R. 1080: Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 1085: Ms. MCKINNEY and Mr. ENGLISH.
H.R. 1095: Mr. COYNE, Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. WYNN, Mr. VENTO, Mr. LAMPSON, and Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.
H.R. 1102: Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. COMBEST, and Mr. COYNE.
H.R. 1108: Ms. MCKINNEY.
H.R. 1111: Mr. CANADY of Florida, and Mr. LEVIN.
H.R. 1115: Mr. CARDIN, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. LEE, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. CONDIT, and Mr. KILDEE.
H.R. 1138: Mr. ALLEN.
H.R. 1168: Mr. ROEMER, Mr. KILPATRICK, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. CAPPS, and Mr. GORDON.
H.R. 1175: Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. CLAY, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. TURNER, and Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma.
H.R. 1196: Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LEACH, Mrs. KELLY, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, and Mr. TIERNEY.
H.R. 1214: Mr. JEFFERSON.
H.R. 1221: Mr. PASTOR and Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky.
H.R. 1222: Mr. BURTON of Indiana.
H.R. 1248: Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.
H.R. 1250: Mr. HINOJOSA.
H.R. 1256: Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. DOOLITTLE, and Mr. SHIMKUS.
H.R. 1259: Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. WILSON, and Mr. MINGE.
H.R. 1286: Mr. JEFFERSON.
H.R. 1299: Mr. GEPHARDT.
H.R. 1301: Mr. OXLEY, Mr. LARGENT, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. FORBES, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. KASICH, and Mr. GILCHREST.
H.R. 1322: Mr. SHAYS.
H.R. 1326: Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. NETHERCUTT, Mr. JEFFERSON, and Mr. WU.
H.R. 1355: Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mr. LAMPSON, and Mr. CUMMINGS.
H.R. 1382: Mr. MCHUGH.
H.R. 1385: Mr. KOLBE, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. LEACH, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. NUSSLE, Mr. KANJORSKI, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. WHITFIELD, and Mr. BOUCHER.
H.R. 1413: Mr. BONILLA.
H.R. 1456: Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. LEE, and Mr. UDALL of Colorado.
H.R. 1476: Mr. FILNER and Mrs. THURMAN.
H.R. 1485: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 1494: Mr. MCKEON.
H.R. 1496: Mr. PITTS, Mr. SOUDER, and Mr. HILLEARY.
H.R. 1560: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. MINGE.
H.R. 1592: Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. SISISKY, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. SPRATT, Mr. COOKSEY, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. RYUN of Kansas, Mr. JONES of North Carolina, and Mr. HOSTETTLER.
H.R. 1598: Mr. ARCHER and Mr. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 1620: Mr. HILLEARY.
H.R. 1628: Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. SHAW, and Mr. WEXLER.
H.R. 1649: Mr. LINDER.
H.R. 1650: Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut and Ms. DANNER.
H.R. 1659: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. HINOJOSA, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas.
H.R. 1665: Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. WOLF, and Mr. DINGELL.
H.R. 1690: Mr. HERGER.
H.R. 1691: Mr. WOLF, Mr. KING, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. RILEY, and Mr. SHOWS.
H.R. 1710: Mr. HILLEARY.
H.R. 1734: Ms. WATERS.
H.R. 1771: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. FORBES, Mr. GOSS, Mr. POMBO, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GOODE, and Mr. SHOWS.
H.R. 1772: Mr. RAHALL, Mr. FORBES, Mr. POMBO, Mr. GIBBONS, Mr. GOODE, and Mr. SHOWS.
H.R. 1777: Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon, Mr. FROST, and Mr. SHAYS.
H.R. 1837: Mr. WHITFIELD, Mr. FROST, Mr. DOYLE, and Mr. CAMP.
H.R. 1857: Mr. LEVIN, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. FROST, and Mr. ENGLISH.
H.R. 1861: Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. MCCRERY, and Mr. FOLEY.
H.R. 1867: Mrs. BONO and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 1885: Mr. SHOWS.
H.J. Res. 7: Mr. HALL of Texas.
H.J. Res. 53: Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin.
H. Con. Res. 34: Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, and Ms. RIVERS.
H. Con. Res. 51: Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas and Mr. DIXON.
H. Con. Res. 58: Mr. JEFFERSON.
H. Con. Res. 60: Mr. PASTOR, Mr. GILCHREST, and Mr. DIXON.
H. Con. Res. 67: Mr. FORBES, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PORTER, and Mr. WEINER.
H. Con. Res. 107: Mr. MCKEON, Mrs. MYRICK, and Mr. SCHAFFER.
H. Con. Res. 109: Mr. LANTOS, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Ms. WOOLSEY, and Mr. GONZALEZ.
H. Res. 144: Mr. JEFFERSON.
H. Res. 169: Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. ROHRABACHER, Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin, and Mr. LANTOS.
H. Res. 178: Mr. VENTO, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. DIXON, Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. BLAGOJEVICH, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. SOUDER, and Mr. TANCREDO.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1083: Mr. CRANE.
H.R. 1660: Mr. DAVIS of Virginia.
H.J. Res. 33: Mr. Moran of Virginia

AMENDMENTS

Under clause 8 of rule XVIII, proposed amendments were submitted as follows:

H.R. 1259

OFFERED BY: MR. TRAFICANT

AMENDMENT NO. 1: Add at the end the following new section:

SEC. 6. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF THE OLD-AGE, SURVIVORS, AND DISABILITY INSURANCE PROGRAM AND THE HOSPITAL INSURANCE PROGRAM.

It is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the moneys of the United States held for purposes of the old-age, survivors, and disability insurance program and the hospital insurance program maintained under the Social Security Act and related laws of the United States should always be held in separate and independent trust funds and should always be segregated from all other moneys of the United States,

(2) the receipts and disbursements of such programs (including revenues dedicated to such programs) should never be included in any budget totals set forth in the budget of the United States Government as prepared by the President or any budget prepared by the Congress, and

(3) the Congress should never make any law authorizing the use of such trust funds for any purpose other than for providing for the prompt and effective payment of benefits, payment of administrative expenses, and payment of such amounts as may be necessary and appropriate to correct prior incorrect payments, and no agency or instrumentality of the United States, or any officer or employee thereof, should ever be authorized to use, or to authorize the use of, such trust funds for any such other purpose.

H.R. 1401

OFFERED BY: MR. TRAFICANT

AMENDMENT NO. 2: At the end of title XXVIII (page ____, after line ____), insert the following new section:

SEC. ___. DESIGNATION OF NAVAL FACILITY, GRICIGNANO D'AVERSA, ITALY.

(a) DESIGNATION.—The facility of the United States Navy located in Gricignano d'Aversa, Italy, and known as the Naples Support Site, shall be known and designated as the ''Thomas M. Foglietta Support Site''.

(b) REFERENCES.—Any reference to the Naples Support Site in any law, regulation, map, document, record, or other paper of the United States shall be considered to be a reference to the ''Thomas M. Foglietta Support Site''.

H.R. 1905

OFFERED BY: MR. ROEMER

AMENDMENT NO. 1: Page 10, insert after line 9 the following (and redesignate the succeeding sections accordingly):

SEC. 104. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any amounts appropriated under this Act for Members' Representational Allowances for the House of Representatives which remain after all payments are made under such Allowances for fiscal year 2000 shall be deposited in the Treasury and used for deficit reduction (or, if there is no Federal budget deficit after all such payments have been made, for reducing the Federal debt, in such manner as the Secretary of the Treasury considers appropriate).

H.R. 1906

OFFERED BY: MR. BASS

AMENDMENT NO. 1: Insert before the short title the following new section:

SEC. __. (a) LIMITATION.—None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to award any new allocations under the market access program or to pay the salaries of personnel to award such allocations.

(b) CORESPONDING REDUCTION IN FUNDS.—The amount otherwise provided by this Act under the headings ''COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION FUND'' and ''REIMBURSEMENT FOR NET REALIZED LOSSES'' to reimburse the Commodity Credit Corporation for net realized losses sustained is hereby reduced by $90,000,000.

H.R. 1906

OFFERED BY: MR. BASS

AMENDMENT NO. 2: Insert before the short title the following new section:

SEC. __. (a) LIMITATION.—None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to award any new allocations under the market access program or to pay the salaries of personnel to award such allocations.

H.R. 1906

OFFERED BY: MR. DEFAZIO

AMENDMENT NO. 3: In the item relating to ''SALARIES AND EXPENSES'' under the heading ''ANIMAL AND PLANT HEALTH INSPECTION SERVICE'', insert after the first dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $7,000,000)''.

H.R. 1906

OFFERED BY: MR. DEFAZIO

AMENDMENT NO. 4: Insert before the short title the following new section:

SEC. ____. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available to the Secretary of Agriculture by this Act to carry out the first section of the Act of May 2, 1931 (7 U.S.C. 426), may be used to conduct campaigns for the destruction of wild animals for the purpose of protecting livestock.

H.R. 1906

OFFERED BY: MR. DEFAZIO

AMENDMENT NO. 5: Insert before the short title the following new section:

SEC. ____. (a) LIMITATION.—None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act for Wildlife Services Program operations to carry out the first section of the Act of March 2, 1931 (7 U.S.C. 426), may be used to conduct campaigns for the destruction of wild animals for the purpose of protecting livestock.

(b) CORRESPONDING REDUCTION IN FUNDS.—The amount otherwise provided by this Act for salaries and expenses under the heading ''ANIMAL AND PLANT HEALTH INSPECTION SERVICE'' is hereby reduced by $7,000,000.

H.R. 1906

OFFERED BY: MRS. MEEK OF FLORIDA

AMENDMENT NO. 6: Add before the short title the following new section:

SEC. . After March 1, 2000, none of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used by the Secretary of Agriculture—

(1) to permit the importation of meat or meat food products under subsections (a) and (f) of section 20 of the Federal Meat Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 620) from any foreign country with respect to which the Secretary has not made the determination, as is required by subsection (e) of such section, that the foreign country's meat inspection requirements currently achieve a level of sanitary protection equivalent to that achieved under United States standards; and

(2) to permit the importation of poultry or poultry products under subsection (a) of section 17 of the Poultry Products Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 466) from any foreign country with respect to which the Secretary has not made the determination, as is required by subsection (d) of such section, that the foreign country's poultry inspection requirements currently achieve a level of sanitary protection equivalent to that achieved under United States standards.

H.R. 1906

OFFERED BY: MRS. MEEK OF FLORIDA

AMENDMENT NO. 7: Add before the short title the following new section:

SEC. ____. After March 1, 2000, none of the funds appropriated or otherwise available by this Act may be used by the Secretary of Agriculture—

(1) to permit the importation of meat or meat food products under subsections (a) and (f) of section 20 of the Federal Meat Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 620) from any foreign country in violation of subsection (f) of such section; and

(2) to permit the importation of poultry or poultry products under subsection (a) of section 17 of the Poultry Products Inspection Act (21 U.S.C. 466) from any foreign country in violation of subsection (d) of such section.

H.R. 1906

OFFERED BY: MR. MORAN OF KANSAS

AMENDMENT NO. 8: Insert before the short title the following new section:

SEC. ____. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to implement the final rule of the Food Safety and Inspection Service of the Department of Agriculture entitled ''Pathogen Reduction; Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Points (HACCP) Systems'' with respect to very small establishments, as such establishments are defined in the rule.

H.R. 1906

OFFERED BY: MR. SANDERS

AMENDMENT NO. 9: Insert before the short title the following new section:

SEC. ____. For an additional amount for the Department of Agriculture (consisting of an additional $5,000,000 for the commodity supplemental food program under the ''COMMODITY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM''), $5,000,000.

H.R. 1906

OFFERED BY: MR. SANDERS

AMENDMENT NO. 10: Insert before the short title the following new section:

SEC. ____. For an additional amount for the Department of Agriculture (consisting of an additional $7,000,000 for the commodity supplemental food program under the ''COMMODITY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM''), $7,000,000.

H.R. 1906

OFFERED BY: MR. SANDERS

AMENDMENT NO. 11: At the end of the bill (preceding the short title), Insert the following new section:

SEC. ____. The amounts otherwise provided by this Act are revised by increasing the amount for the Department of Agriculture (consisting of a $2,000,000 competitive grant program for elementary and secondary schools to work with local farmers to purchase locally-grown foods) and reducing the amount for ''FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE AND GENERAL SALES MANAGER'', by $2,000,000.

H.R. 1906

OFFERED BY: MR. SANDERS

AMENDMENT NO. 12: Page 35, line 7 (relating to the rural community advancement program), insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(increased by $3,000,000)''.

Page 53, line 7 (relating to ocean freight differential grants), insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $3,000,000)''.

H.R. 1906

OFFERED BY: MR. SANDERS

AMENDMENT NO. 13: Page 10, line 14 (relating to the Agricultural Research Service), insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $10,000,000)''.

Page 50, line 9 (relating to the commodity assistance program), insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(increased by $10,000,000)''.

H.R. 1906

OFFERED BY: MR. SANDERS

AMENDMENT NO. 14: Page 10, line 14 (relating to the Agricultural Research Service), insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(reduced by $5,000,000)''.

Page 50, line 9 (relating to the commodity assistance program), insert after the dollar amount the following: ''(increased by $5,000,000)''.

H.R. 1906

OFFERED BY: MR. SANFORD

AMENDMENT NO. 15: Insert before the short title the following new section:

SEC. ____. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act to the Department of Agriculture may be used to pay the salaries and expenses of personnel who issue, under section 156 of the Agricultural Market Transition Act (7 U.S.C. 7272), any loans to sugar beet or sugar cane processors.

H.R. 1906

OFFERED BY: MR. TRAFICANT

AMENDMENT NO. 16: Insert before the short title the following new sections:

SEC. ____. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be expended by an entity unless the entity agrees that in expending the assistance the entity will comply with sections 2 through 4 of the Act of March 3, 1933 (41 U.S.C. 10a–10c; popularly known as the ''Buy American Act'').

SEC. ____. (a) PURCHASE OF AMERICAN-MADE EQUIPMENT AND PRODUCTS.—In the case of any equipment or products that may be purchased using financial assistance provided using funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act, it is the sense of the Congress that entities receiving such assistance should, in expending the assistance, purchase only American-made equipment and products.

(b) NOTICE TO RECIPIENTS OF ASSISTANCE.—In providing financial assistance using funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act, the Federal agency providing the assistance shall provide to each recipient of the assistance a notice describing the statement made in subsection (a) by the Congress.

SEC. ____. If it has been finally determined by a court or Federal agency that any person intentionally affixed a label bearing a ''Made in America'' inscription, or any inscription with the same meaning, to any product sold in or shipped to the United States that is not made in the United States, such person shall be ineligible to receive any contract or subcontract made with funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act, pursuant to the debarment, suspension, and ineligibility procedures described in section 9.400 through 9.409 of title 48, Code of Federal Regulations.