United States of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 106th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 145 WASHINGTON, MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 13, 1999 No. 118

# House of Representatives

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

## DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
*September 13, 1999.*

I hereby appoint the Honorable JIM GIBBONS to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. McDevitt, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1906. An Act 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.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H.R. 1906) ''An Act 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,'' requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. COCHRAN, Mr. SPECTER, Mr. BOND, Mr. GORTON, Mr. MCCONNELL, Mr. BURNS, Mr. STEVENS, Mr. KOHL, Mr. HARKIN, Mr. DORGAN, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, Mr. DURBIN, and Mr. BYRD, to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which concurrence of the House is requested.

S. 28. An Act to authorize an interpretive center and related visitor facilities within the Four Corners Monument Tribal Park, and for other purposes.

## MORNING HOUR DEBATES

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

## MONEY

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, my topic today is money. About the only thing most of us know about money is that we need more of it. But there is really a lot more that we need to know about our money system.

For example, most people do not know that we pay rent on our money; yes, interest or rent on the cash we use. It costs every American about $100 every year indirectly to rent our cash, that is, our paper money, from its owners, the Federal Reserve.

Of course, the Fed does not just spend that money. It is returned to the Federal Treasury. Thus, in reality, if it goes to the Treasury, it is a tax or rent we Americans pay to the Fed for the privilege of using the Fed's money, an indirect tax on our money in circulation.

We all know that we are taxed on nearly everything, but not many people know that we pay a tax on our money. This tax, about $25 billion, or $100 per person, is paid to the Fed each year by the U.S. Treasury to pay interest on U.S. bonds that are held by the Fed to back our money. What a foolish and costly system, to rent Federal Reserve notes for $25 billion a year, when the U.S. Treasury could issue our own currency, our own United States notes, without debt or bonds or any interest at all, just as we issue our coins.

Our coins are minted by the United States Treasury and essentially spent into circulation. The Treasury makes a neat profit on them of over 80 percent of the face value of the coins issued. That is a lot of profit. A grave question is, why do we not issue our paper money the same way we issue coins, and gain an immense profit or seigniorage for our Treasury, and, of course, for the American people?

It has been said that the U.S. Government goes further into debt whenever it issues currency, but makes a profit when coins are placed into circulation. This is truly a system that defies logic. Again, why do we not issue our own paper money, just as we issue our coins? There is no legitimate reason why we do not.

I am pleased to present a simple and realistic way to accomplish this. Congress needs only to pass legislation requiring the U.S. Treasury to print and issue U.S. Treasury currency in the same amount and the same denominations as the Federal Reserve notes.

The Treasury would issue these new U.S. notes through the banks, while withdrawing a like amount of Federal Reserve notes. Thus, there would be no change in the money supply. As these Federal Reserve notes are collected by the U.S. Treasury, they must be returned to the Fed to buy back or redeem the face value, the same face value in U.S. interest-bearing bonds now held by the Fed, a total of about $500 billion. So over a couple of years, we would have real U.S. currency circulating, and the U.S. debt would be reduced by substantially more than $400

billion. It sounds too simple, does it not? There must be a down side. Well, it is that simple, and there is no down side.

In fact, there is a substantial up side. The U.S. debt would be reduced by over $400 billion, and U.S. interest on the debt reduced each year by about $25 billion. Ask the chairman of the Committee on the Budget if it could help to reduce U.S. Treasury expenditures by $25 billion each year. I intend to introduce legislation to carry out this concept.

## EAST TIMOR

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year I had an opportunity to travel with a congressional delegation chaired by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. KOLBE) to the island Nation of Indonesia.

There we had an opportunity to meet with President Habibie, to meet in prison with Jose Alexandre Gusmao, who is likely to be the president of an independent East Timor, should that ever come to pass, as well as maybe of Indonesia's military leaders, people who appear to be sophisticated, many of whom are United States-educated.

Again and again we heard of Indonesia's commitment to democracy and its determined effort to undo the damage done by the Asian financial crisis and its need for our support. The scheduling of an election on independence for East Timor was perceived as a positive sign. But over the last 8 months we have been watching those events unfold in East Timor, hoping for the best, but with a growing sense of apprehension. Last month's election results and the carnage that followed realized our worst fears.

East Timor is in fact different from Indonesia's other areas of ethnic tension. Its history is different. It was ruled for hundreds of years by the Portuguese, not the Dutch. It is overwhelmingly Roman Catholic, not Muslim, like most of Indonesia.

The people of East Timor have done everything that the world community could have expected in seeking their independence. They have suffered 25 years of repression at the hands of Indonesian military and paramilitary groups. In August, over 98 percent of the 450,000 eligible voters braved grave personal peril to journey to the polls.

Only 2 weeks ago, those election results were described as a model vote, and the results, of course, were overwhelmingly clear. By a majority of more than three to one, East Timor voted for independence from Indonesia. But the reaction to this vote was chilling. Military groups have gone on a rampage. Innocent civilians, United Nations personnel, priests, nuns, women, and children have been attacked and killed. Hundreds, perhaps thousands, of deaths have been added to the over 200,000 lives that have been lost on this troubled island over the last 25 years.

The situation in East Timor is indeed complex and delicate, because Indonesia is simultaneously trying to restore its own democracy after years of military dictatorship, repair a shattered economy, and retrain its military to respect civilian authority.

Whether it will be able to do those things is very much an open question. There is a great deal at stake in Indonesia's resolving these problems. It is indeed a huge country, the fourth most populous in the world. It has the largest Muslim population in the world. It is rich in natural resources. It was, until recently, aspiring to be an Asian and a world leader. Now it is just trying to hold itself together. Struggling with centrifugal forces of ethnicity are Nation's separatist movements that could splinter this vast Nation created and held together by force.

But the greatest threat to Indonesia's future is to allow the hardliners to overturn the referendum through violence and fear. Tolerating this would send exactly the wrong message to the Indonesians, their military, and people struggling to make democracy work.

The credibility of many is on the line. The United Nations did not create this crisis, but it must follow through if it is to have political and moral credibility. The neighboring Asian countries, through ASEAN, have a chance to be heard and a chance to play an important role in events of such direct interest to them, and perhaps putting a more Asian face on any peacekeeping effort.

The United States should continue to exert pressure and influence through every means possible to restore peace and bring democracy to East Timor. For 20 years, we have erred on the side of caution. We have been timid in seeking to protect East Timor. Perhaps that role is changing, as it should. I am greatly encouraged by the United States' role over the last 96 hours.

There are some that argue that we have to be selective in playing a role as the guarantor of freedom and the protector of those who seek democracy worldwide. There are limitations, it is argued, on the powers and realities in the many potential areas of involvement.

But the people of East Timor have already earned our support, paying a horrible price over the last 25 years. The world community needs to prove its capacity to keep its commitments to people aspiring to freedom. Indonesia must be strongly encouraged in new directions of tolerance and democracy, lest this vast island country dissolve, with enormous consequences to world stability, as well as to the 211 million Indonesians.

The United States has the opportunity and the responsibility to help Indonesians and the world keep their commitments. We in Congress should use every opportunity in the days ahead to keep the spotlight trained on this troubled island.

## 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 42 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. FOLEY) at 2 p.m.

## PRAYER

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

We know, O God, that You are the God of grace and forgiveness. At our best moments we realize that You wish to save us from any conceit or selfishness that keeps us from being truly human. Allow us to open our hearts and our very souls to Your life giving peace, that peace that passes all human understanding. May Your good spirit fulfill our lives that we will live with thanksgiving and praise and our lives will have confidence and assurance. Bless us, O God, this day and every day, we pray. 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 Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. PITTS 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.

## REPUBLICAN PLAN DOWNSIZES THE POWER OF GOVERNMENT AND UPSIZES THE POWER OF PEOPLE

(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, over the August recess I held nearly 20 town hall meetings across the great State of

Nevada talking with constituents about the Republican tax plan and how it was going to help them and their families.

Now this legislation is based on a very simple idea, the idea that once Government pays its bills and has money left over, it should be returned to those who paid: the taxpayer. Most taxpayers know if their money is left in Washington, politicians will spend it every time.

Mr. Speaker, the average family in Nevada worked until May 14 this year just to pay their tax bill. Simply put: Nevadans spent roughly the first 4 months of each year working for the Federal Government.

We are at a crossroads in our country's history. We balanced the budget, reformed welfare, cut wasteful spending, and created a surplus revenue in Washington, D.C. But a windfall for Washington is not right. Working families should not be working just for Washington, but Washington should be working for taxpayers, and cutting taxes is the best way to tip the scales back to our constituents, the hard-working people.

After all, Mr. Speaker, this debate is about downsizing the power of Government and upscaling the power of the people.

## PILLOW TALK AT THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

(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, after all the buying and spying, the Department of Energy has announced their new security policy. All scientists must now report any and all romantic affairs that they have with foreigners.

Now if that is not enough to centerfold our Playboys, check this out. There is one exception, and I am not kidding: one night stands are still permitted.

Beam me up, Mr. Speaker. The next time, Congress, we see an ad for a temporary, overnight, meaningful relationship, be careful. It may be from a real rocket launcher at the Department of Energy.

Launch this.

I yield back all the pillow talk at the Department of Energy.

## SUPPORT THE PAIN RELIEF PROMOTION ACT

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

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, is the Netherlands really ready for killing sick children? That is the question currently pending in Holland as they consider a bill that would allow the killing of six children as young as 12 years old if they are terminally ill. A spokeswoman for the Royal Dutch Medical Association said:

''The doctor will do his utmost to try to reach an agreement between patient and parents, but if the parents do not want to cooperate, it is the doctor's duty to respect the wishes of their patient.''

So much for the Hippocratic Oath for a civilized medical institution.

This situation in Netherlands gives us all the more reason to work to pass the Pain Relief Promotion Act, which disallows the intentional use of controlled substances to cause or assist in suicide. At the same time it recognizes that using controlled substances to alleviate pain and discomfort in the usual course of professional practice is a legitimate medical purpose and consistent with public health and safety.

Mr. Speaker, we never want to see a day when our young kids or elderly parents legally and intentionally die at the hands of a so-called doctor. Support the Pain Relief Promotion Act.

## RURAL EDUCATION INITIATIVE

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

Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, over 20 percent of the students in this country attend small rural schools. Many of these schools are in my Nebraska district. These schools offer students excellent educations and many benefits including small classes, excellent educations, personal attention, strong family and community involvement. However, until now federal education programs have not addressed the unique funding needs in these districts. All current federal education formula grants unintentionally ignore small rural schools because these formulas do not produce enough revenue to carry out the program the grant is intended to fund.

To address this problem I have introduced a bill, the Small Rural Schools initiative to provide flexibility for districts with fewer than 600 students to combine funds from federal education formula grants to support local education efforts. The Small Rural Schools initiative is a common sense approach to help these schools to use federal funds for the purpose that Congress intended, to make a meaningful impact in the education of all students.

## TIME TO ELIMINATE THE MARRIAGE TAX PENALTY

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

Mr. WELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have an important question to ask, and that is what is the President going to do about the marriage tax penalty?

Over the last 2 years, dozens of us in this House have asked the important question, is it right, is it fair, that under our Tax Code married working couples with two incomes pay higher taxes than identical couples with identical incomes living together outside of marriage. We believe it is wrong that 21 million married working couples pay higher taxes just because they are married; and this Congress, this Republican Congress, has passed, the end of July, legislation which will eliminate the marriage tax penalty for a majority of those who suffer it.

The question we have: Is the President going to join with us and make it a bipartisan effort to eliminate the marriage tax penalty by signing into law the tax cut when we send it to him later this week?

Twenty-one million married working couples pay $1,400 more in higher taxes just because they are married. Is it not time that we eliminate the marriage tax penalty?

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of 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 today after debate has been concluded on all motions to suspend the rules, but not before 6 p.m. today.

## CONGRESSIONAL AWARD ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1999

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill (S. 380) to reauthorize the Congressional Award Act.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 380

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

**SECTION 1. CONGRESSIONAL AWARD ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1999.**

(a) CHANGE OF ANNUAL REPORTING DATE.—Section 3(e) of the Congressional Award Act (2 U.S.C. 802(e)) is amended in the first sentence by striking ''April 1'' and inserting ''June 1''.

(b) MEMBERSHIP REQUIREMENTS.—Section 4(a)(1) of the Congressional Award Act (2 U.S.C. 803(a)(1)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraphs (A) and (D), by striking ''member of the Congressional Award Association'' and inserting ''recipient of the Congressional Award''; and

(2) in subparagraphs (B) and (C), by striking ''representative of a local Congressional Award Council'' and inserting ''a local Congressional Award program volunteer''.

(c) EXTENSION OF REQUIREMENTS REGARDING FINANCIAL OPERATIONS OF CONGRESSIONAL AWARD PROGRAM; NONCOMPLIANCE WITH REQUIREMENTS.—Section 5(c)(2)(A) of the Congressional Award Act (2 U.S.C. 804(c)(2)(A)) is amended by striking ''and 1998'' and inserting ''1998, 1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, and 2004''.

(d) TERMINATION.—Section 9 of the Congressional Award Act (2 U.S.C. 808) is amended by striking ''October 1, 1999'' and inserting ''October 1, 2004''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) and the

gentleman from California (Mr. MARTINEZ) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO).

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of S. 380, the Congressional Award Act amendments of 1999. Congress established the Congressional Award in 1979 to recognize initiative, achievement, and service in our young people across the country. Senator Malcolm Wallop, a Republican from Wyoming, and Representative James Howard, a Democrat from New Jersey, authored the original legislation in a bipartisan effort.

The original legislation established the Congressional Award as a private-public partnership which receives funding from the private sector and was originally signed into law by President Jimmy Carter. In addition, Presidents Reagan, Bush, and Clinton have signed legislation to reauthorize the act.

The Congressional Award is presented on a noncompetitive individual basis to young people in the United States between the ages of 14 and 23 to recognize their initiative, achievement, and service. Young people from all walks of life and levels of ability can work to earn the award. Participants range from the academically and physically gifted to those with severe physical, mental and socioeconomic challenges.

To earn a Congressional Award, participants work with advisers to set individual goals and plan activities to meet these goals in four program areas including voluntary public service, personal development, physical fitness, and expedition exploration. Participants strive for either a bronze, silver, or gold award. At each level 50 percent of the required minimum hours to earn the award are in volunteer public service, a minimum of 100 hundred hours for the bronze, 200 for the silver and 400 for the gold. To date, more than 6,500 Congressional Awards have been presented representing more than 1.5 million hours of volunteer service from all 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico.

Congress has spent a greater part of the 106th Congress working to ensure that tomorrow is a safer and more positive place for our youth. We now have an opportunity to reaffirm our commitment to America's youth for another 5 years. Crime prevention, working with the United Way, aiding the elderly, collecting, sorting and distributing food for the needy and building a handicap-accessible ramp are just a few of the services that individuals perform while working to attain Congressional Awards.

America's youth is crying out for support and encouragement, and this award is helping to give them this today.

Several challenges are currently being implemented to the Congressional Award program to give more young people the opportunity to participate and earn awards. These changes include the reduction in the paperwork necessary to enroll, a lower enrollment fee, a shift of authority from national to local control which allows State councils, youth service organizations, and other entities to operate the Congressional Award and an additional track of awards called the Congressional Certificates to recognize individuals in a less demanding manner and help instigate interest in earning the Congressional Award. In addition, the Congressional Award has made a commitment to America's promise, headed by General Colin Powell, to increase the number of youth enrolled in the program over the next 2 years.

S. 380 was introduced in the Senate by Senator LARRY CRAIG on February 4, reported out by the Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs on March 4. The bill would reauthorize this important initiative for 5 years. It also makes minor changes to current law to better streamline the annual reporting process and changes the membership requirements of the board of directors to allow for more participation at the local level enabling communities that do not have a Congressional Award Council to participate on the board of directors.

□ 1415

The bill passed the Senate by unanimous consent on April 13, 1999.

It is important to continue the authorization of the Congressional Award for several reasons. The Congressional Research Service submitted a memorandum to committee staff regarding the potential consequences to the Congressional Award program if it were not reauthorized. CRS concluded that if the board were not reauthorized, questions may arise as to the propriety of its continued use of the Congressional Award program name; an alternative mechanism for appointment of board members would be required because members of the board are currently appointed by Congressional leadership. Alternative means of financing the Congressional Award medals would be required because the U.S. Mint is currently directed to strike the medals used for the Congressional Award; I might add, at no direct expense to the taxpayers, and an in-kind congressional support, primarily office space at the Ford Building, could be terminated because of questions as to the propriety of the use of official resources to support an activity that did not seem to have the support of Congress.

There are currently around 2,000 young people from across the country pursuing the Congressional Award, with more entering the program each day. Each of these young people exemplifies the qualities of commitment to service and citizenship that our country embodies and which we promote through our own service in Congress.

I believe that this program, which is a private-public partnership that receives nearly all of its funding from the private sector should be supported by each and every Member.

Congress should support our Nation's youth in their efforts and recognize their achievements through the Congressional Award program.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill and ask them to encourage the youth of their States to begin a quest to earn the Congressional Award by enrolling on-line at www.congressionalaward.org.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 380, a bill to reauthorize the Congressional Award Act. As has been said by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO), first passed by Congress and signed into law by President Carter in 1979, the Congressional Award Act recognizes young Americans for their commitment to self-and community-improvement.

Program participants ages 14 to 23 set individual goals in the areas of voluntary community service, personal development, physical fitness, and exploration. Once these goals are achieved, they earn bronze, silver, or gold medals which are presented to them during a special ceremony by their Member of Congress.

Because a Congressional Award is noncompetitive and individuals earn rather than win awards, any young person, regardless of his or her life circumstances or physical or mental abilities, can participate.

The benefits of the Congressional Award program are numerous and lasting. While young people work to earn awards, they develop a sense of self-worth, self-confidence, and responsibility. They also learn important life skills such as initiative, organization, teamwork and problem solving.

In addition, the communities in which these young people reside benefit from their volunteerism and hard work. Since the program's inception in 1979, 8,204 young Americans have received Congressional Awards, and over 2 million hours of volunteer service have been completed.

While programs are administered at the local level by Congressional Award Councils, national activities and program oversight are carried out by the Congressional Award Foundation and the board of directors. Currently serving on the board are Senators MAX BAUCUS and LARRY CRAIG, and the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. CUBIN) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) and the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ).

Although the Congressional Award program is a private-public partnership that receives no Federal funding, the Congressional Award Act has been reauthorized twice, once during the Reagan administration and once during the Bush administration, and it is once again due for reauthorization.

On April 13, S. 380 passed the Senate by unanimous consent, and I urge my House colleagues to follow that body's example and pass S. 380 today.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of reauthorization of the Congressional Award Program. This year marks the 20th anniversary of the award program and I believe that it is appropriate to consider and review the origins and meaning of the award and our expectations for the board that serves to administer it on our behalf.

I take special pride in the fact that the Congressional Award was started by our late distinguished colleague Representative James J. Howard from central New Jersey. The award was enacted 20 years ago this November by Representative Howard who began laying the groundwork in 1969 for the program with the help of a young and future physician, Frank H. Arlinghaus, Jr., of Rumson, NJ, to fashion this uniquely American program. With the help of former Senator Malcolm Wallop, a bipartisan program was enacted in 1979. At the time of this sponsorship in the Senate, Senator Wallop and Representative Howard noted that Congress recognized a responsibility and opportunity to elevate and encourage the pursuit of excellence and to focus the creative energies of America's young people on positive ends. Congress, they said, wished to offer young people an opportunity and a challenge to new endeavors and achievement.

Representative Howard noted at that time that, although there were many programs for young people throughout the world, the Congressional Award Program was ours, it was unique and was to be independent of any other organization or association. Indeed the senior leadership of Congress gave explicit guidance to the National Director in 1982 that while the mandate of the Congressional Award is to make the program available to all interested young Americans, the autonomy of the Congressional Award as an independent program must be preserved at all times as it bore the imprimatur of Congress. Any relationship with any organization wither domestic or international is subject to that proviso.

My distinguished colleagues on both sides of the aisle from New Jersey take special pride in the fact that the Congressional Award in New Jersey operates under the most successful council in the country. That council has recently surpassed 1,300 awards earned in New Jersey alone and is now embarked on a record setting year of participation. There are hundreds of young people participating in the program, equally as many advisors and validators, and a host of supporting voluntary agencies and corporate supporters. This year alone there may be as many as four ceremonies to recognize these special young Americans.

The Congressional Award is Congress's special message to young people about national aspirations, values and goals. This award is a special message to young people and is a way of our communicating to them and to provide an avenue of communication with the young people who will comprise the leadership of America in the future.

This program is not necessarily easy nor is it difficult, but it takes character, persistence, initiative, service and achievement. At the Bronze Award level 100 hours of public service, 50 hours of personal development and 50 hours of physical fitness endeavors with a one night expedition is a beginning test for a young person over 14 years old. It requires 7 months but not more that 12 to complete. The Silver Award requires 200 hours of public service, 100 hours of personal development effort, and 100 hours of physical fitness endeavor with a 2-night expedition. This requires over a 12-month commitment but not over 24 months. The Gold Congressional Award requires 400 hours of public service, 200 hours of personal achievement effort, 200 hours of physical fitness with a 4-night expedition. This supreme effort requires a 24-month commitment but not more than 36 months. A young person must be at least 16 to begin and be over 18 to earn and receive the Gold Award which our leaders present in a special ceremony in the Capitol. Each of these awards are earned separately and work done on one level is not counted for work on another level.

Indeed the special and rigorous nature of the award as achieved by those outstanding future leaders was cited by our distinguished Senate colleagues Senator LOTT and Senator DASCHLE as a requisite hallmark of the Congressional Award in their remarks at the Gold Award ceremony on June.

How do young people meet this challenge and earn this distinction? As was provided for in prior legislation, a state council is formed and appointed with consultation among our colleagues. The many adult volunteers and advisors who assist these young people are recruited, educated, and trained to administer the program. Each applicant registers, proposes their program, and it is evaluated and modifications made where appropriate. At the conclusion of that initial process their work begins. At the conclusion of demonstrated commitment, service, and achievement, we in turn through our councils assisted by the National Office salute their work with Congressional Award.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to include in the legislative record my concerns about the direction of the Congressional Award and the changes that have been proposed by the National Office.

From the very beginning, when the Congressional Award was introduced by my predecessor, Representative James J. Howard, and then passed by the Congress In 1979, it was made very clear that the Award should be its own independent award under the sponsorship of the U.S. Congress. Congress did not intend that it be part of an international award under the patronage of Prince Philip of Great Britain. As stated by Congressman Howard ''It was never our intention to duplicate in design and purpose the Duke of Edinburgh's Award.''

The National Office of the Congressional Award has established new standards that make major changes in the award requirements including creating a second, less demanding track that enable young people to earn Congressional Award certificates. This is intended to bring the program more in line with the International Award. Unfortunately, it would also water down the overall program. Ultimately, I fear, young people would choose the easier route and the more intense medal program would fall by the wayside. This is not what Congress intended in 1979.

In addition the certificate track eliminates the close relationship that develops between adult advisors and young people as they plan their program goals. The certificate is awarded after the fact and there is little if any contact prior to that.

Finally, other changes have been made that affect how the hours spent by young people in voluntary public service, personal development and physical fitness as calculated toward earning gold medals.

I am very proud of the success of our New Jersey Congressional Award Program under the leadership of Dr. Frank Arlinghaus of Rumson, NJ. It was his idea to establish a Congressional Award.

As someone who has attended many of the Congressional Award ceremonies in New Jersey and seen many of my young constituents honored for their hard work, I would like to ask that the National Board of the Congressional Award address these questions and respond to the concerns raised by the programs in New Jersey, Arizona and elsewhere.

I believe we have a commitment to those who have earned the awards to date to maintain the high standards of the program. We also have a commitment to future participants and our colleagues to maintain the Award as it was originally intended by Congress.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the Congressional Award program and specifically how this program has worked in New Jersey.

Mr. Speaker, many involved in the Congressional Award program know that this program's success is the byproduct of the hard work of my former colleague and a member of the New Jersey delegation, Congressman Jim Howard. Jim worked closely with Dr. Frank H. Arlinghaus, Jr., the Chairman of the New Jersey Congressional Award Council, in drafting the legislation that created this program in 1979. Dr. Arlinghaus, as a member of the national board of directors, as well as the driving force behind the program in New Jersey, has been instrumental in the growth of this program, both in New Jersey, as well as across the country. He has advised other state councils on the best way to educate America's youth as to the intent and benefits of participation in the Congressional Award Program.

As part of the Congressional Award program, my office has worked closely with teenagers in the 4th Congressional District of New Jersey, as they volunteer the hundreds of hours required for the bronze, silver, and gold medals. Many of them have shared with me how their experiences in the areas of public service, physicial fitness, and personal growth have broadened their world view and fostered a greater appreciation for personal achievement.

On average, four students per year from the 4th Congressional District have received one of the three medals. Highlights of their community service has included volunteering at a local hospital where the students have assisted with everything from admitting patients and discharging patients, working in the children's clinic, and helping visitors with a variety of requests. Personal growth has included building physical endurance or improving a skill such as piano playing, which has facilitated their abilities on a variety of sports teams and in musical competitions. Students have also traveled overseas to the Philippines, Western Europe, and the Bahamas, experiencing first hand the challenges of cross cultural communication.

Recently, the National Board of Directors has been examining various ways to expand participation through a certificate program. To date, more than 6,500 awards have been presented nationwide. In New Jersey, we are

proud that 1300 of those awards, roughly 20 percent, have been given to young people from our state. Clearly, a program that is working so well in my state could offer a lot of ideas to the rest of the country about ways to attract more and more qualified students into the program.

In light of the recently proposed changes in the program and the shared goal of attracting more young people, I would suggest that a hearing on the Congressional Award program would be appropriate. The future growth of this program requires that Congress examine its development over the last 20 years as well as its future. I hope my good friend and colleague Chairman GOODLING will give full consideration to this request.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Congressional Award Program. This program has an Olympian quality because it encourages young people to stretch to their limits. The difference is that they set the high goals themselves. The experience is that the self-initiated goals are set so high that only 400 of the 1,000 students who start the program complete it.

Too often, we allow the impressive accomplishments of our youth to go unrecognized and unappreciated. We must encourage our young women and young men to strive to do their best in activities which develop themselves or their communities. The Congressional Award Program does just that by challenging students to set high goals for themselves in either personal development, physical fitness, or public service and provides them with recognition when they reach these goals. Last year I was proud to present seven awards representing a total of at least 400 hours of work to D.C. high school students, and this year, I believe that I will be able to award many more. I would like to recognize the 1998 recipients of the Congressional Award:

Leidi Reyes of Bell Multicultural High School, Silver medal; Jehan Carter—Banneker Senior High School, Bronze medal; Christin Chism—Bishop McNamara High School, Bronze medal; Brian Ford—Eastern Senior High School, Bronze medal; Miya Jackson—Eastern Senior High School, Bronze medal; Christiana Hodge—Eastern High School, Bronze medal; and Kate Ottenberg—Maret High School, Bronze medal.

These young people's families and community are rightly proud of them. They are members of an elite group of only 400 young people across the country who completed the program. I ask my colleagues to support them by supporting the re-authorization of the Congressional Award Program through 2004.

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to support this bill (S. 380) that will re-authorize the Congressional Award Act. The re-authorization of this Act is significant because the program that is supported by this bill is one way in which the Congress provides an opportunity for the youths of the United States to better their own lives.

The Congressional Award has existed since 1979 as a way to encourage and reward American youth who undertake community service to benefit their community and themselves. It teaches our young people about such American values as citizenship, civic responsibility, and the importance of setting and achieving personal goals. Several thousand youths have participated in this program since its inception and have received recognition for their efforts.

Congressioinal awards come in different forms: certificates, which are ''introductory'' level awards; and medals, which are more difficult to achieve. Certificates and medals come in the form of gold, silver and bronze awards. Each award is earned through the accumulation of hours of community service. When an award is earned, those hours can be applied toward the achievement of the next award. The gold medal, which is the highest level of the awards, is extremely prestigious and very difficult to earn, because it requires a minimum of 800 hours of service accumulated over a period of at least 24 months.

I am one of the Members of Congress currently serving on the Board of Directors of the Congressional Award Foundation and I am honored to serve in this position. I have the privilege of working alongside Congresswoman BARBARA CUBIN in this capacity.

In addition to serving on the Board of Directors of the Foundation, I am equally proud that the congressional award will soon be established in Puerto Rico. We hope to publicize the award in schools on the island and I am confident that there will be large numbers of school children who will take up the challenge to earn their own congressional medals.

I would like to encourage other members to publicize the award and ask the young people in their districts to participate in the Congressional Award process. This is an excellent way to motivate young people to make positive contributions in their local communities and to develop important leadership skills for the future. I believe it is the duty for all of us serving in this body to make the Congressional Award more readily available to every young person in our communities. The first step in this process is through the passage and enactment of this Congressional Award reauthorization bill.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 380.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on S. 380, the Senate bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

## MULTIDISTRICT, MULTIPARTY, MULTIFORUM TRIAL JURISDICTION ACT OF 1999

The SPEAKER pro tempore.

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2112) to amend title 28, United States Code, to allow a judge to whom a case is transferred to retain jurisdiction over certain multidistrict litigation cases for trial, and to provide for Federal jurisdiction of certain multiparty, multiforum civil actions, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2112

*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 ''Multidistrict, Multiparty, Multiforum Trial Jurisdiction Act of 1999''.

**SEC. 2. MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION.**

Section 1407 of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the third sentence of subsection (a), by inserting ''or ordered transferred to the transferee or other district under subsection (i)'' after ''terminated''; and

(2) by adding at the end the following new subsection:

''(i)(1) Subject to paragraph (2) and except as provided in subsection (j), any action transferred under this section by the panel may be transferred for trial purposes, by the judge or judges of the transferee district to whom the action was assigned, to the transferee or other district in the interest of justice and for the convenience of the parties and witnesses.

''(2) Any action transferred for trial purposes under paragraph (1) shall be remanded by the panel for the determination of compensatory damages to the district court from which it was transferred, unless the court to which the action has been transferred for trial purposes also finds, for the convenience of the parties and witnesses and in the interests of justice, that the action should be retained for the determination of compensatory damages.''.

**SEC. 3. MULTIPARTY, MULTIFORUM JURISDICTION OF DISTRICT COURTS.**

(a) BASIS OF JURISDICTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 85 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

**''§ 1369. Multiparty, multiforum jurisdiction**

''(a) IN GENERAL.—The district courts shall have original jurisdiction of any civil action involving minimal diversity between adverse parties that arises from a single accident, where at least 25 natural persons have either died or incurred injury in the accident at a discrete location and, in the case of injury, the injury has resulted in damages which exceed $75,000 per person, exclusive of interest and costs, if—

''(1) a defendant resides in a State and a substantial part of the accident took place in another State or other location, regardless of whether that defendant is also a resident of the State where a substantial part of the accident took place;

''(2) any two defendants reside in different States, regardless of whether such defendants are also residents of the same State or States; or

''(3) substantial parts of the accident took place in different States.

''(b) SPECIAL RULES AND DEFINITIONS.—For purposes of this section—

''(1) minimal diversity exists between adverse parties if any party is a citizen of a State and any adverse party is a citizen of another State, a citizen or subject of a foreign state, or a foreign state as defined in section 1603(a) of this title;

''(2) a corporation is deemed to be a citizen of any State, and a citizen or subject of any foreign state, in which it is incorporated or has its principal place of business, and is deemed to be a resident of any State in which it is incorporated or licensed to do business or is doing business;

''(3) the term 'injury' means—

''(A) physical harm to a natural person; and

''(B) physical damage to or destruction of tangible property, but only if physical harm described in subparagraph (A) exists;

''(4) the term 'accident' means a sudden accident, or a natural event culminating in an accident, that results in death or injury incurred at a discrete location by at least 25 natural persons; and

''(5) the term 'State' includes the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and any territory or possession of the United States.

''(c) INTERVENING PARTIES.—In any action in a district court which is or could have been brought, in whole or in part, under this section, any person with a claim arising from the accident described in subsection (a) shall be permitted to intervene as a party plaintiff in the action, even if that person could not have brought an action in a district court as an original matter.

''(d) NOTIFICATION OF JUDICIAL PANEL ON MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION.—A district court in which an action under this section is pending shall promptly notify the judicial panel on multidistrict litigation of the pendency of the action.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 85 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''1369. Multiparty, multiforum jurisdiction.''.

(b) VENUE.—Section 1391 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(g) A civil action in which jurisdiction of the district court is based upon section 1369 of this title may be brought in any district in which any defendant resides or in which a substantial part of the accident giving rise to the action took place.''.

(c) MULTIDISTRICT LITIGATION.—Section 1407 of title 28, United States Code, as amended by section 2 of this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''(j)(1) In actions transferred under this section when jurisdiction is or could have been based, in whole or in part, on section 1369 of this title, the transferee district court may, notwithstanding any other provision of this section, retain actions so transferred for the determination of liability and punitive damages. An action retained for the determination of liability shall be remanded to the district court from which the action was transferred, or to the State court from which the action was removed, for the determination of damages, other than punitive damages, unless the court finds, for the convenience of parties and witnesses and in the interest of justice, that the action should be retained for the determination of damages.

''(2) Any remand under paragraph (1) shall not be effective until 60 days after the transferee court has issued an order determining liability and has certified its intention to remand some or all of the transferred actions for the determination of damages. An appeal with respect to the liability determination and the choice of law determination of the transferee court may be taken during that 60-day period to the court of appeals with appellate jurisdiction over the transferee court. In the event a party files such an appeal, the remand shall not be effective until the appeal has been finally disposed of. Once the remand has become effective, the liability determination and the choice of law determination shall not be subject to further review by appeal or otherwise.

''(3) An appeal with respect to determination of punitive damages by the transferee court may be taken, during the 60-day period beginning on the date the order making the determination is issued, to the court of appeals with jurisdiction over the transferee court.

''(4) Any decision under this subsection concerning remand for the determination of damages shall not be reviewable by appeal or otherwise.

''(5) Nothing in this subsection shall restrict the authority of the transferee court to transfer or dismiss an action on the ground of inconvenient forum.''.

(d) REMOVAL OF ACTIONS.—Section 1441 of title 28, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (e) by striking ''(e) The court to which such civil action is removed'' and inserting ''(f) The court to which a civil action is removed under this section''; and

(2) by inserting after subsection (d) the following new subsection:

''(e)(1) Notwithstanding the provisions of subsection (b) of this section, a defendant in a civil action in a State court may remove the action to the district court of the United States for the district and division embracing the place where the action is pending if—

''(A) the action could have been brought in a United States district court under section 1369 of this title, or

''(B) the defendant is a party to an action which is or could have been brought, in whole or in part, under section 1369 in a United States district court and arises from the same accident as the action in State court, even if the action to be removed could not have been brought in a district court as an original matter.

The removal of an action under this subsection shall be made in accordance with section 1446 of this title, except that a notice of removal may also be filed before trial of the action in State court within 30 days after the date on which the defendant first becomes a party to an action under section 1369 in a United States district court that arises from the same accident as the action in State court, or at a later time with leave of the district court.

''(2) Whenever an action is removed under this subsection and the district court to which it is removed or transferred under section 1407(j) has made a liability determination requiring further proceedings as to damages, the district court shall remand the action to the State court from which it had been removed for the determination of damages, unless the court finds that, for the convenience of parties and witnesses and in the interest of justice, the action should be retained for the determination of damages.

''(3) Any remand under paragraph (2) shall not be effective until 60 days after the district court has issued an order determining liability and has certified its intention to remand the removed action for the determination of damages. An appeal with respect to the liability determination and the choice of law determination of the district court may be taken during that 60-day period to the court of appeals with appellate jurisdiction over the district court. In the event a party files such an appeal, the remand shall not be effective until the appeal has been finally disposed of. Once the remand has become effective, the liability determination and the choice of law determination shall not be subject to further review by appeal or otherwise.

''(4) Any decision under this subsection concerning remand for the determination of damages shall not be reviewable by appeal or otherwise.

''(5) An action removed under this subsection shall be deemed to be an action under section 1369 and an action in which jurisdiction is based on section 1368 of this title for purposes of this section and sections 1407, 1660, 1697, and 1785 of this title.

''(6) Nothing in this subsection shall restrict the authority of the district court to transfer or dismiss an action on the ground of inconvenient forum.''.

(e) CHOICE OF LAW.—

(1) DETERMINATION BY THE COURT.—Chapter 111 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

**''§ 1660. Choice of law in multiparty, multiforum actions**

''(a) FACTORS.—In an action which is or could have been brought, in whole or in part, under section 1369 of this title, the district court in which the action is brought or to which it is removed shall determine the source of the applicable substantive law, except that if an action is transferred to another district court, the transferee court shall determine the source of the applicable substantive law. In making this determination, a district court shall not be bound by the choice of law rules of any State, and the factors that the court may consider in choosing the applicable law include—

''(1) the place of the injury;

''(2) the place of the conduct causing the injury;

''(3) the principal places of business or domiciles of the parties;

''(4) the danger of creating unnecessary incentives for forum shopping; and

''(5) whether the choice of law would be reasonably foreseeable to the parties.

The factors set forth in paragraphs (1) through (5) shall be evaluated according to their relative importance with respect to the particular action. If good cause is shown in exceptional cases, including constitutional reasons, the court may allow the law of more than one State to be applied with respect to a party, claim, or other element of an action.

''(b) ORDER DESIGNATING CHOICE OF LAW.—The district court making the determination under subsection (a) shall enter an order designating the single jurisdiction whose substantive law is to be applied in all other actions under section 1369 arising from the same accident as that giving rise to the action in which the determination is made. The substantive law of the designated jurisdiction shall be applied to the parties and claims in all such actions before the court, and to all other elements of each action, except where Federal law applies or the order specifically provides for the application of the law of another jurisdiction with respect to a party, claim, or other element of an action.

''(c) CONTINUATION OF CHOICE OF LAW AFTER REMAND.—In an action remanded to another district court or a State court under section 1407(j)(1) or 1441(e)(2) of this title, the district court's choice of law under subsection (b) shall continue to apply.''.

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 111 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''1660. Choice of law in multiparty, multiforum actions.''.

(f) SERVICE OF PROCESS.—

(1) OTHER THAN SUBPOENAS.—(A) Chapter 113 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

**''§ 1697. Service in multiparty, multiforum actions**

''When the jurisdiction of the district court is based in whole or in part upon section 1369 of this title, process, other than subpoenas, may be served at any place within the United States, or anywhere outside the

United States if otherwise permitted by law.''.

(B) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 113 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''1697. Service in multiparty, multiforum actions.''.

(2) SERVICE OF SUBPOENAS.—(A) Chapter 117 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new section:

**''§ 1785. Subpoenas in multiparty, multiforum actions**

''When the jurisdiction of the district court is based in whole or in part upon section 1369 of this title, a subpoena for attendance at a hearing or trial may, if authorized by the court upon motion for good cause shown, and upon such terms and conditions as the court may impose, be served at any place within the United States, or anywhere outside the United States if otherwise permitted by law.''.

(B) The table of sections at the beginning of chapter 117 of title 28, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following new item:

''1785. Subpoenas in multiparty, multiforum actions.''.

**SEC. 4. EFFECTIVE DATE.**

(a) SECTION 2.—The amendments made by section 2 shall apply to any civil action pending on or brought on or after the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) SECTION 3.—The amendments made by section 3 shall apply to a civil action if the accident giving rise to the cause of action occurred on or after the 90th day after the date of the enactment of this Act.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today, in support of H.R. 2112, the Multidistrict, Multiparty, Multiforum Trial Jurisdiction Act of 1999 and urge the House to adopt the measure. This bill is authored by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER).

Section 2 of H.R. 2112 responds to a 1998 Supreme Court decision pertaining to multidistrict litigation, the so-called ''Lexecon'' case.

Section 2 of the bill would simply amend the multidistrict litigation statute by explicitly allowing the transferee court to retain jurisdiction over referred cases for trial or refer them to other districts as it sees fit.

This change, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, makes sense in light of past judicial practice under the multidistrict litigation statute.

In addition, section 3 of H.R. 2112 offers what I believe are modest but necessary improvements to a specific type of multidistrict litigation, that involving disasters such as an airline or train accident, in which several individuals from different States are killed or injured.

Finally, I note that there is a technical error in the committee report. Pursuant to a change advocated by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), which we accepted at full committee markup, the dollar threshold for cases brought under section 3 was raised from a previous draft of $50,000 to $75,000. $75,000 is the correct figure.

This legislation obviously promotes judicial administrative efficiency without compromising the rights of litigants and their counsel to due process and appropriate compensation. It is strongly endorsed by the Administrative Office of the United States Courts, and I urge my colleagues to support it as well.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Multidistrict, Multiparty, Multiforum Trial Jurisdiction Act of 1999. I would like to thank, on behalf of the ranking member, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), the gentleman from North Carolina (Chairman COBLE), and the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER) of the Subcommittee on Courts and Intellectual Property for their hard work on this bill and for the bipartisan fashion in which they operated.

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

Mr. COBLE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr. MARTINEZ) for his generous remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), the sponsor of the bill

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2112 is a combination of two other freestanding bills which I have introduced. Section 2 consists of the text of H.R. 1852, which would reverse the effects of the 1998 Supreme Court decision in the so-called ''Lexecon'' case, that would simply amend the multidistrict litigation statute by explicitly allowing a transferee court to retain jurisdiction over referred cases for trial or to refer them to other districts as it sees fit.

Section 3 is comprised of the language of H.R. 967, which beginning in the 101st Congress has been supported by the Department of Justice, the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts, two previous Democratic Congresses, and one previous Republican Congress.

Section 3 will help reduce litigation costs as well as the likelihood of forum shopping in single-accident mass tort cases. All plaintiffs in these cases would ordinarily be situated identically, making the case for consolidation of these actions especially compelling. These types of disasters, with their hundreds of thousands of plaintiffs and numerous defendants, have the potential to impair the orderly administration of justice in the Federal courts for an extended period of time.

In brief, section 3 addresses these problems by conferring original jurisdiction upon a Federal District Court of any civil action which features four basic attributes. First, the action is one in which minimal diversity exists between adverse parties. Second, the action arises from a single accident. Third, at least 25 people have either died or incurred injury in the accident. Fourth, in the case of injury, the injury has resulted in damages which exceed $75,000 per person.

Moreover, the relevant district court overseeing such a consolidated action is given wider authority to apply appropriate choice of law rules. This is a great improvement over the existing convoluted system in which a myriad of State laws ties the hands of a federal judge. The criteria the Court must invoke when making its decisions include examination of the place of the injury, the place of the conduct causing the injury, the principal place of business or domicile of the parties, the danger of creating unnecessary incentives for forum shopping and whether the choice of law would be reasonably foreseeable to the parties.

In addition, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) and I jointly amended the bill at full committee by making two basic and noncontroversial changes.

First, the treatment of compensatory damages in Section 2 will be made consistent with that in section 3.

Second, based upon a recommendation from the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), we will raise the dollar threshold in section 3 actions from $50,000 to $75,000.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I wish to acknowledge the good faith efforts of the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) in resolving the one outstanding issue governing compensatory damages prior to the full committee markup. His willingness to work with us has resulted in a truly bipartisan and noncontroversial measure. I want these sentiments on the record, especially in his absence today.

So, Mr. Speaker, this legislation speaks to process, fairness and judicial efficiency. It will not interfere with jury verdicts or compensation rates for litigators. I, therefore, urge my colleagues to join the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) and myself in a bipartisan effort to support the Multidistrict, Multiparty, Multiforum Jurisdiction Act of 1999.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the ''Multidistrict, Multiparty, Multiforum Jurisdiction Act of 1999.'' I'd like to begin by expressing thanks to Chairman COBLE and Representative SENSENBRENNER of the Intellectual Property and Courts Subcommittee for their hard work and dedication to working out the concerns that we raised with respect to the original version of the bill in a truly bipartisan fashion.

I. SECTION 2—OVERTURNS LEXECON V. MILBERG WEISS, 523 U.S. 26 (1998)

Section 2 of the bill overturns the recent Supreme Court decision of Lexecon V. Milberg Weiss, where the Supreme Court held that a transferee court (a district court assigned to hear pretrial matters by a multidistrict litigation panel in multidistrict litigation cases) must remand all cases back for trial to the districts in which they were originally filed, regardless of the views of the parties.

It is my understanding from the hearing that for some 30 year the transferee court often retained jurisdiction over all of the suits by invoking a venue provision of Title 28, allowing a district court to transfer a civil action to any other district where it may have been brought—in effect, the transferee court simply transferred all of the cases to itself. The Judicial Conference testified that this process has worked well, and as a matter of judicial expedience, I support overturning the Lexecon decision.

There was a concern raised at the Subcommittee hearing, however, that Section 2, as originally drafted, would have gone far beyond simply permitting a multidistrict litigation transferee court to conduct a liability trial, and instead, would have allowed the court to also determine compensatory and punitive damages. The concern here is that trying the case in the transferee forum could be extremely inconvenient for plaintiffs who would need to testify at the damages phase of the trial.

As a result of discussions between the minority and majority, Representative BERMAN successfully offered a bipartisan amendment addressing this concern at the Full Committee markup. Pursuant to this amendment, Section 2 now creates a presumption that the trial of compensatory damages will be remanded to the original district court.

II. SECTION 3—MINIMAL DIVERSITY FOR SINGLE ACCIDENTS INVOLVING 25 PEOPLE

Section 3 of the bill expands federal court jurisdiction for single accidents involving at least 25 people having damages in excess of $75,000 per claim and establishes new federal procedures in these narrowly defined cases for selection of venue, service of process, issuance of subpoenas and choice of law. It is my understanding here that mass tort injuries that involve the same injury over and over again such as asbestos and breast implants, etc., would be excluded. And that the types of cases that would be included would be plane, train, bus, boat accidents, environment spills, etc.—many of which may already be brought in federal court.

While I traditionally oppose having federal courts decide state tort issues, and disfavor the expansion of the jurisdiction of the already-overloaded district courts, unlike the broader class action bill (H.R. 1875), this bill would only expand federal court jurisdiction in a much narrower class of actions, with the objective of judicial expedience.

Thus, I support this Section with the understanding that it would only apply to a very narrowly defined category of cases and does not in any way serve as a precedent for broader expansion of diversity jurisdiction.

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

Mr. COBLE. 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 North Carolina (Mr. COBLE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2112, 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.

□ 1430

## LACKAWANNA VALLEY NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA ACT OF 1999

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 940) to establish the Lackawanna Heritage Valley American Heritage Area, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 940

*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 ''Lackawanna Valley National Heritage Area Act of 1999''.*

***SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.***

*(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds the following:*

*(1) The industrial and cultural heritage of northeastern Pennsylvania inclusive of Lackawanna, Luzerne, Wayne, and Susquehanna counties, related directly to anthracite and anthracite-related industries, is nationally significant, as documented in the United States Department of the Interior-National Parks Service, National Register of Historic Places, Multiple Property Documentation submittal of the Pennsylvania Historic and Museum Commission (1996).*

*(2) These industries include anthracite mining, ironmaking, textiles, and rail transportation.*

*(3) The industrial and cultural heritage of the anthracite and related industries in this region includes the social history and living cultural traditions of the people of the region.*

*(4) The labor movement of the region played a significant role in the development of the Nation including the formation of many key unions such as the United Mine Workers of America, and crucial struggles to improve wages and working conditions, such as the 1900 and 1902 anthracite strikes.*

*(5) The Department of the Interior is responsible for protecting the Nation's cultural and historic resources, and there are significant examples of these resources within this 4-county region to merit the involvement of the Federal Government to develop programs and projects, in cooperation with the Lackawanna Heritage Valley Authority, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and other local and governmental bodies, to adequately conserve, protect, and interpret this heritage for future generations, while providing opportunities for education and revitalization.*

*(6) The Lackawanna Heritage Valley Authority would be an appropriate management entity for a Heritage Area established in the region.*

*(b) PURPOSE.—The objectives of the Lackawanna Valley National Heritage Area are as follows:*

*(1) To foster a close working relationship with all levels of government, the private sector, and the local communities in the anthracite coal region of northeastern Pennsylvania and empower the communities to conserve their heritage while continuing to pursue economic opportunities.*

*(2) To conserve, interpret, and develop the historical, cultural, natural, and recreational resources related to the industrial and cultural heritage of the 4-county region of northeastern Pennsylvania.*

***SEC. 3. LACKAWANNA VALLEY NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA.***

*(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is hereby established the Lackawanna Valley National Heritage Area (in this Act referred to as the ''Heritage Area'').*

*(b) BOUNDARIES.—The Heritage Area shall be comprised of all or parts of the counties of Lackawanna, Luzerne, Wayne, and Susquehanna in Pennsylvania, determined pursuant to the compact under section 4.*

*(c) MANAGEMENT ENTITY.—The management entity for the Heritage Area shall be the Lackawanna Heritage Valley Authority.*

***SEC. 4. COMPACT.***

*To carry out the purposes of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior (in this Act referred to as the ''Secretary'') shall enter into a compact with the management entity. The compact shall include information relating to the objectives and management of the area, including each of the following:*

*(1) A delineation of the boundaries of the Heritage Area.*

*(2) A discussion of the goals and objectives of the Heritage Area, including an explanation of the proposed approach to conservation and interpretation and a general outline of the protection measures committed to by the partners.*

***SEC. 5. AUTHORITIES AND DUTIES OF MANAGEMENT ENTITY.***

*(a) AUTHORITIES OF THE MANAGEMENT ENTITY.—The management entity may, for purposes of preparing and implementing the management plan developed under subsection (b), use funds made available through this Act for the following:*

*(1) To make grants to, and enter into cooperative agreements with States and their political subdivisions, private organizations, or any person.*

*(2) To hire and compensate staff.*

*(3) To enter into contracts for goods and services.*

*(b) MANAGEMENT PLAN.—The management entity shall develop a management plan for the Heritage Area that presents recommendations for the Heritage Area's conservation, funding, management, and development. Such plan shall take into consideration existing State, county, and local plans and involve residents, public agencies, and private organizations working in the Heritage Area. It shall include recommendations for actions to be undertaken by units of government and private organizations to protect the resources of the Heritage Area. It shall specify the existing and potential sources of funding to protect, manage, and develop the Heritage Area. Such plan shall include, as appropriate, the following:*

*(1) An inventory of the resources contained in the Heritage Area, including a list of any property in the Heritage Area that is related to the themes of the Heritage Area and that should be preserved, restored, managed, developed, or maintained because of its natural, cultural, historic, recreational, or scenic significance.*

*(2) A recommendation of policies for resource management which considers and details application of appropriate land and water management techniques, including, but not limited to, the development of intergovernmental cooperative agreements to protect the Heritage Area's historical, cultural, recreational, and natural resources in a manner consistent with supporting appropriate and compatible economic viability.*

*(3) A program for implementation of the management plan by the management entity, including plans for restoration and construction, and specific commitments of the identified partners for the first 5 years of operation.*

*(4) An analysis of ways in which local, State, and Federal programs may best be coordinated to promote the purposes of this Act.*

*(5) An interpretation plan for the Heritage Area.*

*The management entity shall submit the management plan to the Secretary for approval within 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act. If a management plan is not submitted to the Secretary as required within the specified time, the Heritage Area shall no longer qualify for Federal funding.*

*(c) DUTIES OF MANAGEMENT ENTITY.—The management entity shall—*

*(1) give priority to implementing actions set forth in the compact and management plan, including steps to assist units of government, regional planning organizations, and nonprofit organizations in preserving the Heritage Area;*

*(2) assist units of government, regional planning organizations, and nonprofit organizations in establishing and maintaining interpretive exhibits in the Heritage Area; assist units of government, regional planning organizations, and nonprofit organizations in developing recreational resources in the Heritage Area;*

*(3) assist units of government, regional planning organizations, and nonprofit organizations in increasing public awareness of and appreciation for the natural, historical, and architectural resources and sites in the Heritage Area; assist units of government, regional planning organizations and nonprofit organizations in the restoration of any historic building relating to the themes of the Heritage Area;*

*(4) encourage economic viability in the Heritage Area consistent with the goals of the plan; encourage local governments to adopt land use policies consistent with the management of the Heritage Area and the goals of the plan;*

*(5) assist units of government, regional planning organizations, and nonprofit organizations to ensure that clear, consistent, and environmentally appropriate signs identifying access points and sites of interest are put in place throughout the Heritage Area;*

*(6) consider the interests of diverse governmental, business, and nonprofit groups within the Heritage Area;*

*(7) conduct public meetings at least quarterly regarding the implementation of the management plan; and*

*(8) for any year in which Federal funds have been received under this Act, make available for audit all records pertaining to the expenditure of such funds and any matching funds, and require, for all agreements authorizing expenditure of Federal funds by other organizations, that the receiving organizations make available for audit all records pertaining to the expenditure of such funds.*

*(d) PROHIBITION ON THE ACQUISITION OF REAL PROPERTY.—The management entity may not use Federal funds received under this Act to acquire real property or an interest in real property. Nothing in this Act shall preclude any management entity from using Federal funds from other sources for their permitted purposes.*

*(e) SPENDING FOR NON-FEDERALLY OWNED PROPERTY.—The management entity may spend Federal funds directly on non-federally owned property to further the purposes of this Act, especially in assisting units of government in appropriate treatment of districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.*

***SEC. 6. DUTIES AND AUTHORITIES OF FEDERAL AGENCIES.***

*(a) TECHNICAL AND FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE.—The Secretary may, upon request of the management entity, provide technical and financial assistance to the management entity to develop and implement the management plan. In assisting the management entity, the Secretary shall give priority to actions that in general assist in—*

*(1) conserving the significant natural, historic, and cultural resources which support its themes; and*

*(2) providing educational, interpretive, and recreational opportunities consistent with its resources and associated values.*

*(b) APPROVAL AND DISAPPROVAL OF MANAGEMENT PLANS.—The Secretary, in consultation with the Governor of Pennsylvania, shall approve or disapprove a management plan submitted under this Act not later than 90 days after receiving such management plan.*

*(c) ACTION FOLLOWING DISAPPROVAL.—If the Secretary disapproves a submitted management plan, the Secretary shall advise the management entity in writing of the reasons therefore and shall make recommendations for revisions in the plan. The Secretary shall approve or disapprove a proposed revision within 90 days after the date it is submitted.*

*(d) APPROVING AMENDMENTS.—The Secretary shall review substantial amendments to the management plan for the Heritage Area. Funds appropriated pursuant to this Act may not be expended to implement the changes made by such amendments until the Secretary approves the amendments.*

***SEC. 7. ADDITIONAL ANTHRACITE COAL REGION DESIGNATION.***

*(a) DESIGNATION.—Upon publication by the Secretary in the Federal Register of notice that the Secretary has signed a compact (as provided for in subsection (b)) there is hereby designated the Schuylkill River National Heritage Area.*

*(b) COMPACT.—The compact submitted under this section with respect to the Schuylkill River National Heritage Area shall consist of an agreement between the Secretary and the Schuylkill River Greenway Association (who shall serve as the management entity for the area). Such agreement shall define the area (including a delineation of the boundaries), describe anticipated programs for the area, and include information relating to the objectives and management of the area. Such information shall include, but not be limited to, an explanation of the proposed approach to the conservation and interpretation of the area and a general outline of the protection measures committed to by the partners.*

*(c) AUTHORITIES AND DUTIES.—The authorities and duties of the management entity and other Federal agencies for the Schuylkill River National Heritage Area shall be the same as provided for by sections 5 and 6 of this Act, except that for such purposes any reference in such sections to the ''Heritage Area'' shall be deemed to be a reference to the Schuylkill River National Heritage Area and any reference to the ''management entity'' shall be deemed a reference to the Schuylkill River Greenway Association.*

***SEC. 8. CULTURE AND HERITAGE OF ANTHRACITE COAL REGION.***

*All authorized existing and future heritage area management entities in the Anthracite Coal Region in Pennsylvania are authorized and directed to coordinate with one another in the management of such areas. Each such management entity is authorized to use funds appropriated for such heritage areas for the purposes of this section.*

***SEC. 9. SUNSET.***

*The Secretary may not make any grant or provide any assistance under this Act after September 30, 2012.*

***SEC. 10. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.***

*(a) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated under this Act not more than $1,000,000 for any fiscal year for each heritage area designated by this Act. Not more than a total of $10,000,000 may be appropriated for each heritage area under this Act.*

*(b) 50 PERCENT MATCH.—Federal funding provided under this Act, after the designation of each heritage area, may not exceed 50 percent of the total cost of any assistance or grant provided or authorized under this Act.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD) and the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) each will control 20 minutes.

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

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

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

I am pleased that we are considering H.R. 940, the Lackawanna Valley National Heritage Area Act, a similar version which was passed by the House in the last Congress.

There are many excellent reasons to support the designation of this historic heritage area. The Lackawanna Valley National Heritage Area Act would ensure the conservation of northeastern Pennsylvania's significant natural, historic and cultural resources. The Lackawanna Valley was the first heritage area designated by the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and is recognized as nationally significant through its documentation into the U.S. Department of Interior's Register of Historic Places.

In the last decade, for every dollar contributed by the National Park Service to the Lackawanna Heritage Valley Authority, the ''management entity'' cited in my bill, has leveraged $10 in other federal, State, local and private sector funds to finance preservation activities. The Lackawanna Heritage Valley Authority would continue to foster these important relationships with all levels of Government, the private sector, and local communities.

The Lackawanna Valley encompasses the counties of Lackawanna, Wayne, Susquehanna, and Luzerne in northeastern Pennsylvania. The Valley tells the story of the development of anthracite coal, one of North America's greatest natural resources. From early in the 19th century, Pennsylvania's coal provided an extraordinary source of energy which fueled America's economic growth for over 100 years. At the center of the world's most productive anthracite field, the Lackawanna Valley witnessed the inception, spectacular growth, and eventual deterioration of an industry which led our country to unparalleled prosperity.

The landscape of the Valley conveys the story of the industrial revolution most clearly. Miles of track and hundreds of industrial sites and abandoned mines are daily reminders of the importance of the regent industry. Heritage sites like Pennsylvania's Anthracite Heritage Museum, the Scranton Iron Furnace Historic Site, the Lackawanna County Coal Mine, and the Steamtown National Historic Site help to commemorate the hardships of the industrial revolution which has led us to our current prosperity. These sites provide the framework for the historic preservation which will be cemented by my proposed legislation.

A hearing was held on June 10 in the Subcommittee on National Parks and

Public Lands in which testimony was heard from the National Park Service, private citizens, and elected officials in strong support of the legislation. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 940 was subsequently amended in the full Committee on Resources to direct the Secretary of the Interior to designate the Schuylkill River Corridor as a national heritage area. This addition to the bill will allow the history and culture of the major anthracite coal regions in Pennsylvania to be preserved for future generations. The amended bill passed by voice vote.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN), the chairman of the Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands, and the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), the chairman of the full Committee on Resources, for their support and leadership on this important legislation. H.R. 940 is a bipartisan bill which deserves our support.

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

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I do want to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his sponsorship of this piece of legislation.

H.R. 940, as introduced by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD), my colleague of the Committee on Resources, would have established the Lackawanna Valley Heritage Area in northeastern Pennsylvania.

The Lackawanna Valley covers the four counties of Lackawanna, Luzerne, Wayne, and Susquehanna Counties. In 1991, local citizens and governments established the Lackawanna Heritage Valley Authority to foster a partnership among State and local governments, business and civic organizations in the promotion of the Valley's historic, cultural, natural and economic resources.

Unlike other proposed heritage areas, the Lackawanna Valley has received significant federal funding prior to its establishment. Since 1989, a total of $3.147 million in the National Park Service funds has been earmarked in appropriations bills for a variety of unauthorized purposes.

In hearings on H.R. 940 before the Committee on Resources, the National Park Service testified in general support of the legislation, but did note several concerns with the bill's language, especially in regards to the lending authority and the requirement for certain studies. The bill was amended by the committee to address those concerns.

Mr. Speaker, in addition, the Committee on Resources adopted an amendment that provides for the designation of an additional heritage area so that the preservation and interpretation of the resources of the anthracite coal region will also include those resources found in the southern anthracite coal fields of the Schuylkill River Valley located in the district of our colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOLDEN).

The bill already anticipated such cooperative heritage efforts by directing that the various management entities to coordinate with one another in the management of the heritage of the anthracite coal region in Pennsylvania. The changes made by the amendment will provide more complete coverage of the heritage of this entire coal region.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 940, as amended, is a good piece of legislation for heritage preservation, and I do urge my colleagues to support this bill.

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

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I have no more requests for time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOLDEN).

Mr. HOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 940 this afternoon. I would like to thank the chairmen of the committee and the subcommittee for bringing this legislation to the floor, and I thank the ranking members of the committee and subcommittee for their assistance, as well as the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD), my good friend, for the way that he cooperated and extended his hand so that we were able to include the entire anthracite coal field in this heritage corridor, and I do truly appreciate the cooperation of the gentleman.

The link between the Schuylkill Heritage Corridor and the Lackawanna Heritage Corridor, as the gentleman mentioned, is anthracite coal, the anthracite coal that fueled the industrial revolution in this country, first by way of the Schuylkill Canal and then by way of the railroads. We should all be proud of that heritage, and I am certain that our managing entities are going to work very closely together so that we can highlight that proud history of anthracite coal.

Along with the coal fields in Pennsylvania came the first real effort for organized labor to set foot in the United States. I am very pleased to say that the work of the association started in Schuylkill County and was the forerunner to the United Mine Workers of America, where men fought long and hard for equitable pay and for working privileges and working rights that they were not able to have in the days when anthracite coal was first begun to be mined in Pennsylvania.

Through their efforts and through their long and hard work, they were able to have decent salaries and decent wages and decent working conditions in the anthracite fields right now. We should continue to honor the heritage of what was done in organized labor.

Mr. Speaker, there is much more to be told about the Schuylkill River Heritage. As we leave Schuylkill County and move down the Schuylkill River, we have a proud heritage in agriculture, a proud heritage in textiles, and in iron ore. All of these industries have a great tradition, and we all have great pride in what was accomplished right down the Schuylkill River as we get to Valley Forge and to Philadelphia. It was our link to get our goods to the marketplace, and we should make every effort possible to be appreciative as to what was done, but also try to highlight through Heritage Corridor what was done in the past and continue to move for economic development.

I am absolutely positive that when this Schuylkill River Heritage Corridor gets into a working agreement and hits the ground running, that it is going to be able to model itself after the Lackawanna Corridor, as my friend mentioned, where they were able to leverage with federal money, with private money, and State money and county money to do so much good in the Lackawanna Valley, and I am hoping we are going to use that example as we do in the Schuylkill River Corridor.

So I would just like to take this opportunity to say that this is a good piece of legislation. It certainly has been done in a very bipartisan manner. I think we all cooperated very well. Again, I would like to extend my gratification for that effort that was made to assist in making sure that anthracite coal and all of the treasures of the Schuylkill River can have a heritage corridor that we can work on.

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

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

I certainly want to thank both gentlemen from Pennsylvania for their introduction of this piece of legislation. I note with interest the mentioning of Susquehanna County as part of a very strong cultural heritage as part of our American history. In my little reading of history, I recall that the Susquehanna River has a very profound historical event that transpired as far as the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints is concerned, and I wanted to note that as a matter of record. I do want to thank my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. HOLDEN) for his comments.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 940, 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.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: ''A bill to designate the Lackawanna Valley National Heritage Area and for other purposes.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## THOMAS COLE NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE ACT

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 658) to establish the Thomas Cole National Historic Site in the State of New York as an affiliated area of the National Park System, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 658

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

***SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.***

*(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Thomas Cole National Historic Site Act''.*

*(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents of this Act is as follows:*

*Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.*
*Sec. 2. Definitions.*
*Sec. 3. Findings and purposes.*
*Sec. 4. Establishment of Thomas Cole National Historic Site.*
*Sec. 5. Retention of ownership and management of historic site by Greene County Historical Society.*
*Sec. 6. Administration of historic site.*
*Sec. 7. Authorization of appropriations.*

***SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.***

*As used in this Act:*

*(1) The term ''historic site'' means the Thomas Cole National Historic Site established by section 4 of this Act.*

*(2) The term ''Hudson River artists'' means artists who were associated with the Hudson River school of landscape painting.*

*(3) The term ''plan'' means the general management plan developed pursuant to section 6(d).*

*(4) The term ''Secretary'' means the Secretary of the Interior.*

*(5) The term ''Society'' means the Greene County Historical Society of Greene County, New York, which owns the Thomas Cole home, studio, and other property comprising the historic site.*

***SEC. 3. FINDINGS AND PURPOSES.***

*(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:*

*(1) The Hudson River school of landscape painting was inspired by Thomas Cole and was characterized by a group of 19th century landscape artists who recorded and celebrated the landscape and wilderness of America, particularly in the Hudson River Valley region in the State of New York.*

*(2) Thomas Cole is recognized as America's most prominent landscape and allegorical painter of the mid-19th century.*

*(3) Located in Greene County, New York, the Thomas Cole House, also known as Thomas Cole's Cedar Grove, is listed on the National Register of Historic Places and has been designated as a National Historic Landmark.*

*(4) Within a 15 mile radius of the Thomas Cole House, an area that forms a key part of the rich cultural and natural heritage of the Hudson River Valley region, significant landscapes and scenes painted by Thomas Cole and other Hudson River artists, such as Frederic Church, survive intact.*

*(5) The State of New York has established the Hudson River Valley Greenway to promote the preservation, public use, and enjoyment of the natural and cultural resources of the Hudson River Valley region.*

*(6) Establishment of the Thomas Cole National Historic Site will provide opportunities for the illustration and interpretation of cultural themes of the heritage of the United States and unique opportunities for education, public use, and enjoyment.*

*(b) PURPOSES.—The purposes of this Act are—*

*(1) to preserve and interpret the home and studio of Thomas Cole for the benefit, inspiration, and education of the people of the United States;*

*(2) to help maintain the integrity of the setting in the Hudson River Valley region that inspired artistic expression;*

*(3) to coordinate the interpretive, preservation, and recreational efforts of Federal, State, and other entities in the Hudson Valley region in order to enhance opportunities for education, public use, and enjoyment; and*

*(4) to broaden understanding of the Hudson River Valley region and its role in American history and culture.*

***SEC. 4. ESTABLISHMENT OF THOMAS COLE NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE.***

*(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—There is established, as an affiliated area of the National Park System, the Thomas Cole National Historic Site in the State of New York.*

*(b) DESCRIPTION.—The historic site shall consist of the home and studio of Thomas Cole, comprising approximately 3.4 acres, located at 218 Spring Street, in the village of Catskill, New York, as generally depicted on the boundary map numbered TCH/80002, and dated March 1992.*

***SEC. 5. RETENTION OF OWNERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT OF HISTORIC SITE BY GREENE COUNTY HISTORICAL SOCIETY.***

*The Greene County Historical Society of Greene County, New York, shall continue to own, administer, manage, and operate the historic site.*

***SEC. 6. ADMINISTRATION OF HISTORIC SITE.***

*(a) APPLICABILITY OF NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM LAWS.—The historic site shall be administered in a manner consistent with this Act and all laws generally applicable to units of the National Park System, including the Act of August 25, 1916 (16 U.S.C. 1 et seq.; commonly known as the National Park Service Organic Act), and the Act of August 21, 1935 (16 U.S.C. 461 et seq.; commonly known as the Historic Sites, Buildings, and Antiquities Act).*

*(b) COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.—*

*(1) ASSISTANCE TO SOCIETY.—The Secretary may enter into cooperative agreements with the Society to preserve the Thomas Cole House and other structures in the historic site and to assist with education programs and research and interpretation of the Thomas Cole House and associated landscapes.*

*(2) OTHER ASSISTANCE.—To further the purposes of this Act, the Secretary may enter into cooperative agreements with the State of New York, the Society, the Thomas Cole Foundation, and other public and private entities to facilitate public understanding and enjoyment of the lives and works of the Hudson River artists through the provision of assistance to develop, present, and fund art exhibits, resident artist programs, and other appropriate activities related to the preservation, interpretation, and use of the historic site.*

*(c) ARTIFACTS AND PROPERTY.—The Secretary may acquire personal property associated with, and appropriate for, the interpretation of the historic site.*

*(d) GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN.—Within two complete fiscal years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall develop a general management plan for the historic site with the cooperation of the Society. Upon the completion of the plan, the Secretary shall provide a copy of the plan to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives. The plan shall include recommendations for regional wayside exhibits, to be carried out through cooperative agreements with the State of New York and other public and private entities. The plan shall be prepared in accordance with section 12(b) of Public Law 91–383 (16 U.S.C. 1a–1 et seq.; commonly known as the National Park System General Authorities Act).*

***SEC. 7. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.***

*There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this Act.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD) and the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) each will control 20 minutes.

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

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

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

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 658 would establish the Thomas Cole Historic Site in the State of New York as an affiliated area of the National Park System. This bill is the result of the dedication of the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY) and retired Congressman Jerry Solomon, also from New York, who worked hard to protect this historic site. The Thomas Cole House is currently listed on the National Register of Historic Places and has been designated as a national historic landmark. H.R. 658 also authorizes the Secretary to enter into cooperative agreements with both public and private entities relating to the preservation, the interpretation and use of this historic site.

One of the private entities, the Greene County Historical Society, shall continue to own, manage and operate this historic site.

This bill also directs the historical society with assistance from the Secretary to develop a management plan for the site within 2 fiscal years of enactment. This bill is supported by the administration, and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 658.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R.658 establishes the Thomas Cole National Historic Site in the State of New York as an affiliated area of the National Park System.

Mr. Thomas Cole, who lived from 1801 to 1848, was the founder of an American artistic movement known as the Hudson River School. Mr. Cole painted landscapes of the American wilderness. Students and followers included such artists as Frederick Church, Alfred Dierstadt, and Thomas Moran. This school of painting, with its focus on natural landscapes, is closely associated with the beginning of the conservation movement.

The Thomas Cole property, known as Cedar Grove, is located in Catskill, New York. Originally encompassing 88

acres, the home and grounds now occupy 3.4 acres. The property has been designated a national historic landmark. In 1991, the National Park Service completed a suitability and a feasibility study of the Thomas Cole property.

□ 1445

Legislation dealing with the Thomas Cole property has been around since the early 1900s. Hearings were held on a nearly identical bill, H.R. 1301, in the 105th Congress. That legislation was favorably reported by the Committee on Resources, passed the House last September, but unfortunately, action was not completed on the measure prior to adjournment.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Resources adopted a minor amendment to H.R. 658 that made a clarifying change requested by the National Park Service. We believe this is a good change in the bill, and support the bill. I do urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Again, I thank my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD) for his management of this legislation.

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

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SWEENEY).

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to begin by thanking my good friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD), for bringing up this legislation, and also thanking the gentleman from Alaska (Chairman YOUNG) of the Committee on Rules, the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN), the ranking member, the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ), and my friends on the other side for their assistance here.

This legislation, as has been said, Mr. Speaker, would allow the Greene County Historical Society to remain as owners and operators of the Thomas Cole House while establishing the site as an affiliated area of the national park system.

Essentially what this legislation does, it allows for the historical society to develop interpretive programs related to the facility. It also requires an annual general management plan by the historical society. Both of these things I think are very important to the continued health and welfare of the Thomas Cole House.

I am a strong supporter of preserving our national historical sites generally, and specifically here as it relates to the Thomas Cole House. The circumstances of the Thomas Cole House make this an important piece of legislation, given its age. It is a true national treasure in the heart of one of the most scenic areas of the Nation, New York's Hudson River Valley.

As has been stated, Thomas Cole was one of the country's preeminent landscape painters in the earlier 19th century. His work inspired generations of artists, including Frederick Church and Thomas Moran, to chronicle the growth of the young United States and help to generate interest in our country's natural beauty.

Today the paintings provide insight and reflect the growth of what is the uniquely American spirit. In passing this legislation, we will preserve this school of art and the very residence Thomas Cole worked from within in creating many of his paintings, as well as the landscapes these artists painted of the beautiful Hudson River Valley.

Last year the legislation passed the House. It was not passed by the Senate point. That was because there was some language in the bill that the Senate objected to regarding the purchase by the Secretary of the Interior of the paintings and artwork. We have revised that and made amendments to make that language more palatable. I am confident that the Senate will pass it this year.

In conclusion, I would like to thank the committee and the National Park Service for their assistance, as well as the local organizations in my district who worked strenuously to see this bill passed, and who worked as a partnership to ensure the continuation of the Thomas Cole House. I look forward to seeing the Thomas Cole site become an important addition to the National Park Service.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation that will provide the Thomas Cole National Historic Site with appropriate federal recognition and assistance. It is appropriate because Thomas Cole continues to be a major figure in our nation's history, and an important influence on many Americans who would not recognize his name.

As founder of the Hudson River School of American Painting, Thomas Cole stood at the beginning of a long line of artists who taught Americans to love and appreciate dramatic landscapes. It is hard for us now to imagine a time when places like the Hudson Highlands, the Grand Canyon, and the mountain peaks of the east and west were not treasured, but that was largely the case before Thomas Cole's time. They were regarded as obstacles or places of danger. His paintings showed people they were beautiful; his allegories invested them with meaning. If it were not for Thomas Cole, we might not have our national parks today; we would almost certainly not have our long tradition of landscape art.

I hope this legislation will enable more people to learn about Thomas Cole and his followers and the history of how our people came to appreciate the beauty of nature and the landscape. I further hope it will bring more people to the Hudson Valley that Cole loved and painted, and educate them about the role that the Hudson Valley—through its natural features, its people, and its history—has had in defining our country's vision of itself.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 658, as amended.

The question was taken.

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

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

## FISHERMAN'S PROTECTIVE ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1999

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1651) to amend the Fisherman's Protective Act of 1967 to extend the period during which reimbursement may be provided to owners of United States fishing vessels for costs incurred when such a vessel is seized and detained by a foreign country, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1651

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

**TITLE I—EXTENSION OF PERIOD FOR REIMBURSEMENT UNDER FISHERMEN'S PROTECTIVE ACT OF 1967**

**SEC. 101. SHORT TITLE.**

This title may be cited as the ''Fishermen's Protective Act Amendments of 1999''.

**SEC. 102. EXTENSION OF PERIOD FOR REIMBURSEMENT UNDER FISHERMEN'S PROTECTIVE ACT OF 1967.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 7(e) of the Fishermen's Protective Act of 1967 (22 U.S.C. 1977(e)) is amended by striking ''2000'' and inserting ''2003''.

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—Section 7(a)(3) of the Fishermen's Protective Act of 1967 (22 U.S.C. 1977(a)(3)) is amended by striking ''Secretary of the Interior'' and inserting ''Secretary of Commerce''.

**TITLE II—YUKON RIVER SALMON**

**SEC. 201. SHORT TITLE.**

This title may be cited as the ''Yukon River Salmon Act of 1999''.

**SEC. 202. YUKON RIVER SALMON PANEL.**

(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There shall be a Yukon River Salmon Panel (in this title referred to as the ''Panel'').

(2) FUNCTIONS.—The Panel shall—

(A) advise the Secretary of State regarding the negotiation of any international agreement with Canada relating to management of salmon stocks originating from the Yukon River in Canada;

(B) advise the Secretary of the Interior regarding restoration and enhancement of such salmon stocks; and

(C) perform other functions relating to conservation and management of such salmon stocks as authorized by this or any other title.

(3) DESIGNATION AS UNITED STATES REPRESENTATIVES ON BILATERAL BODY.—The Secretary of State may designate the members of the Panel to be the United States representatives on any successor to the panel established by the interim agreement for the conservation of salmon stocks originating

from the Yukon River in Canada agreed to through an exchange of notes between the Government of the United States and the Government of Canada on February 3, 1995, if authorized by any agreement establishing such successor.

(b) MEMBERSHIP.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Panel shall be comprised of six members, as follows:

(A) One member who is an official of the United States Government with expertise in salmon conservation and management, who shall be appointed by the Secretary of State.

(B) One member who is an official of the State of Alaska with expertise in salmon conservation and management, who shall be appointed by the Governor of Alaska.

(C) Four members who are knowledgeable and experienced with regard to the salmon fisheries on the Yukon River, who shall be appointed by the Secretary of State in accordance with paragraph (2).

(2) APPOINTEES FROM ALASKA.—(A) The Secretary of State shall appoint the members under paragraph (1)(C) from a list of at least 3 individuals nominated for each position by the Governor of Alaska.

(B) In making the nominations, the Governor of Alaska may consider suggestions for nominations provided by organizations with expertise in Yukon River salmon fisheries.

(C) The Governor of Alaska may make appropriate nominations to allow for appointment of, and the Secretary of State shall appoint, under paragraph (1)(C)—

(i) at least one member who is qualified to represent the interests of Lower Yukon River fishing districts; and

(ii) at least one member who is qualified to represent the interests of Upper Yukon River fishing districts.

(D) At least one of the members appointed under paragraph (1)(C) shall be an Alaska Native.

(3) ALTERNATES.—(A) The Secretary of State may designate an alternate Panel member for each Panel member the Secretary appoints under paragraphs (1) (A) and (C), who meets the same qualifications, to serve in the absence of the Panel member.

(B) The Governor of the State of Alaska may designate an alternative Panel member for the Panel member appointed under subsection (b)(1)(B), who meets the same qualifications, to serve in the absence of that Panel member.

(c) TERM LENGTH.—Panel members and alternate Panel members shall serve four-year terms. Any individual appointed to fill a vacancy occurring before the expiration of any term shall be appointed for the remainder of that term.

(d) REAPPOINTMENT.—Panel members and alternate Panel members shall be eligible for reappointment.

(e) DECISIONS.—Decisions of the Panel shall be made by the consensus of the Panel members appointed under subparagraphs (B) and (C) of subsection (b)(1).

(f) CONSULTATION.—In carrying out their functions, Panel members may consult with such other interested parties as they consider appropriate.

**SEC. 203. ADVISORY COMMITTEE.**

(a) APPOINTMENTS.—The Governor of Alaska may establish and appoint an advisory committee of not less than 8, but not more than 12, individuals who are knowledgeable and experienced with regard to the salmon fisheries on the Yukon River. At least 2 of the advisory committee members shall be Alaska Natives. Members of the advisory committee may attend all meetings of the Panel, and shall be given the opportunity to examine and be heard on any matter under consideration by the Panel.

(b) COMPENSATION.—The members of such advisory committee shall receive no compensation for their services.

(c) TERM LENGTH.—Members of such advisory committee shall serve two-year terms. Any individual appointed to fill a vacancy occurring before the expiration of any term shall be appointed for the remainder of that term.

(d) REAPPOINTMENT.—Members of such advisory committee shall be eligible for reappointment.

**SEC. 204. EXEMPTION.**

The Federal Advisory Committee Act (5 U.S.C. App.) shall not apply to the Panel or to an advisory committee established under section 203.

**SEC. 205. AUTHORITY AND RESPONSIBILITY.**

(a) RESPONSIBLE MANAGEMENT ENTITY.—The State of Alaska Department of Fish and Game shall be the responsible management entity for the United States for the purposes of any agreement with Canada regarding management of salmon stocks originating from the Yukon River in Canada.

(b) EFFECT OF DESIGNATION.—The designation under subsection (a) shall not be considered to expand, diminish, or otherwise change the management authority of the State of Alaska or the Federal Government with respect to fishery resources.

(c) RECOMMENDATIONS OF PANEL.—In addition to recommendations made by the Panel to the responsible management entities in accordance with any agreement with Canada regarding management of salmon stocks originating from the Yukon River in Canada, the Panel may make recommendations concerning the conservation and management of salmon originating in the Yukon River to the Department of the Interior, the Department of Commerce, the Department of State, the North Pacific Fishery Management Council, and other Federal or State entities as appropriate. Recommendations by the Panel shall be advisory in nature.

**SEC. 206. ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS.**

(a) COMPENSATION.—Panel members and alternate Panel members who are not State or Federal employees shall receive compensation at the daily rate of GS–15 of the General Schedule when engaged in the actual performance of duties.

(b) TRAVEL AND OTHER NECESSARY EXPENSES.—Travel and other necessary expenses shall be paid by the Secretary of the Interior for all Panel members, alternate Panel members, and members of any advisory committee established under section 203 when engaged in the actual performance of duties.

(c) TREATMENT AS FEDERAL EMPLOYEES.—Except for officials of the United States Government, all Panel members, alternate Panel members, and members of any advisory committee established under section 203 shall not be considered to be Federal employees while engaged in the actual performance of duties, except for the purposes of injury compensation or tort claims liability as provided in chapter 81 of title 5, United States Code, and chapter 71 of title 28, United States Code.

**SEC. 207. YUKON RIVER SALMON STOCK RESTORATION AND ENHANCEMENT PROJECTS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Secretary of Commerce, may carry out projects to restore or enhance salmon stocks originating from the Yukon River in Canada and the United States.

(b) COOPERATION WITH CANADA.—If there is in effect an agreement between the Government of the United States and the Government of Canada for the conservation of salmon stocks originating from the Yukon River in Canada that includes provisions governing projects authorized under this section, then—

(1) projects under this section shall be carried out in accordance with that agreement; and

(2) amounts available for projects under this section—

(A) shall be expended in accordance with the agreement; and

(B) may be deposited in any joint account established by the agreement to fund such projects.

**SEC. 208. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary of the Interior to carry out this title $4,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2000, 2001, 2002, and 2003, of which—

(1) such sums as are necessary shall be available each fiscal year for travel expenses of Panel members, alternate Panel members, United States members of the Joint Technical Committee established by paragraph C.2 of the memorandum of understanding concerning the Pacific Salmon Treaty between the Government of the United States and the Government of Canada (recorded January 28, 1985), and members of an advisory committee established and appointed under section 203, in accordance with Federal Travel Regulations and sections 5701, 5702, 5704 through 5708, and 5731 of title 5, United States Code;

(2) such sums as are necessary shall be available for the United States share of expenses incurred by the Joint Technical Committee and any panel established by any agreement between the Government of the United States and the Government of Canada for restoration and enhancement of salmon originating in Canada;

(3) up to $3,000,000 shall be available each fiscal year for activities by the Department of the Interior and the Department of Commerce for survey, restoration, and enhancement activities related to salmon stocks originating from the Yukon River in Canada, of which up to $1,200,000 shall be available each fiscal year for Yukon River salmon stock restoration and enhancement projects under section 207(b); and

(4) $600,000 shall be available each fiscal year for cooperative salmon research and management projects in the portion of the Yukon River drainage located in the United States that are recommended by the Panel.

## TITLE III—FISHERY INFORMATION ACQUISITION

**SEC. 301. SHORT TITLE.**

This title may be cited as the ''Fisheries Survey Vessel Authorization Act of 1999''.

**SEC. 302. ACQUISITION OF FISHERY SURVEY VESSELS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, subject to the availability of appropriations, may in accordance with this section acquire, by purchase, lease, lease-purchase, or charter, and equip up to 6 fishery survey vessels in accordance with this section.

(b) VESSEL REQUIREMENTS.—Any vessel acquired and equipped under this section must—

(1) be capable of—

(A) staying at sea continuously for at least 30 days;

(B) conducting fishery population surveys using hydroacoustic, longlining, deep water, and pelagic trawls, and other necessary survey techniques; and

(C) conducting other work necessary to provide fishery managers with the accurate and timely data needed to prepare and implement fishery management plans; and

(2) have a hull that meets the International Council for Exploration of the Sea standard regarding acoustic quietness.

(c) AUTHORIZATION.—To carry out this section there are authorized to be appropriated to the Secretary $60,000,000.

Amend the title so as to read: ''To amend the Fishermen's Protective

Act of 1967 to extend the period during which reimbursement may be provided to owners of United States fishing vessels for costs incurred when such a vessel is seized and detained by a foreign country, and for other purposes.''.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) and the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON).

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

(Mr. SAXTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1651 is a package of noncontroversial bills that should pass this body without much debate.

The first title amends the Fisherman's Protective Act to extend the period of time during which reimbursements may be provided to owners of U.S. fishing vessel for costs incurred when a vessel is illegally seized and detained by a foreign country. The time period is extended from October 1, 2000, to October 1, 2003.

The second title, the Yukon River Salmon Act of 1999, establishes the Yukon River Salmon Panel, which will advise the Secretary of State regarding negotiations on any international agreement with Canada relating to the management of salmon stocks originating from the Yukon River.

In addition, the panel will advise the Secretary of the Interior and the Alaska Department of Fish and Game regarding restoration and enhancement of Yukon River salmon.

In 1995, Congress passed the Yukon River Salmon Act as part of the Fisheries Act of 1995. This Act created the Yukon River Salmon Panel, as required in the interim agreement between the United States and Canada for the conservation of Yukon River salmon stocks originating in Canada.

This interim agreement expired in March of 1998. The expiration of the interim agreement has made the role of the Yukon Salmon Panel unclear. This legislation authorizes the panel and its activities, regardless of the agreement with Canada. If a new agreement cannot be reached between United States and Canada, the Secretary of State is authorized to appoint the advisory panel members to any panel created by the new agreement. The authorized appropriations in this title have been capped at the level authorized in 1995.

The third title to the bill authorizes the Secretary of Commerce to acquire and equip a fishery survey vessel. This new vessel will provide fishery managers with accurate and timely data necessary to implement the fishery management plans and to meet international treaty obligations.

Mr. Speaker, I ask for an aye vote on the bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I would like to initially commend the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON), the chairman of our Subcommittee on Fisheries Conservation, Wildlife and Oceans, and as the ranking member of that subcommittee, again I want to thank the gentleman for his leadership and for his ability to bring these pieces of legislation under a substitute format.

I also want to thank the chairman of our Committee on Resources, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), and the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER), our ranking Democrat, for their support of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the three fisheries-related bills included in the substitute amendment that will be offered are noncontroversial and have the full support of the administration. Thus, I do urge that the substitute be adopted by my colleagues.

I am particularly pleased this bill will authorize funding to construct a fisheries research vessel. The fleet of research vessels operated by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, Mr. Speaker, is aging. Without modern vessels, NOAA will be unable to obtain accurate data on fish stocks and oceanographic conditions, and thus will compromise the Administration's ability to manage our Nation's fisheries as mandated by the Magnuson-Stevens Act and several international treaties.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will authorize funds for one vessel. I look forward to working with the chairman of the Committee on Resources to authorize funds in future years to modernize NOAA's fishing research fleet, not only for ships in Alaska, but throughout our Nation's waters, so our administration can gather the best data possible to fulfill its statutory obligations and successfully manage our $3 billion annual commercial fishing industry.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to thank the gentleman from American Samoa, the ranking member of the subcommittee, for his great work in support in getting this bill to the floor. It is much appreciated.

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 New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1651, 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.

The title was amended so as to read:

''To amend the Fishermen's Protective Act of 1967 to extend the period during which reimbursement may be provided to owners of United States fishing vessels for costs incurred when such a vessel is seized and detained by a foreign country, and for other purposes.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1651, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Sherman Williams, one of his secretaries.

## BIKINI RESETTLEMENT AND RELOCATION ACT OF 1999

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2368) to assist in the resettlement and relocation of the people of Bikini Atoll by amending the terms of the trust fund established during the United States administration of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2368

*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 ''Bikini Resettlement and Relocation Act of 1999''.

**SEC. 2. PARTIAL DISTRIBUTION OF TRUST FUND AMOUNTS.**

Three percent of the market value as of June 1, 1999, of the Resettlement Trust Fund for the People of Bikini, established pursuant to Public Law 97–257, shall be made available for immediate ex gratia distribution to the people of Bikini, provided such distribution does not reduce the corpus of the trust fund. The amount of such distribution shall be deducted from any additional ex gratia payments that may be made by the Congress into the Resettlement Trust Fund.

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

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

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

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

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2368, the Bikini Resettlement and Relocation Act of 1999 is an important

measure to help the relocation and resettlement of the people of the Bikini Atoll. This community was displaced during the time of United States nuclear testing in the Pacific, and while the U.S. was the administering authority for the islands under the United Nations' Trust Territory of the Pacific islands.

In the 1982, Congress established a Resettlement Trust Fund for the benefit of the Bikinians. H.R. 2368 would authorize a one-time 3 percent distribution from the Resettlement Trust Fund for relocation and resettlement assistance primarily for the remaining senior citizens of the Bikini Atoll, 3 percent of $126 million, or $3.7 million.

This will not require any appropriation of any funds by the U.S. Congress, and will not diminish the original corpus of the Resettlement Trust Fund of $110 million.

These funds will provide relocation assistance now to the surviving 90 members of Bikini who were removed from their home island, as it may still take years to complete radiological restoration of the atoll to permit safe habitation.

The bill also responds to the resolution of the Bikini Council requesting this legislative action by Congress. I urge my colleagues to support this bipartisan measure.

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

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

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

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, this act would authorize a one-time 3 percent distribution from the resettlement fund for the people of Bikini established by Congress in 1982 for relocation and resettlement assistance primarily for the remaining senior citizens of Bikini Atoll.

The odyssey of the Bikini people is a very sad one, indeed. They were moved off their atoll in March of 1946 by the U.S. Navy to facilitate the U.S. nuclear testing program. They were first moved to Rongerik, an uninhabited atoll some 100 miles east of Bikini. Naval officials stated that Rongerik was bigger and richer than Bikini, but it turned out that the move was ill-conceived and poorly planned.

Contrary to the Navy's assertions, Rongerik's land area is one-quarter of the size of Bikini, and its life-sustaining pandanus and coconut trees were considerably less productive than those of Bikini.

The situation on Rongerik steadily deteriorated over the next 2 years. In July of 1947, a medical officer who visited the atoll reported that the Bikinians were visibly suffering from malnutrition. Several sites for another relocation were explored, but none proved satisfactory.

However, when a Navy physician examined the Bikinians in March of 1948 and found them to be a starving people, emergency measures were called for and the Bikinians were immediately evacuated to the Navy base at Kwajalein Atoll. As early as 1948, as the official Navy history of the Trust Territory notes, ''Definite physiological scars were left on the people.'' The consequences of their two relocations, 2 years on Rongerik and nearly 8 months on Kwajalein, were already abundantly evident.

In less than 3 years, the once self-sufficient people had been transformed into dependent wards of the United States. Their very existence had been threatened, and the little confidence that they had in themselves was diminished.

□ 1500

The third relocation of the Bikinians occurred in November of 1948 when the community was moved to Kili Island some 400 miles south of Bikini. Although Kili receives more rainfall than Bikini and has richer soils, it is an island, a high island, not an atoll, and it is about one-ninth the land area of Bikini.

It has neither lagoon, sheltered fishing ground, protected anchorage, nor good beaches. Instead, a flat reef shelf forms around the circumference of the island and drops abruptly to great depths. As a result, it is virtually inaccessible by sea from November to May, when tradewinds cause heavy surf to pound the shore.

This drastic change from an atoll existence, with its abundant fish and islands as far as the eye could see, to an isolated island with no lagoon and inaccessible marine resources, took a severe physiological toll on the Bikini people.

Since their arrival there in 1948, the Bikinians have compared Kili to a jail. The elders sorely miss the ability to move about an atoll, engage in fishing expeditions across the lagoon or in the open sea, and sail to other islands. At Bikini, much of men's lives had centered about their sailing canoes, and they spent many hours working together on them. These sailing canoes had to be abandoned on Kili, and the Bikinians have lost virtually all thier sailing and fishing skills.

Today, 53 years after their move from Bikini, less than half the ''elders'' who were moved off originally in 1946 are still alive. The radiological cleanup and resettlement of Bikini is at least a decade away, and will cost at least several hundred million dollars, and the numerous relocations of the people have had severe consequences.

The Bikinians did not desire relocation in 1946, but they believed they had no alternative but to comply with the wishes of the United States.

Much of the Bikinians' culture and society and identity are rooted in their ancestral home: the islands, reefs, and lagoon of Bikini Atoll. The people's identity, the very essence of their perceptions of themselves, is intimately tied to their home atoll.

The system of land rights provided much of the underlying structure for the organization of the community. Short of loss of life itself, the loss of their ancestral homeland represented the worst calamity imaginable for the Bikini people.

The confinement of the Bikini people to Kili has deprived them of most of the activities and pleasures that they enjoy at Bikini Atoll.

The people of Bikini gave the United States everything they had, their land and their home. They demanded nothing in return. They asked only that the United States care for them until their land had served its purpose and could be returned to them. The United States promised that it would do so, but some 53 years later, and 41 years after the last nuclear test at Bikini, the Bikinians are still not home. They lived up to their side of the deal, and the people of the free world did well by them.

They made contributions to the victory and the Cold War that many other peoples did not. The tests in the Marshall Islands cost hundreds of billions of dollars, but we never questioned their value because these nuclear tests assured U.S. nuclear superiority over the Soviet Union and saved billions of dollars in defense spending.

As the Atomic Energy Commission reported to Congress in 1953, ''Each of the tests involved a major expenditure of money, manpower, scientific effort, and time. Nevertheless, in accelerating the rate of weapons development, they saved far more than their costs.''

In an attempt to assist the people of Bikini, we provided funding for their Resettlement Trust Fund in 1982. Those funds have been well invested, and it is only appropriate for us to support a one-time 3 percent distribution to the heads of household, with the understanding that the Bikini elders will be the primary beneficiaries.

Thanks to sound investment decisions, this trust fund has earned almost 14 percent annually since 1982, so a 3 percent distribution will not require an appropriation of funds by Congress nor will it diminish the original corpus of the trust.

I want to say on a personal note that this especially goes out to the family of Ralph Waltz who was a Peace Corps volunteer on Kili Atoll and who was personal witness to this. Mr. Waltz has since passed away, but he was a very good friend of mine, and he first brought me to these issues that are attendant to the plight of the Bikini people.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as I may consume to the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA).

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) for yielding this time to me to say a few words concerning this piece of legislation. I do

thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD) for his management of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 2368, a bill to assist the resettlement and relocation of the people of Bikini Atoll by amending the terms of the trust fund established during the United States administration of a Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.

Mr. Speaker, 53 years ago, we removed the residents of Bikini Atoll from their home to conduct atomic and nuclear weapons tests. Between 1946 and 1958, we conducted well over 23 such tests, which made the Atoll uninhabitable. In 1968, we told the former residents it was safe to return to the Atoll only to remove them again in 1979 because radiation levels were still far in excess of Federal standards.

Mr. Speaker, today the remaining nine residents of Bikini in 1946 who are still alive, and some of the descendants of the other 158 people of the atoll, are still living in a temporary location 400 miles from their true home.

Mr. Speaker, in an effort to partially compensate the residents of Bikini for all the injury and suffering the United States has caused them, it is only reasonable that Congress establish a trust fund in 1982, and a total of $110 million has been appropriated for the fund. The fund has been well managed, and the market value of the fund is now approximately $126 million. H.R. 2368 authorizes a one-time distribution of 3 percent of the value of the trust, which will go primarily to the elders of this group.

Mr. Speaker, I have taken to this floor many times over the years to advocate that the United States devote more of its resources to this problem, especially as it deals with the good people of the Republic of the Marshall Islands. This is only a small part of the mess we created by conducting atomic and nuclear atmospheric tests in the Pacific.

The residents of the Bikini and other atolls of the Pacific have been forced to make considerable sacrifices so that our Nation could remain militarily strong, and I find it highly offensive that we have not addressed this problem forthrightly.

Even today, Mr. Speaker, we do not have a plan to clean up and resettle the atoll, and it is estimated that cleanup and resettlement will take 10 years, 10 more years, Mr. Speaker. We can, and we should be doing better than that.

I want to thank the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG), the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), our ranking Democrat of the committee, and their staffs for moving this bill as quickly as they have. This is important to the former residents of Bikini and shows that this authorizing committee can act in a timely manner.

Mr. Speaker, I know the Bikinians would have liked to have seen this provision in the fiscal year 2000 Interior appropriations bill, but with today's action in the House and a little luck in the Senate, they may get their money just as quickly as following regular authorizing procedures. I support this bill and believe we have a moral obligation to do much more than this.

Mr. Speaker, again I want to commend the gentleman from Guam (Mr. UNDERWOOD) for his tireless efforts and tremendous leadership to assist his fellow Pacific Island community.

Again, I ask my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I have cosponsored this legislation with Chairman YOUNG which directs the Secretary of Interior to distribute 3% of interest made from the Resettlement Trust Fund for the People of Bikini to surviving Bikini elders. This payment will be a one time only payment and comes from interest made, does not need an additional appropriation, and will not effect the original corpus of the fund.

To facilitate the US nuclear testing program, the people of Bikini were moved off their islands in 1946. Between 1946 and 1958, the U.S. government detonated 23 atomic and hydrogen bombs at Bikini Atoll, including the March 1, 1954 Bravo shot, the largest nuclear test ever conducted by the United States. Our treatment of the people directly affected by these tests has not always been forthright and just. Much information about the test shots was kept from the Marshallese until I was able to persuade the Bush Administration to finally release DOE documents to the Marshall Islands Government. While this process has been slow, it has resulted in thousands of pages of new information released.

In 1982 Congress established the Resettlement Trust Fund to assist the people of Bikini, ''for the relocation and resettlement of the Bikini People in the Marshall Islands, principally on Kili and Ejit Islands.'' Congress appropriated additional funds in 1988 into the trust and modified its terms to provide that monies could also be ''expended for the rehabilitation and resettlement of Bikini Atoll.''

The people of Bikini have maintained the fiscal integrity of the Resettlement Trust Fund since its inception. They have hired U.S. banks as trustees and well respected investment advisors and money managers. The Trust has averaged a nearly 14% annual return since inception and has permitted the Bikini community to provide for scholarships, health care, food programs, housing electrical power, construction, maintenance and repairs on the islands of Kili and Ejit, as well as infrastructure, cleanup and resettlement activities on Bikini Atoll. Through prudent management and voluntary restrictions on the use of the corpus by the people of Bikini, the market value of the Resettlement Trust Fund today is approximately $125 million.

Throughout this most tumultuous time, the elders of the community have remained the solid base for all the people of Bikini. This one time payment is being made at the request of the Bikini community based, in part, on the reality that resettlement of the atoll is unlikely during the lifetime of the elders. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2368, the Bikini Resettlement and Relocation Act of 1999. I fully support the request of the Bikini Council to have a one-time 3% distribution from the Resettlement Trust fund to assist in the resettlement and relocation of the people of Bikini Atoll.

In 1946, our country made the decision to test nuclear weapons in the Bikini Atoll in the Marshall Islands. This difficult decision, during World War II, created a negative situation for the Bikini Atoll. This environmental catastrophe still exists, over thirty years later. The people of Bikini Atoll have been relocated twice since the Island was polluted with nuclear residue during the nuclear testing that started in 1946.

I commend our government's recognition of the devastation caused during this testing period and I commend our efforts to restore this magnificent Island so its citizens can return to their homes. Unfortunately, it appears another 10 years is necessary to guarantee the return of the Bikini people to an environmentally safe home.

Traditionally, the people of Bikini Atoll have administered the Resettlement Trust Fund in a commendable manner. I fully support the Council's decision to make available 3% percent of the market value of the Resettlement Trust Fund for immediate ex gratia distribution to the people of Bikini. The culture and tradition of the people of Bikini pay special homage to the seniors of the communities. It is anticipated that the senior citizens of Bikini, many who will not have an opportunity to return to the Island and their homeland because of the length of clean-up time, may be the primary beneficiaries of this distribution.

The Congressional Budget Office estimates that the enactment of the bill would have no impact on the federal budget. Mr. Speaker, dear colleagues, I urge that we continue to support the restoration of Bikini Island and resettlement of its citizens.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, the Bikini Resettlement and Relocation Act of 1999, H.R. 2368, is an important measure to help the relocation and resettlement of the people of Bikini Atoll. This community was displaced during the time of United States nuclear testing in the Pacific and while the U.S. was the administering authority for the islands under the United Nations Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands. Congress continues to have responsibility for the trust funds that were established during the trusteeship for the resettlement and relocation of certain island communities, including Bikini Atoll.

The Committee on Resources conducted a Congressional pre-hearing briefing on May 10th and a hearing on May 11th, 1999, on the status of nuclear claims, relocation and resettlement efforts in the Marshall Islands. During the hearing process, the elected representative of the people of Bikini presented the Kili/Bikini/Ejit Local Government Council's May 12, 1999 Resolution, asking Congress to support a one-time 3% distribution from the Resettlement Trust Fund, which is used both for the cleanup of Bikini and for the ongoing needs of the Bikini people. In addition, the Marshall Islands Government expressed unqualified support for the Bikini request. Congress established the Resettlement Trust Fund in 1982 pursuant to P.L. 97–257 and appropriated additional funds in 1988 pursuant to P.L. 100–446.

I introduced H.R. 2368 jointly with the Ranking Minority Member GEORGE MILLER of the Committee on Resources on June 29, 1999, to respond to the request of the Bikini community and the government of the Marshall Islands. My statement of introduction appeared

in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on that date with the text of the Kili/Bikini/Ejit Local Government Council's May 12, 1999 Resolution on June 29, 1999 H.R. 2368 would:

Authorize a one-time 3% distribution from the Resettlement Trust Fund for relocation and resettlement assistance primarily for the remaining senior citizens of Bikini Atoll [3% of $126 million or $3.7 million]; not require an appropriation of any funds by the U.S. Congress; not diminish the original corpus of the Resettlement Trust Fund [$110 million]; provide relocation assistance now to the surviving 90 members of Bikini who were removed from their home island, as it may still take years to complete radiological restoration of the atoll to permit safe habitation; and respond to the resolution of the Bikini Council requesting this legislative action by Congress.

The Bikinians, for their part, have ensured the fiscal integrity of the Resettlement Trust Fund. They have selected reputable U.S. banks as trustees, hired well-respected and talented investment advisors and money managers, and provided for routine monthly financial statements and annual audits. Due to the Bikini Council's voluntary restraint on the use of these funds, and the success of the fund managers, the corpus remains intact, the trust fund has earned almost 14% annually, every dollar has been accounted for, annual audits are prepared, and monthly financial statements are sent to the Interior Department.

In light of the strength of the trust, its fiscal integrity, the lengthy time a cleanup and restoration will take, and the special circumstances of the elders, the Bikinians wish to make a one-time 3% distribution from the Resettlement Trust Fund, with the understanding that the primary beneficiaries of the distribution will be the 90 surviving Bikini elders. Because of the excellent management of the trust fund, such a distribution will not require an appropriation of funds by Congress, nor will it diminish the original corpus of the trust.

The authorization in H.R. 2368 for the people of Bikini is appropriate and consistent with the desires of the community of Bikini and congressional intent for the resettlement of the people whose lives and homes were disrupted by U.S. testing. This measure assists some of the people of the former Trust Territory community administered by the United States, who we still maintain relations through a Compact of Free Association. Without any additional cost to the U.S. taxpayer, Congress can be responsive to the remaining senior Bikini elders' resettlement and relocation efforts.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers. I urge an ''aye'' vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2368.

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.

## SPANISH PEAKS WILDERNESS ACT OF 1999

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 898) designating certain land in the San Isabel National Forest in the State of Colorado as the ''Spanish Peaks Wilderness.''

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 898

*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 ''Spanish Peaks Wilderness Act of 1999''.

**SEC. 2. DESIGNATION OF SPANISH PEAKS WILDERNESS.**

(a) COLORADO WILDERNESS ACT.—Section 2(a) of the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (Public Law 103–77; 107 Stat. 756; 16 U.S.C. 1132 note) is amended by adding at the end the following:

''(20) SPANISH PEAKS WILDERNESS.—Certain land in the San Isabel National Forest that—

''(A) comprises approximately 18,000 acres, as generally depicted on a map entitled 'Proposed Spanish Peaks Wilderness', dated February 10, 1999; and

''(B) shall be known as the 'Spanish Peaks Wilderness'.''.

(b) MAP; BOUNDARY DESCRIPTION.—

(1) FILING.—As soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary of Agriculture (referred to in this Act as the ''Secretary''), shall file a map and boundary description of the area designated under subsection (a) with—

(A) the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate.

(2) FORCE AND EFFECT.—The map and boundary description under paragraph (1) shall have the same force and effect as if included in the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (Public Law 103–77; 107 Stat. 756), except that the Secretary may correct clerical and typographical errors in the map and boundary description.

(3) AVAILABILITY.—The map and boundary description under paragraph (1) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the Office of the Chief of the Forest Service.

**SEC. 3. ACCESS.**

Within the Spanish Peaks Wilderness designated under section 2—

(1) the Secretary shall allow the continuation of historic uses of the Bulls Eye Mine Road established prior to the date of enactment of this Act, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary may provide; and

(2) access to any privately owned land within the wilderness areas designated under section 2 shall be provided in accordance with section 5 of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1134 et seq.).

**SEC. 4. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.**

Section 10 of the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (Public Law 103–77; 107 Stat. 756; 16 U.S.C. 1132 note) is repealed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD) and the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) each will control 20 minutes.

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

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

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

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 898, the Spanish Peaks Wilderness Act of 1999, was introduced by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS), my esteemed colleague, and would simply add the Spanish Peaks area to a list of areas designated as wilderness by the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993.

The gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) has worked long and hard to protect local interests while trying to preserve an outstanding scenic and geological area. I have hunted and hiked through the Spanish Peaks, and they rise above the high plains majestically all by themselves and are an area certainly worthy of preservation.

This bill passed through subcommittee and full committee on a voice vote, therefore, I would urge my colleagues to support the passage of H.R. 898, the Spanish Peaks Wilderness Act of 1999, under suspension of the rules.

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

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

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 898 would designate approximately 18,000 acres of land in Colorado, San Isabel National Forest, as wilderness. These lands which contain headwaters in two spectacular 13,000 foot peaks have been studied and considered for wilderness designation for nearly two decades.

This month marks the 35th anniversary of the law that created a national wilderness preservation system. The Wilderness Act has led to the protection of more than 104 million acres of Federal lands. In light of this anniversary, it is most appropriate, Mr. Speaker, that the House is acting on a wilderness bill, an all too infrequent event in recent years I would say.

I do commend the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL), our Democratic colleague, for their sponsorship and hard work on this legislation.

This is a worthy bill, this legislation. It certainly deserves the support of our colleagues, and I ask my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to engage in a colloquy here with the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS).

Mr. Speaker, this bill does differ from last year's Skaggs-McInnis bill in a few respects, and I want to take a few moments to discuss one in particular, namely the exclusion from wilderness of an old road, known as the Bulls Eye Mine Road and the inclusion of language related to that road.

Because some questions have been raised about the scope and effect of that language, contained in subsection 3(1), I think it appropriate to provide a further explanation of how that subsection would or would not affect management of this area.

Accordingly, at the request of the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) I would like to engage the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) in a brief colloquy regarding this part of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, one of the questions that has been raised concerning the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture with regard to regulating the use of the road. During the subcommittee hearing of the bill, the gentleman from Montana (Mr. HILL) asked whether the Secretary would continue to limit those uses to hiking and horseback riding and was assured that the Secretary could do that under the terms of the bill.

Would my colleague agree that, under this bill, the Secretary will continue to have that authority?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS).

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, to the gentleman's inquiry, the answer to that is yes.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, another important question concerns the extent to which the bill might be read as requiring the federal government to repair or maintain the road. This is important, Mr. Speaker, because my colleague will recall that the Forest Service testified that they are in no position to make any commitments to keep the road open, and because its condition is such as to raise serious safety problems and possibly even questions of liability, would the gentleman from Colorado agree that nothing in the bill would have the effect of requiring the United States to undertake any improvements of the road or to maintain any part of the road?

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, to the gentleman from American Samoa, the answer is yes.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, some parties have raised the question about ownership of the road right-of-way itself. Does the gentleman from Colorado agree that nothing in this bill would have the effect of lessening any property before the United States of that land or of limiting the ability of the Secretary to take legal action to assert those interests?

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman repeat the question.

□ 1515

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Does my colleague agree that nothing in this bill would have the effect of lessening any of the property interests of the United States in that land or of limiting the ability of the Secretary to take legal action to assert those interests?

Mr. MCINNIS. The answer to that is yes.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers at this time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS).

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, this is a very exciting day for me and for the people of the State of Colorado that the designation of the Spanish Peaks as a wilderness area is about to pass the House of Representatives. This bill has bipartisan support. This bill does something that we should have done a couple of years ago.

At the very beginning of my comments, I think it is appropriate to give credit to my former colleague, our former colleague, David Skaggs, who retired from Congress 2 years ago, I think. The gentleman put a lot of effort into the Spanish Peaks wilderness. I was privileged to work with David Skaggs for a period of several years on this legislation, and today I hope he is watching so he gets to see this pass.

I have got a lot of personal interest in the Spanish Peaks of Colorado. First a little description of the Spanish Peaks. There are two peaks, the east and west peak. These peaks were often used as guidance for the pioneers who settled in Colorado. When we see them against the Colorado horizon, they stand out against that beautiful blue sky. It really is an asset to the people of this country to have the Spanish Peaks. Now to take that movement to put the Spanish Peaks into a wilderness area is a designation that is well served.

Let me point out an issue that I think is very important. Number one, it is important for all who are watching today and my colleagues on the floor to understand that there are lots of different ways to manage public lands. Wilderness is not the only way to manage public lands. We have lots of tools out there.

For example, we have national parks, we have national forests, we have special areas. There are lots of different ways to manage public lands. The most restrictive and, therefore, the one we should utilize with the most caution is the wilderness designation.

How should we go about naming an area or designating an area as ''wilderness''? The first thing that I think fundamentally to the principle of wilderness is that we have got to have local input. We do not have an outside interest come in and dictate to the local people what they ought to do in that local community. We had a lot of local input.

This bill did not start with an outside interest. This bill did not start with some organization outside of the area. This bill started with the local people. I know a lot of those local people.

My great grandparents homesteaded down in that area in La Veta, Colorado, in the 1880s. I know those people down there, and they got together several years ago and they said, the Spanish Peaks at the very top where, by the way, Mr. Speaker, it does not affect water rights, which are absolutely crucial in the State of Colorado, the local people got together and said these are beautiful peaks. Let us manage a small part of the peaks, about 18,000 acres, as wilderness; and let us do it at the very top where it does not impact water rights, where it limits impact on private property.

I am a strong advocate of private property rights in this country. When this idea first came up, there was some conflict, there was some controversy. So did we look outside of the State of Colorado or even outside that area for advice or dictate on how we ought to resolve that controversy or that conflict? No. We sat down together; we sat down and we talked.

We have had a lot of able leadership through that community to come to a resolution that we are now seeing today about ready to pass the United States House of Representatives.

This bill will mark the Spanish Peaks as a wilderness for many, many, many centuries to come. And long after we are all gone, people will look back and say, the United States Congress, with these conditions and this particular area, made the right decision for wilderness.

A moment to comment about my colleague WAYNE ALLARD. Senator WAYNE ALLARD is also carrying this. He has put a lot of time into this effort. We have got a good team working. We have also had good support from the Colorado delegation. I would be remiss if I did not mention the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. HEFLEY), our senior Member from Colorado Springs; if I did not mention the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. SCHAFFER), if I did not mention the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TANCREDO), and the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE).

I should also mention the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. UDALL) who has spent a good deal of time since he has been elected to Congress to work specifically with me on making sure that the agreements that we have in place are being kept. He has been supportive. I know that that came up a little quicker today than we imagined, so he is not in our presence. He certainly would be here today, but he does support it. And his concerns I think are well protected.

But back to what I think is something all of us can be proud of, and that is, if my colleagues have the opportunity to go to Colorado, my district, the third congressional district is the highest district in the country in elevation and so on. It has got 56 mountains over 14,000 feet, and one of those Spanish Peaks goes over that 14,000. If my colleagues have an opportunity to go to Colorado, take a look at the Spanish Peaks. Understand the history of those mountains and what it means to the people of this country, what it means to the people of Huerfano County, what it means to the people of every county in the State of Colorado.

Today, a great moment for the State of Colorado. It is a great moment for this country. I am proud to be the sponsor of the Spanish Peaks Wilderness area.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Colorado for his eloquence and certainly for in a more specific way allowing Members of our body to understand the specifics of this legislation. I, too, would like to commend his former colleague and our good friend, the gentleman from Colorado, Mr. David Skaggs, for his cosponsorship originally of this legislation with my good friend from Colorado.

Mr. Speaker, since I do not have any additional speakers, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, could we have a time check?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD) has 12 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) has yielded back the balance.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS).

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, to my good colleagues on the other side, I would like to make a couple more comments. I do not have any other speakers. My colleague, although he has yielded back his time, if he would like me to yield time, I would be happy to.

Again, now that I know I have got a couple more minutes, let me be a little more exhaustive in my remarks about, number one, David Skaggs.

David came to me several years ago. As my colleagues know, David is a Democrat. I am a Republican. David and I have known each other for a long period of time. We worked together in the Colorado House of Representatives. At the time, I was the majority leader and he was the minority leader.

It was kind of fun to come back here in Congress and to be able to work on something that we completely agreed on and we had our hearts in. I wish David were here today, but I know that David will be at the dedication that we have of the Spanish Peaks down in southern Colorado when we dedicate that portion of the wilderness.

I also want to emphasize and talk for just a couple more minutes about wilderness and what is important about it. There is a philosophy out there or a thought out there that the only way to protect federal lands is to put them in wilderness. As I mentioned, earlier in my remarks, wilderness is the most restrictive and most inflexible management tool we have in our arsenal of tools to manage federal lands. Once we put an area into wilderness, it is in essence locked into that designation forever.

Now, it is true that Congress can overturn a wilderness designation, but for that politically to occur it would be next to impossible.

So before we designate wilderness, I think we, one, need to take our time and make sure that it meets all of the conditions for wilderness designation; number two, that we try to think into the future and try to come up with what might be the unintended consequences in putting that into wilderness instead of, say, a special area or some type of reserve or a conservation area or national park and so on.

Because the measure is so dramatic, we should manage a wilderness designation just like the former Congressman David Skaggs and myself and the Colorado delegation and my good colleague on the other side of the aisle have done, and that is we sat down and we met with the local community, we took the local input; we let most of the controversy be resolved at the local level; we put together legislation in a very open type of manner. We did not push this as a public relations type of campaign, going out and getting billboards for wilderness and things like that. This has a lot of substance to it. It has got a lot of study and a lot of energy into it. This is the way we ought to name wilderness bills that go through this Congress.

So once again, I thank my colleagues from the Colorado delegation. I thank my good colleague from the other side of the aisle. But more than anything else, I thank the people of America for allowing us to take care of the Spanish Peaks with this designation at the very top.

Every one of my colleagues, this vote they make today will be a vote that generations from now will look back and say, my grandpa and my grandma or my great grandpa or my great grandma voted yes for this.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCINNIS. I yield to the gentleman from American Samoa.

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I want to note, for the RECORD, if there is anything as a demonstration of my colleagues in this chamber, I would say that the delegation from Colorado, both Republican and Democrats, probably has displayed the highest example of what bipartisanship should be when it comes to this issue of wilderness legislation.

I want to commend the gentleman for being a part of that ability to give and take. Sometimes we get to be a little too extreme in our views and not be tolerable to the views of another Member, especially on an issue as important as wilderness area. So I commend and thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I too share the comments of the gentleman. We did not try to sneak minimum wage or the Republican tax cut in this bill. This bill was kept clean through the process. It is purely bipartisan, and we can all be very proud when the vote names the Spanish Peaks of Colorado as a wilderness.

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, as an original cosponsor of H.R. 898, I rise in support of this important bill to designate the Spanish Peaks as wilderness.

The mountains we call the Spanish Peaks are two volcanic peaks in Las Animas and Huerfano Counties. Their Native American name is Wayatoya. The eastern peak rises to 12,893 feet above sea level, and the summit of the western peak is at 13,626 feet.

These two peaks were landmarks for Native Americans and for some of Colorado's other early settlers and for travelers along the trail between Bent's Old Fort on the Arkansas River and Taos, New Mexico.

This part of the San Isabel National Forest has outstanding scenic, geologic, and wilderness values, including a spectacular system of more than 250 free-standing dikes and ramps of volcanic materials radiating from the peaks. These lands are striking for their beauty and are also very valuable for wildlife habitat.

Since 1977, the Spanish Peaks have been included on the National Registry of Natural Landmarks, and the State of Colorado has designated them as a natural area. The Forest Service first reviewed them for possible wilderness designation as part of its second roadless area review and evaluation and first recommended them for wilderness in 1979. However, the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1980 instead provided for their continued management as a wilderness study area—a status that was continued on an interim basis by the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993.

In short, Mr. Speaker, the Spanish Peaks are a very special part of Colorado. Their inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System has been too long delayed. In fact, I had hoped that designation of this area as wilderness would be completed last year. The House did pass a Spanish Peaks wilderness bill sponsored by my predecessor, Representative David Skaggs, and Representative MCINNIS after it was favorably reported by the Resources Committee. Unfortunately, the Senate did not act on that measure.

So, I am very appreciative of the persistence shown by Representative MCINNIS as well as the good work of Chairman YOUNG and Subcommittee Chairman CHENOWETH, and the leadership of Representative MILLER of California and the gentleman from Washington, Mr. SMITH. As a new Member of the Committee, I am very glad to have been able to work with them to bring us to where we are today with this bill.

This bill does differ from last year's Skaggs-McInnis bill in a few respects, and in particular by the exclusion from wilderness of an old road, known as the Bulls Eye Mine Road, and the inclusion of language related to that road.

Because some questions have been raised about the scope and effect of that language, contained in subsection 3(1), I thought it was important to provide a further explanation of how that subsection would or would not affect management of this area. Accordingly, I greatly appreciate the assistance of the gentleman from American Samoa in engaging my colleague from Colorado, Mr. MCINNIS, in a brief colloquy regarding that part of the bill. This colloquy is an important part of the legislative history of this bill.

As was mentioned earlier during debate on this bill, its passage is an appropriate step in recognition of the recent 35th anniversary of the enactment of the Wilderness Act. As a strong supporter of protecting wilderness—and particularly of protecting our wilderness areas in Colorado—I hope that this is only the first of several Colorado wilderness bills that will come before the House in the months ahead.

Already, the Resources Committee has approved a bill that, among other things, would

designate additional wilderness in the area of the Black Canyon of the Gunnison. And currently pending before the Committee are two wilderness bills I have introduced, dealing with the James Peak area and with lands within Rocky Mountain National Park, as well as a very important bill by our colleague Ms. DEGETTE that breaks important new ground in terms of protecting wilderness areas on public lands in Colorado managed by the Bureau of Land Management. In my opinion, all these measures deserve priority consideration in our Committee and here on the floor of the House.

Meanwhile, Mr. Speaker, I again thank both the gentleman from American Samoa and my colleague, Mr. MCINNIS, for their cooperation, and am glad to join in support of the Spanish Peaks Wilderness Act.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I have no more 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 Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R.898.

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.

## QUINEBAUG AND SHETUCKET RIVERS VALLEY NATIONAL HERITAGE CORRIDOR REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 1999

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1619) to amend the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley National Heritage Corridor Act of 1994 to expand the boundaries of the Corridor, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1619

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

***SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; REFERENCE.***

*(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley National Heritage Corridor Reauthorization Act of 1999''.*

*(b) REFERENCE.—Whenever in this Act a section or other provision is amended or repealed, such amendment or repeal shall be considered to be made to that section or other provision of the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley National Heritage Corridor Act of 1994 (Public Law 103–449; 16 U.S.C. 461 note).*

***SEC. 2. FINDINGS.***

*Section 102 of the Act is amended—*

*(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting ''and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts'' after ''State of Connecticut'';*

*(2) by striking paragraph (2) and redesignating paragraphs (3) through (9) as paragraphs (2) through (8), respectively; and*

*(3) in paragraph (3) (as so redesignated), by inserting ''New Haven,'' after ''Hartford,''.*

***SEC. 3. ESTABLISHMENT OF QUINEBAUG AND SHETUCKET RIVERS VALLEY NATIONAL HERITAGE CORRIDOR; PURPOSE.***

*(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Section 103(a) of the Act is amended by inserting ''and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts'' after ''State of Connecticut''.*

*(b) PURPOSE.—Section 103(b) of the Act is amended to read as follows:*

*''(b) PURPOSE.—It is the purpose of this title to provide assistance to the State of Connecticut and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, their units of local and regional government and citizens in the development and implementation of integrated natural, cultural, historic, scenic, recreational, land, and other resource management programs in order to retain, enhance, and interpret the significant features of the lands, water, structures, and history of the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley.''.*

***SEC. 4. BOUNDARIES AND ADMINISTRATION.***

*(a) BOUNDARIES.—Section 104(a) of the Act is amended—*

*(1) by inserting ''Union,'' after ''Thompson,''; and*

*(2) by inserting after ''Woodstock'' the following: ''in the State of Connecticut, and the towns of Brimfield, Charlton, Dudley, E. Brookfield, Holland, Oxford, Southbridge, Sturbridge, and Webster in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, which are contiguous areas in the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley, related by shared natural, cultural, historic, and scenic resources''.*

*(b) ADMINISTRATION.—Section 104 of the Act is amended by adding at the end the following:*

*''(b) ADMINISTRATION.—*

*''(1) IN GENERAL.—(A) The Corridor shall be managed by the management entity in accordance with the management plan, in consultation with the Governor and pursuant to a compact with the Secretary.*

*''(B) The management entity shall amend its by-laws to add the Governor of Connecticut (or the Governor's designee) and the Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts (or the Governor's designee) as a voting members of its Board of Directors.*

*''(C) The management entity shall provide the Governor with an annual report of its activities, programs, and projects. An annual report prepared for any other purpose shall satisfy the requirements of this paragraph.*

*''(2) COMPACT.—To carry out the purposes of this Act, the Secretary shall enter into a compact with the management entity. The compact shall include information relating to the objectives and management of the Corridor, including, but not limited to, each of the following:*

*''(A) A delineation of the boundaries of the Corridor.*

*''(B) A discussion of goals and objectives of the Corridor, including an explanation of the proposed approaches to accomplishing the goals set forth in the management plan.*

*''(C) A description of the role of the State of Connecticut and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.*

*''(3) AUTHORITIES OF MANAGEMENT ENTITY.—For the purpose of achieving the goals set forth in the management plan, the management entity may use Federal funds provided under this Act—*

*''(A) to make grants to the State of Connecticut and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, their political subdivisions, nonprofit organizations, and other persons;*

*''(B) to enter into cooperative agreements with or provide technical assistance to the State of Connecticut and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, their political subdivisions, nonprofit organizations, and other persons;*

*''(C) to hire and compensate staff; and*

*''(D) to contract for goods and services.*

*''(4) PROHIBITION ON ACQUISITION OF REAL PROPERTY.—The management entity may not use Federal funds received under this Act to acquire real property or any interest in real property.''.*

***SEC. 5. STATES CORRIDOR PLAN.***

*Section 105 of the Act is amended—*

*(1) by striking subsections (a) and (b);*

*(2) by redesignating subsection (c) as subsection (a);*

*(3) in subsection (a) (as so redesignated)—*

*(A) by striking the first sentence and all that follows through ''Governor,'' and inserting the following: ''The management entity shall implement the management plan. Upon request of the management entity,''; and*

*(B) in paragraph (5), by striking ''identified pursuant to the inventory required by section 5(a)(1)''; and*

*(4) by adding at the end the following:*

*''(b) GRANTS AND TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE.—For the purposes of implementing the management plan, the management entity may make grants or provide technical assistance to the State of Connecticut and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, their political subdivisions, nonprofit organizations, and other persons to further the goals set forth in the management plan.''.*

***SEC. 6. DUTIES OF THE SECRETARY.***

*Section 106 of the Act is amended—*

*(1) in subsection (a)—*

*(A) by striking ''Governor'' each place it appears and inserting ''management entity'';*

*(B) by striking ''preparation and''; and*

*(C) by adding at the end the following: ''Such assistance shall include providing funds authorized under section 109 and technical assistance necessary to carry out this Act.''; and*

*(2) by amending subsection (b) to read as follows:*

*''(b) TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.—The Secretary may not make any grants or provide any assistance under this Act after September 30, 2009.''.*

***SEC. 7. DUTIES OF OTHER FEDERAL AGENCIES.***

*Section 107 of the Act is amended by striking ''Governor'' and inserting ''management entity''.*

***SEC. 8. DEFINITIONS.***

*Section 108 of the Act is amended—*

*(1) in paragraph (1), by inserting before the period the following: ''and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts''.*

*(2) in paragraph (3), by inserting before the period the following: ''and the Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts'';*

*(3) in paragraph (5), by striking ''each of'' and all that follows and inserting the following: ''the Northeastern Connecticut Council of Governments, the Windham Regional Council of Governments, and the Southeastern Connecticut Council of Governments in Connecticut, (or their successors), and the Pioneer Valley Regional Planning Commission and the Southern Worcester County Regional Planning Commission (or their successors) in Massachusetts.''; and*

*(4) by adding at the end the following:*

*''(6) The term 'management plan' means the document approved by the Governor of the State of Connecticut on February 16, 1999, and adopted by the management entity, entitled 'Vision to Reality: A Management Plan', the management plan for the Corridor, as it may be amended or replaced from time to time.*

*''(7) The term 'management entity' means Quinebaug-Shetucket Heritage Corridor, Inc., a not-for-profit corporation (or its successor) incorporated in the State of Connecticut.''.*

***SEC. 9. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.***

*Section 109 of the Act is amended to read as follows:*

***''SEC. 109. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.***

*''(a) IN GENERAL.—There is authorized to be appropriated under this title not more than $1,000,000 for any fiscal year. Not more than a total of $10,000,000 may be appropriated for the Corridor under this title after the date of the enactment of the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley National Heritage Corridor Reauthorization Act of 1999.*

*''(b) 50 PERCENT MATCH.—Federal funding provided under this title may not exceed 50 percent of the total cost of any assistance or grant provided or authorized under this title.''.*

***SEC. 10. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.***

*(a) LONG TITLE.—The long title of the Act is amended to read as follows: ''An Act to establish the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley*

*National Heritage Corridor in the State of Connecticut and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, and for other purposes.''.*

*(b) HEADING.—The heading for section 110 of the Act is amended by striking ''**service**'' and inserting ''**system**''.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD) and the gentleman from American Samoa (Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA) each will control 20 minutes.

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

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

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 1619 amends the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers National Heritage Corridor Act of 1994 by expanding the boundaries of the Corridor.

Specifically, this bill authorizes the expansion of the Corridor into the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. The Corridor currently is wholly contained within the State of Connecticut. These river valleys contain significant natural and historical resources, including scenic vistas, archaeological sites, and recreational opportunity.

As a college student, I canoed down through this river. It is a beautiful river valley.

□ 1530

The bill, as amended, assures that both the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and the State of Connecticut remain involved in the management of the corridor. Furthermore, the legislation provides for a sunset of the funding and assistance from the Federal Government which may not exceed 50 percent of the total cost of that assistance or grant.

This bill has local and State support and is also supported by the administration. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1619, as amended.

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

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

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, I do want to commend first the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL) for their sponsorship of this legislation. I also want to commend the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) and the gentleman from Puerto Rico (Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ), the chairman and ranking member of the Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands, for their sponsorship and support of this legislation; and definitely both the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and the gentleman from California (Mr. GEORGE MILLER), the chairman and the ranking member of the full committee, for their support.

Mr. Speaker, the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley National Heritage Corridor is an 850-square-mile area, including more than 25 towns, along the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers in Northeastern Connecticut. The area includes lush woodlands, clean rivers and streams, as well as many historically and culturally significant sites. This corridor has been referred to as the ''last green valley'' in the area between Boston and Washington.

The 103rd Congress designated the area as a National Heritage Corridor. None of the land within the corridor is federally owned but the designation has allowed the National Park Service to provide important technical assistance, coordination and funding to what began, and has continued to be, a grassroots effort to preserve this area and to educate people about its importance.

Mr. Speaker, a management plan for the corridor, approved by the Governor of Connecticut, was adopted earlier this year and a private, nonprofit organization has been designated to implement the plan.

The bill, H.R. 1619, sponsored, as I said earlier, by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. GEJDENSON) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL) would reauthorize the corridor and extend its reach in the process. This legislation would add several counties in Massachusetts to the corridor and amend the original enabling legislation to reflect adoption of the management plan. Importantly, this measure was amended by the Committee on Resources to increase oversight of the corridor's management entity.

Mr. Speaker, creation of this heritage corridor has led to important educational and preservation efforts. It has worked so well, in fact, that another State now wants to be included. This bill, H.R. 1619, would allow more people to experience and benefit from the beauty and history of this area. Again, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. GEJDENSON. Mr. Speaker, as the sponsor of H.R. 1619 along with Congressman NEAL, I rise in strong support of this measure. I would like to begin by thanking Chairmen YOUNG and HANSEN and Ranking Members MILLER and ROMERO-BARCELÓ and their staffs for their support in moving this legislation through the Committee process. I truly appreciate their efforts.

The bill before us today represents a consensus reached between residents of Connecticut and Massachusetts to expand the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley National Heritage Corridor. The new communities in Massachusetts and Connecticut are linked to the existing 25 towns in the Corridor by geography, history, culture and, most importantly, the rivers they share.

The bill before us today has been slightly modified from the measure Congressman Neal an I introduced in late April. I am pleased to report that the amended version has the support of the National Park Service, the States of Connecticut and Massachusetts, the management authority and citizens in both states.

The bill expands the boundary of the Corridor to include Union, Connecticut and the towns of Brimfield, Charlton, Dudley, E. Brookfield, Holland, Oxford, Southbridge, Sturbridge, and Webster, Massachusetts. It designates a local, nonprofit entity—Quinebaug-Shetucket Heritage Corridor, Inc.—as the management entity. It provides a continuing role for the Governors of Connecticut and Massachusetts in Corridor management. Finally, the measure increases federal support for the Corridor.

I believe the increase in funding is reasonable. It would provide the necessary funds to expand programs into the new communities in Massachusetts and Connecticut. It would also bring the Quinebaug and Shetucket in line with other Corridors created since 1996. The National Park Service has also supported the increase in testimony before the subcommittee on Parks and Public Lands.

I want to note that this bill does not change the non-regulatory nature of the Corridor. Land use and zoning regulations will remain completely under the control of local governments. Moreover, the management entity does not have the authority to purchase land with federal funds. Land will remain in private hands and local residents will continue to chart the region's direction. The Corridor has always been, and continues to be, a mechanism for organizing many efforts to achieve common goals.

The Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers National Heritage Corridor is a nationally significant resource which deserves continued federal support. The Corridor has proven to be successful over the last four years in preserving cultural, natural and historic resources and in promoting to better understanding of the importance of this region to our country. Passing this legislation today will allow citizens in Connecticut and Massachusetts to build on this record of success.

I urge my colleagues would join me in voting in support of H.R. 1619.

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of an extremely worthwhile piece of legislation, the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley National Heritage Corridor Reauthorization Act of 1999, House Resolution 1619. H.R. 1619 expands the boundaries of this National Heritage Corridor by ten towns, nine of which are in my home state of Massachusetts. I'd also like to take this opportunity to thank Mr. GEJDENSON for his tireless efforts on behalf of this bill.

The Quinebaug and Shetucket region's history and significance begins with the Native Americans, as it was largely a frontier zone between tribes. European settlement began in the late 1650s, and the area soon became a center of fiscal, religious, and political radicalism. The Industrial Revolution began on a small scale here, with water powered textile structures on lesser streams and as a spillover from the adjoining Blackstone Valley. However, the latter half of the nineteenth century saw the construction of the great mills that characterize the valley. Staffed by immigrants from Europe and Canada, these factories were the region's prime economic engine.

However, the twentieth century brought steady declines of the textile industry, leaving many formerly busy mills empty or only marginally used. Thus, the region entered a long period of economic recession and the need to

develop a more diversified economy, a condition that brings us to the present day.

The region into which we wish to expand this Heritage Corridor is clearly both culturally and environmentally part of ''the Last Green Valley.'' The expansion area shares a history, a desire to protect resources and a view to economic revitalization. The mill towns and farmland offer residents and visitors a special view into the American experience and allow them to explore New England's agrarian and industrial past.

Environmental protection is one of the most important tasks facing the American people as we go forth into the new millennium. As such, the goal of this legislation is to develop and implement natural, cultural, historic, scenic, recreational, land and other resource management programs. The purpose is to retain and enhance the significant features of lands, water, structures, and history of the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley. The National Heritage Corridor designation allows local governments and grassroots organizations to carry out their visions for a healthier, more sustainable society. As always, the delicate balance between environmental protection and economic growth is at the heart of the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley National Heritage Corridor.

Since the authorization of the Quinebaug and Shetucket Rivers Valley National Heritage Corridor in 1994, the State of Connecticut, via the Quinebaug-Shetucket Heritage Corridor, Inc., has worked efficiently under a constrained budget by combining the financial resources of the public and private sectors. As a result, the economic aspect of the Corridor has been as successful as the environmental protection programs. The Corridor Commission has been able to match federal funds at a ratio of 12:1. The Commission and its partners have revitalized Industrial Revolution era mills, enhanced greenways and waterways, and have increased preservation of open space and wildlife habitats, resulting in an increase in tourism. The proximity of the Corridor to the major metropolitan areas of Springfield, Worcester, Boston, Hartford, Providence, and New York City serves as further evidence that this expansion is an economically viable venture.

In order to ensure that the projects selected reflect the needs and desires of the states, the Corridor Commission Board of Directors will include voting members from the offices of the Governors of Massachusetts and Connecticut. The Commission will also be linked to, and under the guidance of, the Secretary of the Interior via a compact.

Mr. Speaker, the most important people involved in the environmental and historical preservation process are the locals. These are the people involved in the actual work that our legislation authorizes. I would like my colleagues to understand that the local governments and local business along the Corridor are in overwhelming support of this legislation. I have received numerous calls from businessmen and women looking for ways to get involved and the Boards of Selectmen of the affected towns have been pressing the issue in their town halls. The people have spoken out and they are in favor of the Corridor Expansion.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to note that we in Massachusetts are not stepping on the toes of our Connecticut neighbors. The members of the Massachusetts State Heritage Corridor Commission have been working with their successful counterparts from Connecticut for a long time now. The two groups have come to an understanding and are looking forward to working together. In order for the Corridor Expansion to be a success, the experience of those on the Connecticut side must be utilized.

Mr. Speaker, once again I would like to thank Mr. GEJDENSON for all of his work, and I would like to thank the members of the Corridor Commission who have been the driving force behind this legislation.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHERWOOD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 1619, 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. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the six bills just considered.

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

There was no objection.

## SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING IMPORTANCE OF FAMILY FRIENDLY TELEVISION PROGRAMMING

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 184) expressing the sense of Congress regarding the importance of ''family friendly'' programming on television.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 184

Whereas American children and adolescents spend between 22 and 28 hours per week viewing television;

Whereas American homes have an average of 2.75 television sets, and 87 percent of homes with children have more than one television set;

Whereas there is a need to increase the availability programs suitable for the entire family during prime time viewing hours;

Whereas surveys of television content demonstrate that many programs contain substantial sexual or violent content;

Whereas although parents are ultimately responsible for appropriately supervising their children's television viewing, it is also important to provide positive, ''family friendly'' programming that is suitable for parents and children to watch together;

Whereas efforts should be made by television networks, studios, and the production community to produce more quality family friendly programs and to air them during times when parents and children are likely to be viewing together;

Whereas members of the Family Friendly Programming Forum are concerned about the availability of family friendly television programs during prime time viewing hours; and

Whereas Congress encourages activities by the Forum and other entities designed to promote family friendly programming, including—

(1) participating in meetings with leadership of major television networks, studios, and production companies to express concerns;

(2) expressing the importance of family friendly programming at industry conferences, meetings, and forums;

(3) honoring outstanding family friendly television programs with a new tribute, the Family Program Awards, to be held annually in Los Angeles, California;

(4) establishing a development fund to finance family friendly scripts; and

(5) underwriting scholarships at television studies departments at institutions of higher education to encourage student interest in family friendly programming: Now, therefore, be it

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

(1) recognizes and honors the efforts of the Family Friendly Programming Forum and other entities supporting family friendly programming;

(2) supports efforts to encourage television networks, studios, and the production community to produce more quality family friendly programs;

(3) supports the proposed Family Friendly Programming Awards, development fund, and scholarships, all of which are designed to encourage, recognize, and celebrate creative excellence in, and commitment to, family friendly programming; and

(4) encourages the media and American advertisers to further a family friendly television environment within which appropriate advertisements can accompany the programming.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on this legislation and insert extraneous material in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, the resolution before us today is also a statement on behalf of the Members of this body that we expect better television programming than perhaps what is being offered today to our children and our families to survive the ratings battle. The broadcast networks do spend a considerable amount of time trying to develop sound, family-friendly programming that consumers will watch. Unfortunately, all too often this type of

programming does not receive the high ratings necessary to keep those series on the air. This is unfortunate, but the networks should not give up hope or stop trying to improve the quality of their TV offerings.

I am pleased that the House today has an opportunity to consider H. Con. Res. 184. I am hopeful that the other body will soon offer a companion resolution. I would also like to acknowledge the leadership of the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) for bringing this issue to the attention of the Committee on Commerce. I am also hopeful that the Committee on Commerce members will have an opportunity to consider the impact of media outlets on the culture of the Nation in the near future.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN).

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding and for all the effort he has put into this and for coming to the floor today to support it. I would also like to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BLILEY), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. DINGELL) and the Committee on Commerce staff for allowing us to have this resolution come to the floor today in an expedited manner.

Mr. Speaker, I was pleased to join with the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) to introduce House Concurrent Resolution 184. The resolution is pretty straightforward. It recognizes the importance, as the gentleman from Michigan has said, of family-friendly television programming and the specific contributions of a new group called the Family Friendly Programming Forum and the efforts they are undertaking to make this goal a reality.

Recent events have intensified a national debate on child development and particularly the influence of popular culture on our children. We cannot overlook the important role that television plays in shaping the attitudes and the outlook of our Nation's young people. Studies show that on average children will watch between 22 and 28 hours of television every week which in many cases, Mr. Speaker, is about the same amount of time they spend in school.

And television is not only a powerful influence, unfortunately it is too often a negative one. Let us be clear. Parents should always have the final responsibility for regulating their children's viewing habits. But the simple fact remains that the number of family-friendly programs available, particularly during prime time, has been declining. Parents are looking for more programs that are appropriate for them to watch together with their children.

This resolution specifically supports the work of the Forum, an organization of 33 of the Nation's very largest advertisers who have recognized this unmet need in the marketplace.

The argument is sometimes made that family-friendly programs do not draw big ratings, that advertisers will not support them and that, therefore, networks cannot afford to carry them. The work of the Family Friendly Programming Forum is changing this perception. The major advertisers who are members of the Forum are taking specific steps, including a new annual awards program that recognizes excellence in family-friendly programming, the first of which took place in Beverly Hills, California just last week. The Forum is also making a financial commitment. It has established a development fund to finance family-friendly scripts. It is underwriting university scholarships to encourage students' interest in writing family-friendly programming. The Forum is also conducting a series of public awareness events, campaigns around the country, to encourage families to seek out new options during prime time.

Mr. Speaker, family-friendly does not mean dull. Good programming over the years, such as the 1999 Family Friendly Programming Forum Lifetime Achievement award winner ''The Cosby Show'' and the long-running ''Home Improvement'' demonstrates that television programming can be both appropriate and enjoyable for the entire family and very successful. There is a market for good programming of this type. Frankly, the statement made by the advertising community through this forum about their interest in this kind of programming is to me very significant.

Mr. Speaker, as a father of three, I am all too well aware of the powerful influence that television programming can have on our kids and the need for more programming we can enjoy as a family. While Congress cannot and should not tell the television networks what programming to air, we can and should support efforts like the Forum's constructive, free market approach to promoting family-friendly television. That is what this resolution is all about. By passing it at the beginning of the school year as we are doing, we as a Congress are making an important statement about the need for more suitable programming on our Nation's airwaves for all Americans.

I commend the Family Friendly Programming Forum and the goals they are advancing. I urge adoption of House Concurrent Resolution 184.

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

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

I begin by complimenting, praising the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), who is the principal author of this resolution. I thank him for asking me to be his coauthor. This is without question an important statement for the Congress to make. After all, we do spend a considerable amount of time here in Congress criticizing the impact which the media have upon the culture of our country, especially as it impacts the children in our society, so I think that as the Family Friendly Programming Forum begins a process of trying to encourage positive, family-friendly television, that we should praise them.

This resolution does four things: First, it recognizes and it honors the efforts of the Family Friendly Programming Forum and other entities supporting family-friendly programming. Secondly, it supports efforts to encourage television networks, studios and production communities to produce more quality family-friendly programs. Third, it supports the proposed Family Friendly Programming Awards, development fund, and scholarships, all of which are designed to encourage, recognize and celebrate creative excellence in, and commitment to, family-friendly programming. And, fourth, it encourages the media and American advertisers to further a family-friendly television environment within which an appropriate advertisement campaign can accompany the appropriate programming.

Now, this Family Friendly Programming Forum is a project of the National Association of Advertisers, which includes some of our Nation's largest companies: General Motors, Procter & Gamble, Wendy's, Coca-Cola, Bell Atlantic, Gillette and others. These companies are the life's blood of free, over-the-air television, because, of course, without advertising from these large companies, there can be no television because there would be no advertising that the networks would use in order to fund the production of programs that are run on every single community in our country. These network ads are critically important to the cable industry and to the satellite industry as well, and as a result they have tremendous leverage over the television industry in general, whether it be broadcast, cable or satellite. And so we should all applaud this effort.

The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) has, I think, done an enormous favor to each of us in bringing this resolution out because it will give us a chance to go on record in support of the kinds of initiatives that we would like to see large American corporations undertake to use their leverage in order to stem the trend towards more sex, more violence, lowering of standards, increasing the tsunami of words and images that assault the minds of young children in our country.

Now, this is a huge breakthrough. Back in 1993, I attempted to have a hearing on this issue, inviting the largest advertisers to come to Congress to discuss it. At the time, only AT&T was willing to come forward to discuss a strategy by which these largest corporations would advance this kind of a cause. So it is heartening indeed to see this broad coalition today come together. I think that the more that we come to realize that these advertisers have this clout as the broadcasters attempt to attract large audiences in influencing the kind of programming that is played on the air, that we are

going to have the kind of influence that we would like to see, and, as the gentleman from Ohio said, private sector initiated, advertisers pressuring, encouraging broadcasters to do the right thing, because they, that is, those advertisers, want to be associated with the right thing, with that kind of programming.

□ 1545

As the Family Friendly Forum states in their mission statement: we support a wide range of programming options, and we will continue to advertise on shows that appeal to different target audiences, but we want to ensure the existence of a family-friendly television environment, particularly in the early evening time period.

And most importantly, they are establishing a development fund to finance TV scripts, underwriting scholarships for students interested in exploring family-friendly programming, and granting awards for excellence in this area. They held their first awards ceremony just last Thursday, as the gentleman from Ohio pointed out. It is something that should be applauded and encouraged.

The WB Network has already taken up the challenge. In August, WB CEO Jamie Kellner and Andrea Alstrup, vice president of advertising for Johnson & Johnson, on behalf of the Forum agreed to identify writers to produce new scripts that will entertain and engage family audiences.

As my colleagues know, the V-Chip is an important device to have built into TV sets, and by the beginning of next year, that is, January of the year 2000, every television set that is sold in the United States will have a V-chip built into it. We sell 25 million TV sets a year in the United States. But the V-chip is really only a way by which parents, in programming it, can block out the programming they do not want their children to be exposed to. In no way can the V-Chip put good programming on the air.

What is happening here, what is being encouraged by the advertisers of the United States, is encouragement given to the networks, to the cable industry, to the satellite industry to put good programming on that parents can sit their children down in front of with the parent sitting there with them and watch as a family. It is something that should be encouraged. It is something that this resolution, I think, correctly identifies as just the kind of trend that we should be encouraging here in the Congress.

I want to again congratulate my friend from Ohio.

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

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. METCALF).

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time. I rise in support of this resolution. I have long been an advocate for more family-friendly programming on television. American children spend much of their time each week in front of a TV, and it is important that at least some of the programs available to them are devoid of the gratuitous sex and violence that so frequently pollute prime TV. I really believe the sponsors should not be allowed their advertising deduction when they sponsor programming which is clearly over the line for family audiences. We in the House should be encouraging the television industry to clean up its act, and I am happy to support this resolution today.

Again, I thank the gentleman for having yielded this time to me.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution because it encourages TV networks, studios, and the production community to produce more quality family programs. In a time of extreme violence and graphic situations on television, I am proud to support this measure. We need to encourage any voluntary efforts by the entertainment industry to clean up prime time TV.

Traditionally, prime time television was concentrated in the early portion of the evening TV schedule—7 or 8 pm. During this time, families would watch television together, usually with dinner or shortly thereafter while the children were still awake. The programming that was aired during these hours focused on the family unit.

Recently, this trend has changed dramatically. Most of the networks do not air any family programming at this time, or such programming has been limited to certain nights of the week, such as Sunday. Gone are the days of an entire family sitting around the television set.

The traditional family programming has been replaced with violence, sexual situations and profanity. Thankfully, the industry's internal system of checks and balances has weighed heavily in favor of the family's return to prime time.

The Family Friendly Programming Forum, established this year by 30 advertisers, encourages the networks to develop family friendly programming for families to view together. In addition to encouraging more family friendly programming through advertising revenues, the Forum will establish a special fund to finance scripts written for such programming.

The Forum will also establish a scholarship program to encourage student interest in family friendly programming. Such efforts will send a powerful message to television producers, network executives and other advertisers that consumers deserve better programming for their families and that advertisers will be more selective in sponsoring certain programs.

I support this effort because families deserve to have a time to sit and watch television together. Parents should ultimately maintain control over the television and what programs are acceptable in the home, but the networks do have some responsibility to promote a more positive alternative to the sex and violence currently seen in prime time.

Advertisers are in the unique position to provide that internal check—advertising dollars that can send the message that parents want more programming geared for family viewing. I strongly support internal industry checks on television content and I support the efforts of the Family Friendly Programming Forum. I urge my Colleagues to support this resolution.

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, I do not have any further speakers, so I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I have no additional requests for time either, so I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H.Con.Res. 184.

The question was taken.

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

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

## UNITED STATES PARTICIPATION IN THE UNITED NATIONS— 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:*

I am pleased to transmit herewith a report of the activities of the United Nations and of the participation of the United States therein during the calendar year 1998. The report is required by the United Nations Participation Act (Public Law 79–264; 22 U.S.C. 287b).

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *September 13, 1999.*

## APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 1906, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table 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, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I will not object, but I do want to take this time simply to point out that the minority was not told until a very few minutes ago that these motions were going to be made at

this time today. We are in the situation where several of our ranking subcommittee members are not on the floor because they did not know this motion was going to be made. I do not think it is quite fair to them to proceed under this kind of a situation.

I recognize it is not the fault of the gentleman from New Mexico, so I will not object; and we have no interest in delaying the action of the House, but I would simply ask that in the future, action be taken to make certain that the minority is made aware in a timely fashion of the intent to make these motions at a time so that we can be prepared as quickly as possible in making the correct motions.

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

□ 1600

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, I share the same approach that the gentleman has because we were given the word at exactly about the same time that he had it. Thank God the word finally got here, but it certainly puts a lot of folks in a position of not knowing that it was coming on the floor.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments. I would simply say to the leadership of the House, we are trying to be cooperative on this committee on both sides. It is pretty hard to cooperate if we don't have prior notice.

The gentleman has indicated he hasn't had that notice either, and I think that's equally unfortunate.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOLEY). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. OBEY moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the House and Senate on H.R. 1906, Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies Appropriations for FY 2000, be instructed to provide maximum funding, within the scope of conference, for food safety programs at the Department of Agriculture and the Food and Drug Administration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), and the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. SKEEN) each will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

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

Mr. Speaker, I will not take very long. The situation is very simple. The House bill is $15 million above the Senate bill for the Department of Agriculture's food and safety inspection service programs, and it is $5 million above the Senate bill for FDA food safety initiatives. We believe the public has a right to have total confidence in the safety of its food supply. It certainly, in some instances unfortunately, does not have that to date. We think that the numbers in the bill will be at least minimally affected in increasing our ability to assure a safe food supply for the American public and would urge, therefore, that the conferees be instructed to provide the higher of the two numbers in each account in order to do the maximum that is allowable under rules, given the difference in scope between the two bills, to assure that food safety is the highest priority in the bill as it comes back from conference.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the gentleman that I support his effort and have no quarrel whatever with the work. I think this is the time that we should work toward the goal of taking care of the matters attendant to the field of agriculture, and to get it done as quickly as possible because it has been sitting there fermenting for quite some time.

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

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will name the conferees at a later time.

## THE REASON FOR CONFUSION IN THE HOUSE

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

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, in case people are wondering what is happening here, why the House looks so disorganized, it is for the following reason: Those of us on the Minority on the Appropriations Committee have been working with the Majority on the committee all today under the assumption that we would have a common understanding about what the schedule would be for the remainder of the day, and we had expected one and perhaps at most two motions would be made to go to conference on appropriation bills.

We were trying to cooperate with the Majority in making sure that that went smoothly on the matters that we understood might come before us. Then what happened is that evidently the House leadership decided it wanted to make a unilateral decision to have motions on five different appropriation bills. The problem is that the Majority on the Committee on Appropriations did not know that that was going to happen and neither did the Minority. In my view, that is a lousy way to run a railroad. The House is running around here now looking confused because it is confused.

It just seems to me that there is no particular purpose to be served in rushing to conference on these bills when neither side even understood that we were going to be doing that. I am still trying to cooperate under these circumstances, but I would ask the House leadership that if we cannot do this in an orderly fashion for some of the remaining bills that we simply deal with it tomorrow morning, if we run out of bills that we can handle in a rational fashion, because otherwise we are simply stumbling around here. And in the process, we will be denying Members the opportunity to debate questions which I know Members wanted to debate on at least two of the bills that are coming up today.

Members did not know this would be happening before they got back, and I think the leadership has an obligation to avoid situations like that.

## RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 8 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1700

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS) at 5 p.m.

## APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2605, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2605) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. VISCLOSKY

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. VISCLOSKY moves that in resolving the difference between the House and Senate, the

managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill H.R. 2605, be instructed to insist on the higher funding levels for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Civil Works program included in the House-passed bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) and the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD) each will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY).

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

Mr. Speaker, I bring this motion to instruct conferees to the House floor today and would argue four points on its behalf.

First of all, I again would want to compliment the gentleman from California (Mr. PACKARD) and the staff on both sides and members of the subcommittee because I think we in the House have put together a very good work product. I would hope that we collectively in the House could protect our prerogatives during the conference.

I would, first of all, point out as far as water projects that are important as far as the economic viability and future of this country, as well as to individual Members and their constituencies, our figure is $454 million over the Senate figure.

Because of the misallocation between the two bodies, there is a $1.2 billion difference between the House and Senate versions. And, essentially, if we factor that $400 million in, the differential as far as protecting Members' interest is about 1.6. So I think it is very important that we make the point today to the other body that we want to hold firm to protect the economic infrastructure of this country and Members' prerogatives.

Secondly, since this House passed the bill to the other body, the Water Resources and Development Act has been signed into law and that has placed even more demand as far as the limited resources we have.

The third point I would make is that, even with the higher water figure in the House, we are $320 million under what the Corps' capability is if we would fund all of the Corps' capability and projects on the boards.

Those include such important economic improvement such as harbor dredging, commercial and navigation as far as our economic infrastructure, including flood control to prevent the loss of life and property damage. It includes environmental restoration. And we have some major projects in the proposal of the beach nourishment. We recently had tropical storms and hurricanes devastate portions of the United States.

Finally, the important issue of water supply. I would close this portion of my remarks by simply saying again, given the misallocation and higher allocation with the other body, given their preponderance to oversubscribe for Department of Energy programs, I would want to protect the prerogatives of this institution.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) has made I think very substantive points on his motion, and I support his motion without exception to instruct conferees.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY).

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. PACKARD, ROGERS, KNOLLENBERG, FRELINGHUYSEN, CALLAHAN, LATHAM, BLUNT, YOUNG of Florida, VISCLOSKY, EDWARDS, PASTOR, FORBES, and Mr. OBEY.

There was no objection.

## APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2561, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2561) making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. OBEY moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill, H.R. 2561, be instructed to insist on:

Section 8113 of the House bill providing $50,000,000 to enhance United States defense capabilities against domestic terrorist attacks using weapons of mass destruction, and on Section 8114 of the House bill providing $150,000,000 to improve the protection of Department of Defense computer systems from non-authorized access.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the gentleman from California (Mr. LEWIS) each will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

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

Mr. Speaker, I did not expect to be here alone on this question today. I regret that because of the surprise nature of the consideration of these issues that the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) was not able to be here to deal with the agriculture bill that was brought before us.

The gentleman from New York (Mr. SERRANO) had no notice either of the intention of the House to deal with the State, Justice, Commerce bill. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MURTHA) is in the same situation with respect to the Defense appropriations bill.

Let me say that this motion to instruct is very simple. It asks the Congress to think about the kind of threats that we will face in the future, not the kind of threats that we have faced in the past. We must be mindful of the latter, but we must be even more alert to the former.

It seems to me that we have to recognize the fact that one of the largest dangers to our security interests over coming years will be a threat that comes from potential terrorist attacks using chemical and biological and other different kinds of weapons that are traditionally thought of when one thinks of war.

As we move more and more into an electronics age, as we are more and more both aided by and imprisoned by computers, we need to recognize the fact that there is a substantial security risk to this country on the part of persons who can weave their way into our own computers, not just at DOD but other agencies across Government.

So this motion simply asks that the higher amounts that are within scope in the conference on these items be approved so that we do whatever it is possible to do to the maximum given the nature of the bills before us to enhance our security against terrorist attacks and to enhance our ability to defend against computer hackers.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I would say to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) that he is never here on the floor alone when he and I have an opportunity to work on behalf of the American public together.

In the meantime, the motion of the gentleman is a good one. It is not controversial. We are pleased to accept it on our sides.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct

offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. LEWIS of California, YOUNG of Florida, SKEEN, HOBSON, BONILLA, NETHERCUTT, ISTOOK, CUNNINGHAM, DICKEY, FRELINGHUYSEN, MURTHA, DICKS, SABO, DIXON, VISCLOSKY, MORAN of Virginia, and Mr. OBEY.

There was no objection.

## APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2670, DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 2670) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

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

There was no objection.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to instruct conferees.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. OBEY moves that in resolving the difference between the House and Senate, the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill H.R. 2670, be instructed to insist on the higher funding levels for programs related to embassy security included in the House-passed bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) each will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

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

Mr. Speaker, what is at issue here is what level of funding we ought to provide to do our dead-level best to provide security arrangements for our various embassies around the world. As we very well know, we have had a number of terrorist attacks against those embassies. Many people in our society have a tendency to dismiss State Department officials as being ''stripe pants boys.'' But the fact is that many of them have lost their lives promoting U.S. interests around the world and a number of those lives have been lost in terrorist attacks.

I find it somewhat interesting that the administration seems to be in a position where they are damned if you do and damned if they do not in terms of embassy security.

I remember earlier in the year the House committee held a hearing and at that point demanded that the administration support a higher level of funding for embassy security. The administration requested an additional $314 million in this bill, and the House committee approved $314 million. But then when it got to the Senate, the Senate cut back that number to $110 million.

In my view, the House number is correct. The purpose of this motion is to send a clear signal that the House would prefer to fund the highest level possible given what the spread of the difference is between the House and the Senate on this issue.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I will be brief. This is a motion that we can agree to. It is not controversial, at least on this side of the Capitol. It may be when we reach the other body.

But the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) is correct. After the embassy bombings in Africa, the administration made announcements that they were going to pursue embassy security around the world in a much more vigorous way, something that we agree with here in this subcommittee and I think the full Congress.

□ 1715

But then when the administration sent their budget to the Hill, we looked very quickly to the section dealing with embassy security and maintenance of U.S. missions abroad, and found that there was an absolutely inadequate request. When the Secretary came to testify before the subcommittee, the request, I think, was for $36 million. We told the Secretary that the request was absolutely inadequate, that we had to pay attention to the problems that were being presented to us around the world in the way of threats to our personnel, and we asked her to go back to the White House and to come up with an amended request.

In due course of time, they did just that. And so the request, then, from the administration was amended. They requested an additional $264 million, for a total of $300 million for a security capital construction program. And that is exactly the dollar figure that the subcommittee, the full committee and now the full House included in this appropriation bill. The Senate bill is at $36 million for this program. That is the original request level. The Crowe Commission, named for Admiral Crowe who headed it up, dealing with embassy security, had called for a major investment in new secure embassy facilities. That followed on the heels of many other requests by various commissions down through the years. And so we stand ready to pursue the full House figure. We hope we can convince our colleagues across the Capitol that this level of funding is necessary.

I commend the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY) for bringing the matter to the attention of the body, and it is a matter that we can fully agree upon. I urge the adoption of the motion.

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

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

I would simply say in closing that I think this is one point on which there is no difference of opinion between the administration and the House on either side of the aisle in the House. I do think if I were the administration, I would be hard-pressed to follow the conflicting instructions that seem to be coming from the two congressional bodies, with the Senate going in one direction and the House in another, but I think they are going in the right direction on this item with their amended request. I think the House agrees with that. I think this motion to instruct will make it clear to the Senate that we believe they ought to back off and accept the higher number now contained in the administration request.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY).

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. ROGERS, KOLBE, TAYLOR of North Carolina, REGULA, LATHAM, MILLER of Florida, WAMP, YOUNG of Florida, SERRANO, DIXON, MOLLOHAN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD and Mr. OBEY.

There was no objection.

## APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 1906, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees on 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: Messrs. SKEEN, WALSH, DICKEY, KINGSTON, NETHERCUTT, BONILLA, LATHAM, Mrs. EMERSON, MR. YOUNG of Florida, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. DELAURO, and Messrs. HINCHEY, FARR, BOYD and OBEY.

There was no objection.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until approximately 6 p.m.

□ 1802

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS) at 6 o'clock and 2 minutes p.m.

## MOTION TO CLOSE CONFERENCE COMMITTEE MEETINGS ON H.R. 2561, DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000, WHEN CLASSIFIED NATIONAL SECURITY IS UNDER CONSIDERATION

Mr. LEWIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LEWIS of California moves, pursuant to rule XXII, clause 12 of the House rules, that the conference meetings between the House and the Senate on the bill H.R. 2561, making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2000, and for other purposes, be closed to the public at such times as classified national security information is under consideration; provided, however, that any sitting Member of Congress shall have a right to attend any closed or open meeting.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule XXII, this motion is nondebatable and must be taken by the yeas and nays.

Members are advised that this vote will be followed by a 15-minute vote and a 5-minute vote on suspensions considered earlier today.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 388, nays 7, not voting 38, as follows:

[Roll No. 405]

YEAS—388

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

NAYS—7

DeFazio
Gutierrez
Hilliard
Kucinich
Lee
McKinney
Stark

NOT VOTING—38

Barcia
Brown (FL)
Buyer
Carson
Clay
Dooley
Ehlers
Gephardt
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hulshof
Jefferson
Johnson, Sam
Kasich
Kingston
Lantos
Largent
Linder
Manzullo
McCarthy (MO)
McCrery
McIntosh
Meeks (NY)
Moakley
Neal
Porter
Pryce (OH)
Rogan
Ros-Lehtinen
Scarborough
Serrano
Shaw
Shuster
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Whitfield
Wicker
Wu

□ 1827

Mr. HILL of Indiana changed his vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 405, I missed the vote due to flight delays on two successive United Airlines flights. Had I been present, I would have voted ''yea.''

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 405. The motion to close proceedings on H.R. 2561, I was unavoidably detained on Midwest Express. Had I been present, I would have voted ''aye''.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). 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. 658, de novo; and House Concurrent Resolution 184, de novo.

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

## THOMAS COLE NATIONAL HISTORIC SITE ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 658, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The question was taken.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 396, noes 6, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 406]

AYES—396

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

NOES—6

Chenoweth
Coble
Paul
Royce
Sanford
Sensenbrenner

NOT VOTING—31

Barcia
Bliley
Brown (FL)
Carson
Clay
Dooley
Gephardt
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hulshof
Jefferson
Johnson, Sam
Kingston
Lantos
Largent
Manzullo
McCrery
McIntosh
Moakley
Neal
Porter
Pryce (OH)
Rogan
Ros-Lehtinen
Scarborough
Serrano
Shaw
Shuster
Taylor (NC)
Wicker
Wu

□ 1846

Mr. SENSENBRENNER changed his vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). 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 may be taken on the additional motion to suspend the rules on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

## SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING IMPORTANCE OF FAMILY FRIENDLY TELEVISION PROGRAMMING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 184.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 184.

The question was taken.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. PORTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 396, noes 0, not voting 37, as follows:

[Roll No. 407]

AYES—396

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Andrews
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baird
Baker
Baldacci
Baldwin
Ballenger
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Biggert
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Bono
Borski
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Cannon
Capps
Capuano
Cardin
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Collins
Combest
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Costello
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crane
Crowley
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (IL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
DeMint
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Dunn
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Fletcher
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gibbons
Gilchrest
Gillmor
Gilman
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green (TX)
Green (WI)
Greenwood
Gutierrez
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Hayworth
Hefley
Herger
Hill (IN)
Hill (MT)
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoeffel
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hunter
Hutchinson
Hyde
Inslee
Isakson
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kleczka
Klink
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
Kuykendall
LaFalce
LaHood
Lampson
Larson
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas (KY)
Lucas (OK)
Luther
Maloney (CT)

Maloney (NY)
Markey
Martinez
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McInnis
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
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
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ose
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Phelps
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Portman
Price (NC)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reyes
Reynolds
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Rothman
Royce
Rush
Ryan (WI)
Ryun (KS)
Sabo
Salmon
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sanford
Sawyer
Saxton
Schaffer
Schakowsky
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Sherman
Sherwood
Shimkus
Shows
Simpson
Sisisky
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Souder
Spence
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Strickland
Stump
Stupak
Sununu
Sweeney
Talent
Tancredo
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (MS)
Terry
Thomas
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Toomey
Towns
Traficant
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Vitter
Walden
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
Whitfield
Wilson
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—37

Barcia
Bliley
Brown (FL)
Carson
Clay
Dooley
Gephardt
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hulshof
Jefferson
Johnson, Sam
Kingston
Lantos
Largent
Manzullo
McCrery
Meehan
Moakley
Neal
Ortiz
Porter
Pryce (OH)
Rogan
Ros-Lehtinen
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Scarborough
Serrano
Shaw
Shuster
Spratt
Taylor (NC)
Weiner
Wicker
Wu
Wynn

□ 1856

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, due to the threat of Hurricane Floyd to South Florida I found it necessary to stay in my district to attend to the needs of my constituents. However, I wish to be recorded as a ''yes'' vote on the motion to close the conference on H.R. 2561, the Fiscal Year 2000 Defense Appropriations bill due to national security reasons. I also wish to be recorded as a ''yes'' vote on H. Con. Res. 184 and H.R. 658.

## 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.

## ENHANCING INFRASTRUCTURE

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

Mr. METCALF. Mr. Speaker, citizens chronically complain about the state of America's public capital, about dilapidated school buildings, condemned highway bridges, contaminated water supplies, and other shortcomings of the public infrastructure.

In addition to inflicting inconvenience and endangering health, the inadequacy of public infrastructure adversely affects productivity and the growth of our economy. Public investment, private investment, and productivity are intimately linked.

For more than two decades, Washington has retreated from public investment as the costs of entitlements and of the interest payable on rapidly rising debt have mounted.

State and local governments, albeit to a lesser extent, have also slowed investments. Their taxpayers were frequently reluctant to approve bond issues to finance the infrastructure.

Whereas, in the early 1970s, non-defense public investment accounted for 3.2 percent of GDP, it now accounts for only 2.5 percent. That is a huge loss. Widespread neglect of maintenance has contributed substantially to the failure of the stock of public capital assets to keep pace with the Nation's needs.

□ 1900

For instance, the real nondefense public capital stock expanded in the past two decades at a pace only half that set earlier in the post-World War II period.

Evidence of failures to maintain and improve infrastructure is seen every day in such problems as unsafe bridges, urban decay, dilapidated and overcrowded schools, and inadequate airports. A General Accounting Office study finds that education is seriously handicapped by deteriorating school buildings and that an investment of $110 billion is needed to bring them up to minimally acceptable.

The problems take a toll in less visible and perhaps even more important ways, in unsatisfactory gains in private sector productivity and a diminished rise in real income for the Nation at large. Seemingly endless traffic jams, disruptions to commuter service and backed-up airport runways, everyday experiences for Americans, spell waste and inefficiency for the economy at large. Congestion on the Nation's highways alone costs the Nation over $100 billion a year according to the Competitiveness Policy Council estimate. That estimate does not include the cost of added pollution and the wear and tear on vehicles.

This legislation is designed to help the Nation take a significant step both toward overcoming its infrastructure debt and promoting the productivity needed to meet the competitive challenges of the 21st century.

The plan is fiscally sound. It follows the best accounting procedures of the private sector and is designed to recognize the statutes that mandate a balanced Federal budget. In salient ways, it advances sound fiscal operation. The plan would provide $50 billion a year for mortgage loans to State and local governments for capital investment in types of projects specified by Congress and the President. These mortgage loans would be at zero interest. They would thereby cut the overall cost of projects about in half, depending on the prevailing interest rates, for State and local taxpayers.

We have a plan, the opportunity to rebuild and maintain our infrastructure for the 21st century. By using an innovative and logical approach to sound public financing without debt and without huge interest payments.

## IMMIGRATION RESTRUCTURING AND ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 1999

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

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to talk about the Immigration Restructuring and Accountability Act of 1999 that I have offered along with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), the gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN) and others.

Partly this discussion this evening is prompted by a very effective hearing, field hearing, that was held today that I just came from in Chicago, Illinois, called by the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HYDE) and attended by the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH) and myself, the ranking Democrat on the Subcommittee on Immigration and Claims of the House Committee on the Judiciary.

What I was most struck by is the consensus of all those who had gathered that this is a Nation of laws but it is also a Nation of immigrants. We all have come from somewhere. And we all stand willing and waiting, if you will, to be patriotic and to love this country if given the opportunity. In fact, one of the statements made by the witnesses was that many immigrants and most of them come to this land for a better way of life. We heard testimony from

very outstanding members of the Illinois delegation, Democrats and Republicans, we heard testimony from district constituency workers of Members of Congress, Democrats and Republicans, and we heard testimony from the INS regional director. Sadly, however, much of the commentary was about the ills of the INS, the difficulties in getting service, the difficulties in getting the right answers, the difficulties in the timeliness of the responses, the long lines. I was very gratified to hear by the INS regional director, however, that he was struck by these complaints, and of course, had been working over the last couple of months to remedy the concerns that had been expressed. He offered on behalf of his staff a genuine interest to work with congressional offices but most importantly to do the taxpayers' business, and, that is, to do the very best task that he might be able to do.

I believe, however, that he needs additional assistance. And one of the points that was made is that we should not throw money, good money, if you will, after bad. We should not throw money at a problem and yet not be able to fix its very infrastructure. And so the Immigration Restructuring and Accountability Act of 1999, I believe, offers real reform.

Americans, I think, in their heart of hearts appreciate the fact that this is a Nation that welcomes immigrants in order to have a better way of life. We realize that we support and our Constitution and our laws support legal immigration, not illegal immigration. In order to do that, we must encourage those who seek to go through the processes, the legal processes, we must expedite that process, we must not penalize and be punitive, we must not be negative, we must not characterize immigrants as people who are taking and not giving, deadbeats who are not willing to contribute to this society. I could list a whole litany of contributions that immigrants throughout the years and ages have given to this Nation. And all of us stand in a position that we can claim some contribution to this Nation.

The Immigration Restructuring and Accountability Act of 1999 does several things. We restructure and reorganize the immigration function within the Department of Justice through the creation of a fair, effective and efficient National Immigration Bureau, the NIB. Such a bureau is urgently needed, given both the importance of this entity's mission, the hundreds of thousands of people, of family members who are already citizens within this country and in the international community and the size of the agency which is larger than five current Cabinet agencies. We need to establish the INS not as an agency but as a bureau to separate the enforcement and adjudication functions of the Federal immigration function. The goal of such separation is to lead to more clarity of mission and greater accountability which in turn will lead to more efficient adjudications and more accountable, consistent, effective and professional enforcement to create strong centralized leadership for integrated policymaking and implementation.

Coordination is a key. In order to fulfill this new agency's important responsibilities, a single voice is needed at the top to coordinate policy matters and interpret complex laws in both enforcement and adjudications. We must also emphasize that the INS, now named INS, I hope the NIB, key goal is service. There is an enforcement responsibility and we all know the tragedy of the Resendez-Ramirez case, the alleged serial killer, we want to end that as well by giving the enforcement aspect the tools that it needs to ensure that illegal and also criminal aliens do not make it into the United States, and if they do so that they are caught immediately.

To coordinate policymaking and planning between the National Immigration Bureau offices so as to ensure efficiencies and effectiveness that result from shared infrastructure and unified implementation of the law among the office of immigration, adjudication, enforcement, prehearing services and detention and shared services. Those are the subsets of what I think we need to fully fund the adjudication function. Many, many people are in the process, are in the works, if you will, yet they wait 3 and 4 and 5 years in order to be adjudicated to become a naturalized citizen. This keeps them from employment. This keeps them from planning for their future. This disallows young people to get scholarships. It prevents young people from getting into college.

We are a Nation, Mr. Speaker, of laws, but we are also a Nation of immigrants. I would ask my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring the Immigration Restructuring and Accounting Act of 1999 for real INS reform.

## WELCOME BACK TO THE CLEVELAND BROWNS

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

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about something close to my heart, the Cleveland Browns football team. As many of my colleagues may know, Sunday marked the beginning of a new season for us, an important one, a historic day in Cleveland because this is the first season, since the departure of the original Browns for Baltimore, Cleveland has its own NFL franchise.

Though the result of the game was decidely not what the fans assembled were hoping for, seeing our Browns take the field in a regular season NFL contest was extremely satisfying. We were welcomed back to the Dawg Pound, the brown and orange colors of the Browns, and the familiar uniforms of the team. Just being able to host the game was exciting for those of us from Cleveland.

Hats off to Al Lerner, the owner, and Carmen Policy, its manager. Thank you. Cleveland Browns, we are going to win the rest of the season.

## CRISIS IN EAST TIMOR

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, the House Committee on International Relations Subcommittee on Asia-Pacific Affairs, of which I am a member, held a joint hearing with the Senate Subcommittee on East Asian and Pacific Affairs to review the current crisis in East Timor and the implications on the overall future of Indonesia. I certainly want to commend the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) and the Senator from Wyoming (Mr. THOMAS) for jointly addressing this compelling crisis now confronting the international community.

Mr. Speaker, I recall some 38 years ago right outside this Chamber at his inaugural address, I believe it was in 1961, that President John F. Kennedy made this profound statement to the world, and I quote: ''Let every Nation know that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival and the success of liberty.''

Mr. Speaker, like many of my colleagues, I am greatly disturbed and saddened by the brutal, violent response of the pro-Jakarta militia and Indonesian military to the overwhelming vote for independence demonstrated by the courageous people of East Timor. However, I am not at all surprised at the rampant killings, Mr. Speaker, as the Indonesian military has routinely used violence as a tool of repression as it is doing now and for the past 30 years.

Mr. Speaker, although the Timorese struggle for self-determination has received much publicity, scant attention has been paid to the people of West Papua New Guinea who have similarly struggled in Irian Jaya to throw off the yoke of Indonesian colonialism. Mr. Speaker, one cannot talk about the crisis in East Timor and ignore the same crisis in West Papua New Guinea or it is now known as Irian Jaya. As in East Timor, Indonesia took West Papua New Guinea by military force in 1963 in a pathetic episode, Mr. Speaker, that the United Nations in 1969 sanctioned a fraudulent referendum, where only 1,025 delegates were hand-picked and paid off by the Indonesian government, permitted to participate in a so-called plebiscite, and at the point of guns on their heads and with threats on their lives, these 1,025 individuals voted obviously for Indonesian rule. At the same

time, the rest of West Papua New Guinea, well over 800,000 strong Indonesians, had absolutely no voice in this undemocratic process.

Mr. Speaker, since Indonesia subjugated West Papua New Guinea, the native Papuan people have suffered under one of the most repressive and unjust systems of colonial occupation in the 20th century. Like in East Timor where 200,000 East Timorese are thought to have died, the Indonesian military has been just as brutal in Irian Jaya. Reports estimate that between 100,000 to 300,000 West Papua New Guineans have died or simply vanished at the hands of the Indonesian military. While we search for justice and peace in East Timor, Mr. Speaker, we should not forget the violent tragedy that continues to this day to play out in West Papua New Guinea. I would urge my colleagues and my fellow Americans and the international community to revisit the status of West Papua New Guinea to ensure that justice is also achieved there.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to the events of the past week in East Timor, the Indonesian government should be condemned in the strongest terms for allowing untold atrocities to be committed against the innocent, unarmed civilians of East Timor. I commend President Clinton for terminating all assistance to and ties with the military of Indonesian. The latest United Nations estimates are that up to 300,000 East Timorese, over a third of the population of East Timor, have been displaced and it remains to be seen how many hundreds more, if not thousands, have been killed in the mass bloodletting and carnage. A war crimes tribunal as called for by UNHCR head Mary Robinson is necessary to punish those responsible for the atrocities.

Mr. Speaker, I further commend the decision of the United Nations to maintain its presence in Delhi, even if only with a skeletal staff. It was absolutely essential that international observers, such as the United Nations, not desert East Timor or the likelihood of genocide against the Timorese people would have substantially increased.

It is clear the United Nations must also commit to a peacekeeping force and not shirk its duty. Besides playing a significant role in supplying airlift capabilities and logistical support, I believe America should also contribute a small, if not symbolic, contingent of ground troops which by its presence, Mr. Speaker, an international peacekeeping force in East Timor may well lend a hand in stabilizing not just that island but the fragile democracy that ostensibly governs that country.

Mr. Speaker, with Indonesia being the fourth largest nation and the largest Muslim country in the world which sits astride major sea lanes of communication and trade, I urge my colleagues that we do something about this, raising the question about the instability of that country but more importantly make the will of the East Timorese people become a reality.

Mr. Speaker, last Thursday, the House International Relations Subcommittee on Asia-Pacific Affairs, of which I am a member, held a joint hearing with the Senate Subcommittee on East Asian and Pacific Affairs to review the current crisis in East Timor, and the implications on the overall future of Indonesia. I commend the gentleman from Nebraska, Chairman DOUG BEREUTER, and the gentleman from Wyoming, Senate Chairman CRAIG THOMAS for jointly addressing this urgent and compelling crisis now confronting the international community.

Like many of our colleagues, I am greatly disturbed and saddened by the brutal, violent response of the pro-Jakarta militia and Indonesian military to the overwhelming vote for independence demonstrated by the courageous people of East Timor. However, I am not at all surprised at the rampant killings, Mr. Speaker, as the Indonesian military has routinely used violence as a tool of repression now, and for the past thirty years.

Although the Timorese struggle for self-determination has received much publicity, Mr. Speaker, scant attention has been paid to the people of West Papua New Guinea who have similarly struggled in Irian Jaya to throw off the yoke of Indonesian colonialism. Mr. Speaker, one cannot talk about the crisis in East Timor, and then ignore the same crisis in West Papua New Guinea or Irian Jaya. As in East Timor, Indonesia took West Papua New Guinea by military force in 1963. In a pathetic episode, Mr. Speaker, that the United Nations in 1969 sanctioned a fraudulent referendum, where only 1,025 delegates were handpicked and paid off by the Indonesian government were permitted to participate in a so-called plebiscite, and at the point of guns on their heads and with threats on their lives, these 1,025 individuals voted for Indonesia. The rest of the West Papuan people, over 800,000 strong, had absolutely no voice in this undemocratic process.

And, Mr. Speaker, recent media reports indicate even Australia and our own country were parties to this fraudulent plebiscite.

Since Indonesia subjugated West Papua New Guinea, the native Papuan people have suffered under one of the most repressive and unjust systems of colonial occupation in the 20th century. Like in East Timor where 200,000 East Timorese are thought to have died, the Indonesia military has been just as brutal in Irian Jaya. Reports estimate that between 100,000 to 300,000 West Papuans have died or simply vanished at the hands of the Indonesian military. While we search for justice and peace in East Timor, Mr. Speaker, we should not forget the violent tragedy that continues to play out today in West Papua New Guinea. I would urge my colleagues, my fellow Americans, and the international community to revisit the status of West Papua New Guinea to ensure that justice is also achieved there.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to the events of the past week in East Timor, the Indonesian Government should be condemned in the strongest terms for allowing untold atrocities to be committed against the innocent, unarmed civilians of East Timor. I commend President Clinton for terminating all assistance to and ties with the Indonesian military. The latest U.N. estimates are that up to 300,000 Timorese, over a third of the population of East Timor, have been displaced and it remains to be seen how many hundreds, if not thousands, have been killed in the mass bloodletting and carnage. A war crimes tribunal, as called for by UNHCR head Mary Robinson, is necessary to punish those responsible for the atrocities.

I further commend the decision of the United Nations to maintain its UNAMET operations in Dili, even if only with a skeletal staff. It was absolutely essential that international observers, such as the U.N., not desert East Timor or the likelihood of genocide against the Timorese people would have substantially increased.

As to the issue of a U.N. or international peacekeeping force, I strongly support such an intervention in East Timor and commend Indonesian President Habibie for his decision this weekend to authorize entry. While Australia and new Zealand may take the lead in the formation of such a peacekeeping force, it is crucial that Southeast Asian nations, such as the Philippines, Malaysia, and Thailand, contribute significant troops to the effort, and I applaud the cooperation and commitment of these countries. Jakarta, however, should not be permitted to dictate which countries shall comprise and contribute to the international peacekeeping force.

It is clear the United States must also commit to this peacekeeping effort and not shirk its duty. Besides playing a significant role in supplying airlift capabilities and logistical support, I believe America should also contribute a small, if not symbolic, contingent of ground troops, which could easily be drawn from our substantial forces of U.S. Marines based in Okinawa.

With Indonesia being the fourth largest nation and the largest Muslim country in the world, which sits astride major sealanes of communication and trade—certainly we have substantial national interests in preserving stability in Indonesia and Southeast Asia, as well as preventing a U.N. initiative from turning into a catastrophic humanitarian disaster.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, I believe that what has happened in East Timor—where the Indonesian military forces played a major role in the horrific violence—holds prophetic ramifications for the future of Indonesia as a whole. In front of the world, President Habibie has been humiliated by the inability to control his own military while Defense Minister General Wiranto's hand in the unfolding events in East Timor is still being questioned. It raises the question as to who is actually in control in Jakarta, and whether a civilian democratic government or military regime holds the reigns of power to Indonesia—now and for the future.

By its simple presence, Mr. Speaker, an international peacekeeping force in East Timor may well lend a hand in stabilizing not just that island but the fragile democracy that ostensibly governs Indonesia.

□ 1915

## PREPARING FOR HURRICANE FLOYD

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

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to speak out in support for all of those people who are now

working to prepare for the probable arrival of Hurricane Floyd. Hurricane Floyd is a Class Four, possibly Class Five, hurricane right now, which represents an extremely powerful and strong storm. The last hurricane that was a Class Four to hit the United States was Hurricane Andrew.

I had the opportunity to go down into the devastated area after Hurricane Andrew came through south Florida as part of a program involving the Florida Medical Society. I went into the area to work in a clinic, and I was able to see firsthand the devastation wrought by this powerful storm, and it is for that reason that my heart, my concerns, my prayers go out to all those people who are being now asked to respond to this devastating storm, and in particular those people who are being asked to evacuate. Emergency management personnel are now calling for the evacuation of many of the barrier island communities such as the community of Indialantic in my congressional district.

Additionally, the storm is projected to go up the coast and come very close to Kennedy Space Center, and I had the opportunity to visit Kennedy Space Center today and review there with the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM) and the Senate Director, Roy Bridges, the preparations that are underway. At Kennedy Space Center right now is about $8 billion worth of space station hardware that is being prepared for launch on the space shuttle. Obviously, all the space shuttles are there as well. And the crews are doing a great job in getting ready, and boarding up the buildings and preparing the equipment for the arrival of this storm, and I would be very happy to yield to my colleague from Orlando, Florida (Mr. MCCOLLUM).

Mr. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding both because I want to comment on this storm with him as I know all about the east coast of Florida is preparing for what could be one of the most serious hurricanes to strike the United States in years, including Hurricane Andrew; and we all pray that it does not happen.

We do not want to see it strike landfall anywhere because of the strength and power of this storm, but it could be particularly devastating to our coastline and for the families that are there; but also to comment with him, as he has pointed out on the fact, that we were today at the Cape. I was scheduled as my colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. WELDON), knows to go with him to visit and tour the Cape for other reasons, as it is a neighboring district to mine and I have a great interest in the space program, as the gentleman and I have shared over the years.

But to me to be there today when they were making these preparations is a reminder of the enormous task that NASA has to be involved with not only in launch preparations in terms of all of the shuttle program and now the space station program and the tremendous effort and dedication the men and women there for those purposes, but also to prepare for disasters like this, to protect those valuable goods that are there at taxpayer expenses.

So I want to pay tribute with the gentleman from Florida tonight to the men and women who work at the Cape for all they have done to be dedicated not only to the program itself, but to the preparation each and every time there has been an approaching storm like this, but particularly now.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I, too, would ask that all Members keep the communities not only in coastal Florida, but as well Georgia and South Carolina in the path of this devastating storm in their thoughts and prayers. We have great emergency management personnel that are preparing the communities and getting ready for the arrival of Hurricane Floyd; and we certainly do hope that the winds carry it out to sea further up north into the cooler waters of the Atlantic where it could be downgraded into a tropical storm and then ultimately perhaps just become a rain storm.

Mr. McCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. WELDON of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. McCOLLUM. As my colleague knows, one of the things that we talked about today that was impressive to me is this is just the wind damage that could be terrible and devastating. It is the storm surge itself, the water levels, Pointed out at the Cape that that could come up 6 to 15 feet above sea level; and I know that is important to everybody concerned with the protection of all of the valuable equipment that is there.

But in addition to that, in your district and in many others along the coast of Florida there are many, many homes that are at a level which could be devastated by this, not just right on the beaches, but inland, too, if the water surge and storm surge comes up that much.

So there is a great threat in the storm that is approaching, not just in the wind and the things you read about from the tornadoes and the storms that are spawned by it, but also by the tremendous potential for flooding and water damage from that surge.

Mr. WELDON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

---

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

(Mr. RUSH addressed the House. HIs remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

## IN MEMORY OF FATHER HILARIO MADEIRA AND FATHER FRANCISCO SOARES WHO WERE MURDERED IN EAST TIMOR

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

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I welcome the news that Indonesia will allow an international peacekeeping force into East Timor, but let me emphasize that the international community must act quickly before more lives are lost.

Shortly before the August 30 referendum on independence, I was in East Timor with two of my colleagues from the other body. Dili was a bustling city as it prepared for the U.N.-supervised vote. We were the only Congressional delegation to travel to East Timor before the elections and the last Members of Congress to see Dili as it once was. The burned, looted, and destroyed city emptied of its people is heartbreaking. Our delegation traveled to two towns along the western border, Maliana and Suai; and I would like to share some of what I saw in Suai.

August is the dry season in East Timor. It was sweltering, hot and dusty. In this poor town we went to the Catholic church compound where over 2,000 people were seeking refuge. Father Hilario Madeira, the senior parish priest, and Father Francisco Soares who would be our guides greeted us. They introduced us to their world, one filled with worry and tension and subjected daily to violence and intimidation by the Indonesian military and militias organized and armed by the Indonesian armed forces.

Despite the strain and uncertainty of their situation, I was impressed by Father Hilario and Father Francisco's warmth, good humor, hospitality, and steady nerves. Here were men carrying out God's mandate to love and care for your neighbor, protect the weak and live humbly.

In talking to the refugees, we discovered most had been burned out of their homes or forcibly evicted. The majority were women and children. They sought refuge in the church compound surrounded by militia who over the past 2 days had cut off all their food and water.

Our delegation met with town officials asking that the water be restored. It was clear that militias were in charge of the water and that town officials would do nothing. The armed Indonesian police and soldiers, those charged with protection and security of the East Timorese people during the U.N. process, stood in the shade doing nothing, laughing and joking with the militias.

When I met with President Habibie in Jakarta, we demanded the water be restored in Suai. Less than 24 hours later the militias turned on the water.

Father Hilario shared with us his concerns about the current violence and his fears about violent retaliation

against the people who would go to the polls scarcely a week later, and we took that message to heart.

That evening in Dili we had dinner with Nobel Peace Prize winner and Catholic bishop Carlos Belo. In the dining room of his house overlooking the courtyard between his residence and the chapel where he said mass, Bishop Belo emphasized the need for protection following the vote, and as we met in Dili with Indonesian officials, police and military commanders, we were constantly assured they were providing security for the people. They brushed aside our description of the situation in Suai, and I asked that they could cite a single instance where they had detained, arrested, or confiscated the weapons of any militia member, and they could not.

As our delegation prepared to depart from Dili, we called upon the U.N. to immediately deploy armed peacekeepers to East Timor to protect the people from further violence, especially following the referendum.

Now we know everyone's worst fears have been realized. Over the Labor Day weekend I received word that the home of Bishop Belo where I had dined just 2 weeks ago had been burned to the ground. The bishop barely escaped with his life. The 3,000 people given refuge in his courtyard were forced out at gun point by uniformed Indonesian military militias. Their fates are unknown.

And on Wednesday morning I received a phone call from human rights workers in Jakarta that eyewitnesses reported militias had gunned down and killed Father Hilario and Father Francisco along with Jesuit priest Father Dewanto. Many of the people of Suai sheltering inside the church were also killed. Some escaped while others were forcibly transported out of the country. These were good men; these were holy men. Nothing we say or do here in Congress, nothing President Clinton may say or do, nothing the U.N. may say or do can bring these men back to the people of Suai. In so many ways we in the United States and the international community failed them. They trusted us, and we failed them. If we were to honor their memory, then we must not fail them again.

Mr. Speaker, we must support the rapid deployment of an international force to rescue and guarantee the security of the people of East Timor. We must take immediate steps to protect refugees and displaced people from further harm and attacks. We must disarm the militias and confiscate and destroy their weapons. We must provide humanitarian support, food and medicine for East Timor. We must safely return those who are forced to leave their homes, villages, and country. We must guarantee the full and safe implementation of the independence process for East Timor, and we must help the East Timorese people rebuild their cities and towns.

This time the international community must keep its word to the people of East Timor.

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 11, 1999]

NUNS DESCRIBE SLAUGHTER IN E. TIMOR—MILITIAMEN KILLED PRIESTS, THEN REFUGEES IN CHURCH, WITNESS SAYS

(Doug Struck)

KUPANG, Indonesia, Sept. 10—Father Dewanto was the first to die, said Sister Mary Barudero.

The militiamen had lined up outside the old wooden church filled with refugees from East Timorese town of Suai on Monday afternoon, and parishioners watched as the young Indonesian Jesuit priest stepped out dressed in his clerical robes to meet the trouble.

A burst of gunfire cut him down. Father Francisco followed. The militiamen waited for the senior parish priest, Father Hilario. When he did not emerge, a witness said, they kicked down the door to his study and sprayed him with automatic weapons fire.

A nun who watched the massacre from the window of her house described the scene to Barudero less than an hour later. The nun told Barudero the militiamen entered the church filled with refugees, and began firing long bursts from their weapons. Then they threw hand grenades into the huddled victims.

Inside, there had been only young children and women, babies at their mothers' breasts, and pregnant women, Barudero said. The men had fled days earlier. Barudero, who works as a nurse, had sent four of the pregnant women from her hospital to Suai just two hours earlier to await further progress in their labor.

''They went to the church because that's where they felt safe. They felt being near the priests was protection,'' said the 64-year-old nun, vainly fighting her tears.

Her account of the massacre, also reported Thursday by the Vatican's missionary news agency Fides, is one of the first graphic descriptions of the violence that has wracked East Timor at the hands of Indonesian military-backed militiamen who opposed the independence for the province.

Roman Catholic clergy, seen by the militia as having supported independence for East Timor, were among the first victims. Most citizens of East Timor, a former Portuguese colony, are Roman Catholics. Indonesia is the world's largest Muslim country.

Barudero, a Philippine-born Indonesian citizen who belongs to the French order of Sisters of St. Paul of Chartres, agreed to talk to a reporter here in western Timor, because ''I have lived my life. I am not afraid to die.''

Other refugees still feel the militias' reach in the supposed safety of western Timor, and have been warned not to talk to reporters. Barudero's colleague who watched the massacre, and who belongs to the Canossian order, has fled to Darwin, Australia, but still is afraid to be identified, she said.

Barudero said the militia that carried out the massacre had been active in the area and was well known to residents. Of the three priests who died, young Father Dewanto was an Indonesian citizen from Java who arrived in Suai just three weeks before the massacre and had been ordained only a month before that. Father Hilario, who had been in the town for some time, was well known as a supporter of independence for East Timor, according to Fides.

Fides also said about 100 people were killed in the Suai massacre. It quoted witnesses as saying 15 priests were killed in the cities of Dili and Baukau, and some nuns were killed in Baukau.

Here in the western part of the island of Timor, refugees who fled the violence in East Timor still have cause for fear. The militiamen who brought destruction to East Timor, have taken control of the 84,000 refugees now in camps in western Timor, and move freely around the city. Some are armed; some seem intent on intimidating foreigners and refugees. Foreigners have not been allowed in the camps.

At a western Timor refugee camp in Atambua, on the border with East Timor, a man identified as a supporter of independence was killed Wednesday, apparently by militiamen.

An official of Catholic Relief Services, who had just returned from Atambua, provided some confirmation of reports that pro-independence refugees were forcibly removed from East Timor.

''If you ask the refugees once, they say they left because it was unsafe, and they had to leave their houses. But if you ask again, they will tell you that the soldiers terrorized them and made them come,'' said William Openg, an Indonesian relief worker for Catholic Relief Services.

Although many in the refugee camps are said to be opponents of independence—like the militiamen—those who support the outcome of the Aug. 30 referendum favoring independence may not acknowledge it.

''They are afraid to show their faces. It could cost them their lives,'' said Agapitus Prasetya, an Indonesia UNICEF worker who has been in the refugee camps. ''The militias are everywhere. They are all over.''

Anti-foreigner passions have been whipped up by the militias, and even Indonesian staff members distributing food to the refugees strip the UNICEF signs off their cars, he said.

''The militias are killing people, and the people are threatened here in west Timor,'' complained a Catholic clergyman who fled Dili only to find militiamen in control of refugee camps in western Timor. ''Where is the law and order in Indonesia? The militias, the military and the police are above the law.''

He and several other clergy members described their flight from East Timor on condition that their names not be used. They said they fear consequences from the Indonesian military and Timorese militias.

One nun who lived in Dili said the gunfire began about three hours after the ballot result approving independence was announced last Saturday.

''It was really frightening. We couldn't go out of the house,'' she said. ''We could see a lot of fires. It looked like they would use diesel gas, because the fires would be big black balls, and then you could see white smoke from houses. That was everywhere.''

On Monday, she and other nuns decided it was too dangerous, and left in an old pickup truck in a convoy escorted by police. As they passed through Dili, she saw a surrealistic scene of fires and lawlessness, she said.

''It was remarkable. There was shooting going on, and people were running for their lives. But others were looting the stores, very calmly, as though they were so relaxed.'' She said she saw some looters loading goods into military trucks.

In one section, ''all the stores were razed,'' she said. ''I saw a lot of military, and of course, the militias. Some people were ransacking, and some people were looting. The whole place was in ruins, except for the government buildings.''

''And there were a lot of people moving out, because their houses were burning.''

Another clergyman said the gunfire intensified after the referendum results. ''God, it was frightening,'' he said. ''There were motorcycles running all over, bringing military and militias. You could hear the big guns of the military.''

On Tuesday, water, electricity and telephone lines were cut in his section of Dili, and he decided to leave, the clergyman said. He passed many burned houses, he said. ''It

seemed the pro-independence houses were targed. But the referendum was approved 4 to 1, so they didn't have to go very far.''

''I never saw any instance of refugees being forced by gun-point,'' said a priest. ''Our people did not want to leave. But they were told if they stayed, the houses would be burned and they might be killed. They were forced out by fear.''

The militias were particularly strong in the western areas of East Timor, where Barudero and four other nursing nuns ran a hospital in Suai, and where Roman Catholic priests ran the church where the massacre occurred.

Barudero said she was not intending to leave, even after the men fled, even after more victims of the rising violence came to the hospital, even after she and the other nuns had to dig a grave for a victim on the grounds of the hospital. The victim's family members were too afraid to claim him or were victims themselves, she said.

But after the massacre, ''there was no one left to help. They had all left or been killed. And I knew, if we stayed, we could be killed,'' she said. ''I am old, I'm ready to die. But the young sisters would not go unless I went. They have many years left to help people. Finally, I said, 'pack what you can. We will leave.''''

---

[From the Washington Post, Sept. 12, 1999]

JAKARTA'S ARMY TIED TO DEATHS—REPORT SAYS SYMPATHETIC TROOPS JOINED MILITIA RAMPAGE

(By Doug Struck)

KUPANG, Indonesia, Sept. 11—A human rights organization said today it has documented atrocities in East Timor that implicate the Indonesian military and militias in at least seven instances of mass killings and dozens of individual slayings.

''Killing, plundering, burning, terror intimidation and kidnapping [have] been carried out by the Indonesian armed forces along with the pro-Jakarta militia'' in the days since East Timor voted overwhelmingly for independence on Aug. 30, concludes the report by the Foundation for Law, Human Rights and Justice, based in Dili, the East Timor capital.

The organization interviewed many refugees secretly because of fears of retribution from militiamen in the refugee camps. Most of the atrocities cited by the group have not been verified, because after the shooting erupted in Dili, journalists were confined to the U.N. compound and then evaluated.

According to the report, witnesses identified Indonesian military members, in addition to the militaries, as having participated in the atrocities. Indonesia has denied that any mass killings occurred and has sent more troops to East Timor to impose martial law and end the turmoil.

[U.N. human rights commissioner Mary Robinson said Sunday that she wanted an international war crimes tribunal set up to investigate human rights violations in East Timor. She said she would also probe the extent of military and police involvement in such violations.]

The Indonesian human rights group's report includes some incidents that have been verified by the media and other sources and others not previously known. Among them:

Several hours before results of the independence referendum were announced on Sept. 4, 45 people were killed in Maliana, in western East Timor. They included 21 drivers and local employees of the U.N. observers' operation.

Ten people in Bidau Macaur Atas, a neighborhood in Dili, were hacked to death Sept. 4 by militiamen and Indonesian soldiers, according to the human rights report. Some were buried by relatives, but ''others were put into bags and thrown away on the side of the road. Others were thrown into the ocean.''

On the same day, militia members killed 50 people in Bedois, in eastern Dili. The next day, the report said, eight people who went to the Dili harbor to try to leave by ferry were identified as pro-independence and shot dead by Aitarak militia members.

The group said it also has documented the attack on the Dili Roman Catholic diocese that killed at least 25 people, including a baby; the killing on Sept. 5 of 15 local employees of the International Committee of the Red Cross in Dili; and an attack by the army and militia on a Catholic church compound in the Dili neighborhood of Balide, where unknown numbers were slain.

The human rights group, which is working in western and East Timor, provided reliable reports in Dili before chaos engulfed the city last week. Its offices there were ransacked, and many of its files were destroyed.

Much of the violence has been carried out by pro-Indonesian militias, but there also have been frequent reports of shooting and looting by the military. The Indonesian armed forces chief Gen. Wiranto, acknowledged today that the militias and military are ''comrades in arms.'' He said his forces have not succeeded in ending the violence because, for his soldiers, ''I can understand it is very hard to shoot their own people.''

An official of the foundation asked not to be identified for fear the group's work would be stopped by the military or the militias, who control the refugee camps in western Timor through fear and intimidation. For the same reason, the official said, the witnesses were not identified in the report.

In Australia, aid worker Isa Bradridge told Channel 7 that his wife, Ina, had seen piles of dead bodies stacked in a room at a police station in Dili before the couple was evacuated. ''It was chockablock full of dead bodies, right up to the roof.'' he was quoted as saying. ''All she could see through the bars were arms hanging out, heads, old and new, blood dribbling out under the door.'' The report could not be verified.

Some human rights groups alleged that some East Timorese were forced by the militias to become refugees. Accounts slowly emerging from the refugee camps in western Timor appeared to confirm that claim.

''We were asked by the local government and the Aitarak [militia] to leave East Timor,'' said a 29-year-old Dili resident of the Noelbaki Refugee Camp near Kupang. ''I didn't want to go. . . . I would like to go back to Dili.''

Reporters have been barred from the camps in western Timor, though several Indonesian journalists accompanied Social Affairs Minister Yustika S. Baharsjah on a quick tour of three camps today.

---

[From the Sidney Morning Herald, Sept 9, 1999]

CATHOLIC CLERGY EXECUTED BY INDONESIAN MILITARY

(By Louise Williams)

Catholic Church leaders were hiding in remote East Timor mountains last night after military backed pro-Jakarta militia gangs went on a rampage of bloody retribution, murdering at least 14 priest and nuns and stabbing the Bishop of Baucau.

Six nuns were reported killed in Baucau, four nuns in Dili and three priests in Suai, said a spokeswoman for Caritas Australia, the Catholic overseas aid agency. The Bishop of Baucau, the Most Rev Basilio do Nascimento, was stabbed before escaping into the mountains.

Father Francisco Barreto, the local director of Caritas, was believed to have been murdered just outside the capital, Dili.

He had warned the Foreign Minister, Mr. Downer, during a visit to Australia in April that terrible violence would be orchestrated by the Indonesian military.

One account of the attack on the six Canossian sisters in Baucau, 115 kilometers east of Dili, said the militia thugs had forced them into a forest where they were murdered.

Reports of the atrocities emerged as Indonesia announced last night that a five-member United Nations Security Council team would travel to East Timor tomorrow, but Jakarta remained strongly opposed to any UN peacekeeping force.

In the worst slaughter to date, the UN confirmed that at least 100 people, including three priests, had died in an attack earlier this week on refugees sheltering in the church at Suai, on the remote east coast.

The dead priests were Father Hilario Madeira, who had long been an outspoken critic of military and militia abuses, Father Francisco Soares and Father Tarcisius Dewanto.

The savage attacks are the first deliberate violations of the sanctity of the church under Indonesian rule and have robbed the East Timorese of their last refuge.

The militias appear to be using a death list of independence sympathizers compiled before the ballot to systematically hunt down their targets.

Many of the priests and nuns are sheltering on Mate Bean, the mountain of death, where tens of thousands were killed by bombing in the first years of the Indonesian occupation.

It is not known whether they have any supplies or access to medical treatment.

A communications blackout in Dili has made it impossible to confirm the number of dead or injured in the attacks and Catholic networks in Australia and Indonesia are working with the Vatican to try to establish the facts.

Some reports have been received by overseas diocese offices through e-main from outlying Catholic schools and churches in East Timor, describing attacks on churches and buildings were nuns and priests were sheltering with thousands of refugees.

A Caritas Australia spokeswoman, Ms. Jane Woolford, said: ''We don't even know where many of our local staff are. We hold grave fears for their safety as many of them have been on death militia lists before and have been attacked trying to deliver aid.''

Many church leaders were identified as independence supporters and the Catholic Church became an important symbol of opposition to the Muslim-dominated Indonesian Government.

The leader of the Catholic Church in East Timor, Bishop Carlos Belo, was evacuated to Darwin earlier this week after his offices and home were burnt to the ground, with scores killed.

Father Jose San Juan, also recently evacuated to Darwin, said: ''I fear many, many priests and sisters will be killed if they stay. In the past the church was a safe place, even from the Indonesian military, but if they can attack the bishop then that's it.''

The militia units were stacked with Indonesian operatives, and Father San Juan, a Filipino from the Salesian order.

''I saw the militias attacking churches before I got out and many of them were speaking in Indonesian, not the local language, so I do not believe they are all East Timorese,'' he said.

''They were yelling at people to get out or be killed, and if they refused they just shot or stabbed them. The Indonesian police and military were just standing there.''

The chairman of Caritas Australia, Bishop Hilton Deakin, said: ''These murderous attacks on the church are part of a much wider unjust genocide.

''When Catholic Church members, who have offered relief and refuge to East Timorese, are struck down, we realize there is no respect for any life in East Timor.''

Ms. Ana Noronha, director of the East Timor Human Rights Commission, said information on the deaths had been sent to the United Nations. ''It is now obvious that the violence is reaching everyone and that there is a pattern of the Catholic Church being attacked.''

---

[From the Carter Center East Timor Weekly Report No. 9, Sept. 13, 1999]

INDONESIAN ARMED FORCES CONTINUE CAMPAIGN OF MURDER, VIOLENCE, AND MASSIVE FORCED DEPORTATION IN EAST TIMOR AS MILITIAS TERRORIZE TIMORESE REFUGEES IN WEST TIMOR

The Carter Center is encouraged by the decision of the Indonesian government to allow the deployment of an international peacekeeping force in East Timor. However, the Indonesian military and police, with the assistance of their militia surrogates, continue to murder and terrorize the people of East Timor, destroying buildings and infrastructure and forcibly expelling tens of thousands of unarmed civilians from the territory. The city of Dili, the capital of East Timor, has been almost completely destroyed over the past week, and reports from other parts of the territory indicate widespread destruction, looting, and murder. It is clear that the Indonesian armed forces are executing a deliberate, planned campaign under the direction of senior military commanders to destroy and forcibly depopulate East Timor.

In West Timor armed pro-integration militias are now operating with official support, openly terrorizing the more than 100,000 East Timorese refugees who have been forced over the border. Those displaced by the violence, both in East Timor and West Timor, now face the threat of malnutrition and disease as domestic and international humanitarian efforts are hampered by militia and military activity and Indonesian government efforts to block access to refugee camps.

Carter Center staff and observers, forced at gunpoint to evacuate Dili Sept. 5 and now reporting from several locations throughout Indonesia, have confirmed the following through eyewitness accounts from reliable sources:

Refugees fleeing East Timor have been subject to extreme intimidation and acts of violence. The Carter Center has confirmed that pro-integration militia members murdered approximately 35 young men traveling on the Dobon Solo ferry from Dili to Kupang on Tuesday, Sept. 7, and dumped their bodies overboard.

In the attack at Bishop Belo's compound last week, militiamen hacked to death with machetes some 40 refugees in the courtyard while TNI soldiers fired into the bishop's residence from the street. A military ambulance later came and removed all but two of the bodies.

In an Indonesian television interview, Rui Lopez, a militia leader, admitted that Indonesian civilian police and military officials in Suai, East Timor, held a meeting before announcement of balloting results and were given instructions to attack UNAMET offices, burn the town of Suai, and drive the population into West Timor.

There are now more than 100,000 refugees from East Timor in West Timor and on the islands of Flores and Alor, and estimates of the total number of people displaced from the territory range from 120,000 to 200,000 (nearly one-fourth of the entire population). Refugees have been transported by Indonesian military ships and aircraft to a number of locations within Indonesia, including Irian Jaya, Ambon, Sulawesi, Surabaya, and Bali, some of which are thousands of kilometers from East Timor.

Pro-integration militias are now active throughout West Timor, particularly in the towns of Atambua and Kupang. Eyewitnesses report that militia members have entered refugee camps with lists of names of supporters of independence, and that a number of individuals have been removed from camps or executed in the camps of militiamen. Militia members armed with automatic weapons also have been seen stopping and searching vehicles in central Kupang and driving looted UNAMET vehicles in and out of the provincial police headquarters.

The Indonesian military and police have prevented international aid workers, journalists, and observers from visiting refugee camps in West Timor and from interviewing Timorese refugees.

Eyewitnesses report that the Indonesian military and police have joined in the looting and destruction of Dili. Indonesian soldiers and police officers have frequently sold looted food and other basic necessities to refugees under their control at exorbitant prices.

It is now apparent that militia violence has been targeted at political, social, and religious leaders, and a number of priests and nuns have been murdered during militia and military attacks on churches sheltering those seeking refugee from the violence.

---

## PRESIDENT GRANTS CLEMENCY TO THE FALN

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

Mr. FOSSELLA. Mr. Speaker, last Friday culminated a very rough week, indeed a rough few weeks and a rough 24 years for some families across America, because some individuals associated with the FALN, the most notorious terrorist group to set foot on American soil, had engaged in a reign of terror across America in the 1970's and 1980's and claimed responsibility for 130 bombings that killed innocent people, that maimed innocent people, that in part had no remorse or offered no apologies for the damage that they created or for the victims that they made. They were set free on Friday, back into society because our White House offered these terrorists clemency, in other words, a get-out-of-jail-free card.

So to those families who have had to endure, for example, like Ms. Diana Berger of Cherry Hill, New Jersey, whose husband was dining in Fraunces Tavern in 1975 like any other American would have been in any other bar or restaurant, Ms. Berger was 6 months pregnant with their first child when her husband was killed. Or Joseph Connor and Thomas Connor. Joseph was 9 years old; his brother was 11. Joseph was celebrating his ninth birthday. His father was in that same restaurant, again out for a business lunch. He never came home to celebrate Joseph's ninth birthday because he was killed by a FALN bomb. Or on December 31, 1982, when this same group of terrorists claimed responsibility proudly for several bombs in downtown New York. Officer Rocco Pascarella of upstate New York lost a leg in that explosion. Officer Richard Pastorella in an attempt to respond to officer Rocco Pascarella, got another call for a bomb threat. He responded to that bomb threat. He tried to diffuse the bomb. He is blinded for life. He has lost all his fingers on one hand. He has 22 screws in his head, has undergone 13 major surgeries. He will never be the same. His partner that night was Officer Anthony Semft from Long Island, New York, who was blinded in one eye and who is partially deaf.

Those are just a few of the victims of this terrorist organization known as the FALN. They were serving rightly a long time in prison until the President offered them clemency, clemency that they initially rejected and finally accepted. I think this is absolutely the worst thing that we can be doing to send a signal to anybody contemplating terrorism on American soil to set these terrorists free. If anybody sitting at home or anybody in this chamber could imagine if in 10 or 15 years a man by the name of Terry Nichols who is affiliated or associated with the Oklahoma City bombing, who many argue was not actually at the bomb scene, but clearly involved in the conspiracy to kill innocent people, so many families left without children, left without fathers, left without mothers, left without grandmothers, if 10 or 15 years the then President steps forward and offers clemency, can you imagine the outrage across America?

□ 1930

That is the outrage that we are experiencing right here today. That is why so many people cannot fathom how the President reached this decision. That is why a wide range of law enforcement agencies, including the FBI, the Bureau of Prisons, the U.S. attorney's offices in Illinois and Chicago, all recommended against granting clemency. Why? Because this is a wrong signal to be sending to terrorists but, above all, these people killed were part of a killing operation, and to this very day, while they are celebrating their release and while there are some who are calling them heroes, to this very day show no remorse, offer no apologies, offer no contrition for what they did.

Indeed, what they suggest is that the Connor or the Berger family or the Pastarella family or the Pascarella family or the Semft family, they were casualties of war. I hope and pray that these people never get the opportunity to bomb and kill an innocent person ever again.

My prayers and thoughts go out to all of the victims associated with the terror associated with the FALN and may we rue the day if they ever act as they did for 10, 15 and 20 years.

## SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH IN THE UNITED STATES AND THE IMPACT IT HAS ON OUR ECONOMY

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

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to rise and discuss the issue of scientific research in the United States and the impact that it has on our economy.

The reason I do this is because there currently is an underfunding of scientific research in the budget proposals we have before us and in the appropriations bills which we have passed. I would like to review why that is dangerous for our Nation and why we must increase our spending on scientific research.

Let me first back up a year or two. A previous speaker, Mr. Gingrich, had a keen interest in science and technology and asked the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, chairman of the Committee on Science, to give me the responsibility of reviewing science and technology policy in the United States Government and make recommendations for improvement.

After all, the previous study had been done by Vannevar Bush in 1945 and, although it was outstanding, it is clearly out of date. There has been some excellent science policy work done recently by individuals outside of the government, but our government had not done anything official in that direction.

As a result of our work, after holding a considerable number of hearings, working hand-in-glove with the Speaker and with the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. SENSENBRENNER), we were able to produce a new science policy report. It has just come out in paperback, and it has been very well received by the scientific community. It makes a number of arguments for the importance of scientific research in our Nation and explains what we should do in the way of Federal funding. I believe the recommendations are well founded and should be followed.

I would also like to briefly display the number of letters I received just in the past few weeks from leaders of scientific associations protesting the lack of funding in this year's budget. I have a letter, for example, from Jerry Friedman, President of the American Physical Society; from the American Association for the Advancement of Science; American Association of Engineering Societies; American Astronomical Society; American Ceramic Society; American Chemical Society; American Electronics Associations, which represents one of the bigger industries in our Nation; American Geological Institute; American Institute of Biological Sciences, the Chemical Engineers, the Mathematical Society, et cetera, all expressing the great concern in the scientific world about this particular issue.

Similarly, there was an op-ed piece in the Washington Post just a week ago by Allan Bromley, outstanding physicist and former presidential science advisor, who has been a leader in the scientific community for many years. The title of his article is No Science and No Surplus, and I would like to at this point enter that into the RECORD.

[From the Washington Post, August 26, 1999]

NO SCIENCE, NO SURPLUS

(By D. Allan Bromley)

America is on a roll. We're balancing the federal budget, reforming welfare and making retirement secure. Sound like a breakthrough in fiscal management? Not exactly. Our awesome economic success can be traced directly to our past investments in science. The problem is, this year's federal budget for science is a disaster, and it compromises our nation's economic and social progress.

Here are the latest budget numbers: NASA science is slashed by $678 million; science at the Department of Energy is cut by $116 million; and the National Science Foundation ends up with $275 million less than the president requested. Clearly, Congress has lost sight of the critical role science plays in America.

Federal investments in science pay off—they produce cutting-edge ideas and a highly skilled work force. The ideas and personnel then feed into high-tech industries to drive the U.S. economy. It's a straightforward relationship: Industry is attentive to immediate market pressures; the federal government makes the venturous investments in university-based research that ensures long-term competitiveness. So far, it's been a powerful tandem.

Thirty years ago, the laser and fiber optic cable were born from federal investments in university research. Over time, those two discoveries formed the backbone of a multi-billion-dollar telecommunications industry.

The fusion of university research and industrial development now generates about 5,000 new jobs and contributes a quarter-billion dollars in taxes to the federal coffer every day. It accounts for 70 percent of our economic growth. The result is undeniable. The fusion is primarily responsible for our booming economy and our growing federal surplus. So the consequences of a budget cut to science are equally undeniable: no science, no surplus.

The benefits of the science investment go deeper than just the surplus. Three years ago this month, welfare underwent dramatic reform. No one knew what the fallout from that would be. But the high-tech economy eased the burden. Unemployment was dropping to a 25-year low, and jobs were being created at a record pace. As it turned out, half of those jobs were generated by the high-tech sector.

The legislative challenge before us is patching up Social Security. Again, we'll rely on the science and technology juggernaut. Whether the solution lies in stimulating private investment or in steady federal surpluses, the proposals all rely on a familiar friend—the strength of our nation's booming economy. And while Congress dithers, the public already is taking steps of its own.

Americans hold more than $5 trillion in communications and technology stocks. Our mutual funds, our 401K plans and IRAs are stuffed full of high-tech investments. The retirement security of Americans now depends upon the steady flow of innovations from technology companies. In turn, those companies rely on the steady flow of discoveries and trained work force generated by the scientific community. No science, no savings.

Scientific research at our universities and national labs is now a foundation of the economy and thereby vital to the success of social legislation. But rather than reinforcing the foundation, Congress is eroding it. That action couldn't come at a worse time.

America's science infrastructure is in decay—aged science buildings on our campuses, dated laboratory equipment, antiquated computers. During the Bush administration, the Office of Science and Technology Policy estimated the cost of rebuilding our science infrastructure at $100 billion. The Clinton administration has done little to address the problem. The budget Congress is proposing guarantees continued decay.

Congress must significantly increase science funding. Senators recognized the need last week when, with the support of Sens. Trent Lott and Tom Daschle, they passed the Federal Research Investment Act, which calls for doubling the federal investment in science by the year 2010. But appropriators haven't followed through. It's not too late—budgets won't be settled until October.

For the sake of the country, I hope Congress will recognize the significant role science plays in society. Without science, there won't be a surplus.

Mr. EHLERS. The key point is this: when we analyze what is causing our economic boom of the past few years, the first major cause is monetary policy, which has largely been headed by Alan Greenspan; next is tax and regulatory policy, where the Republicans in the Congress have made tremendous improvements; and the final and very vital cause is scientific research. If we analyze the economic development taking place today we will find that over half of all economic development is directly related to scientific research, whether it is the Internet, whether it is medical research, any of the other research projects going on.

Dr. Bromley's thesis is very simple. He says: no science, no surplus. Why? Because the economic boom we are enjoying now, which has resulted in the first surpluses in the Federal Government since 1969, is to a large extent caused by the scientific research that has been done in the last 2 to 4 decades. If we do not continue to do that research, we are doing a grave disservice to our children and grandchildren, because we are condemning them to a United States which will not have as much economic growth and which will not have the resources and the surplus which will enable them to enjoy a good economy as we enjoy it today.

Mr. Speaker, I advocate very strongly that we review the appropriations bills that have passed the House and are before the Senate, and that we make every effort to increase the funding for scientific research.

As it stands now, NASA science is slashed by $678 million; science of the Department of Energy is cut by $116 million; and the National Science Foundation ends up with $275 million less than requested.

I think it extremely important that we review these bills and that we increase funding for scientific research so that we may continue to enjoy not

only the results of the research, but also the economic benefits that will arise from the fruits of that research.

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.)

## CAMPAIGN INTEGRITY ACT OF 1999

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

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased this evening to take this opportunity to address a very important subject. Tomorrow this House will once again consider legislation that would improve our campaign finance laws.

I know that my colleagues will say well, we have been here before. In fact, we have been here before many, many times, because this Congress and previous Congresses have considered year after year various forms of campaign finance legislation and none of those have ever passed both Houses, signed by the President and actually become law. So there is a growing frustration and cynicism among the American public.

I believe that this is a cause still worth fighting for, that there is a consensus still yet to be maintained and to be gained and I hope that we can do that this Congress; whether it is this vote tomorrow or whether it is later on.

The bill that I am proposing is the Campaign Integrity Act of 1999, which we have worked hard to draft in a fair and bipartisan manner and will address the greatest abuses in our campaign system. I am delighted to have two of my colleagues joining me in this discussion tonight, the gentleman from Montana (Mr. HILL) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY). I want to hear what their views are on this and why this is important for us to address this subject of campaign finance reform, and particularly this bill that we have all cosponsored, the Campaign Integrity Act of 1999.

So I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. HILL), who has done such a tremendous job in showing leadership on an issue that I think is vital to our political process. I know he has been active as a State party chairman in Montana. He understands the political process. He understands the role of parties and candidates, and I am very grateful for his support, and I want to yield to him so he can talk about why this is needed.

Mr. HILL of Montana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. HILL of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) for yielding, and let me compliment the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) for his untiring effort at trying to help reform the campaign finance laws of this country.

We started this process as freshmen in the last Congress, holding hearings, drafting legislation, bringing together Democrats and Republicans in a bipartisan bill, and it was his leadership that helped us accomplish that.

It seems to me that we need to accomplish three things when we are going to reform the campaign finance laws. At least from my judgment, there are some things that are broken in the current system and we need to accomplish some changes.

One of those is that we need to have more competitive campaigns. Over 90 percent of the Members of this House who stand for reelection are reelected election after election after election. Even in the great revolutionary election of the 104th Congress in 1994, nearly 90 percent of the Members who stood for reelection were reelected.

One of the reasons for that is that it is difficult for challengers to raise the resources necessary to have a viable election. In fact, I find it kind of interesting that there are some who helped sponsor legislation similar to this in the last Congress, when they came as freshmen Members who this was their first time in Congress and they had maybe run a challenger's race who are now incumbents, some might say are entrenched incumbents, who do not support campaign finance reform that would allow us to have competitive elections, but I appreciate the gentleman's untiring effort.

The other thing we need to do is deal with the issue of soft money. As the gentleman knows, soft money are large corporate contributions, labor union contributions. It has been the tradition of this country for almost all of this century that large organizations, corporations and labor unions, should not be able to contribute unlimited sums of money to the political process because the view is that they would overwhelm the process. This bill that we are advocating would put restrictions on soft money to the political parties.

The other thing that we need to accomplish when we reform finance laws is to maintain our commitment to the First Amendment. Some people would advocate changes in the campaign finance laws that would have the effect of stifling the competitive thought that is out there; the outside groups and others who want to express themselves about what we do here. So there are some who in closing the soft money loophole want to close the loophole of the First Amendment, the right for people to express their views, and we cannot allow that to happen, too.

So what this bill does is it says to the political parties, the political parties cannot accept soft money but allows independent groups to be able to continue to express their views about what we do and how we go about doing it and in the process not chilling free speech.

So those three things, this bill does. It protects our First Amendment freedoms, reinforces them. It eliminates the potential problems that soft money and the corrupting influence that that might have on our political parties but it also endeavors to make campaigns competitive again, which is so important to this country.

So I just want to compliment the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) for his hard work. This is a good bill. Our colleagues are going to have an opportunity to vote on this this week. I think this is the right alternative to reform our system, and I know that the gentleman has been a strong advocate for that, and I thank him for yielding to me this evening.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Well, I thank the gentleman for his remarks. He is exactly on point, that we do not want to harm the First Amendment and the freedoms we all enjoy in the political process in order to just do something and make a change in the law.

So I believe that we can have a balance, that we can actually stop the flow of soft money into our national political parties; we can stop the greatest abuse; we can still have a significant and critical role that the parties play but still not infringe upon those groups that are out there expressing themselves in election.

Imagine how counterproductive it would be if we burdened these outside groups and said, you cannot participate in the political or we are going to put so many regulations on you that your participation will be really rendered meaningless.

So I do not think that is the direction we want to go. This bill is very balanced. It addresses the abuse in our system, but like the gentleman said, it makes sure that we protect our First Amendment freedoms.

So I am delighted also to have my good friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY), here, who has been so outspoken in favor of reform and particularly supportive of the Campaign Integrity Act. So I would just like to yield to him for his comments on this bill.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUTCHINSON. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, first I thank the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) for yielding, but also for his leadership on this issue.

As freshmen together 2 years ago, the gentleman played the leadership role in working together, Republicans and Democrats, over a very thoughtful 5-month period, meeting with experts on constitutional law, citizens who felt the way we finance campaigns ought to be changed, people who thought the status quo was fine, listening to all opinions and approaches before, I

think, developing a very reasonable, balanced, thoughtful approach that is real reform. It is not, as some of these measures are, hidden as a campaign advantage bill, which gives an edge to one party or the other.

This bill is designed to create more of a citizen Congress, to push us back toward a Congress as a representative of the people that we have the privilege of representing, and that is why I am so glad to be a part of this effort.

I think we are drifting away from a citizen Congress here in this Nation.

□ 1945

The average cost of a congressional campaign, a competitive, open seat is just a little under $1 million, and it is doubling about every 4 years.

Now, there are a lot of good people in my communities who would do a great job in the U.S. House of Representatives or in the U.S. Senate, but they do not have $1 million and they do not know where they would get a hold of it; and as a result, they are not going to raise their hand to run for Congress. My concern is not that the very wealthy cannot make the decisions, many of them can. But for a country founded on a representative democracy where people from all walks of life, and whether they have a big wad or they have made some choices in life that they have pursued other goals, and so that they do not have that, but they would be great here in Congress are not going to be able to run.

So what this bill does is really start to push us back toward a citizen Congress, start to close that national loophole on soft money, preserves free speech for individuals, groups, even for States to remembering soft money the way they have very responsibly. It increases and indexes, which is long overdue, the individual contributions which again, to move people into Washington and back home where we want that support to come, and increases disclosure so that people who are watching our campaigns, who are trying to decide which person to vote for can quickly and electronically determine who our backers are and that that represents part of their decision-making in this process.

And, as importantly, which the gentleman from Montana (Mr. HILL) and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) have stressed, we encourage people to get involved in the process, groups who want to do score cards, individuals who feel so strongly about an issue they want to take out ads to get involved, and we preserve and encourage that free speech, but we start that very important first step back toward a citizen Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I think all of us believe that the first step in any campaign finance reform is first to enforce the laws that we have already on the books, because it does not make such sense to add new ones if we are not going to enforce them either. Secondly, we have to preserve free speech. But after that, the real choice tomorrow when Congress meets on campaign finance reform is this: do we go with the Shays-Meehan bill which has gotten a lot of attention, and those two sponsors have worked very hard on behalf of that bill. I take nothing at all away from them. But my concern is that Shays-Meehan will pass the House again, not much of a margin, but it will pass again and it will die exactly where it died last year, in the Senate. They have debated it fully, they have had a great discussion on it; it is not going to pass the Senate. Even if it were, it could never pass constitutional muster. It would be struck down and never be the law of the land. I guess my concern is that each year we raise campaign finance reform and each year it fails.

I think we turn off another group of voters who are hoping for more of a citizen Congress, who want these changes. People say today, well, campaign finance reform does not rate very high in all of these polls they take by the day and the hour anymore around here. My thought is that I think people still want campaign finance reform. They want to change the way we do business in Washington. But I think they have given up hope that we will do it. I think they have given up belief that we will do something that makes life a little tougher on us, and it will; that gives more of a fair chance to challenges, and it will; that forces us out of Washington and back in our districts; more of a citizen Congress, and it will.

None of those are easy tasks, but it is the right thing to do, and rather than pass a bill forward that I sincerely know will die, and it will die again next year and it will die again the year after, I think the HUTCHINSON bill is a substantial, significant reform measure that can pass the Senate, that we know, we know can pass constitutional muster and can become the will of the land to start to restore that faith in what Washington is doing.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is a good measure, and I would say to the gentleman that I am here tonight mainly to tell him that with his integrity that was shown throughout the impeachment proceedings, the integrity shown throughout his service here in Congress and before in Arkansas, the gentleman has shown he is not afraid to take on the tough issues. I know that this is a balanced bill, it does not give an edge to our party, and I love being a Republican, but I am glad this does not give us an edge necessarily.

I do not think we ought to take one for the Democrats either. It ought to be balanced. The gentleman has worked hard to do that. I think this is a great, solid, significant step for people who still have hope that Washington will change, bring a little more moderation and balance into how we finance our campaigns. I appreciate the gentleman's leadership.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his remarks and his leadership on this important issue. In addition to my friend from Montana and my friend from Texas, we have had the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MORAN) who has been extraordinarily instrumental this year in moving this legislation forward, as well as the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HULSHOF) who is former president of the class, who has really pushed this legislation and has been a real leader on this effort.

The gentleman mentioned how we got here and where we started with this as a freshman class, when I think back about the process and the history as to how we got here. When we look back, whenever we first came here as freshmen, we were still warm from the campaign trail; we understood that there needed to be some changes, we understood what people were telling us to get up here and make a difference and work with our colleagues from the other side of the aisle. So I will never forget our first term whenever we had six Democrats from the freshman class and six Republicans from the freshman class that were assigned together to work out and hammer out together in a bipartisan fashion this legislation. So we met together. The gentleman from Maine (Mr. ALLEN) led the Democrat side, and I chaired the Republican side; and we met over a period of five months.

This is not something that happened quickly. As the gentleman mentioned, we heard from constitutional experts; we heard from the political party leaders, we heard from the ACLU and the National Right to Life. We heard from candidates. And through that process, we reached some conclusions as to what we needed to do to get this passed.

First of all, we said, if we are going to pass legislation, we have to avoid the extremes. That is what has killed reform in the past, is that everybody moved to their perfect bill, to their perfect idea which was usually sort of an extreme position over here and said, this is what is going to work, and we find out there was not anyone else who supported that position, or there was not a majority that did. So if we are going to pass something, we have to avoid the extremes in legislation. That is what we propose to do.

The second thing we have to do is we said we have to be realistic. We have to figure out what can pass this body, what can pass the Senate, and what can be signed into law. And as my friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) said, we have to follow the Constitution. We cannot just fight against the Supreme Court; we cannot just move in that direction and say we are going to ignore the First Amendment, we are going to hope that they change their position. We have to follow the Constitution, and that was the guideline that we had.

Finally, we said we have to seek common ground. If we are going to work, Democrats and Republicans together,

we seek the common ground, and those are the principles that we followed. The result was that we gave up some things that we wanted, but we came up with a bill that we genuinely believed in our hearts could pass this body, could pass the Supreme Court, could be signed into law and really change our society in terms of our campaigns.

So we did that, and we introduced the bill the last Congress, and we fought an enormous battle against our leadership many times. Our leadership was not excited about this. We said this is important for the people and so we have to stay engaged in this.

Finally, we moved this forward with other reformers and we had a huge debate on the floor of this House. We advocated for our bill, the freshman bill of the last Congress. There were our good friends, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS) and the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MEEHAN), who said well, ours is a better bill, and they worked very hard on their bill. It was what we considered not seeking the common ground, but going for that ideal, some of the extreme positions, and they said, give us a shot at this comprehensive reform. It will pass the Senate. We said, there is not the votes over in the Senate. They said give us a shot, give us a shot. So we sent that bill over to the Senate, and as was predicted, it could not break filibuster; it could not get the votes necessary and it died.

Once again, that increases the cynicism of the American people. It says, Congress cannot deal with this issue. So it tears our hearts out. We come back to this Congress, and I do not know about my friends, but I really see a change in America. I see that they are more interested in reform now than ever before. I would just like to yield to my colleagues to comment about what they are hearing in their town meetings, what the American people are telling them. That is the sense I get, is that they are more excited, but there is a real malaise in this Congress about it.

Could my friend from Montana comment?

Mr. HILL of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

One of the things that I believe is that oftentimes people do not say that they want campaign finance reform as high on their list of reforms more because I think they believe that Congress is incapable of reforming campaigns as opposed to what they really want. There is no doubt in the minds of the people that when I talk to that, they believe that there is something pretty wrong with the system the way it is now.

The gentleman was commenting earlier, the gentleman from Texas's comments that we have to follow the Constitution. I do not feel following the Constitution is an obligation; I think it is a privilege to follow the Constitution. There are some who have the arrogance to say that the Constitution gets in the way of how we would reform campaign finance laws. Some of my colleagues have proposed an amendment that would allow us to put restrictions on people's freedom of speech in order to change how we finance political campaigns.

The fact of the matter is, the tradition, the history of this country is that individuals and individual groups have a right to speak out about the political leadership in this country before we ever had the Constitution. The fact is that that is not only part of the Constitution, but a part of the tradition.

I just want to comment on one thing. Because what people are saying to me as much as anything, they are concerned about the abuse of soft money because they read about it in the paper; but they also know that today, elections are not competitive. They know that incumbents get reelected and the power of incumbency and the ability of the resources to gain reelection has created a tremendous advantage for incumbents. Many of the other reform measures, particularly the Shays-Meehan measure, my greatest objection to that bill is the fact that it does not do anything to help with competitive elections.

In fact, I met last week with one of the public interest groups that have been strong advocates for campaign finance reform, and I raised this objection to them. I said, but the problem with Shays-Meehan is that it does not do anything to get us back to competitive elections, and their comment to me was, so what? That is the way the system is now.

Well, if we are going to reform this system, one of the things that we should try to accomplish is to restore the idea that people can compete for elections. Now, there are two thoughts about that. One is public financing of elections. I do not happen to support that. The other is to allow people to get the resources from the party that they are affiliated with. That is what this bill does. This bill says there is no limit to how much your party can support you to help you get the resources to your campaign, but it has to be hard money; it has to be appropriate money.

Now, what the Shays-Meehan bill does and what the greatest flaw in it is it creates an environment where the parties are going to be competing with candidates for money. So what we are going to have is, parties will raise money and incumbents will raise money, but challengers are not going to be able to raise money. We know that is how the system will work.

Our bill fixes that by saying there will be a separate limit. Parties can raise a limit that they can use to support candidates, and candidates have a separate limit; and there is no money going back and forth between those. So it eliminates that competition. And by lifting the limits of support that parties can give to challenger races, it means we can have a competitive race in every district in America. That is what the goal of our bill ought to be.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, if I understand the point the gentleman is making, if you have an incumbent, a United States Congressman who has $1 million in his war chest, and he is very, very difficult to compete with financially and you have a challenger, he can raise money individually, but that the party can put more money into his campaign to make that race more competitive. Is that what you see in this bill?

Mr. HILL of Montana. Mr. Speaker, that is exactly right. As the gentleman knows, the Shays-Meehan bill perpetuates a situation where the parties cannot do that. So what happens around here, and you know that, is incumbents build these huge war chests and that discourages a challenger from ever entering the race because they know that they could never compete. One of the interesting things, if we study campaigns, is that challengers actually win with less money than incumbents do, but there is a certain minimum threshold that they have to get across. What most incumbents do is they try to keep their challenger from crossing that threshold.

Under this bill, under the bipartisan Campaign Integrity Act, every, every challenger out there would be assured of the opportunity to cross that threshold because their party could help them get over that threshold and we could have competitive elections again.

□ 2000

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to just go through the basic revisions of the bill and then yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) for some additional comments.

But so that my colleagues will understand, the Bipartisan Campaign Integrity Act does the most important thing, it addresses the enormous abuse in our system, which is to ban soft money to our national parties. This is where our Federal candidates, our Federal officers are going out and raising enormous sums of money usually in the chunks of $100,000, $200,000, sometimes $500,000 for the parties, and then it flows into the different campaigns through ads.

This has been the abuse in the 1996 election. It continues to be an enormous problem for our political system. So we ban that soft money to the national parties.

Then these people raise the objection that, well, how about if the State parties raise the soft money? We do not prohibit that. Well, the State parties try to do get out the vote efforts, some basic things that build the party structure, that help our candidates locally, but it has not been a problem.

But to make sure that it does not become a problem, we say that there cannot be any transfer of soft money from the State party that is using it for a get out the vote effort might have some excess cash and will transfer it from the national party. Well, they cannot do that. The national party

cannot take any soft money from the State parties or from anyone. It is prohibited. So we address that.

The second thing that we do is that we assist the parties. If we take this soft money away, we have to help the parties. So we help them to raise the hard money, we call it the honest money, the regulated money. So it increases the individual contributor limits to all candidates, PACs going to the parties from $25,000 per election to $25,000 per year. The contribution limits to the parties is raised.

As the gentleman from Montana (Mr. HILL) said, we remove the party candidate coordination limit. So we strengthen the parties, but it is all hard dollars. It is all the honest money.

Then we help the candidates out there. They have to raise the money. We finally help the individual by indexing the contribution limits for individuals to inflation. So as inflation goes up, it will not just erode that contribution limit, but we strengthen the role of individual by indexing it to inflation.

Then we increase disclosure. We are simply trying to provide the American public more information as to what the candidates are spending so that they are required to report more regularly, monthly, and more timely, and more information.

Then to the third party or the issue advocacy groups, they are required to disclose information as to who they are and how much money they are spending.

So we are providing information to individual voters out there to strengthen them in that way. We are reducing the influence of special interests by banning soft money to the national parties. Then we are strengthening the parties by allowing them to be able to raise the hard money, the honest dollars, according to the law much easier.

So I think that this is a good bill, is balanced, and this is the main provisions that we try to address.

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

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) for pointing out the key parts of this bill, because it is very reasonable. As he says, it puts a premium on hard money, which sounds like a hard phrase, but the principal of hard money is so sound for America.

What it says is that we think a contribution ought to come from a person, from their pocketbook, from what they have earned, what their family has decided to contribute to another person, to a party, to a cause that they believe strongly in. I want everything to be hard money. I want it to come from a person directly to a party, principle, a cause that they believe in.

I watch our Republican women's clubs in parties. Each year, they will host a fundraising, barbecue, or catfish fry, or silent auction that one will go to. They will work for 2, 3 months ahead of time. They will get a local business person to donate the food. They decorate the tables. There are silent auction items, quilts that they have made, local restaurants donate a dinner. They have got American prints. Flags have been flown over the Capitols, just good solid American products.

People are out there, and they get their neighbors to come to bid on these. Together, they might, they might net maybe $2,000, maybe $800 that they will net, they will make off one of these events after 2 or 3 months of hard work to give to their local candidates in their State and the people that they support.

To me, I put so much more value on that $800 or that $2,000 that has come in hard money from real people than a check written that same day for $200,000 from some company, some industry, some group that goes in soft money to one of the parties or some other direction. Because I really think for the future of democracy, for the citizen Congress, that hard money is so valuable long-term, getting people involved, keeping us close to the people that we represent.

Let me destroy two myths for my colleagues if people out there have bought into this at all that we hear quite a bit. One is that the Republicans and Congress do not support campaign finance reform. Everyone knows historically that the party that is in majority up here has tended to resist some of the reform because, frankly, they used the current system, they fought hard, played by the rules to get to that majority. So human nature says they are a bit resistant.

Since we had campaign finance reform under Richard Nixon, the Democrats held the House for more than two decades and resisted campaign finance reform for all that period, or most that period themselves. So, historically, whoever is in the majority tends to resist a bit, and those that are in the minority use it as campaign tools. So that is what has happened again. Do not believe this. We have found so many good solid Republicans who want to change the way business is done.

It is really to Speaker HASTERT's credit that he has scheduled a very reasonable timetable this year. Rather than rush into it, rather than just let one bill be anointed, Speaker HASTERT set a September timetable which was very fair. He said first things first, let us tackle our budget. Let us be the first Congress since 1974 to get our budget done in time. Let us focus on rebuilding our defense, on quality education, on local control, on tax relief. Let us make first things go first and schedule a good time for campaign finance reform.

Let us go through the committee process so that all the good ideas, and there are a lot of them, on campaign finance reform can be heard, which was done. Then the four major bills are set for debate tomorrow. I think that is a very fair timetable. We are already in the election process. If we made a change today in haste, we would only be giving the advantage to one person or another in these campaigns.

Rather than to rush through this, let us do it right. It is so important that we do it right, that we have a full and open debate. We are getting that. That is to Speaker HASTERT's credit. I am very proud that he has given us this opportunity.

Mr. HUTCHINSON. Mr. Speaker, I will make a few closing remarks here to my colleagues. Tomorrow's debate I believe is critically important for the Nation. I would like to think as a result of this debate we are going to pass out of this House a legislative proposal that will go to the Senate, that will garner the support necessary there, and be passed by the Senate, get over the filibuster, and be sent to the President.

But I am a realest here in this Congress, and I understand the battle we are up against. I know the temptation is, well, we passed Shays-Meehan out of the last Congress. Let us come back in and just cast the same vote. We had about 150 votes for our bill here, but the Shays-Meehan got the majority, and it went to the Senate, and it failed over there.

I would just make a comment here that I think is instructive that we can learn from it. I actually used this quote in the last debate in the last Congress. This was from RollCall, a publication here on Capitol Hill. It is dated August 6, 1998, a year ago, when we were engaged in this debate. It says, ''One leadership source said that the Republican leaders favored the Shays-Meehan bill going to the Senate because the Senate already voted on it, and it has no chance of passing. While the freshman bill would pose a slightly greater threat in the Senate because, when you offer something new, and streamline, it becomes a new fight.''

I just yearn for a new fight. I think that we ought to learn from our past mistakes. We gave the best shot for Shays-Meehan. It has been voted on in the Senate once. It has been voted twice. It has never broken the magic number in order to get it passed. So we do not know what would happen over there. But we do know what would happen if we repeat the same actions of the last Congress.

So I would just urge my colleagues to support reasonable, realistic, commonsense reform that addresses the greatest abuse in our campaign system. I believe the Campaign Integrity Act, the old freshman bill, is much wiser now since we are upper classmen. We have been here, but we are not frustrated. We are not cynical. We believe that we can do this for the American people.

If, perhaps, that we send this over to the Senate, we repeat the same action of the last Congress, we send Shays-Meehan over there once again, and they do not break filibuster, then that is three times. Perhaps then we can

take the ideas of this bill, we can work together in a common way, Democrats and Republicans, and we can move forward a bill and actually get it passed this Congress. It is still my goal. It is still my desire. It is my yearning, and I believe it is the yearning of the American public.

## THE INFLUENCE OF AERONAUTICAL RESEARCH ON MILITARY VICTORY

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

Mr. PICKETT. Mr. Speaker, early this year the nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the NATO alliance achieved a military victory in Yugoslavia. The military objective of the 3-month long campaign in the Yugoslav province of Kosovo was to drive the Serbian armed forces out of Kosovo.

This objective was achieved largely through the use of air power applied in a sophisticated and comprehensive manner. The bulk of the sorties flown were executed by fighter-bomber aircraft based in Italy between 200 and 300 miles away from their objectives in Yugoslavia.

These sorties were accomplished largely by F–15E, AF–8B, and F–16 aircraft operated by the United States, Belgium, the Netherlands, and other European countries, and Tornado attack aircraft operated by Great Britain and Germany and also French attack aircraft used by the Air Force of France.

In addition, heavy, long-range bombers, B–52s and B–1Bs based in England and B–52s based in Missouri delivered a substantial fraction of the weapons on the targets.

Finally, unpiloted reconnaissance aircraft were used extensively for the first time in this conflict.

Although air power has been a significant component of all warfare since 1939, it can be argued that this was the first campaign where air power was absolutely the dominant factor.

Given what has happened in Kosovo, it is a legitimate question to ask how the air power that achieved that victory was created. The record shows that it did not happen overnight. In 1944, the Commander in Chief of the U.S. Army Air Forces, General Henry H. (Hap) Arnold said, ''the first essential of air power is preeminence in research.'' The key word in this statement is research. It is important to understand how this research was performed, who paid for it, and how the results were used.

In 1917, a provision was put in the Naval appropriations bill to create a National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics called NACA because the inferiority of American aircraft during World War I was patently obvious, not a single airplane of American design or manufacture was used in combat during World War I.

The decision to create NACA changed that circumstance for all time. A research laboratory in Hampton, Virginia, the Samuel Pierpont Langley Aeronautical Laboratory was established a year later, and from then on, the United States of America has been preeminent in military aviation.

For a short period, the Germans and the Japanese built more airplanes than the United States during World War II. However, after less than 2 years, American air power emerged in vastly superior numbers with aircraft that were decisively superior in quality. The reason why the United States could accomplish this end was due in large measure to the research done in the laboratories of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics between the First and Second World Wars.

All-metal airplanes, efficient radial engines, accurate flight control systems that made dive-bombing possible were all developed during those years in the NACA laboratories with the assistance of the military.

A strong and independent civilian research agency had been created to advance knowledge in aeronautics. The chairman of the committee was always a civilian, but both the Commanding General of the Army Air Corps and the Chief of the Navy's Bureau of Aeronautics were statutory members of the committee. Thus, a close connection to the military was assured.

Things have changed since the end of the Second World War, but the aeronautical strength of the United States still depends on the successor institution to the NACA that was established after the end of the Second World War.

□ 2015

In 1958, the launch of the Sputnik by the Soviet Union as the first man-made object to orbit the Earth stimulated the creation of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, NASA. This organization consisted of all of the facilities of the old NACA plus some military facilities that were added to enhance the space mission of the new agency.

The National Aeronautics and Space Act of 1958 made the new agency responsible for continuing the support of military aviation. This most important mission has been successfully accomplished for the past 40 years and the results were evident in the Kosovo campaign.

The most successful fighter-bomber of the 20th century is undoubtedly the F–16. The facilities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration were used extensively during the decade of the 1970s to develop the flying qualities of this aircraft. Many thousands of hours of wind tunnel and flight simulator time were devoted to the creation of the F–16.

The former commander of the Israeli Air Force and the current president of the state of Israel, Ezer Weitzmann, has called the F–16 the ''Spitfire'' of the 1980s after flying the F–16 himself. Weitzmann became famous in 1948 when he flew a black painted ''Spitfire'' in the Israeli war of independence. Thousands of pilots across the world have agreed with his assessment.

The F–15 aircraft was also a product of NASA technology through the employment of NASA's extensive facilities. The conically cambered wing on the F–15 was a product of NASA research and the attack version of this airplane, the F–15 ''Strike Eagle,'' is one of the most potent attack aircraft in the world.

Finally, the concept of vertical takeoff in land combat aircraft originated in the United States and was picked up by British aerospace concerns. The first version of the aircraft that eventually became the ''Harrier,'' the ''Kestrel,'' was extensively tested in NASA facilities in the 1960s. The ''Harrier'' eventually evolved into the AV–8B, which was also tested extensively in NASA flight simulators and wind tunnels. The former was particularly important in developing the complex flight control system for this aircraft.

As previously mentioned, a remarkable feature of the Kosovo air campaign was that a significant fraction of the damage done on the ground was due to aircraft that were based more than a thousand miles from the combat zone. B–52 and B–1B bombers based in England delivered thousands of tons of bombs and other guided weapons on targets in Kosovo and Yugoslavia.

Even more impressive was the achievement of the stealthy B–2 aircraft which flew its missions from Whiteman Air Force Base in Missouri, 5,000 miles from the target zone. An F–16 can carry two thousand-pound bombs, and a B–1B can carry 24 of these so that a single mission by a B–1B bomber might be equivalent to 12 sorties by an F–16.

Both the B–1B and the B–2 were the creations of an industry supported by NASA facilities. Neither would have been built without thousands of hours of wind tunnel and simulator time devoted to them in government-owned NASA facilities.

Even more important was the application of NASA research results to both aircraft. These results range from aerodynamics, materials, and flight controls to the human factors that had to be considered to protect the pilots and the crew from the environments that they would face in accomplishing their missions.

Finally, the Kosovo campaign was the one in which unpiloted aircraft were extensively used for reconnaissance that turned out to be a decisive factor in the campaign. Unpiloted vehicles have been around for a long time and were used as target drones and as experimental test vehicles during experiments that traditionally involved the destruction of the vehicle.

However, recent advances once again pioneered by NASA in flight control

systems and in sensors have made it possible to use unpiloted vehicles for many other purposes. Probably the first application of unpiloted vehicles requiring sophisticated technology was the highly maneuverable aircraft test vehicle. This was a small, unpiloted aircraft with a sophisticated flight control system designed to perform experiments in maneuvering regimes that had not yet been explored with piloted aircraft. The experiments done by NASA with this vehicle during the 1970s demonstrated to all concerned the utility of unpiloted aircraft for sophisticated purposes.

In the last two decades, a large variety of unpiloted aircraft have been developed and with the recent advances in control systems and communication systems and in the ability to transmit intelligence data in real-time to command posts, unpiloted reconnaissance aircraft have come into their own.

A special example is the ''Predator'' unpiloted reconnaissance aircraft that played a very important role in Kosovo. In one incident, a ''Predator'' vehicle spotted a concentration of Serb troops on the ground and with accurate pictures transmitted by satellite link reported the concentration and its location to the command post. This information was then used to divert a flight of B–52 bombers that had already been on another mission to the troop concentration which was accurately located by the GPS signal transmitted by the ''Predator.''

The B–52s bombed the troops, killing most of them on the ground. This kind of coordinated attack with heavy bombers guided to the target using unpiloted aircraft and a sophisticated command and control system was a decisive element to secure the victory in this campaign.

The technology to do all of this could not have been developed without the aeronautical research performed in NASA's research centers. The research performed to create the aircraft systems described here dates back to the 1970s, somewhere between 20 and 30 years ago.

In 1970, the aeronautics budget of NASA was approximately 25 percent of the agency's budget, some $1 billion out of a total of $4 billion. It was this heavy investment in aeronautical technology that in a very real sense made the victory this year in Kosovo possible.

Today, however, we have a very serious problem. The aeronautics budget in NASA today is a much smaller fraction than it was in 1970, about $2 billion out of $14 billion or just 14 percent. In terms of spending power when inflation is factored into this calculation, NASA's investment in aeronautical research today is about half of what it was 30 years ago.

One result of this massive reduction in aeronautical research has been that many important NASA aeronautical research facilities have had to be shut down entirely or perhaps mothballed. This has forced some U.S. aerospace firms to use European facilities. More important, it has become difficult to attract the best talent into NASA's aeronautical research enterprises.

In the past year, this situation has reached the crisis stage because further reductions in NASA's aeronautics research are now being proposed. In view of this circumstance, it is legitimate to ask the question where the knowledge and the technology will come from to make victory possible in another Kosovo perhaps 20 years from now.

The sad fact is that we are no longer making the investments necessary to maintain the kind of Air Force that has the capability that we have today. This situation can only be changed by reversing the trend in aeronautical research funding and reinvesting in this critically important technology. An investment in NASA aeronautics program of about $4 billion annually is what is required to maintain our effort.

General Arnold's statement of more than half a century ago is as valid as it is was then. The security of the United States and the stability of the world depend on a relatively small investment in advanced aeronautical technology so that NASA can continue to do the work which will allow the United States to maintain its leadership and superiority in military aviation.

I urge all Members to support this effort.

## LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. CARSON (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business.

Mr. HASTINGS of Florida (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today on account of official business.

Mr. WICKER (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of official business.

Mr. MANZULLO (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of illness.

Mr. ROGAN (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of a death in the family.

Mr. SHAW (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today on account of official business.

Mr. KINGSTON (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today and September 14 on account of impending Hurricane Floyd.

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

Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. RUSH, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. MCGOVERN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. CUMMINGS, for 5 minutes, today.

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

Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin, for 5 minutes, September 15.

Mr. METCALF, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. EHLERS, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WELDON of Florida, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. FOSSELLA, for 5 minutes, today.

## ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, September 14, 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:

4020. A letter from the Administrator, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Flood Compensation Program (RIN: 0560–AF57) received September 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4021. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Horses From Morocco; Change in Disease Status [Docket No. 98–055–2] received September 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4022. A letter from the Administrator, Farm Service Agency, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Small Hog Operation Payment Program (RIN: 0560–AF70) received September 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4023. A letter from the Administrator, Agricultural Marketing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule—Milk in the New England and Other Marketing Areas; Order Amending the Orders [DA–97–12] received September 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4024. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Avermectin B1 and its delta-8, 9-isomer; Pesticide Tolerance [OPP–300916; FRL–6380–7] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received September 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4025. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Chlorfenapyr; Re-Establishment of Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [OPP–300910; FRL–6095–8] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received August 26, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4026. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information,

Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Cymoxanil; Extension of Tolerance for Emergency Exemptions [OPP–300903; FRL–6094–4] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received August 26, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4027. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Difenoconazole; Pesticide Tolerances for Emergency Exemptions [OPP–300904; FRL–6094–3] (RIN: 2070–AB78) received August 26, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

4028. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Department's final rule—Section 8 Tenant-Based Assistance; Statutory Merger of Section 8 Certification and Voucher Programs: Change in Effective Date [Docket No. FR–4428–N–02] (RIN: 2577–AB91) received August 24, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

4029. A letter from the Assistant to the Board, Federal Reserve Board, transmitting the Board's final rule—Truth in Savings [Regulation DD; Docket No. R–1003] received September 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

4030. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule—Training of Interpreters for Individuals Who Are Deaf or Hard of Hearing and Individuals Who Are Deaf-Blind—received August 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

4031. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Office of Postsecondary Education, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final rule—William D. Ford Federal District Loan Program (RIN: 1840–AC68) received September 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

4032. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, Department of Education, Office of the Chief Financial Officer, transmitting the Department's final rule—Administration of Grants and Agreements with Institutions of Higher Education, Hospitals, and Other Non-Profit Organizations; Direct Grant Programs; State-Administered Programs; Definitions that Apply to Department Regulations; Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements to State and Local Governments; Protection of Human Subjects; Student Rights in Research, Experimental Programs and Testing; Family Educational Rights and Privacy—Received August 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

4033. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Department of Education, Office of Postsecondary Education, transmitting the Department's final rule—Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants Program (RIN: 1840–AC67) received August 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

4034. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulations, Department of Education Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Projects With Industry—received August 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

4035. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Indirect Food Additives: Polymers [Docket No. 96F–0176] received August 26, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4036. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—General and Plastic Surgery Devices; Effective Date of Requirement for Premarket Approval of the Silicone Inflatable Breast Prosthesis [Docket No. 91N–0281] (RIN: 0910–AZ17) received August 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4037. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Indirect Food Additives: Adhesives and Components of Coating [Docket No. 99F–0487] received September 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4038. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Food Additives Permitted in the Feed and Drinking Water of Animals; Menadione Nicotinamide Bisulfite [Docket No. 94F–0283] received September 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4039. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Food Additives Permitted in the Feed and Drinking Water of Animals; Menadione Nicotinamide Bisulfite [Docket No. 98F–0195] received September 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4040. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans Tennessee: Approval of Revisions to the Tennessee State Implementation Plan [TN 190–9930a; TN 196–9931a; FRL–6433–4] received September 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4041. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; Maryland; Control of Emissions from Existing Municipal Solid Waste Landfills [MD–091–3041a; FRL–6433–7] received September 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4042. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Texas: Final Authorization and Incorporation by Reference of State Hazardous Waste Management Program [FRL–6422–1] received August 26, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4043. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Louisiana: Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions [FRL–6428–6] received August 26, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4044. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Implementation Plans: Alaska [AK–21–1709-a; FRL–6412–7] received August 26, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4045. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementations; Ohio Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; Ohio [OH 121–1c; FRL–6425–1] received August 26, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4046. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Commonwealth of Virginia; Enhanced Inspection & Maintenance Program [VA092/098–5044; FRL–6428–8] received August 26, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4047. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Massachusetts; Volatile Organic Compound Regulation [MA–19–01–5892a; A–1–FRL–6421–8] received August 30, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4048. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; California—Owens Valley Nonattainment Area; PM–10 [CA–221–158; FRL–6430–7] received August 30, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4049. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Delaware; Approval of Miscellaneous Revisions [DE101–1–25a; FRL–6434–6] received September 7, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4050. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; California State Implementation Plan Revision, Mojave Desert Air Quality Management District and Tehama County Air Pollution Control District [CA 192–0161; FRL–6434–2] received September 7, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4051. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Final Rule Making a Finding of Failure to Submit a Required State Implementation Plan for Carbon Monoxide; Nevada—Las Vegas Valley [FRL–6434–4] received September 7, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4052. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Final Authorization of State Hazardous Waste Management Program Revision [FRL–6430–4] received August 26, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4053. A letter from the 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 (Judsonia, Arkansas) [MM Docket No. 99–98;

RM–9483] (Del Norte, Colorado) [MM Docket No. 99–148; RM–9556] (Dinosaur, Colorado) [MM Docket No. 99–149; RM–9557] (Poncha Springs, Colorado) [MM Docket No. 99–150; RM–9558] (Captain Cook, Hawaii) [MM Docket No. 99–152; RM–9560] received September 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4054. A letter from the Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Policy and Rules Division, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Review of the Commission's Regulations Governing Television Broadcasting [MM Docket No. 91–221] Television Satellite Stations Review of Policy and Rules [MM Docket No. 87–8] received August 31, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4055. A letter from the Chief, Mass Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Department's final rule—Review of the Commission's Regulations Governing Attribution of Broadcast and Cable/MDS Interests [MM Docket No. 94–150] Review of the Commission's Regulations and Policies Affecting Investment in the Broadcast Industry [MM Docket 92–51] Reexaminiation of the Commission's Cross-Interest Policy [MM Docket No. 87–154] received August 31, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4056. A letter from the Attorney, Advisor, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Child Restraint Systems; Child Restraint Anchorage Systems [Docket No. NHTSA–99–6160] (RIN: 2127–AH65) received August 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4057. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Changes to Requirements for Environmental Review for Renewal of Nuclear Power Plant Operating Licenses (RIN: 3150–AG05) received September 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4058. A letter from the Secretary, Division of Investment Management, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule—Personal Investment Company Personnel [Release Nos. 33-7728, IC–23958, IA–1815; File No. S7–25–95] (RIN: 3235–AG27) received September 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

4059. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting notification that the national emergency declared by Executive Order 12924 has been extended, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1622(d); (H. Doc. No. 106–118); to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed.

4060. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a 6-month periodic report on the national emergency declared by Executive Order 12924 of August 19, 1994, to deal with the threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States caused by the lapse of the Export Administration Act of 1979, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); (H. Doc. No. 106–119); to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed.

4061. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the President's bimonthly report on progress toward a negotiated settlementof the Cyprus question, covering the period February 1999 and March 1999, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2373(c); (H. Doc. No. 106–120); to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed.

4062. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting Progress toward a negotiated settlement of the Cyprus question covering the period June 1 to July 31, 1999, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2373(c); (H. Doc. No. 106–121); to the Committee on International Relations and ordered to be printed.

4063. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report on proliferation of missiles and essential components of nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2751 nt.; to the Committee on International Relations.

4064. A letter from the Executive Director, Committee For Purchase From People Who Are Blind Or Severely Disabled, transmitting the Committee's final rule—Procurement List Additions and Deletions—received August 16, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

4065. A letter from the Executive Director, Committee For Purchase From People Who Are Blind Or Severely Disabled, transmitting the Committee's final rule—Procurement List Addition—received August 16, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Government Reform.

4066. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Office of Migratory Bird Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Migratory Bird Permits; Amended Certification of Compliance and Determination that the States of Vermont and West Virginia Meet Federal Falconry Standards (RIN: 1018–AE65) received September 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4067. A letter from the Director, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Final Endangered Status for 10 Plant Taxa from Maui Nui, Hawaii (RIN: 1018–AE22) received September 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4068. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Fish and Wildlife and Parks, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule—Migratory Bird Hunting; Final Approval of Tungsten-Iron and Tungsten-Polymer Shots and Temporary Approval of Tungsten-Matrix and Tin Shots as Nontoxic for Hunting Waterfowl and Coots (RIN: 1018–AF65) received August 16, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4069. A letter from the Acting Assistant Administrator For Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule—Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Snapper-Grouper Fishery Off the Southern Atlantic States; Closure of the Red Porgy Fishery [Docket No. 990823235–9235–01; I.D. 061699F] (RIN: 0648–AM55) received September 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4070. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock by Vessels Catching Pollock for Processing by the Inshore Component in the Bering Sea Subarea [Docket No. 990304063–9063–01; I.D. 082699E] received September 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4071. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Coastal Migratory Pelagic Resources of the Gulf of Mexico and South Atlantic; Closure [Docket No. 990506120–9220; I.D. 082399b] received August 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4072. A letter from the 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 in the Central Regulatory Area in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 990304062–9062–01; I.D. 081799D] received August 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4073. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Marine Fisheries Service, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Economic Exclusive Zone Off Alaska; Groundfish Fisheries by Vessels Using Hook-and-Line Gear in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 990304062–9062; I.D. 081799E] received August 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4074. A letter from the 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, Scup, and Black Sea Bass Fisheries; Adjustments to the 1999 Summer Flounder Commercial Quota [Docket No. 981014259–8312–02; I.D. 081199A] received August 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4075. A letter from the 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; Vessels Catching Pollock for Processing by the Inshore Component in the Bering Sea Subarea [Docket No. 990304063–9063–01; I.D. 081899A] received August 24, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4076. 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; Halibut Bycatch Mortality Allowance in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No. 99030463–9063–01; I.D. 072199B] received August 24, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

4077. A letter from the Assistant Secretary For Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's final rule—VISAS: Regulations Regarding Public Charge Requirements under the Immigration and Nationality Act, as Amended [Public Notice 2903] (RIN: 1400–AA79) received September 7, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

4078. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment to Class E Airspace; Nevada, MO [Airspace Docket No. 99–ACE–40] received September 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4079. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 737–100, –200, –300, –400, and –500 Series Airplanes [Docket No.

99–NM–187–AD; Amendment 39–11283; AD 99–18–17] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received September 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4080. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Revision to the Legal Description of the Riverside, March Air Force Base (AFB), Class C Airspace Area; CA [Airspace Docket No. 99–AWA–1] (RIN: 2120–AA66) received September 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4081. A letter from the Program Assistant, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Bell Helicopter Textron, A Division of Textron Canada, Model 206L, L–1, L–3, and L–4 Helicopters [Docket No. 99–SW–30–AD; Amendment 39–11265; AD 99–17–19] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received August 24, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4082. A letter from the Program Assistant, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Allison Engine Company, Inc AE 2100A and AE 2100C Series Turboprop Engines [Docket No. 99–NE–14–AD; Amendment 39–11257; AD 99–17–09] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received August 24, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4083. A letter from the Senior Attorney, Office of the Secretary, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Petitions Involving the Effective Dates of the Disclosure of Code-Sharing Arrangements and Long-Term Wet Leases Final Rule, and the Disclosure of Change-of-Guage Services Final Rule [Docket Nos. OST–95–179, OST–95–623, and OST–95–177] (RIN: 2105–AC10, 2105–AC17) received September 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4084. A letter from the Program Assistant, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Pratt & Whitney PW4000 Series Turbofan Engines [Docket No. 99–NE–22–AD; Amendment 39–11263; AD 99–17–16] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received August 24, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4085. A letter from the Program Assistant, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; MD Helicopters, Inc. Model 600N Helicopters [Docket No. 98–SW–16–AD; Amendment 39–11264; AD 99–17–18] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received August 24, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4086. A letter from the Program Assistant, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier Model DHC–8 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99–NM–55–AD; Amendment 39–11262; AD 99–17–14] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received August 24, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4087. A letter from the Program Assistant, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 757–200 and -300 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99–NM–06–AD; Amendment 39–11266; AD 99–17–20] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received August 24, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4088. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Pilatus Aircraft Ltd. Models PC–12 and PC–12/45 Airplanes [Docket No. 99–CE–10–AD; Amendment 39–11256; AD 99–17–08] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received August 24, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4089. A letter from the Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Amendment of Class E Airspace; Fort Rucker, AL [Airspace Docket No. 99–ASO–11] received August 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4090. A letter from the Program Assistant, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Removal of Class E Airspace: Arlington, TN [Airspace Docket 99–ASO–16] received August 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4091. A letter from the Program Assistant, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Establishment of Class D Airspace; Tupelo, MS [Airspace Docket No. 99–ASO–10] received August 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4092. A letter from the Program Assistant, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification of Class E Airspace; Sheridan, IN [Airspace Docket No. 99–AGL–31] received August 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4093. A letter from the Program Assistant, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification of Class E Airspace; Minneapolis, MN [Airspace Docket No. 99–AGL–33] received August 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4094. A letter from the Program Assistant, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification of Class E Airspace; Eau Claire, WI [Airspace Docket No. 99–AGL–28] received August 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4095. A letter from the Program Assistant, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification of Class E Airspace; La Crosse, WI [Airspace Docket No. 99–AGL–29] received August 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4096. A letter from the Program Assistant, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Modification of Class E Airspace Mankato, MN [Airspace Docket No. 99–AGL–30] received August 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4097. A letter from the Program Assistant, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Boeing Model 737–700 and -800 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99–NM–179–AD; Amendment 39–11267; AD 99–18–01] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received August 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4098. A letter from the Program Assistant, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; British Aerospace Model BAe 146 and Model Avro 146–RJ Series Airplanes [Docket No. 97–NM–129–AD; Amendment 39–11260; AD 99–17–12] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received August 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4099. A letter from the Chief, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, USCG, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Safety Zone: Chelsea Street Bridge Fender System Repair, Chelsea River, Chelsea, MA [CGD1–99–141] (RIN: 215–AA97) received August 24, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4100. A letter from the Program Assistant, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A319, A320, and A321 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 96–NM–29–AD; Amendment 39–11259; AD 99–17–11] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received August 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4101. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Pharmaceutical Manufacturing Category Effluent Limitations Guidelines, Pretreatment Standards, and New Source Performance Standards; Correcting Amendments [FRL–6431–8] (RIN: 2040–AA13) received August 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4102. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Israel Aircraft Industries, Ltd., Model Astra SPX Series Airplanes [Docket No. 99–NM–204–AD; Amendment 39–11254; AD 99–17–05] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received August 24, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4103. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Model A310 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 93–NM–125–AD; Amendment 39–11255; AD 99–17–06] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received August 24, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4104. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Empresa Brasileira de Aeronautica S.A. (EMBRAER) Model EMB–120 Series Airplanes [Docket No. 98–NM–233–AD; Amendment 39–11253; AD 99–17–04] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received August 24, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4105. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Schweizer Aircraft Corporation Model 269A, 269A–1, 269B, 269C, 269C–1 and 269D Helicopters [Docket No. 99–SW–31–AD; Amendment 39–11258; AD 99–17–10] (RIN: 2120–AA64) received August 24, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4106. A letter from the Program Analyst, Office of the Chief Counsel, Federal Aviation Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Amendment to Class E Airspace; Frederick Municipal Airport, MD [Airspace Docket No. 99–AEA–04FR] received August 24, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4107. A letter from the Chairman, Surface Transportation Board, transmitting the Board's final rule—Expedited Procedures For Processing Rail Rate Reasonableness, Exemption and Revocation Proceedings—received September 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4108. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel, Small Business Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Liquidation of Collateral and Sale of Commercial Loans—received September 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Small Business.

4109. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulations Management, Office of General Counsel, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule—Delegations of Authority; Tort Claims (RIN: 2900–AJ31) received September 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

4110. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Branch, Customs Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Textiles and Textile Products; Denial of Entry [T.D. 99–68] (RIN: 1515–AC94) received September 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4111. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Branch, Customs Service, Department of Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule—Accreditation of Commercial Testing Laboratories; Approval of Commercial Gaugers [T.D. 99–67] (RIN: 1515–AB60) received September 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4112. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Start-up Expenditures [Announcement 99–89] received August 20, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4113. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—BLS–LIFO Department Stores Indexes—July 1999—received September 3, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4114. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Capital Gains, Installment Sales, Unrecaptured Section 1250 Gain [TD 8836] (RIN: 1545–AW85) received August 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4115. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Coordinated Issue: All Industries-Research Tax Credit-Internal Use Software [UIL: 41.51–10] received August 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4116. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Coordinated Issue: All Industries-Research Tax Credit-Qualified Research [UIL 41.51–11] received August 27, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4117. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Determination of Issue Price in the Case of Certain Debt Instruments Issued for Property [Rev. Rul. 99–37] received August 24, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4118. A letter from the Chief, Regulations Unit, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final rule—Treatment of Distributions to Foreign Persons Under Sections 367(e) and 367(e)(2) [TD 8834] (RIN: 1545–AU22 and 1545–AX30] received August 24, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

4119. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans Kentucky: Approval of Revisions to the Louisville State Implementation Plan [KY–75–1–9910a; KY–97–1–9911a; FRL–6435–4] received September 7, 1999, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); jointly to the Committees on Commerce and Commerce.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. Shuster: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. H.R. 2681. A bill to establish a program, coordinated by the National Transportation Safety Board, of assistance to families of passengers involved in rail passenger accidents (Rept. 106–313). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. Shuster: Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. House Concurrent Resolution 171. Resolution congratulating the American Public Transit Association for 25 years of commendable service to the transit industry and the Nation (Rept. 106–314). Referred to the House Calendar.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BASS:

H.R. 2839. A bill to amend the Act which established the Saint-Gaudens National Historic Site, in the State of New Hampshire, by modifying the boundary, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. UPTON (for himself and Mr. WAXMAN):

H.R. 2840. A bill to amend title V of the Social Security Act to provide for the establishment and operation of asthma treatment services for children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mrs. CHRISTENSEN (for herself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, and Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California):

H.R. 2841. A bill to amend the Revised Organic Act of the Virgin Islands to provide for greater fiscal autonomy consistent with other United States jurisdictions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. CUMMINGS (for himself, Ms. NORTON, and Mrs. MORELLA):

H.R. 2842. A bill to amend chapter 89 of title 5, United States Code, concerning the Federal Employees Health Benefits (FEHB) Program, to enable the Federal Government to enroll an employee and his or her family in the FEHB Program when a State court orders the employee to provide health insurance coverage for a child of the employee but the employee fails to provide the coverage; to the Committee on Government Reform.

By Mr. HAYES (for himself and Mr. FLETCHER):

H.R. 2843. A bill to provide emergency assistance to farmers and ranchers in the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committees on the Budget, and International Relations, 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. ISTOOK:

H.R. 2844. A bill to direct the Secretary of Energy to convey to the city of Bartlesville, Oklahoma, the former site of the NIPER facility of the Department of Defense; to the Committee on Science.

By Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky:

H.R. 2845. A bill to encourage the use of technology in the classroom; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California:

H.R. 2846. A bill to confer citizenship posthumously on Jose J. Casillas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TRAFICANT:

H.R. 2847. A bill to provide for the appointment of an independent counsel to investigate if there were violations of Federal law in the raid on the Branch Davidian compound in Waco, Texas; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma (for himself, Mr. TALENT, Mr. LEACH, and Mr. BAKER) (all by request):

H.R. 2848. A bill to amend the Small Business Investment Act of 1958 and the Small Business Act to establish a New Markets Venture Capital Program, to establish an America's Private Investment Company Program, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish a New Markets Tax Credit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and Small Business, 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 Ms. CARSON (for herself, Mr. WATT of North Carolina, Mrs. MORELLA, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. CAPPS, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. LEE, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. RANGEL, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RUSH, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. WYNN, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. WATERS, Mr. CLAY, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Ms. BERKLEY, Ms. MCKINNEY, Mr. CLYBURN, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. FORD, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. FATTAH, Mr. OWENS, Mr. BISHOP, Mrs. CHRISTENSEN, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. SCOTT, Mr. DIXON, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. TOWNS, and Mrs. MALONEY of New York):

H. Res. 287. A resolution to commend Serena Williams on winning the 1999 U.S. Open Women's Singles and Doubles championships; to the Committee on Government Reform.

## ADDITIONAL SPONORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 110: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 133: Ms. PELOSI.
H.R. 188: Mr. PAUL.
H.R. 274: Mrs. BONO and Mr. GALLEGLY.

H.R. 354: Mr. MATSUI.

H.R. 443: Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. LARSON, and Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 505: Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 534: Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma, and Mr. NUSSLE.

H.R. 585: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 590: Ms. STABENOW.

H.R. 623: Mr. LUCAS of Oklahoma.

H.R. 664: Mr. BLAGOJEVICH.

H.R. 673: Mr. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 712: Mr. PAUL.

H.R. 713: Mr. FOLEY and Mr. PAUL.

H.R. 782: Mr. SHUSTER.

H.R. 783: Mr. GILCHREST and Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.

H.R. 797: Mr. LAHOOD, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LARSON, Mr. PORTER, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, Mr. BOEHLERT, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, and Mr. STRICKLAND.

H.R. 810: Mr. CALLAHAN.

H.R. 860: Mr. LAHOOD.

H.R. 919: Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MINGE, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, and Ms. BROWN of Florida.

H.R. 933: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 997: Mr. MOORE and Mrs. BONO.

H.R. 1071: Mr. FROST and Mr. BROWN of Ohio.

H.R. 1080: Mr. BLAGOJEVICH and Mr. KING.

H.R. 1102: Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 1111: Mr. BARCIA and Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 1115: Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. BAKER, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. HANSEN, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 1145: Mr. HEFLEY.

H.R. 1193: Mr. ISAKSON and Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut.

H.R. 1221: Mr. BURR of North Carolina, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, and Mr. MCINTYRE.

H.R. 1228: Mr. MARKEY and Mr. HOLT.

H.R. 1248: Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. COOK.

H.R. 1283: Mr. ROGAN, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. SWEENEY, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, and Mr. PACKARD.

H.R. 1322: Mr. PAUL.

H.R. 1355: Ms. KAPTUR.

H.R. 1366: Mr. KOLBE and Mr. BARCIA.

H.R. 1409: Mr. PAUL.

H.R. 1413: Mrs. CHENOWETH.

H.R. 1432: Mr. GEJDENSON, Mrs. MORELLA, and Mr. SANDLIN.

H.R. 1505: Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. DANNER, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California, Mr. BOYD, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. SHOWS, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. GORDON, and Mr. BERRY.

H.R. 1593: Mr. GREEN of Wisconsin and Mr. HOSTETTLER.

H.R. 1620: Mr. COOK.

H.R. 1685: Mr. COOK.

H.R. 1728: Mrs. EMERSON and Mr. FROST.

H.R. 1731: Mr. CANNON.

H.R. 1747: Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 1798: Mr. DEUTSCH and Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1814: Mr. LUCAS of Kentucky, Mr. COOK, Mrs. BIGGERT, and Mr. SHIMKUS.

H.R. 1870: Mr. HOSTETTLER.

H.R. 1883: Mr. GEPHARDT, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, Mr. HUTCHINSON, and Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 1916: Mr. RANGEL.

H.R. 1926: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. WEINER, Mr. RILEY, Mr. GOSS, Mr. BAKER, Mrs. BONO, Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GORDON, Mr. LAZIO, and Mr. MINGE.

H.R. 1933: Mr. MCKEON.

H.R. 2066: Mr. OXLEY, Ms. BROWN of Florida, Mr. COOK, Mr. METCALF, Mr. BARCIA, and Mr. WU.

H.R. 2130: Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin.

H.R. 2149: Mr. WISE.

H.R. 2170: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. WISE, Mrs. JONES of Ohio, Mr. DEUTSCH, and Mr. HALL of Ohio.

H.R. 2221: Mr. GARY MILLER of California and Mr. NEY.

H.R. 2247: Mrs. CHENOWETH and Mr. COOK.

H.R. 2319: Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 2325: Mr. CARDIN.

H.R. 2338: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 2364: Mr. PITTS and Mr. PAUL.

H.R. 2403: Mr. LAHOOD and Mr. UDALL of Colorado.

H.R. 2455: Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri.

H.R. 2662: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 2673: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 2691: Mr. JEFFERSON.

H.R. 2720: Mr. ISAKSON, Mr. BARCIA, and Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 2736: Mr. SHOWS, Mr. GALLEGLY, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. FILNER, Ms. CARSON, Mr. ENGLISH, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. FROST, Mr. GUTIERREZ, and Mr. DOYLE.

H.R. 2788: Mr. LATHAM and Mr. NUSSLE.

H.R. 2792: Mr. CRAMER.

H.R. 2808: Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

H.R. 2814: Mr. WELDON of Pennsylvania, Mr. RADANOVICH, and Mrs. CAPPS.

H.J. Res. 59: Mr. TALENT and Mrs. EMERSON.

H. Con. Res. 77: Mr. DEUTSCH.

H. Res. 16: Mr. MINGE.

H. Res. 41: Mr. GIBBONS.

H. Res. 285: Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. UDALL of Colorado, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. BERMAN, Mr. WU, and Mr. TIERNEY.